122 h6

A GENERAL

DICTIONARY,

Hiſtorical and Critical:

IN WHICH

A New and Accurate TRANSLATION
of that of the Celebrated

Mr. BAYLE,

WITH THE

CORRECTIONS and OBSERVATIONS printed in the late Edition at *Paris*, is included; and interſperſed with ſeveral thouſand LIVES never before publiſhed.

The whole containing the Hiſtory of the moſt illuſtrious Perſons of all Ages and Nations, particularly thoſe of *Great Britain* and *Ireland*, diſtinguiſhed by their Rank, Actions, Learning and other Accompliſhments.

With Reflections on ſuch Paſſages of Mr. BAYLE, as ſeem to favour *Scepticiſm* and the *Manichee* Syſtem.

By the Reverend Mr. JOHN PETER BERNARD;
The Reverend Mr. THOMAS BIRCH;
Mr. JOHN LOCKMAN;
And other HANDS.

And the Articles relating to ORIENTAL HISTORY
By GEORGE SALE, Gent.

VOLUME II.

LONDON,
Printed by *James Bettenham*,
For G. STRAHAN, J. CLARKE, T. HATCHET in *Cornhill*; J. GRAY in the *Poultry*; J. BATLEY in *Pater-Noſter-Row*; T. WORRALL, J. SHUCKBURGH in *Fleetſtreet*; J. WILCOX, A. MILLAR, in the *Strand*; T. OSBORNE in *Grays-Inn*; J. BRINDLEY in *New Bond-ſtreet*; C. CORBET without *Temple-Bar*; C. WARD and R. CHANDLER at the *Ship* between the *Temple Gates*, and ſold at their Shop in SCARBOROUGH.

MDCCXXXV.

A DICTIONARY:

GENERAL

HISTORICAL AND CRITICAL:

IN WHICH

A NEW AND ACCURATE TRANSLATION

OF THAT OF THE CELEBRATED

MR. BAYLE,

WITH THE

ADDITIONS AND CORRECTIONS printed

IN THE LATE EDITION AT PARIS, IS INCLUDED: AND INTERSPERSED

WITH SEVERAL THOUSAND LIVES never before published.

THE WHOLE CONTAINING THE HISTORY OF THE MOST ILLUSTRIOUS PERSONS OF ALL AGES

AND NATIONS INTERMINGLED OF GREAT BRITAIN AND IRELAND, DISTINGUISHED

BY PROPER HEADS, ADDED, LETTERS AND OTHER ACCOMPLISHMENTS.

WITH REFLECTIONS ON EACH PASSAGE OF MR. BAYLE, AS FAR AS TO FAVOUR RELIGION AND

THE MANNERS OF MEN.

By the Ingenious Mr. THOMAS BIRCH.

AND OTHER HANDS.

VOLUME II.

LONDON:

Printed by James Bettenham.

For C. Harper, J. Clarke, J. Hatchet in Cornhill; J. Cleve in the Temple; J. Batley in Paternoster-Row; T. Worrall, J. Shuckburgh in Holborn; J. Wilcox, A. Millar, in the Strand; T. Osborne, in Gray's-Inn; J. Peele in Ave Maria-Lane; C. Corbett, without Temple-Bar; C. Ward, and R. Chandler, at the Black Boy in Pater-Noster-Row.

MDCCXXXVI.

TO

RICHARD MEAD M.D.

Fellow of the COLLEGE of PHYSICIANS,

AND OF THE

ROYAL SOCIETY,

AND

PHYSICIAN to his MAJESTY;

This SECOND VOLUME of the

GENERAL DICTIONARY,

Hiſtorical and Critical,

Is Dedicated by

His moſt Obliged and moſt

Obedient Humble Servants,

The Authors.

The Author.

Obedient Humble Servant

His most Obliged and most

Is Dedicated by

Historical and Critical

GENERAL DICTIONARY

This SECOND VOLUME of the

PHYSICIAN to his MAJESTY:

AND

ROYAL SOCIETY,

AND OF THE

Fellow of the COLLEGE of PHYSICIANS,

RICHARD MEAD M.D.

TO

A GENERAL DICTIONARY Hiſtorical and Critical.

☞ ANGELIS (DOMINICO DE), author of ſeveral pieces relating to the hiſtory of Literature [*A*], was born the 14th of October 1675 at Lecce, the capital of Otranto in the Kingdom of Naples, of one of the nobleſt and moſt conſiderable families of that city. He began his ſtudies of polite Learning, Philoſophy, Divinity, and Civil Law in that city; and at ſeventeen years of age went to finiſh them at Naples, where he applied himſelf likewiſe to the Greek tongue and Geometry. Having made himſelf maſter of theſe parts of Learning, he removed to Macerata, and was admitted Doctor of Law there. The deſire of improving his mind, and enlarging his knowledge of things, induced him afterwards to travel into France and Spain, and he raiſed himſelf a great reputation wherever he went. Several Academies of Italy were ambitious of procuring him for a member, and therefore we find his name not only in thoſe of Trasformati and Spioni of Lecce, but likewiſe in that of the Inveſtiganti of Naples, in that of Florence, and that of the Arcadians at Rome, into which he was admitted the 8th of Auguſt 1698. He received holy Orders very early, and was afterwards Canon and Grand Penitentiary of the Church of Lecce, Vicar General of Vieſti, Gallipoli, and Gragnano; firſt Chaplain of the Troops of the Kingdom of Naples and of the Pope, Auditor of M. Nicholas Negroni, and afterwards of the Cardinal

[*A*] *Author of ſeveral pieces relating to the Hiſtory of Literature.*] I. *Diſſertazione intorna alla patria di Ennio*; i. e. A Diſſertation upon the country of Ennius." Rome 1701, in 8vo, pagg. 55. Florence 1712, in 8vo. This ſecond Edition, in which are ſeveral additions, was printed at Naples, tho' the title ſays at Florence. The Author endeavours to prove, that the town of Rudia two miles from Lecce, and not Rudia near Tarento was the country of that Poet. II. *Vita di Monſignor Roberto Caracciolo, Veſcovo d'Aquino e di Lecce*; i. e. "The Life of "Signior Roberto Caracciolo, Biſhop of Aquino and "Lecce." Naples 1703 in 4to. And among the Lives of the *Letterati Salentini*, firſt part, p. 1. III. *Della Vita di Scipione Ammirato, Patrizio Leccheſe, libri tre*; i. e. "The Life of Scipio Ammirato, a Patrician "of Lecce, in three books." Lecce 1706, in 8vo, and in the firſt part of the *Vite de' Letterati Salentini*. IV. *Vita di Antonio Caraccio, da Nardo*; i. e. "The "Life of Antonio Caraccio of Nardo;" It is publiſhed among the *Vite de gli Arcadi Illuſtri*, Tom. 1, p. 141, and the *Vite de' Letterati Salentini*, firſt part. V. *Vita di Andrea Peſchiulli, da Corigliano*; i. e. "The Life of Andrew Peſchiulli, of Corigliano." Inſerted in the abovementioned Collections. VI. *Vita di Giacomo Antonio Ferrari*; i. e. "The Life of James "Antonio Ferrari." Lecce 1715, in 8vo, and in the *Vite de' Letterati Salentini*, part 1. VII. *Vita di Giorgio Baglivo, Leccheſe*. i. e. "The Life of George "Baglivo of Lecce." The Journal of Venice, which gives an account of this book, mentions neither the year when, nor the form in which it was printed. VIII. *Lettera diſcorſiva al March. Giovan. Gioſeffo Orſi, dove ſi tratta dell' origine e progreſſi de' Signori Accademici Spioni, e delle varie loro lodevoli applicazioni*; i. e. "A Diſcourſe by way of letter to the "Marquis John Joſeph Orſi, in which an account is "given of the origin and progreſs of the Academi-"cians of Spioni, and of their ſeveral commendable "employments." Lecce 1705, in 8vo. We have obſerved in the text of this article, that our Author was a Member of this Academy. IX. *Diſcorſo hiſtorico, in cui ſi tratta dell' origine e delle fondazione della citta di Lecce, e d'alcune migliori e piu principali notizie di eſſa*; i. e. "An hiſtorical Diſcourſe concerning the original and foundation of the city of Lecce, "and ſome of the remarkable things relating to it." Lecce 1705, in 8vo. X. *Le Vite de' Letterati Salentini parte* 1ª. i. e. "The Lives of the learned men of "Terra d'Otranto, part 1." Florence 1710, in 4to. This edition was printed at Naples, tho' the title mentions Florence. The *ſecond part* was publiſhed at Naples 1713, in 4to. The Authors, whoſe Lives are given in the firſt part of this work are, 1. Robert Caracciolo, who died the 6th of May 1495. 2. Antonio Galateo, who died the 12th of November 1517. 3. Scipio Ammirato, who died the 30th of January 1600. 4. James Anthony Ferrari, who died in 1587. 5. Andrew Peſchiulli, who died the 19th of Jan. 1691. 6. Antonio Caraccio, who died the 14th of February 1702. In the ſecond part are contained the Lives 1. of Laurentio Scupoli, who died the 28th of November 1610. 2. John Charles Bovio, Archbiſhop of Brundufium, who died in September 1570. 3. John Baptiſta Criſpo, who was living in 1591. 4. Quinto Mario Corrado, who died in 1575. 5. Bonaventure Morone, a Franciſcan Monk, who died in 1621. 6. *Aſcanio Grandi*, who was living in 1632. 7. Ferdinand Donno, who died in 1649. 8. Fulgentio Gemma, who died in 1634. 9. Epiphanio Ferdinando, who died the 6th of September 1638. 10. Peter Galatino. Theſe Lives are very curious, and written with great accuracy and judgment. XI. *Orazione Funebre, recitata in occaſione della morte dell' Imperadore Giuſeppe, nel Veſcoval Domo di Gallipoli*; i. e. "A Funeral Oration ſpoken upon the occaſion of the "death of the Emperor Joſeph in the Epiſcopal Palace "of Gallipoli." Naples 1716. XII. *Scritto Iſtorico-legale ſopra le ragioni della ſoſpenſione del l' Interdetto locale generale della chieſa di Lecce e ſua dioceſi*; i. e. "An "hiſtorical and law Treatiſe upon the reaſons of the "ſuſpenſion of the local general interdict of the Church "of Lecce and the Dioceſe of it." Rome 1716. XIII. *Tre Lettere legale*. Theſe three Letters were written in defence of the rights of the Church of Lecce. XIV. He wrote likewiſe ſeveral Poems, and particularly ſeven Sonnets, which are publiſhed in the ſecond part of the *Rime Scelte del. Sign. Bartolommeo Lippi*. Printed at Lucca 1719, in 8vo (1). T.

(1) See *Memoires pour ſervir &c.* p. 283, 284, 285, 286; and the *Journal of Venice*, tom. 33. Part 2. p. 254.

Cardinal his uncle. While King Philip V of Spain was maſter of the Kingdom of Naples, he was honoured with the title of his principal Hiſtoriographer, and afterwards became Secretary to the Duke of Gravina. He died at Lecce the 9th of Auguſt 1719, in the forty third year of his age, and was interred in the Cathedral of the City (*a*).

(*a*) *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſt. des Hommes Illuſt.* tom. 16. p. 282, 283. edit. Paris 1731.

☞ANGELUS (CHRISTOPHER) a learned Greek in the ſeventeenth Century, and author of ſeveral works [*A*], was born at Peloponneſus in Greece, and obliged by the Turks to abandon his country on account of his religion, having before ſuffered a variety of torments in defence of it. He came afterwards to England, and having landed at Yarmouth, was ſupported by the benevolence of the Biſhop of Norwich, and ſeveral of the Clergy there. By that Biſhop's recommendation he went to Cambridge, and ſtudied for about three years in Trinity College. About Whitſuntide 1610 he took a journey to Oxford, and ſtudied in Baliol College, where he did great ſervice among the young ſcholars of the Univerſity by inſtructing them in the Greek Language; which province he executed till his death, which happened on the firſt of February 1638, leaving behind him the character of an excellent Grecian, and a man of great integrity (*a*).

(*a*) Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.* Vol. 1. Col. 618. 2d edit. 1721.

[*A*] *Author of ſeveral works.*] I. *Of the many ſtripes and torments inflicted on him by the Turks for the faith, which he had in Jeſus Chriſt.* Oxon. 1617, in Greek and Engliſh. II. *Enchiridion de Inſtitutis Græcorum*; i. e. "A Manual concerning the Cuſtoms "of the Greeks." Cambridge 1619, 4to, in Greek and Latin. The Greek copy of this falling into the hands of George Fhelavius a Miniſter of Dantzick, he tranſlated it into Latin, and wrote learned Notes upon it; and it was printed at Francfort 1655, in 8vo. This tranſlation of Fhelavius is intitled *Status & Ritus Eccleſiæ Græcæ*; i. e. "The State and Rites of the "Greek Church." III. *An Encomium of the famous Kingdom of Great Britain, and the two flouriſhing Siſter-Univerſities, Cambridge and Oxford.* Cambr. 1619, in 4to. IV. *De Apoſtaſia Eccleſiæ, & de homine peccati, ſcil. Antichriſto, &c.* i. e. "Of the "Apoſtacy of the Church, and of the Man of Sin, "namely, Antichriſt." London 1624, Greek and Latin, in 4to (1). T.

(1) Wood, Vol. 1. Col. 618.

ANGIOLELLO (JOHN MARIO) born at Vicenza, compoſed in Italian and the Turkiſh Language the *Hiſtory of Mahomet II*, which he dedicated to him. It was very kindly received by that haughty Sultan, who beſides the civilities which he ſhewed to Angiolello, gave him very conſiderable marks of his liberality. The author had been an eye-witneſs of what he related; for being one of the ſlaves of the young Sultan Muſtapha, he followed him in the expedition to Perſia in 1473. I mean that dreadful war which Mahomet carried on in perſon with almoſt two hundred thouſand ſoldiers into the dominions of Uſſun-Caſſan. It is ſomewhat ſurprizing that Angiolello, who knew without doubt the haughty diſpoſition of this Emperor of the Turks, ſhould venture to repeat the abuſive terms, which Uſſun-Caſſan uſed in reproaching him with his illegitimate birth, when he viewed the army of the enemies from a hill upon the bank of the Euphrates. Perhaps Mahomet never knew that his hiſtory had immortalized that reproach upon him; for Princes do not know all that is contained in the books dedicated to them. However that be, Angiolello's book was not the leſs kindly received, or the leſs amply rewarded (*a*). Thoſe who tell us he flouriſhed in 1524 (*b*), conſider him too late in the decline of his life; but what they add, that he wrote the life of Uſſun-Caſſan is more juſt. There was printed at Venice in 1553 a piece of Giov. Mario Angiolello *della Vita & Fatti di Re di Perſia* (*c*); and we find in the Library of Mr. de Thou (*d*), *Relatione della Vita e de' Fatti del Signor Uſun-caſſan*; i. e. *An Hiſtory of the Life and Actions of Signor Uſuncaſſan*, by our Angiolello. They have forgot to mention the date and place of the impreſſion.

(*a*) See the *Hiſtory of Mahomet* by Guillet, tom. 2. p. 210, 218, 234.

(*b*) Konig, *Biblioth. vet. & nova*, in the word *Angelellus.*

(*c*) See the Catalogue of Oxford.

(*d*) Firſt part of the *Catalogue*, p. 450.

ANGLUS (THOMAS) an Engliſh Prieſt, as well known for the ſingularity of his opinions, as the multitude of little books which he wrote in the ſeventeenth Century. He was born of a very good family, which he frequently tells us in the title page of his works [*A*]. He bore ſeveral names [*B*]; and there are few countries in Europe which he did not live in for ſome time. He was principal of the College at Liſbon, and ſubprincipal of that at Doway (*a*). He made a long ſtay at Rome and Paris. He was a conſiderable time a domeſtick of Sir Kenelm Digby's; and he teſtified to the publick that he had a very great eſteem for the opinions of that Gentleman [*C*]. He piqued himſelf upon perſiſting in the Peripatetic Philoſophy, and oppoſing the lights which Mr. Des Cartes

(*a*) See his book intitled *Statera appenſa, &c.* p. 50.

[*A*] *He was born of a good family, which he frequently acquaints us with in the title-page of his works.*] For inſtance, his three Dialogues *de Mundo*, printed at Paris, in 1642, contain in the title, *Authore Thoma Anglo, è generoſâ Albiorum in Oriente Trinobantum proſapiâ oriundo.*

[*B*] *He went by ſeveral names.*] See what Mr. Baillet remarks upon this point. "Sir Kenelm Dig- "by had with him the famous Thomas Anglus, an "Engliſh Gentleman, and a Catholic Prieſt, born "of one of the moſt ancient families in England, "who ſeemed an Iriſhman to outward appearance, "living in very great tho' voluntary poverty. His "true ſirname was *White*, which he uſed to diſguiſe, "ſometimes under that of *Candidus*, ſometimes that "of *Albius* *, ſometimes that of *Bianchi*, and ſome- "times that of *Richworth*; but he was moſt known "in France under that of *Thomas Anglus*..... Des "Cartes generally called him Mr. *Vitus* (1)." We ſee at the bottom of ſeveral of the Dedications of Thomas Anglus, that of *Thomas ex Albiis.*

* *Albius* was equivocal, becauſe of *Albion* and *Albus.*

(1) Baillet, *Vie de Des Cartes*, tom. 2. p. 245, under the year 1644.

[*C*] *He had a particular eſteem for the opinions of Digby.*] The title of one of his books, printed at Lyons in 1646, is as follows; *Inſtitutionum Peripateticarum ad mentem ſummi clariſſimique Philoſophi Kenelmi Equitis Digbæi*; i. e. "Inſtitutions of the Peripa- "tetic Philoſophy according to the hypotheſis of the "great and celebrated Philoſopher Sir Kenelm Dig- "by." The Preface gives the reaſon of this title in this manner: *Quod ad mentem ſummi Viri & clariſſimi Philoſophi Kenelmi Equitis Digbæi ſcriptas pronuntiem, inde eſt quod cum in invidendo illo de animæ immortalitate*

Cartes was willing to have given him [*D*]. He pretended even to make the principles of Ariſtotle ſubſervient to the explaining of the moſt impenetrable myſteries of religion, and upon that view he engaged in the diſcuſſion of free-will and grace. He was very much embaraſſed in this point, and by giving too great a ſcope to his own thoughts, he pleaſed neither the Moliniſts nor Janſeniſts. He had a genius very penetrating aad extenſive; but he had no talent at diſtinguiſhing the ideas which ſhould have ſerved as the rule and foundation of his reaſonings, nor at clearing the points which he was engaged in (*b*). He was a Philoſopher and a Divine of a very ſingular form. Some of his works were cenſured at Rome by the Congregation of the *Index Expurgatorius*, and in other places by the Univerſities [*E*]. He had a very peculiar notion concerning the ſtate of ſouls ſeparated from the body, and the eaſineſs of obtaining ſalvation. I cannot tell in what year he died; it was not till after the reſtoration of King Charles II. I have ſeen ſome of his books compoſed after the marriage of that Monarch with the Infanta of Portugal. He was no friend to the Jeſuits, and would have been glad that they had thought

(*b*) See with regard to his obſcurity the remark [*D*].

immortalitate libro totam naturæ compoſitionem à prima corporis ratione uſque ad inviſibiles animæ ſpiritualis articulos diſſecuerit, & in omnium oculos intulerit; alia quam ipſe præceſſerat incedere neque volui neque potui. Quicquid itaque de illo ſubjecto vides, inde tranſlatum eſt: That is, "With regard to what I ſay, "that I have written this book according to the hy-"potheſis of the great and celebrated Philoſopher Sir "Kenelm Digby, it is upon this account, that ſince "he in his excellent books of the Immortality of "the Soul has examined into the whole compoſition "of Nature from the firſt principles of body to the "inviſible properties of the ſoul, and explained them "in a juſt manner, I was neither willing nor able to "proceed in any other method than he has done. So "that what you have here upon that ſubject, is borrowed "from thence." He was not contented to pay him homage on account of his philoſophical opinions: but alſo raiſed him to the character of a Divine, and this even in the moſt ſublime myſteries; as appears from his book intitled, *Quæſtio Theologica, quomodo ſecundum principia Peripatetices Digbæanæ, ſive ſecundum rationem & abſtrahendo, quantum materia patitur, ab authoritate*, humani arbitrii libertas, *ſit explicanda, & cum* gratia efficaci *concilianda* (2); i. e. "A Theolo-"gical Queſtion, in what manner, according to the "principles of Sir Ken. Digby's Peripatetic Philoſo-"phy, or according to reaſon, abſtracting as much as "the ſubject will permit, from authority, *the free-"dom of man's will* is to be explained and reconciled "with *efficacious grace*." He printed in 1652 his *Inſtitutiones Theologicæ ſuper fundamentis in Peripateticâ Digbæanâ jactis extructæ*; i. e. "Inſtitutions of "Divinity built upon the foundations laid down in "Sir K. Digby's Peripatetic Philoſophy."

(2) It is in 120. The place and date of the impreſſion do not appear. We find by the preface that the author was then old.

[*D*] *He oppoſed the lights, which Mr. Des Cartes was willing to have given him.* I ſhall have recourſe to Mr. Baillet. "Thomas Anglus, ſays he (3), was a "Peripatetic of a more extraordinary form than even "Sir Kenelm Digby, and he certainly exceeded him "in the obſcurity of his ideas, and the unintel-"ligibleneſs of his thoughts. However he was "one of the moſt ſubtle Philoſophers of his age, and "entirely diſengaged from any attachment to the "doctrine of the ſchools, which moſt of the Ariſto-"telians ſubmit to. Mr. Des Cartes had conceived a "great eſteem for him upon the advantageous cha-"racter, which Sir Ken. Digby gave of him. He "permitted Thomas Anglus to make his objections. "The nature of theſe objections, and the high idea "which Sir Kenelm gave of his genius, made him "hope to ſee him ſoon a proſelyte to his Philoſophy; "but the event ſhewed that he preſumed too much "upon the flexibleneſs of Thomas Anglus's temper. "He perplexed his brain with the abſtruſe points of "predeſtination, free-will, and grace, which began "to diſturb the faculties of Divinity at Louvain and "Paris. Being poſſeſſed with the notion, that Mr. "Des Cartes was not ſent by God to give the neceſ-"ſary ſolutions to theſe difficulties, which are en-"tirely above human comprehenſion, he choſe rather "to recur to Ariſtotle's hypotheſes, in order to pe-"netrate into theſe obſcure myſteries. What he wrote "upon this ſcheme is very like the ancient Oracles "for obſcurity; and this is probably that, which "made him ſo unintelligible to the congregation of "the *Index Expurgatorius* at Rome †, and ſo be con-"ſidered as a barbarous Divine § by the Jeſuites."

(3) Baillet, *Vie de Des Cartes*, tom. 2. p. 245.

† *Decret. Sacr. Cong. Collect.*

§ He was called by Labbe Theologaſter, *a trifling Divine.*

It will not be amiſs to mention here, what he replied to thoſe, who accuſed him of obſcurity: His anſwer may give us a clearer notion of the peculiarity of his genius. *I value myſelf*, ſays he (4), *upon ſuch a brevity and conciſeneſs, as is ſuitable for the Teachers of the ſciences. The Divines are the cauſe, that my writings continue obſcure; for they refuſe to give me any occaſion of explaining myſelf. In ſhort either the learned underſtand me, or they do not. If they do underſtand me, and find me in an error, it is eaſy for them to refute me; if they do not underſtand me, it is very unreaſonable for them to exclaim againſt my doctrines.* This ſhews the temper of a man, who ſeeks only to be talked of, and is vexed in not having antagoniſts enough to draw the regard and attention of the Publick upon him. *Riſerunt aliqui hominem quod evidentiam jactet, cum tamen perobſcurè ipſum ſcribere, quotquot eum legunt, queritentur. Reſponait ille, ſe brevitati ſcientiarum traditoribus aptæ ſtudere; Theologos in cauſa eſſe, quod obſcura maneant ipſius ſcripta, dum ſeſe explicandi anſam præbere refugiunt. Addit vel doctos eum intelligere poſſe; unde &, ſi errores ſcribat, ipſum confutare in proclivi eſt; vel non intelligere, & ſic neque debere ipſi occlamitare; cum peſſimus ſit animi morbus calumniari quod neſcis.* There is ſomething very ſophiſtical in this Dilemma.

(4) *Præfat. Statera Appenſa.*

[*E*] *Some of his works have been cenſured by the congregation of the* Index Expurgatorius *at Rome, and in other places by the Univerſities.*] The Decree of this Congregation of the 10th of June 1658 condemns theſe four treatiſes of Thomas Anglus, *Inſtitutiones Peripateticæ*; *Appendix Theologica de Origine Mundi*; *Tabula ſuffragialis de terminandis fidei litibus ab Eccleſia Catholica fixa*; *Teſſeræ Romanæ Evulgatio.* The two laſt pieces were publiſhed againſt the famous Father Macedo, who in all conteſts of the pen, has been a conſtant adventurer, a kind of Knight-Errant, always ready to break a lance. He attacked Thomas Anglus (5); but inſtead of replying to the *Tabulæ ſuffragiales*, and the *Teſſeræ Romanæ Evulgatio*, which had been oppoſed to his attack, he had recourſe to intrigues, and got theſe books condemned by the Congregation of the *Index* (6). The Doctors of Doway cenſured two and twenty propoſitions extracted from the *Sacred Inſtitutions* of Thomas Anglus. He oppoſed to their cenſure his *Supplicatio poſtulativa juſtitiæ*, in which he complains, that they had given a vague uncertain cenſure of him, attended only with a *reſpectivè*, i. e. *reſpectively*, without taxing any propoſition in particular (7). He ſhews them, that this is acting like prevaricating Divines. And in reality, does not this method tend to deceive the ignorant, and lead them to ſlander their neighbours character? If you pronounce in general upon thirty propoſitions, that they are reſpectively raſh, dangerous, heretical, where is the man, whom you will not expoſe to take that for heretical, which is only a raſh aſſertion, or for raſh only, that, which is hereſy in its utmoſt extent? This reflection will have the more weight, if I repreſent it, as it is expreſſed in the Letter of an anonymous Author, who appears to be a man of genius and judgment. It is thus he ſpeaks *upon the ſubject of the Decree of the Inquiſition of the 7th of December* 1690 *againſt one and thirty propoſitions:* "I cannot tell, Sir, ſays the Prelate, addreſſing him-"ſelf to the Doctor, whether you have underſtood "all the artifice and management of the cenſure. "You know the manner in which theſe Gentlemen

(5) He publiſhed in 1654, *Sonus Lituî adverſus Sonum tubæ.* Thomas Anglus had before publiſhed in 1653, *Sonus Buccinæ, cum Appendice adverſus mentem divinitus inſpiratam Innocentio.*

(6) See the Preface to the book intitled, *Statera appenſa quoad ſalutis aſſequendæ facilitatem*, printed at London in 1661, in 120.

(7) See the ſame Preface. A Reflection upon the cenſure of propoſitions extracted from a book.

thought him worthy their reſentments [F]. I have been informed, that at the beginning of the conteſts between King Charles I and the Parliament, he wrote in Engliſh in defence of the doctrine of the Church of England concerning paſſive obedience.

" uſe to characterize the propoſitions, not by giving " to every one of them in particular its proper note " and name, either of ſcandalous, or erroneous, &c. " but in ranging at firſt all the propoſitions, if there " be five hundred, one after another; and then un- " der theſe propoſitions in general, to give them all " the characteriſtics they think proper, by adding a " *reſpectivè*, i. e. *reſpectively* at the end. So that " every particular Divine is to gueſs himſelf, which of " theſe propoſitions are condemned only as ſcandalous, " and which are heretical or otherwiſe (8)." In the next page there is a Counſellor of Parliament introduced ſpeaking thus: " But eſpecially, we ſhould " think we trifled with juſtice, and expoſed ourſelves " to the public ridicule and indignation, if we gave " in our Decrees on one part all the pretenſions of " the parties, and all the heads of the proceſs, and " on the other confuſedly and in groſs all the diffe- " rent deciſions with a *reſpectivè*, which would ren- " der the Decree unintelligible, and prove the occa- " ſion of a thouſand diſputes, that would never end." See the Reflections made upon this ſame Decree of Alexander VIII by the Author of the *Difficulties propoſed to Mr. Steyaert* (9). I return now to Thomas Anglus. He formed ſeveral doubts againſt every particular cenſure of the Divines of Doway; and pretended, that if they did not give him ſatisfaction, it would turn to their ſhame and confuſion and his honour (10). Whenever a cenſure is carried againſt any book by caballing rather than reaſon, the perſon cenſured is ſure to confound the Author of it. We may remember the Letter, which Mr. Arnauld wrote in 1683 to the Univerſity of Doway.

(8) *Lettre d'un Abbé a un Prelat de la Cour de Rome*, p. 29. In the title of my edition it is *Jouxte la Copie imprimée a Thoulouſe*, 1691.

(9) *Difficult. a Steyaert.* IX Part p. 249.

(10) *Præfat. Statera &c.* See the quotation (6).

I have not yet mentioned all that I have to ſay of the cenſures which were fixed upon Thomas Anglus's books. As ſoon as his *Statera Morum* appeared, the Archbiſhop of Mechlen, and the Biſhop of Antwerp, complained to the Nuncio at Bruſſels. There was a pragmatical perſon, who went to England to get hands to ſign againſt the doctrine of this Author (11); and it appeared, that the Biſhop of Chalcedon diſapproved of the treatiſe *de Medio Animarum Statu*, and there was a rumour, that he had cenſured it publickly (12).

Father Baron obſerves, that the *Sonitus Buccinæ* was cenſur'd, and that the Author maintained, that the Church had no power to determine, but only to give her teſtimony to tradition (13).

(11) See the ſame preface to the *Statera*.

(12) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory to the book of Thomas Anglus, intitled, *Vellicationis ſuæ de medio Animarum ſtatu ratio*, printed in 1653.

(13) Baro, *Apologiæ* lib. 4. pag. 344.

[F] *He would have been glad, that the Jeſuites had thought him worthy their reſentments.*] This appears from the Preface, which I have ſo often quoted (14). The Author of that Preface and the Book, which follows it, is not perhaps a different perſon from Thomas Anglus. It is probable he wrote againſt his own *Statera Morum*, as well to clear the difficulties of it, as to engage the publick to take notice of a book, which was in danger of being neglected amidſt ſuch a croud of new books. However that be, the Author of this Preface ſeems to be a perſon well acquainted with the thoughts of Thomas Anglus, and no enemy to him. Let us ſee then what he ſays with regard to the Jeſuits. *Increbuerunt ſæpiuſculè rumores comminatam eſſe doctam illam ſocietatem ſe contra D. Albii opera ſtricturam calamum. Hoc idem ab iis maximè expectabant omnes, ut quos præcipue ac pæne unicè ſcriptis ſuis laceſſiverat. Attamen ſive ex motivis prudentialibus ſuppreſſi ſint libri illi jam ſcripti, ſive nulli omnino ſcripti fuerint, nihil dum editum eſt. Hic triumphat maximè D. Albius, & cauſam ſuam hoc diſcurſu tueri ſolet: Minas illas, quas intentabant, clamores, quibus ipſi paſſim obſtrepebant, manifeſta eſſe indicia non defuiſſe* VOLUNTATEM *illam confutandi: Neque eo genio eſſe PP. Societatis, ut quicquam famâ ſuâ charius habeant; unde evidenter conſtare ſolum iis defuiſſe potentiam, poſtquam ad tam inſignem ignominiam propellendam adeò tardi extiterint.* That is, " There have been fre- " quent reports, that this learned Society had threatned " to write againſt the works of Mr. Albius. This " every body expected from them, as he had attack- " ed them, and ſcarce any but them, in his writings. " But whether thoſe books, which they wrote, were " ſuppreſſed upon prudential motives, or whether they " never wrote any, nothing has been publiſhed. This " is a great occaſion of triumph to Mr. Albius, who " uſes to defend his cauſe in this manner; that their " menaces and clamours againſt him, are plain proofs " that they did not want a *will* to confute him; and " as the Society values nothing ſo much as their re- " putation, it follows from thence, that they only " wanted *power* to do it, ſince they have been ſo ſilent " upon ſuch a flagrant attack upon them." You ſee here a man, who not being able to procure the honour of engaging with the Jeſuits, takes advantage of their ſilence, and defends himſelf by imputing it to their weakneſs, and not their inſenſibility.

(14) *Præfat. Statera appenſa, &c.* See the quotation (6).

☞ANGRIANI, or AYGNANI, or AIGNAN (MICHAEL) commonly called MICHAEL. of BOLOGNA, a Divine of diſtinguiſhed learning in the fourteenth Century, was born at Bologna in Italy, where he entered himſelf into the Order of the Carmelites (*a*). He ſtudied afterwards in the Univerſity of Paris, where he received the degree of Doctor. In the General Chapter of his Order, which was held at Ferrara in 1354, and in that of Bourdeaux in 1358, and in that of Treves in 1362, he was named Regent of the Convent at Paris. It was during this employment that he wrote his *Commentary upon the four books of Sentences* (*b*). In the year 1372 he was preſent at the General Chapter held at Aix in Provence under the character of *Definitor* of the Province of Bologna, and received the title of *Maſter*, that is, Doctor of Divinity, which was likewiſe given him in the General Chapters held at Puy en Velay in 1375, and at Bruges in 1379, where he aſſiſted as Provincial of his Province (*c*). He was choſen Vicar General [A] the 19th of April 1380; and in 1381 unanimouſly elected General of his Order by the General Chapter held at Verne. The Provincials of the Provinces that declared for Pope Clement VII not being preſent, their places were ſupplied by other Monks, who were named in

(a) *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſt. des Hommes Illuſt* tom. 5. p. 392, 393. edit. Paris 1728; and Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* tom. 2. p. 88. edit. Paris 1702.

(b) *Memoires, ubi ſupra.*

(c) Ibid.

[A] *He was choſen Vicar General.*] The great ſchiſm, which divided the Church after the death of Pope Gregory IX, occaſioned likewiſe a great diviſion among the religious Orders, and particularly that of the Carmelites. The Convents of Germany, Hungary, Bohemia, Poland, Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Pruſſia, Flanders, Frieſland, and ſeveral other provinces contiguous to Germany, together with Tuſcany, Lombardy, and the other countries of Italy acknowledged Pope Urban VI. But the Convents of France, Spain, Scotland, and Naples maintained the party of Pope Clement VII, which was joined alſo by Bernard Olenſis or Oleri the ſeventeenth General of the Order of the Carmelites; and for this reaſon he was depoſed by Pope Urban, who gave orders in the General Chapter, which was held at Bruges in 1379, that another ſhould be elected out of the countries, which had ſubmitted to his authority. The Chapter obeyed the Pope's directions, and choſe Angriani under the title of Vicar-General, which was confirmed by a Bull of that Pope, dated the 13th of the Calends of May, that is the 19th of April 1380 (1).

(1) *Memoires pour ſervir, &c.* p. 394, 395.

in their room: in the General Chapter held in 1385 at Bamberge in the Province of Upper Germany, the ſame dignity was conferred upon our Angriani. But the year following going to Genoa to meet Pope Urban VI, he was depoſed from his office without any cauſe alledged for it, except that it was urged by ſome, that he was a friend and confident of ſeveral Cardinals, who were put to death by the Pope's order about that time; but others ſaid, that it was on account of ſome ſuſpicions which the Pope entertained of the Archdeacon of Bruges, who had been Angriani's ſcholar (*d*). Our author being diſcharged from his employment retired to the Convent of Bologna, where he finiſhed the works which we have of him [*B*]. Notwithſtanding his being depoſed from his office of General of the Order, Pope Boniface IX made him Vicar General of the Province of Bologna in 1394, with a full power of governing it; and in 1396 he was preſent at the General Chapter of Placentia, as Definitor of the ſame Province (*e*). He died at Bologna the 16th of November 1400, according to Father Lewis de Sainte Thereſe (*f*), or the firſt of December 1416, the laſt year of the reign of Winceſlaus the Emperor, and under Pope Boniface IX, according to Trithemius (*g*) and Du Pin (*h*). The firſt opinion is more agreeable to the epitaph in the church of the Carmelites at Bologna, engraven upon a marble monument before the great altar. But the obſcurity and barbarous ſtyle of it might give occaſion to Trithemius's aſſertion. We ſhall give this epitaph in a note [*C*]. Trithemius tells us (*i*), that he was a perſon extremely well ſkilled in the Scriptures, and ſecular Learning, and in Canon Law.

(*d*) Ibid. pag. 395.

(*e*) Ibid. pag. 396.

(*f*) Ibid.

(*g*) *De Script. Eccleſ.* c. 674.

(*h*) *Ubi ſupra.*

(*i*) *Ubi ſupra.*

ANICETUS

[*B*] *The works, which we have of him.*] I. *Ad Cardinalem S. Mariæ trans Tyberim inſigne opus & præclarum de Conceptione S. Mariæ Liber* 1; i. e. "A "noble and excellent work addreſſed to the Cardinal "of St. Mary beyond the Tyber concerning the Con"ception of the Virgin Mary, in one book;" in MS. Arnoul Boſtius, a Carmelite Monk, who died at Ghent the 31ſt of March 1499, ſays, that this work of Angriani is every where full of expreſſions of this kind: *Tota pulchra, tota formoſa eſt Maria, amica ſpiritûs almi, verbi divini genetrix, æterni patris comparentalis, eundem cum eo filium habens, & macula originalis non eſt in eâ:* i. e. "The Virgin "Mary is all beautiful and amiable; ſhe is the Mi"ſtreſs of the Holy Ghoſt, the Mother of the Divine "word, nearly related to the Eternal Father, having "the ſame ſon with him; and the ſtain of original "ſin is not in her (2). II. *Super Sententias Libri* IV; i. e. "Commentaries upon the Sentences in four books." The firſt edition of this was printed at Milan in 1510; and afterwards it was publiſhed at Venice in 1632 in fol. by Father Leo Prioli, a monk of the ſame Order (3). III. *Queſtiones Sententiarum, liber unus:* i. e. "One book of Queſtions upon the Sentences." *In Evangelium Matthæi liber:* i. e. "One book upon "the Goſpel of St. Matthew." *Tabula moralium ſancti Gregorii Papæ*; i. e. "A Table of the Morals of "St. Gregory the Pope." *Tabula Decreti*; i. e. "A "Table of the Decree." *In Ethicam Ariſtotelis liber*; i. e. "Upon the Ethics of Ariſtotle in one book." *In Valerium Maximum liber*; i. e. "Notes upon Va"lerius Maximus in one book." *Sermones varii, liber unus*; i. e. "Several Sermons in one book." Theſe tracts are mentioned by Trithemius (4), to which he adds, *In Evangelium Lucæ, liber unus*; i. e. "Com"mentaries upon the Goſpel of St. Luke in one book." The Author of the *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſt. &c.* has quoted all but the laſt; and he obſerves, that we have only the titles of them remaining, unleſs ſome Library in Italy, where Angriani lived for the greateſt part of his Life, has preſerved them in MS. (5). IV. *Lectura ſuper Michæam*; i. e. "A Lecture upon "the Prophet Micah." This work is cited by Angriani in his Commentary upon the 67th Pſalm, verſe 8 (6). V. *Poſtilla ſuper Joannem*; i. e. "A "Poſtill upon St. John." He refers likewiſe to this Tract in his Explications upon the 76th Pſalm ver. 1. and 13 (7). *Poſtillæ in Apocalypſin*; "Poſtills up"on the Revelations." This work is quoted in his Explication of his 77th Pſalm; as alſo the following. VI. *Sermones quadrageſimales*; i. e. "Lent-Sermons" (8). VIII. This perhaps is the ſame, that is called *Quadrageſimale* by Trithemius (9), and it is mentioned by Du Pin (10). VIII. *Dictionarium Divinum*; i. e. "A Divine Dictionary", in MS. This is a Dictionary of the Bible, explaining all the words, which are mentioned in the Scriptures; but death prevented him from finiſhing it. He had only diſpatched the three firſt Letters (11). The MS. of this work, as well as the MSS. of the four preceding are preſerved in the Libraries of the Carmelites at Bologna and Ferrara (12). IX. *Commentaria in Pſalmos*; i. e. "Commentaries upon the Pſalms." This work was firſt publiſhed at Alcala in 1524 by John Jonſica Biſhop of Burgos from a MS. in the Library of the Monaſtery of St. Jerom *Los Totos de Guiſando*. As the name of the Author was not prefixed to it, it was printed under the name of *Ignotus* or *the Unknown*; and in the ſame manner it was publiſhed at Lyons in 1588 and 1603 (13). But Father Baſil Anguſſola, a Monk of the Order of the Carmelites found in the year 1600 in the Library of that Order at Bologna a MS. divided into five volumes, at the end of which were theſe words, *Explicit Lectura primæ, ſecundæ, &c. partis, Pſalterii compilata per F. Michaelem de Bononia Ordinis, B. M. de Monte Carmelo inter Theologos Doct. Pariſienſes Minimum*; i. e. "Here ends the "Lecture upon the firſt, ſecond, &c. part of the "Pſalter, compiled by Brother Michael of Bologna "of the Order of the Bleſſed Virgin Mary of Mount "Carmel the leaſt among the Doctors of Paris." He found likewiſe another MS. about the ſame time in the Library of the Carmelites at Venice, part of which was written in the year 1397, and the reſt in 1424, divided likewiſe into five volumes, at the beginning of which were theſe words: *Incipit lectura ſuper Pſalterium edita & compoſita per Fr. Michaelem de Aygnanis de Bononia ſacræ Theologiæ Doctorem eximium Ord. Fratrum. S. Dei Genetricis Mariæ de Monte Carmelo*; i. e. "Here begins the Lecture upon "the Pſalter publiſhed and compoſed by Brother Mi"chael de Ayguanis of Bologna, an excellent Doctor "of Divinity, of the Order of St. Mary the Mother "of God of Mount Carmel." Upon the firſt leaf of every volume was painted a Profeſſor ſitting in a chair in the habit of a Carmelite with his auditors dreſſed in different habits below; and at the end of every volume the name of the Author was likewiſe written. Both theſe MSS. were preſented to the Patriarch of Venice and the Archbiſhop of Bologna, who named proper perſons to verify them by the Commentary printed at Lyons under the name of *Incognitus* upon the Pſalms; who finding them agreeable to that edition, a new one was undertaken from theſe MSS. and others as ancient, which were found in ſeveral Libraries of the City of Bologna, which had the ſame inſcriptions. After all this examination and precaution therefore theſe Commentaries were publiſhed with the true name of the Author, firſt at Venice in three volumes in 4to, printed by John Guerili, the firſt volume in 1600, and the two others in 1602: at Paris in 1626 in two volumes fol. and at Lyons in 1652 and 1673 in the ſame form (14).

(2) Ibid. p. 397.

(3) Ibid. p. 393 and 397.

(4) *Ubi ſupra.*

(5) *Memoires, &c.* p. 397, 398.

(6) Ibid. p. 398.

(7) Ibid.

(8) Ibid.

(9) *Ubi ſupra.*

(10) *Ubi ſupra.*

(11) Trithem. *ubi ſupra.*

(12) *Memoires, ubi ſupra.*

(13) Du Pin, *ubi ſupra*, ſays in 1602.

[*C*] *We ſhall give this Epitaph in a note.*]

Michael Doctor hic eſt Ayguana Bononias illum
Stirps dat, Carmeli, quem tulit ordo, caput.
In David ejus ovat calamus; ſtupor eſtque Latinis
Et Gallis virtus, ingeniumque ſenis.
Bis ſeptingentos annos patet eſſe Novembrem,
Atque bis octenos explicuiſſe dies (15).

(14) *Memoires, &c.* p. 399, 400, 401.

(15) Ibid. pag. 396, 397.

☞ANICETUS a franchis'd ſlave, Tutor to Nero in his infancy, and afterwards Commander of his Fleet. As Tacitus is the chief author who has furniſhed us with the materials of this article, we ſhall draw it up moſtly in the words of Mr. Gordon's tranſlation. Anicetus was violently hated by Agrippina Nero's mother, and he with equal virulence returned the hatred. Nero intending to be rid of his mother, was at a loſs how to compaſs that deſign [*A*]. Anicetus proffered his ſervice and dexterity; he explained how a veſſel might be ſo contrived, that by the ſudden and artificial burſting of one particular quarter of it in the open ſea, Agrippina might be overwhelmed without the leaſt warning or apprehenſion. Nothing, he ſaid, was ſo fertile of diſaſters as the ſea, and if ſhe was thus diſpatched by ſhipwreck, who could be ſo injurious as to aſcribe the malignity of winds and waves to the malice and contrivance of men? Beſides, the Prince would of courſe beſtow on his deceaſed mother a temple and altars, and all other honours proper to create an oſtentation of filial grief and piety. Nero was pleaſed with the device [*B*], a veſſel was contrived accordingly; Agrippina was enticed to come to Baiæ, where the Emperor then was; he entertained her very magnificently, and when ſhe went away, he prevailed upon her to embark on board the fatal veſſel, which ſhe did, with only two of her attendants. They had not ſailed far, when ſuddenly, upon a ſignal given, the deck, over that quarter where Agrippina lay, was looſened, and being purpoſely loaded with a great quantity of lead, ſunk violently down. Agrippina was happily defended by the poſts of the bed, which happened to be too ſtrong to yield to the deſcending weight. She eſcaped with ſwimming, and with the aſſiſtance of ſome fiſher-boats, which rowed out to ſuccour her, ſhe reached the Lake Lucrinus, and was thence conducted to her own Villa. Nero, while he was hourly expecting expreſſes to appriſe him, that the parricide was executed, was informed, that ſhe had eſcaped only with a ſlight hurt, having ſo far felt the danger, as to remain in no uncertainty who it was that ſought her life. At this Nero became mortally ſtruck with agonies and diſmay [*C*]; he ſent immediately for Burrus

[*A*] *Nero, intending to be rid of his mother was at a loſs how to compaſs that deſign.*] "He was in ſuſpenſe about the means, whether by poiſon, or the "ſword, or any other effectual violence: that of poiſon "was preferred at firſt; but to adminiſter the ſame "was difficult: if it were done at the Prince's table, "its operation could never paſs nor be underſtood as "a ſudden and accidental death, ſince in the like "manner Britannicus had already periſhed; to apply "to her own domeſticks appeared a great riſque; as "ſhe was a woman, who from her own long intima"cy with frauds and blood, was wary and vigilant "againſt all ſnares and circumvention, and moreover "always ſecured herſelf by counterpoiſons againſt the "efforts of poiſon: And, how to diſpatch her with "the ſword, and yet cover the appearance of the "execution, no one pretended to deviſe; it was fear"ed too that the orders would be rejected, to whom"ſoever they were given, for the perpetration of ſo "hideous an iniquity (1)." Xiphilinus adds, that it was atteſted by ſeveral credible perſons, that Seneca himſelf prompted Nero to this murther, either *to cover his own guilt*, εἴτ' οὖν τὸ ἔγκλημα καθ' ἑαυτοῦ ἐπηλογίσασθαι βουληθείς, or, that Nero by this heinous crime might ſooner draw an entire ruin upon himſelf (2). In tranſlating the Greek words we have quoted, we follow H. Stephens's remark, who ſays, that theſe Greek words ſignify, *crimen cui affinis erat*, or word for word, *crimen quod adverſus ſe erat*; and adds, that the crime, which Seneca wanted to hide, was that he himſelf was contriving Nero's death, *quod ipſemet Neronis vitæ inſidiaretur* (3). But why ſhould Seneca adviſe Agrippina's death, in order to hide his own conſpiracy againſt Nero? Except it be ſuppoſed, that he had entered into ſome plot with Agrippina againſt the Emperor, of which there is not the leaſt hint in Hiſtory. It is true Xiphilinus ſays in another place (4), that Seneca conſpired with ſome other illuſtrious men againſt Nero; but not to ſay that this happened after Agrippina's death, for what reaſon ſhould Seneca adviſe Nero to kill her in order to hide his own conſpiracy? I obſerve then, that tho' ἔγκλημα ſignifies ſometimes a *crime*, yet it means more properly a *charge*, an *accuſation*, eſpecially being followed by the prepoſition κατὰ, which with the genitive caſe ſignifies *againſt*; and I take Xiphilinus's ſenſe to be, that Seneca adviſed Agrippina's death, either to avoid any charge againſt himſelf, as tho' he had been concerned in the plot, of which Agrippina was accuſed, or to render Nero more obnoxious. However that be, it is plain from Tacitus, that Seneca was conſulted by Nero concerning the murther of Agrippina; we have given the paſſage of that Hiſtorian in the text of this article, and we ſhall make an obſervation upon it below (5).

(1) Tacit. *Ann. XIV.* tranſlated by Mr. Gordon, tom. 1. p. 351. See alſo Xiphilin. *Dionis Epitom. in Nerone*, p. 162. ed. H. Steph. 1592. fol.

(2) Xiphil. ibid.

(3) Steph. in Xiphil. *ad* pag. 162.

(4) P. 181.

(5) In the remark [*D*].

[*B*] *Nero was pleaſed with the device.*] It was ſo much the more agreeable to him, that it was alſo favoured by the juncture of time, that of the ſolemn feſtival of Minerva, called *Quinquatrus*, which he was then celebrating at Baiæ. Thither he inticed his mother; for he was frequently declaring "That the haſty "humours of parents were by all means to be borne "withal, and towards her it behoved him to ſuppreſs "every irritation of his own ſpirit;" by ſuch declarations he meant to raiſe a general rumour of his own reconcilement to her; a rumour, which he hoped would reach Agrippina, and find credit with her, from the credulous genius of women, prone to believe whatever feeds their wiſhes, and promiſes matter of joy. When ſhe approached he met her upon the ſhore (for ſhe came by ſea from Antium) preſented her his hand, and embraced her; then conducted her to Bauli (6): Here amongſt ſeveral other veſſels lay one more gaudy and ornamental than the reſt; as if in this particular too he meditated freſh honour to his mother; for ſhe had been always wont to be carried in a galley with three banks of oars, rowed by mariners from the fleet. Moreover the banquet, to which ſhe was invited, was ſo timed, that under the dark ſhades of night the horrid execution might be covered. It was however apparent, that ſomebody had betrayed the deſign, and that Agrippina, upon hearing the perfidious machination, tho' ſhe was doubtful whether ſhe ought to believe it, had ſome thoughts of being carried to Baiæ by land; but upon her arrival there, the plauſible and frank behaviour of Nero aſſwaged her fears; for beſides his receiving her graciouſly, placing her at table above him, regaling her magnificently, treating her with all tenderneſs and careſſes; he entertained and amuſed her with great variety of converſation; this minute breaking out into ſallies of youthful frankneſs; the next with an air compoſed and grave, diſcourſing of weighty affairs, as if he had, in truth, therein ſought her counſel and participation: and after he had with this hollow fondneſs drawn out the banquet into a great length, he attended her aſſiduouſly to the ſhore, at parting hung upon her more ardently than before, kiſſed her eyes, kiſſed her boſom, and left it uncertain, whether, by ſuch paſſionate behaviour, he only meant to compleat this baſe ſcene of diſſimulation, or whether the laſt ſad ſight of a mother juſt going to periſh, really pierced him, and check'd his ſpirit however fierce and ſavage (7). How ſhocking muſt ſuch a behaviour appear to every breaſt, that ſtill retains the leaſt principle of humanity!

(6) So the Villa is called, which lying between the Cape of Miſenum and the Gulph of Baiæ, is waſhed by the ſea, which winds round the Point.

(7) Tacit. *ubi ſupra*, pag. 351, 352.

[*C*] *Nero became mortally ſtruck with agonies and diſmay.*]

Burrus and Seneca; they were both ſilent for a conſiderable time, at length Seneca proved the more forward of the two, but no further than to look at Burrus, and aſk, "Whether the orders for this execution were not to be truſted to the ſoldiery? Burrus anſwered, that the Pretorian guards were ſo zealouſly attached to the whole family of the Ceſars, ſo fond in particular of the name and memory of Germanicus (*a*), that againſt any deſcendant of his they could never be animated to any thing that was cruel and bloody, it therefore behoved Anicetus to acquit himſelf of his engagement" [*D*]. Neither did Anicetus pauſe one moment, but even demanded the office of compleating the murther. Nero became revived with theſe words, and declaring himſelf to be that day preſented with the Empire, owned his franchized ſlave for the author of the mighty preſent, and urged him to diſpatch, leading with him for his aſſiſtance ſuch as were moſt prompt to obey. The freedman however having heard that Agerinus was arrived from Agrippina, with the news of her diſaſter and eſcape, contrived a plot to turn the treaſon upon her, and therefore as the other was delivering his meſſage, dropped a dagger between his legs, and then, as if he had caught him in the terrible fact, called for irons to be inſtantly caſt upon him. By this fable he purpoſed to ſupport another, by feigning that the deſtruction of the Prince had been concerted by his mother; and that being ſtruck with confuſion upon the diſcovery of her treaſon, ſhe had deſperately put an end to her own life. Anicetus then went to the Villa, where Agrippina was; he beſet it with a guard, and burſting open the gates ſeized or ſecured all ſuch of her ſlaves as appeared to ſtop him. He then advanced towards her chamber, where he found the door guarded by very few, all the reſt were ſcared away by the terror and violence of his entrance. In her chamber was a ſmall light and only one of her damſels. Agrippina herſelf was more and more toſſed with anxious thoughts, that no ſoul had yet arrived from her ſon, nor had even Agerinus returned; ſhe perceived from without ſtrange viciſſitudes, and an unuſual ſcene, the deſertion of her own people, and the ſudden violence and tumult of ſtrangers, with all the warnings of her laſt fate; inſomuch that ſeeing her maid too about to depart, ſhe ſaid, "Thou likewiſe art going to abandon me;" and that moment ſhe ſpied Anicetus accompanied with Herculeus Captain of a Galley, and Oloaritus a Centurion of the Navy. She told him, "if he came from the Emperor to be informed of her health, he ſhould acquaint him, ſhe was well refreſhed and recovered, if upon any bloody deſign, ſhe would no wiſe believe him commiſſioned by her ſon; her ſon could never give unnatural orders for parricide." The aſſaſſins having placed themſelves round her bed, the Captain was the firſt that wounded her, ſtriking her upon the head with a club, and as the Centurion was drawing his ſword to diſpatch her, ſhe preſented her belly, and with a loud voice, "Strike thy ſword into my womb" [*E*], ſhe cried, and was inſtantly aſſaſſinated with a multitude of wounds (*b*). This was not the only murther in which Anicetus was concerned. When Nero was reſolved to be rid of his wife Octavia, it was agreed to procure ſome one, who ſhould own himſelf guilty of adultery with her, one againſt whom might be alſo feign'd a plauſible charge of meditating a revolution in the State. Anicetus was judged a proper man for this vile purpoſe. He was held by the Emperor in ſome ſlight favour, juſt after the bloody ſervice he had done him in the murther of Agrippina, but from that time in heavier deteſtation; *For Princes*, (ſays the Hiſtorian very juſtly) (*c*), *ever behold the miniſters of their cruelties*

(*a*) Agrippina's father.

(*b*) Tacit. *Ann.* IV. Mr. Gordon's tranſlation vol. 1. p. 351—356.

(*c*) Ibid. p. 395.

diſmay.] Having ſent for Burrus and Seneca, he ſwore to them in paſſionate terms, "That, without peradventure, ſhe (his mother) would preſently be at hand, bent upon taking haſty vengeance; whether by arming the ſlaves, or by ſtirring up againſt him the rage of the ſoldiery, or by flying to the Senate and people, with a tragical repreſentation of the veſſel wreck'd, herſelf wounded, her friend's murther'd, and her ſon the author of all: and againſt this menacing event what reſource, what protection had he, unleſs ſuch could be propoſed by Burrus and Seneca (8)?" Thus it appears in what fears and agonies Nero was: and tho' Agrippina counterfeited perfect ſecurity and fearleſneſs, yet ſhe knew the danger in which ſhe was: And conſidering the character of that woman, who made a jeſt of murther, it was a political prudence for Nero to prevent her.

(8) Ibid. p. 354.

[*D*] *It behoved Anicetus to acquit himſelf of his engagement.*] This advice of Burrus could not but pleaſe Nero; but, as we have ſaid in the foregoing remark, it was now neceſſary. For Burrus and Seneca apprehended, ſays Tacitus (9), that it was in vain to perſuade Nero to drop his deſign of deſtroying his mother, and perhaps they believed it to be already puſhed ſo far, that unleſs Agrippina ſoon periſhed, Nero certainly muſt. The ſame Hiſtorian had ſaid before, that it is not certain, whether, before the affair at Baiæ, Burrus and Seneca were unacquainted with the conſpiracy. Now it is very probable that they adviſed Nero to diſpatch his mother, leſt, if he were prevented by her, as there were good reaſons to apprehend it, they might be thought and accuſed to have acted in concert with her. Thus the paſſage of Xiphilinus, quoted above (10), is clear; Seneca adviſes Nero to kill his mother, either to prevent any charge againſt himſelf, in caſe Nero was prevented by Agrippina, or to render the Emperor more odious, by ſo heinous a crime. I own that theſe reaſons don't juſtify Seneca nor Burrus, for promoting a parricide, but it muſt be confeſſed that they may in ſome meaſure be excuſed, if we conſider the abominable character both of Nero and of his mother; it was doing mankind a real ſervice, to rid the world of ſuch monſters.

(9) Ibid. p. 355.

(10) Remark [*A*] quotat. (2).

[*E*] *Strike thy ſword into my womb, ſhe cried.*] Xiphilinus relates this circumſtance more fully. He tells us (11), that as ſoon as ſhe ſaw the aſſaſſins, and knew for what purpoſe they came; ſhe jumpt out of her bed, and having diſcovered her womb, ſtrike this, ſays ſhe to Anicetus, ſince it has borne Nero. This ſeems to contradict what Tacitus relates, that ſhe told Anicetus, "if he came upon any bloody deſign, ſhe would no wiſe believe him commiſſioned by her ſon." But this is no real contradiction; Agrippina might very well affect to believe, that her ſon would not deſtroy her, and yet finding there was no way for her to eſcape, ſhew by her laſt words, ſhe was not ignorant who it was that ſought her life; nay it was very natural for her in her deſperate condition to repent of what ſhe had done for ſuch a monſter, as Nero was.

(11) *Epitom. Dion. in Nerone*, p. 164.

cruelties and iniquity as men whoſe looks wound their guilty ſouls with inceſſant ſtings and reproaches. Nero therefore ſummoned him, and reminding him of his former meritorious exploit, "Thou alone (ſaid he) didſt protect and relieve me from the black conſpi-"racies of a mother: an opportunity of doing me ſervice of no leſs merit at preſent in-"vites thee, if thou canſt but diſcharge me effectually of an irkſome and diſaffected "wife: nor in this taſk needeſt thou either ſtrength or weapon; thou art only to ac-"knowledge that with Octavia thou haſt been engaged in adultery." For this ſervice Nero promiſed him rewards of great value, though at firſt it was neceſſary, he ſaid, they ſhould continue private and unknown; as alſo, upon his mock condemnation, lovely and delightful places of retirement; but in caſe of refuſal, threatened him with death. Anicetus prompted by the native bent of his frantick ſpirit, and by the protection and impunity which had followed all his former enormities, carried his fictions even beyond orders, and communicated them, as ſecrets, to his friends; a ſet of men whom the Prince had ſet about him, as it were to aid him by their counſels in his deſigns. Then as one convicted by his own confeſſion he was baniſhed to Sardinia, where he underwent a ſort of baniſhment, but one far from neceſſitous or miſerable, and died at laſt by the lot of nature (*d*). Tacitus mentions another ANICETUS, of whom we ſhall give ſome account in a note [*F*].

(*d*) Idem, ibid. P. 395, 396.

[*F*] *We ſhall give ſome account of another Anicetus mentioned by Tacitus.*] This Anicetus was a Barbarian, and had been a freedman to Polemon King of Pontus, once a Commander of that King's Navy, and under him in time paſt mighty in power: he was full of bitterneſs and regret ever ſince the Kingdom of Pontus had been changed into a Roman Province. Arraying therefore in the name of Vitellius the ſeveral nations that dwell in Pontus, and with the proſpect of ſpoil ſeducing all ſuch as were extremely indigent, he ſaw himſelf leader of no inconſiderable band, and with great rapidity aſſailed and entered Trapeſund, a city of Aſia exceeding ancient, founded by the Grecians upon the utmoſt confines of Pontus: There a cohort was ſlain ---. Anicetus likewiſe burnt the Fleet of the Romans, and with ſcorn and inſults ſcoured the ſea then unguarded ---. This affair merited the attention of Veſpaſian (12), who to end it, choſe out a body of Vexillaries from the Legions, and for their Leader, Verdius Geminus, an Officer diſtinguiſhed in war. He, aſſailing the enemy, whilſt they were diſconcerted and roaming aſunder in purſuit of prey, drove them into their veſſels; then in ſome gallies made with diſpatch, chaſed Anicetus into the mouth of the river Chobus, where he relied for ſafety upon the protection of Sedochus, King of the Lazians, an ally whom he had purchaſed by money and preſents. And at firſt the King, in defence of his ſupplicant, betook himſelf to menaces and arms; but as ſoon as a recompence for his treachery was propoſed, and a war threatened, if he refuſed, his fidelity vaniſhed like that of other Barbarians; he ſtruck a bargain for the life of Anicetus, and ſurrendred all the fugitives (13).

(12) Who was ſtill Vitellius's competitor.

(13) Tacit. *Hiſt.* lib. 3. p. 187, 188 of Mr. Gordon's tranſlation.

ANICIUS, a Roman family. It was more illuſtrious under the Chriſtian Emperors than in the time of the Commonwealth, though it produced ſeveral Conſuls before the birth of Julius Cæſar. We find in Pliny one Q. ANICIUS PRÆNESTINUS, who was made *Ædilis Curulis* in the fifth Century of Rome (*a*). L. ANICIUS GALLUS was Pretor in the next age, that is in the year 585, and commanded in Illyricum with ſo much ſucceſs, that he was but a month in conquering it [*A*], and taking King Gentius priſoner. The honour of a triumph was granted him the year following (*b*). One of the Conſuls for the year 593 had the name of L. ANICIUS GALLUS. I find under the firſt Emperors only ANICIUS CEREALIS, who was appointed Conſul for the 813th year of Rome (*c*). He was engaged in a plot againſt Nero, and killed himſelf in the year of Rome 819. He was the leſs regretted, becauſe it was remembred that he diſcovered to Caligula a conſpiracy that was carried on againſt his life (*d*). The Conſulſhip was very frequently in this family after the reign of Diocleſian; and there never were two brothers ſeen Conſuls together till the year of our Saviour 395, when Probinus and Olybrius were Conſuls. They were ſons to Probus, whom we ſhall ſpeak of in his proper place; and they were deſcended from ANICIUS the firſt Nobleman of Rome who embraced Chriſtianity [*B*]. The immenſe riches of this family expoſed them to envy and reproach,

(*a*) Plinius, lib. 33. c. 1.

(*b*) *See* Sigonius *de Faſtis Roman.*

(*c*) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 15. cap. 74.

(*d*) Idem, lib. 16. cap. 17.

[*A*] *He was but one month in conquering Illyricum.*] It never happened till then at Rome, that they heard of the ending of a war, before they knew it was begun. And yet in this war there was a neceſſity of ſubduing the ſtrong fort of Scodra. The ſucceſs was ſo entire, that the Prince, whom he fought with, and his mother, wife, children, brother, and all the chief perſons of his Kingdom, fell into the hands of Anicius, beſides a conſiderable booty. Livy ſpeaks as follows: *Anicius bello Illyrico intra triginta dies perfecto nuncium victoriæ Perpennam Romam miſit, & poſt dies paucos Gentium regem ipſum cum parente, conjuge, ac liberis ac fratre aliiſque principibus Illyricorum. Hoc unum bellum prius perpetratum quam cœptum Romæ auditum eſt* (1). *Hoc bellum*, ſays Florus (2), *ante finitum, quam geri Romæ nunciaretur.* Theſe priſoners of quality were only part of the ornaments of the triumph, the riches, and the ſpoils brought from Illyricum, and the rewards beſtowed on the ſoldiers, made it very conſiderable. The General received greater praiſes from his army, than Paulus Æmilius, who had triumphed a little before, had done from his. *Lætior hunc triumphum eſt ſecutus miles, multiſque dux ipſe carminibus celebratus* (3). Mr. Lloyd obſerves, that the Conſul for the year 593 was ſon to him, who conquered Gentius; but he quotes no authority for it.

(1) Livius, lib. 44. cap. 32.

(2) Florus, lib. 2. cap. 13.

(3) Liv. lib. 45. cap. 43.

[*B*] *One Anicius was the firſt Nobleman at Rome, who embraced Chriſtianity.*] I have no other proof for this, than theſe words of Prudentius:

Fertur enim ante alios generoſus Anicius urbis
Inluſtraſſe caput (4).

(4) Prudent. in *Symmach.* lib. 1. ver. 553.

Baronius conjectures, that this Poet meant Anicius Julianus, who was Conſul in the year 322. Lloyd more poſitive aſſures us, without quoting any Author, that Anicius Julianus was the firſt Roman Senator, who embraced the Goſpel, as Flavius Conſtantine was the firſt Roman Emperor, who did ſo; and that it was upon this account, that almoſt all the Roman Emperors afterwards took upon them the ſirname of Flavius, and almoſt all the Senators that of Anicius. I ſhould be glad to ſee a proof for all this. If the conjecture of Baronius were true, we might compare A-

reproach, as I ſhall ſhew in the article of PROBUS. The Benedictines pretend, that the founder of their Order was of the family of Anicius; and there have been books publiſhed, wherein they have endeavoured to ſhew, that the Auguſt Houſe of Auſtria is likewiſe deſcended from it. Richard Streinnius has written againſt this fabulous ſtory. His book is intitled *Anti-Anician*. It was never printed; and is only in manuſcript in the Emperor's Library (*e*). We ſhall mention ſomething very curious upon the ſubject of this book [*C*].

(*e*) Lambecius, *Comment. Biblioth. Vindobon.* tom. 1. num. 50.

nicius Julianus with that French Nobleman, who was baptized firſt of all after the example of Cloris, and took for his word in battle, *Dieu aide au premier Chretien*, i. e. "God aſſiſt the firſt Chriſtian." It is ſaid, that the Lords of Montmorenci are deſcended from this latter, and are called for this reaſon the *firſt Chriſtian Barons*.

[*C*] I *ſhall mention ſomething very curious concerning the book entitled* Anti-Anician.] According to Mr. Baillet the manuſcript of Streinnius will never be publiſhed for two reaſons; one is, that, which Lambecius has mentioned, becauſe the work is imperfect; and the other is of more importance, and what he did not care to ſpeak of, and this is, that *the* ANTI-ANICIAN *is not written upon the prejudices of the common people in hereditary countries, nor upon the principles of thoſe, who in order to make their court to their Emperor derive the houſe of Auſtria from the oldeſt families in ancient Rome. . . . . The author undertook to railly the Benedictine Monks upon their chimerical pretenſions of being related to the houſe of Auſtria, and to confute in particular the book of a Flemiſh Benedictine named Arnold Wion, who by a ſtrange chain of reveries, had attempted to ſhew the two branches of the Anician family of Rome, one in favour of the Princes of the Houſe of Auſtria, and the other of their Founder St. Benedict* (5). Mr. Baillet adds, that if Richard Strein has not ſpoken of the Anicians in his book of the Roman families, *it is becauſe this was not one of the families of the old ſtock.* He tells us, that Lambecius had a deſign to anſwer the ANTI-ANICIAN *of Streinnius in his Prolegomena to the Annals of Auſtria, which he promiſed . . . .* and it ſeems that he *choſe for the foundation and model of his anſwer* * *a book, publiſhed by a Benedictine Abbot, tho' of the Ciſtercian Order, named John Seyfrid, twelve years after the death of Streinnius, under the title of* ARBOR ANICIANA; *but tho' this Seyfrid had deſigned to attack the* ANTI ANICIAN, *yet it may be ſaid, that Streinnius would have been ſufficiently revenged by Scioppius, who publiſhed in the year* 1651 *a ſhort Diſſertation, to ridicule this Seyfrid and men of his ſtamp, juſt at the time, when a Benedictine Monk, named Bucelin, to encreaſe the number of Viſionaries, publiſhed his* AQUILA IMPERII BENEDICTINA. *He was not,* ſays Mr. Baillet, *upon this occaſion any longer the ſevere and ſatyrical Scioppius. He was a faithful and zealous ſervant of the Houſe of Auſtria, a Counſellor of the Emperor and King of Spain, attached to the Princes of their name by more than one obligation; he was infinitely more learned than theſe idle dreamers; he had made himſelf formidable in point of falſe Genealogies above forty years before by his Scaliger Hypobolimæus. If Scioppius therefore, who was ſo much devoted in other reſpects to the Houſe of Auſtria, thought proper to oppoſe the chimera's of theſe Monks concerning the Anician Genealogy, it is a ſtrong prejudice, that their inventions are not the leaſt honourable to the Princes of the Houſe of Auſtria, nor to the followers of St. Benedict; and that the* ANTI-ANICIAN *of Streinnius muſt be a work of importance. . . . . Tho' Seyfrid has aſſerted, that Saint Thomas was of the illuſtrious family of the Anicians, yet it is hardly to be expected that any French Dominican will ever attempt to give us an* AQUILA IMPERII THOMISTICA. *This perhaps is reſerved for ſome German or Spaniſh Dominican, who is zealouſly attached to the Houſe of Auſtria.* I deſire the reader will conſider me in this whole affair as nothing but a mere copier.

(5) Baillet, tom. 2. of his *Anti*, num. 154. pag. 228, and the following.

* Tom. 2. *Comment. Biblioth. Vindobon.* p. 418, *& ſeq.*

☞ANNA COMNENA, the daughter of Alexius Comnenus Emperor of Conſtantinople, and the Empreſs Irene, wrote an Hiſtory under the title of *Alexias* [*A*]. She was born in that city in the year 1083 (*a*). She was at firſt deſign'd for the marriage of Conſtantine, the ſon of Michael Ducas; but upon his death ſhe was married to Nicephorus Bryennius (*b*). She applied herſelf ſo intenſely to the ſtudy of Literature, that ſhe gained the reputation of being the moſt accompliſhed Lady of that age. Having loſt her mother firſt, and afterwards the Emperor Alexius her father in 1118, and her huſband in 1137, ſhe endeavoured to mitigate the ſenſe

(*a*) Cave, *Hiſt. Literar.* Sæc. 12. p. 568. edit. Coloniæ Allobrog 1720.

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

[*A*] *Wrote an Hiſtory under the title of Alexias.*] It is divided into fifteen books, and it contains an Account of the Church of Conſtantinople, and the controverſies in Religion, which were agitated in the Eaſtern Churches. This work was finiſhed in 1148, many years after the death of her father Alexius (1). It is extant in MS. in the Library of Cardinal Barberini at Rome, in that of St. Laurence at Florence, and in ſeveral other Libraries in Italy (2). The firſt eight books were publiſhed in Greek at Augsburg with the Tranſlation and Notes of David Hœſchelius, in 4to, in 1610, as Du Pin and Dr. Cave inform us (3), or, according to Oudin (4) in 1618. But the intire Hiſtory was publiſhed from the MS. in the Library of Barberini at Rome at Paris in fol. in 1651, with an elegant Latin Verſion, Gloſſary, and Preface, by Peter Poſſin a learned Jeſuit, and Hœſchelius's Notes (5). The celebrated Charles du Freſne has written hiſtorical and philological Notes upon this work, and ſubjoined it to his edition of Johannes Cinnamus, printed at Paris in folio in 1670 (6). The *Alexias* was continued by the abovementioned Cinnamus, who flouriſhed about the year 1150 (7). Voſſius tells us (8), that Anna Comnena has given a very different account of her father in many points, from what the Latins relate; who almoſt univerſally, except Albert Canon of Aix, deſcribe that Emperor as a treacherous and perfidious perſon. But it is very probable, as that learned Critic obſerves, that the Latins gave too great a looſe to their hatred of this Greek Emperor, and his daughter Anna Comnena indulged herſelf in a greater partiality towards him, than the Laws of Hiſtory allow. *Multa verò de parente ſuo longè aliter narrat, quam Latini ſolent; qui omnes propè, ſi unum excipias Albertum, Canonicum Aquenſem, Cæſarem eum deſcribunt, tanquam fraudulentum ac perfidum. Sed ſatis veriſimile eſt, tum Latinos ſuo erga Græcum Imperatorem odio, tum filiam Comnenam amori erga patrem ſuo, aliquanto amplius indulſiſſe quam per leges hiſtoriæ liceret.* The reader may ſee in Oudin (9) the teſtimonies of Robert Abbot of St. Remigius at Rheims in his ſecond book *De Profectione Chriſtianorum Principum in Syriam*; i. e. "Of the Expedition of the Chriſtian "Princes into Syria," in which he was preſent himſelf; of Otto Friſingenſis in his 7th book, c. 10. of his *Chronicles*; of Guillelmus Tyrius L. 2. c. 5. &c. *De Bello Sacro*; i. e. "Of the holy War;" of Gotfridus Viterbienſis in the 18th part of his *Chronicle*; of Conrade Abbot of Urſperg in his Chronicle under the year 1101; of Matthew Paris in his *Hiſtoria Major*, under the years 1096 and 1113; and of Matthew of Weſtminſter in his *Flores Hiſtoriarum* under the year 1105; all which writers unanimouſly repreſent him as a man of the greateſt art and the moſt treacherous and perfidious temper imaginable. Albert Canon of Aix, mentioned by Voſſius, whoſe book was publiſhed by Reiner Reineccius under the title of *Chronicon Hieroſolymitanum* without the Author's name, ſpeaks of him in much more advantageous terms, ſo that he ſeems to have deſigned a direct Apology for that Emperor. T.

(1) Oudin. *Comment. de Script. Eccleſ.* tom. 2. Col. 1176.

(2) Idem, ibid.

(3) Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Aut. Eccleſ.* tom. 9. p. 203. edit. Paris 1697; and Cave, *ubi ſupra.*

(4) *Ubi ſupra.*

(5) Cave, Du Pin, *and* Oudin, *ubi ſupra.*

(6) Cave *and* Oudin, *ubi ſupra.*

(7) Oudin, *ubi ſupra.*

(8) *De Hiſt. Lat.* lib. 2. c. 27.

(9) *Ubi ſupra*, Col. 1176, 1177, 1178 and 1179.

ſenſe of her grief by writing the abovementioned hiſtory of her father from the year 1069 to 1118 (*c*). Zonaras the Hiſtorian gives her a noble character (*d*), and tells us, that ſhe engaged very vigorouſly in the purſuit of Learning, and had a peculiar Attic elegance in her ſtyle; and being endowed with a genius adapted for elevated contemplations, ſhe improved her natural abilities by intenſe ſtudy; for ſhe was perpetually reading, or converſing with men of Learning.

(*c*) Idem, ibid. and Oudin, *Comment. de Script. Eccleſ.* tom. 2. Sæc. 12. Col. 1175.

(*d*) *Annal.* tom. 3. *prope finem.*

☞ ANNAND (WILLIAM) Dean of Edinburgh in Scotland, and Author of ſeveral works [*A*], was ſon of William Annand, Miniſter of Air, the Head-Burg Royal of the Shire of Air in the Dioceſe of Glaſgow in Scotland, and born in that Burgh in 1633. In 1638 his father was obliged to retire with his family into England on account of the commotions in his own country. In 1651 our author became a ſcholar in Univerſity College; and though he was under the care of a Preſbyterian Tutor, yet he took all opportunities of frequenting the Sermons of the contrary party (*a*). He took his Degree of Batchelor of Arts January 30, 1656 (*b*), and in Auguſt the ſame year received holy Orders from Dr. Thomas Fulwar Biſhop of Ardfert or Kerry in Ireland, and was appointed Preacher at Weſton on the Green near Biſter in Oxfordſhire (*c*). He was made Maſter of Arts July 6th 1658 (*d*), and became Vicar of Leighton Buzzard in Bedfordſhire, where he continued in great reputation for his excellent talent in preaching till 1662, when he attended John Earl of Middleton Lord High-Commiſſioner of Scotland into that Kingdom as his Chaplain. In the latter end of 1663 he was inſtituted in the Tolbooth Church at Edinburgh, and ſeveral years after in the Trone Church in that city, which is likewiſe a Prebendſhip. In April 1676 he was made Dean of Edinburgh, and October 1ſt 1685 he commenced Doctor of Divinity in the Univerſity of St. Andrews. He died the 13th of June 1689, and was honourably interred in the Grey-Friars Church, but without a funeral Sermon, which was not permitted by the Preſbyterians, in whoſe hands the Magiſtracy then was (*e*). His life was very exemplary, and his death attended with all the ſentiments of piety and devotion.

(*a*) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* Vol. 2. Col. 832. 2d edit. 1721.

(*b*) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* fol. 108.

(*c*) Idem, *Ath. Oxon. ubi ſupra.*

(*d*) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* Col. 122.

(*e*) Idem, *Athen. Oxon.* Col. 833.

[*A*] *Author of ſeveral works.*] I. Fides Catholica: or, *the Doctrine of the Catholick Church in eighteen grand ordinances, referring to the word, ſacraments, and Prayer, in purity, number, and nature, catholickly maintain'd, and publickly taught againſt hereticks of all ſorts.* London 1661-2, in 4to. II. *Solutions of many proper and profitable queſtions ſuitable to the nature of each ordinance &c.* printed with the *Fides Catholica.* III. Panem quotidianum; or, *a ſhort Diſcourſe tending to prove the legality, decency, and expediency of ſet forms of prayer in the Churches of Chriſt, with a particular Defence of the book of Common-Prayer of the Church of England.* London 1661, in 4to. IV. Pater noſter; *Our Father; or the Lord's Prayer explained, the ſenſe thereof, and duties therein, from Scripture, Hiſtory, and Fathers methodically cleared, and ſuccinctly opened.* London 1670, in 8vo. V. Myſterium Pietatis; or, *the Myſtery of Godlineſs,* &c. London 1671, in 8vo. VI. Doxologia; or, *Glory to the Father, the Churches Hymn, reduced to glorifying the Trinity.* London 1672, in 8vo. VII. Dualitas; or, *a twofold Subject diſplayed and opened, conduceable to godlineſs and peace in order: firſt* Lex loquens, *the Honour and Dignity of Magiſtracy, with the Duties thereupon, &c. Secondly,* Duorum Unitas; or, *the Agreement of Magiſtracy and Miniſtry at the election of the honourable Magiſtrates at Edinburgh, and opening of the Dioceſan Synod of the Rev. Clergy there.* Edenburgh 1674, in 4to (1). T.

(1) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* Vol. 2. Col. 833.

ANNAT (FRANCIS) Confeſſor to Lewis XIV, was born in Roüergue (*a*), the fifth of February 1590. He became a Jeſuit in February 1607, and profeſſed the fourth vow in 1624. He taught Philoſophy at Toulouſe ſix years, and Divinity ſeven; and having acquitted himſelf with great applauſe, he was ſent for to Rome in order to take upon him the office of Cenſor-general of the books publiſhed by the Society, and that of Divine to the General of the Society. Upon his return to his own Province, he was made Rector of the College of Montpellier, and afterwards of that of Toulouſe. He aſſiſted at the eighth Congregation-general of the Jeſuits, which was held at Rome in 1645, as Deputy of his Province, and gave ſuch ſignal proofs of his merit, that Father Vincent Caraffa, General of the Jeſuits, thought no perſon was more qualified to diſcharge the office of Aſſiſtant of France, which had been vacant about eighteen months. The ninth Congregation-general gave him again the ſame poſt under Francis Picolomini, General of the Society, after whoſe death he was made Provincial of the Province of France. While he was engaged in this poſt, he was choſen Confeſſor to Lewis XIV; and having executed this function for ſixteen years, he was obliged to demand his diſcharge, becauſe his great age had extremely weakened his hearing. The King being very much pleaſed with him, diſmiſſed him with a great deal of regret. Father Annat lived but four months after he had left the court. He died in the Maiſon Profeſſe at Paris the 14th of June 1670. Father Sotuel, from whom I have borrowed theſe particulars, gives him the character of a perſon of great virtues, perfect diſintereſtedneſs, prodigious modeſty and humility, an exact attachment to the obſervances and diſcipline of his Order, great caution in uſing his credit for his own private advantage, or the advantage of his family, and of uncommon zeal for religion (*b*). *He was the hammer of hereſies,* ſays he (*c*), *and he attack'd particularly with incredible zeal the new hereſy of the Janſeniſts. He ſtrenuouſly endeavoured to get it condemned by the Pope, and reſtrained by the authority of his moſt Chriſtian Majeſty. Beſides which he confuted it by his pen, with ſuch ſtrength of argument, that his adverſaries had nothing ſolid to reply to him.* There are a great number of perſons, whom Father Sotuel will never convince of this laſt point; but with regard to the diſintereſtedneſs of Father Annat, there needs little pains to evince that; for every one who has a mind

(*a*) Ruthenonſis.

(*b*) Sotuel. *Bib. Scriptor. Societ. Jeſu,* p. 211.

(*c*) *Hæreſium malleus, & nomi natim novæ Janſeniſtarum Hæreſeôs oppugnator acerrimus.* ibid.

mind to inform himſelf, may be aſſured, that this Father Confeſſor never advanced his family. It is reported that the King was heard to ſay, that he knew not whether Father Annat had any relations (*d*). There were ſome who did not forget themſelves, and went to him at the Louvre; but they received no benefices by their ſollicitations. There are times when the great and the little nepotiſm are in vogue; ſometimes the little nepotiſm, while the great is extinguiſhed. In the time of Father Annat the great nepotiſm (*e*) was at its height; but the little nepotiſm, with regard to the Fathers Confeſſors, was at its loweſt ebb in Paris. I make uſe of this reſtriction, becauſe there are a great many other perſons in church preferments, who continue to heap every thing they can procure upon their relations. Several of them without doubt purſued their uſual courſe, while Father Annat never ſuffered about him the wolves that came with open mouths from Roüergue. We read in the *Amours of the Royal Palace*, that he was deſirous to quit his poſt [*A*], while Mademoiſelle de la Valiere was in favour. If this was true, it would be one of the nobleſt paſſages of his life, and the fineſt ſubject for panegyric that can be found in the Confeſſor of a King. The author of this ſatyr, who, according to the genius and nature of this kind of writings, endeavours to give a ſpiteful turn to every thing, ſaw this very plainly; and it is upon that account that he has managed it ſo, that the reader finds nothing commendable in it. There has been handed about a ſatyr of much later date, in which ſo many publick and notorious falſities are added to his true or pretended demand of leave to retire [*B*], that it is ſcarce poſſible to comprehend, that there ſhould

(*d*) *Adeo ut dixiſſe aliquando perhibeatur ſua Majeſtas neſcire ſe an P. Annatus haberet alianos ſanguine ſibi conjunctos.* Ibid.

(*e*) That is that of the court of Rome.

[*A*] *It is ſaid in the* Amours of the Royal Palace (1)*, that he was deſirous to quit his poſt.*] The paſſage is as follows: "Poor Father Annat, Confeſſor "to the King, by the ſuggeſtions of the Queens, went "likewiſe to him, and pretended that he wanted to "quit the court, inſinuating that it was on account "of his criminal converſation with her. The King, "ſmiling, gave him his congé very readily. The "Father ſeeing himſelf taken at his word would "have accommodated the affair again; but the King, "ſtill ſmiling told him, that for the future he would "have no other Confeſſor than the Curate of his "Pariſh. It is inexpreſſible what a reſentment the "whole Order conceived againſt him for this weak "conduct of his." There may be three queſtions ſtarted upon this ſubject: I, Whether it is really true, that Father Annat asked leave of the King to retire: II, Whether this was only by way of feint, and out of complaiſance for the Queens: III, Whether he retired in reality, or whether the Jeſuits had addreſs enough to accommodate the affair. I can only anſwer the firſt queſtion, that I know nothing of the matter, and that the authority of a Satyriſt is of no weight in the leaſt. I pay no regard to what ſuch a one ſays, any further than he proves it. Thoſe, who write an Hiſtory, are diſpenſed from ſwearing to every thing they ſay, and giving us their witneſſes for it (2). They are believed upon their word, without calling upon them to ſwear to it; but as for the writers of libels, it is a mere favour and civility to them, even to credit them upon their oath, tho' it is confirmed by witneſſes. I am ſtill more at a loſs about the ſecond queſtion; I never pretend to dive into the ſecrets of a man's heart. With regard to the third, I cannot tell any thing but what is publickly known, and that is, that Father Annat was without any interruption Confeſſor to the King of France till ſpring in the year 1670.

(1) This book firſt appeared about the year 1665.

(2) *Quis unquam ab Hiſtorico juratores exegit?* Seneca *de Morte Claudii*, init.

[*B*] *A Satyr of a much later date* (3)*, tells us a great many falſities upon this ſubject.*] The Author of this Satyre ſuppoſes, that *Father la Chaiſe had been very ſerviceable in bringing the Pope to grant what the King deſired, after the inſult offered to the French Embaſſador by the Corſican Guards, and that Cardinal Mazarin, in acknowledgment of this ſervice, careſſed him very much, recommended him to the King, and even during his own life got him admitted into his Council of Conſcience, which was properly ſpeaking to make him aſſiſtant to the Confeſſor* (4). In the margin there is marked the year 1663, when the Cardinal firſt began to careſs him; and the year 1665, when he was admitted into the Council of Conſcience. What an ignorance is this of modern Hiſtory? Every body knows, that Cardinal Mazarin died 1661. The Author adds, that Father la Chaiſe ſupplanted Father Annat, by excuſing the amour of the King with Madam la Valiere from the conſideration of the infirmity of human nature, while the Confeſſor *was every day teazing the King upon that ſubject, and never let him reſt* (5). He adds likewiſe, that la Valiere, knowing what were the maxims of Father la Chaiſe, wiſhed to have him for her Confeſſor, and propoſed the thing to him by Mr. de Montauzier (6); but after a converſation, which ſhe had with that Jeſuit, ſhe choſe rather to procure him the place of Father Annat; and having mentioned it to the King, the affair was concluded in a few days, becauſe Father Annat, who was always denouncing the terrible judgments of God, and deſiring leave to retire, ſince his remonſtrances had no effect, was taken at his word (7). In the margin is marked the year 1667. I confeſs I cannot conceive any thing equal to the aſſurance of this writer; for it is univerſally known, that Father Annat did not quit the court till 1670; that a Jeſuit of Rouergue, whoſe name was Father Ferrier, ſucceeded him as Confeſſor to Lewis XIV; and that Father la Chaiſe was not choſen till after the death of Father Ferrier, which happened the 29th of October 1674 (8). What can thoſe think, who publiſh ſuch notorious falſities? How can they avoid ſeeing that they deſtroy their chief deſign by this? For what a prejudice muſt they raiſe againſt their whole book, when they appear to be ſo ignorant of things, which are known to the whole world, or impudent enough, to publiſh evident falſities? Do they follow the maxims of ſome people, who publiſh their pious frauds to the whole world, and reaſon in this manner? *For one perſon, who ſhall know that I am miſtaken, there will be a thouſand, who will know nothing of the matter. A thouſand will be edified by my fraud, for one that will be ſcandalized at it. The diſadvantage will be but ſmall in compariſon of the good it will do. It is therefore charity and prudence to affirm this fiction before ſuch a numerous aſſembly.* I cannot tell whether our writers of Libels reaſon after the ſame manner; but I am ſure they would gain their point much ſooner, if they would ſtudy Chronology more, and obſerve the rules of probability in their fictions. *Eſt ars etiam maledicendi*, ſays Scaliger (9); that is, "There is even an art in "lampooning a perſon;" thoſe, who are ignorant of it, defame their enemy much leſs, than they ſhew an inclination to do it. I have made this remark more for the ſake of the publick advantage, than that of any private perſon; it is neceſſary, that in this Age we ſhould be able to judge of the Satires, which have been publiſhed for theſe thouſand years, and that the following Ages may judge of thoſe, which we ſee now. To form a true judgment of them, we ought to pay no regard to this principle, *It is not probable, that if this was notoriouſly falſe, they would have dared to publiſh it.*

(3) Intitled, *Hiſtoire du Pere La Chaize, Jeſuite, & Confeſſeur du Roi Louis XIV. a Cologne chez Pierre Marteau, en* 1693 *in* 12°. The ſecond part was printed two years after.

(4) Pag. 106.

(5) Pag. 107.

(6) Pag. 108.

(7) Pag. 115.

(8) *Ex* Nathanael. Sotuelli, *Biblioth. Societ.* p. 449.

(9) *Scaligerana* II. p. 10.

Some thoughts about Satyrs.

This will be without doubt the chief uſe of this remark; for in any other reſpect the reflexions or cenſures, that are the beſt grounded, will never have any effect to ſtop the pen of ſuch kind of writers. The general indignation, which every perſon of honour expreſſed againſt the fabulous and ſatyrical writer of Father la Chaiſe's Life, did not hinder the publiſhing of another piece much worſe than that about five years after. It is from one end to the other a ſeries

ſhould be men in the world who will venture to tell lies publickly with ſo little care. Father Annat wrote a great number of books [C], ſome in Latin and others in French. The Latin pieces are much better than the other, becauſe he acquired a much eaſier habit of treating a point of Divinity after the dogmatical and polemical manner of the ſchools, than to give it a turn ſuitable to the genius of the age. However what he wrote in French in anſwer to the *Provincial Letters* is very much commended (*f*).

(*f*) See remark [C] at the end.

What I have ſaid in general concerning the nephews of this Father Confeſſor ought not to be conſidered as any prejudice to their merit; for one of them, who is General of the Fathers *of the Chriſtian Doctrine*, is eſteemed a man of great Learning, and has publiſhed in Latin a work, *which is very much valued.* It is *a methodical apparatus for poſitive Divinity* (*g*). We have an extract from it in the *Journal des Savans* of the 13th of September 1700.

(g) *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, Avril* 1700, p. 477.

of groſs fictions and chimerical adventures, related in the moſt impudent manner, and in a very obſcene ſtile. This fine piece is intitled, *Hiſtoire des intrigues amoureuſes du P. Peters, Jeſuite, Confeſſeur de Jaques II, ci-devant Roi d'Angleterre, ou l'on voit ſes avantures les plus particuliers, & ſon véritable caractere, comme auſſi les conſeils, qu'il a donnez à ce Prince touchant ſon gouvernement. A Cologne, chez Pierre Marteau le jeune, Marchand Libraire*, 1698. While there are people to be found, who buy ſuch books as theſe with pleaſure, there will be Bookſellers enough to pay for the writing and printing of them; and conſequently, men of little conſcience enough, to proſtitute their pens for hire. This evil therefore admits of no remedy.

[C] *Father Annat wrote a great number of books.*] His Latin Tracts, publiſhed at divers times, were collected in three volumes in 4to, and printed at Paris by Cramoiſi in 1666. The firſt contains his book *de Scientiâ mediâ contra novos ejus impugnatores, una cum Exercitatione ſcholaſtica ſub nomine Eugenii Philadelphi, & Appendice ad Guilhelmum Camerarium.* The ſecond contains his book intitled, *Auguſtinus à Bajanis, hoc eſt*, Janſenianis, *vindicatus.* In the third are the following tracts: *Catholica Diſputatio de Eccleſiâ præſentis temporis; De incoactâ Libertate contra novum Auguſtinum Iprenſis Epiſcopi, incentium Lenem, Apologiſtam Janſenii, & Commentatorem quinque Propoſitionum; Informatio de quinque propoſitionibus ex Theologiâ Janſenii collectis, quas Epiſcopi Galliæ Romano Pontifici ad cenſuram obtulerunt; Janſenius à Thomiſtis gratiæ per ſeipſam efficacis defenſoribus condemnatus. Cavilli Janſenianorum contra latam in ipſos à Sede Apoſtolicâ ſententiam, ſeu Confutatio Libelli trium columnarum* (10). Theſe five treatiſes in the third volume have prefixed to them ſeveral Advertiſements to the reader, and ſome Notes upon the *Journal* of Saint-Amour. The following are ſome of his French books. *Réponſe au Livre, qui a pour titre* THEOLOGIE MORALE DES JESUITES; *Réponſe à quelques demandes touchant la premiere lettre de Mr. Arnaud. La bonne-foi des Janſeniſtes dans la citation des Auteurs; Recueil de pluſieurs fauſſetez & impoſtures contenues dans le Journal de tout ce qui s'eſt paſſé en France ſur le ſujet de la Morale, & de l'Apologie des Caſuiſtes* (11); *Remedes contre les ſcrupules, qui empêchent la ſignature du Formulaire; Remarques ſur la conduite, qu'ont tenue les Janſeniſtes dans l'impreſſion & dans la publication du Nouveau Teſtament imprimé à Mons; La Doctrine de Janſenius contraire au Saint Siege Apoſtolique, & à Saint Auguſtin.* I omit the titles of ſeveral others; you may find them in Father Sotuel. But we may obſerve by the by, that Author and his predeceſſor Alegambe have forgot one thing, which ſhould have been obſerved. They ought to have given the titles of books in the ſame language, which the Author wrote in, and then have tranſlated them into Latin. We find every day amongſt the Bookſellers, that if you ask for books not by their proper titles, but only by the ſenſe of their titles, you muſt return without finding them, tho' they are in the warehouſe or ſhop of the Bookſeller. As old as the Jeſuit Annat was during the heat of the diſpute with the Janſeniſts, on account of the Formulary, and the Tranſlation of Mons, yet he publiſhed ſeveral little pieces in 4to upon that ſubject. He was not contented with ſerving the cauſe only by his intereſt with the King, but he was reſolved to defend it by his pen to the laſt drop of his ink.

(10) It is in Father Sotuel, *Calumniarum.*

(11) The Curates of Paris wrote an apology for this Journal, in their 8th and 9th pieces.

I ſhall not omit the Elogiums given him in an Anſwer to the *Provincial Letters* of Mr. Paſcal, which was reprinted in Holland in the year 1696 (12).

(12) *Entretiens de Cleandre & d'Eudoxe*, p. 79, 80. Holland edition.

" But with regard to the Jeſuits, who ventured to
" write againſt Mr. Paſcal, what do you think of
" Father Annat, who is the Author of a book intitled, *La Bonne-foi des Janſeniſtes*, and to whom
" the ſeventeenth and eighteenth *Provincial Letters*
" are addreſſed? Father Annat, anſwers Cleander,
" was in my opinion a man of great genius; the
" Jeſuits wrote nothing ſuperior to what he publiſhed upon the points, which were then in diſpute.
" This good man (for I knew him to be ſuch, and
" he was even modeſty itſelf,) had an excellent talent
" at writing, even in French, if he had ſtudied our
" language a little more. He has very often ſtrokes
" ſo fine, and lively, and agreeable, that I have ſeen
" nothing equal to them any where. I am of your
" opinion, replied Eudoxus; and without mentioning
" his virtue, which I have heard commended even
" by thoſe of the contrary party, I find in him as
" well as you a great exactneſs of judgment, and
" ſometimes ſuch a turn of expreſſion and raillery, as
" is very extraordinary in a School-Divine."

ANNE, the name of ſeveral perſons mentioned in Scripture. The mother of Samuel the Prophet was called ANNE; ſhe was a very pious woman, and extremely beloved by Elkana her huſband. She was barren, and this misfortune afflicted her the more ſenſibly, becauſe ſhe ſaw herſelf expoſed to the raillery and inſults of the other wife of Elkana. She was ſo importunate in her prayers to God for a ſon, that ſhe was at laſt heard (*a*), for God gave her Samuel, and after him three ſons and two daughters (*b*). The book of Tobit, accounted Apocryphal amongſt Proteſtants, mentions another ANNE, the wife of Tobit, and mother of Tobias. In the Goſpel of St. Luke we have ANNE the Propheteſs, daughter of Phanuel (*c*). She was a very devout woman of about eighty four years of age, of which ſhe had lived but ſeven with her huſband. Baronius has repreſented her as a cloiſter'd Nun, but he is miſtaken in that particular [A]. The Goſpel likewiſe mentions a man

(*a*) 1 book of Samuel, ch. i.
(*b*) Ibid. ch. ii. ver. 21.
(*c*) St. Luke ii. 36.

[A] *Baronius repreſents her as a cloiſtered Nun; but he is miſtaken in that particular.*] I ſhall give his own words: *Quomodo autem Annam nunquam è templo diſceſſiſſe dicatur, ut merito eandem S. Cyrillus Hieroſolymitanus * religioſiſſimam monialem appellet, conſule quæ ſuperius dicta ſunt de præſentatione Dei genetricis in templo* (1). We find here two things; I, he takes this expreſſion of Luke literally, *ſhe departed not from the temple* (2): II, he thinks, that St. Cyril had a great deal of reaſon to call her *a moſt religious Nun.* But it is plain, that we ought not to extend the words of St. Luke further than the common meaning, which we always underſtand, when to ſignify that a man goes very often to a houſe, we ſay, *he is never abſent*

* Catechef. x.
(1) Baron. *in Annal. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. i. *ad ann.* 42 num. 41.

(2) Οὐκ ἀφίστατο ἀπὸ τῦ ἱεροῦ, νηστείαις καὶ δεήσεσι λατρεύουσα νυκτὸς καὶ ἡμέρας. i. e. according to the Geneva tranſlation, *She departed not from the temple, ſerving God, in faſting and prayers, night and day.*

man, who was called ANNE in French, or ANNAS, and was High-Prieſt of the Jews in the time of our Saviour. His ſon-in-law Caiaphas held the ſame dignity when Chriſt was put to death. With regard to St. ANNE, the mother of the Virgin Mary, and the moſt famous of all others of that name among the Roman Catholicks, we have no trace of her in all the Scripture. The writings of the three firſt ages of the church make no mention of her. St. Epiphanius is the firſt who ſays any thing of her, and yet the ſucceeding ages have given us a long legend of St. ANNE, as we ſhall ſee in the article of St. JOACHIM her huſband. I am ſurpriſed that Eraſmus could find in the antient writings but three women whoſe names were Anne [*B*].

ſent from it, he is always there, that we find him there perpetually, day and night. This is what we ſay particularly of women of devotion, who go ſeveral times a day to church; *They are never abſent from the altar; they are conſtantly at prayers in the church.* As for what St. Cyril ſays, it is not true, that he calls the Propheteſs Anne *a Nun.* The Latin Tranſlator of that Father did not attend ſtrictly enough to his words. The Greek word ἀσκητὴς, ἀσκητρία, was not ſo peculiarly appropriated to the Monks and Nuns, but that it was likewiſe applied to all thoſe, who are exact in performing the exerciſes of Religion. This is what the learned Antagoniſt of Baronius has ſhewn very evidently (3).

(3) Cauſaubon, *Exercitat. II.* num. 13.

[*B*] *I am ſurprized that Eraſmus could find in the ancient writings but three women, whoſe names were Anne.*] The firſt is the ſiſter of Dido; ſhe was ſirnamed *Perenna, and placed,* ſays he, *in the number of the Gods on account of the ſingular affection, which ſhe had for her ſiſter.* Other Dictionaries have related in ſo full a manner the adventures of this Anne, that I think there is no neceſſity of touching upon them. The ſecond is the wife of Elkana. *It is a ſufficient commendation of her,* ſays he, *to obſerve, that in her old age, and by the peculiar favour of God ſhe brought forth Samuel, who was a moſt pious Prieſt and an incorrupt Judge. Cujus ad laudem abunde ſatis eſt, quod & anus, & auſpice Deo, Samuelem pepererit, non utique ſibi, ſed Deo quidem Sacerdotem religioſiſſimum, populo verò Judicem incorruptiſſimum* (4). The third is the mother of the Virgin Mary. He tells us this laſt Anne was very highly extolled by Rodolphus Agricola and Baptiſta Mantuanus. He has in this article omitted ſome particulars, and miſtaken others. What had the daughter of Phanuel, and the mother of Tobias done to him, that they were thus omitted? But where does he find, that the mother of Samuel was old? The ſacred Hiſtorian ſays nothing of it; but rather intimates, that ſhe was ſtill young enough. Had not ſhe five children after ſhe had weaned Samuel? The ſame Hiſtorian repreſents her as replying to Eli the Prieſt, who accuſed her of being drunk, that ſhe neither had drunk wine nor beer. Joſephus not thinking this particular enough, puts another anſwer into her mouth, that ſhe never had drunk any thing but water. Moreri choſe rather to follow the Jewiſh Hiſtorian than the Scriptures. The Lady, to whom Eraſmus wrote this Letter, in which he mentions theſe three Annes, would deſerve an article; he ſtiles her *Annam Berſalam Principem Verianam.* If I could poſſibly diſcover any thing of her family or life, I would very readily give ſome account of her.

(4) Eraſm. *Epiſtola,* 38. lib. 9. P. 500.

Since the firſt edition of this work, I have diſcovered ſomething relating to this ſubject. See the article BERSALA.

☞ANNICERIS, a Greek Philoſopher of the Cyrenaic Sect, and who gave the name of Annicerians to his diſciples [*A*], was born at Cyrene, and ſcholar to Paræbates (*a*). When Plato, by the command of Dionyſius the Tyrant of Sicily, was ſold as a ſlave at Ægina, our Philoſopher happened to be preſent, and redeemed him for twenty, or, according to others, thirty Minæ, and ſent him to Athens to his friends, who immediately returned the money to Anniceris; but he refuſed it, ſaying, that they were not the only perſons who deſerved to take care of Plato (*b*). He was particularly eminent for his ſkill in chariot-racing, of which he one day gave a proof before Plato, and drove many courſes round the Academy ſo exactly, that his wheels never went out of the track, to the admiration of all who were preſent, except Plato, who reproved him for his too great induſtry in thoſe affairs, telling him, that it was not poſſible but that he, who employed ſo much pains about things of no value, muſt neglect thoſe of greater importance, which are truly worthy of admiration (*c*). He had a brother who was named Nicoteles, a Philoſopher, and the famous Poſidonius was his ſcholar (*d*).

(*a*) Laertius, lib. 2.

(*b*) Idem *in Vitâ Platonis.*

(*c*) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 2. c. 27.
(*d*) Suidas.

[*A*] *Gave the name of Annicerians.*] They, as well as the reſt of the Cyrenaic Philoſophers, placed all good in pleaſure, and conceived virtue to be only commendable ſo far as it produced pleaſure. *Atqui ab Ariſtippo, Cyrenaici atque Annicerii philoſophi nominati, omne bonum in voluptate poſuerunt; virtutemque cenſuerunt ob eam rem eſſe laudandam, quod efficiens eſſet voluptatis* (1). They agreed in all reſpects with the Hegeſians (2), except that they did not aboliſh friendſhip, benevolence, duty to parents, and love to one's country (3). They held, that tho' a wiſe man ſuffer trouble for thoſe things, yet he will lead a life not at all the leſs happy, tho' he enjoy but few pleaſures. That the felicity of a friend is not deſirable in itſelf; for to agree in judgment with another, or to be raiſed above and fortified againſt the general opinion, is not ſufficient to ſatisfy reaſon; but we muſt accuſtom ourſelves to the beſt things, on account of our innate vicious inclinations. That a friend is not to be entertained only for uſeful or neceſſary ends, nor when ſuch ends fail, to be caſt off, but out of an intrinſic good will; for which we ought likewiſe to expoſe ourſelves to trouble and inconvenience. For tho' theſe Philoſophers, like the reſt of that ſect, placed the chief end and good of mankind in pleaſure, and profeſſed that they were uneaſy at the loſs of it, yet they affirmed, that we ought voluntarily to ſubject ourſelves to pain and trouble out of regard to our friends (4). T.

(1) Cicero *de Offiiis*, lib. 3.
(2) See the article of HEGESIAS.
(3) *See* Stanley's *Lives of the Philoſophers*, Part 4. p. 140. edit. 2. London, 1687.
(4) Idem, ibid.

ANNIUS of Viterbo, a famous impoſtor. See NANNIUS.

ANSELM, Archbiſhop of Canterbury, one of the moſt illuſtrious Prelates of his age, died the 21ſt of April 1109, aged ſeventy ſix years (*a*). He deſired to live a little longer in order to finiſh a treatiſe *of the Origin of the Soul* [*A*]. His article is very long

(*a*) Cave, *Hiſt. Litteraria Script. Eccleſ.* p. 627.

[*A*] *He deſired to live to finiſh a treatiſe of the Origin of the Soul.*] This deſire of his has made a Doctor of Louvain ſay, that the opinion of the propagation of the ſoul continued till the end of the 11th Century. *Imo,* ſays he (1), *uſque ad tempora S. Anſelmi, hoc eſt annum Chriſti MC, in Occidente duraſſe videtur hæc de animarum traductione dubitatio. Nam cum paulò poſt moriturus S. Pater decumberet, dixiſſe ſcribit familiaris* &c.

(1) Libert. Fromond. *Philoſoph. Chriſt. de Animâ*, lib. 4. cap. 3. p. 812.

long in Moreri's Dictionary; to which I refer the reader. The Monks of Lerins, who have given a place to this great Prelate in the Chronology of their Saints and illustrious Monks, are confuted by the author (*b*) of a book intitled *Les Mons travestis* (*c*). We shall see below that he made use of an argument for the existence of a God, which Mr. Des Cartes very much improved [*B*].

(*b*) He calls himself Mr. *Peter Joseph*. His book was printed in 1698 in 12°.

(*c*) *Moins Travestis*, tom. 1. p. 49.

* Ediner. *in Vitâ S. Anselmi, apud* Surium, *die* 21 *Aprilis.*

(2) In Remark [*E*] of the article of AVERROES, quotation (47).

† Tom. 2. of his *Letters*, pag. 276, &c.

& convictor ejus Edinerus *.... "*Si Deus mallet me* "*adhuc inter vos saltem tamdiu manere, donec quæ-* "*stionem, quam de animæ origine mente revolvo, ab-* "*solvere possem, gratiosus acciperem, eo quod nescio, u-* "*trum aliquis eam, me defuncto, sit absoluturus.*" I have quoted in another place (2) a passage of Thomas Bartholine, who has made a reflection upon this thought of St. Anselm.

[*B*] *He made use of an argument for the existence of God, which Mr. Des Cartes has very much improved.*] The Catalogue, which Mr. Baillet has given of the Authors, from whom Mr. Des Cartes is pretended to have stolen, contains these words: "They placed "likewise St. Anselm in the number of the ancients, "from whom Mr. Des Cartes † might borrow his "argument for the existence of God, which he "takes from this consideration, that an absolutely per-"fect Being, or at least the most perfect that we "can conceive, includes existence in it. This ar-"gument is found in a book, which this Saint "wrote against *the Fool*, in answer to an unknown "Author, who had written *in favour of the Fool*, "against a point of reasoning, which St. Anselm had "made use of in his book intitled *Prosologion* (3). Observe that Mr. Huet remarks, that Thomas Aquinas confuted this argument. *Celebris illa argumentatio.... tota est Anselmi, & in Proslogio, & in Apologetico contra Gaunilonem: eandemque & exposuit Thomas Aquinas, & refellit* (4).

† Wilh. Leibnitz. *Epist. Mss.* tom. 3. *Oper. Anselm.* edit. Colon.

(3) Baillet, *Vie de Des Cartes*, tom. 2. p. 536, 537.

(4) Huetii, *Cens. Philos. Cartes.* p. 204.

ANSELM, a bare-footed Austin Friar, born at Paris, will be too often quoted in this Dictionary, and has furnished too much matter to Moreri, not to deserve a place here. He died at Paris the 17th of January 1694, aged sixty nine years. He had passed fifty of them in a detachment from all the monastic employment, applying himself wholly to the duty of a religious life, and the writing of books. He was ready to give a second edition of his *Histoire Genealogique de la Maison de France, & des grans Officiers de la Couronne* [*A*], with corrections and additions, which he had long been preparing. He undertook likewise a work, which treated of the *sovereign houses, and most illustrious families in Europe*, and he had then compleated it (*a*). I cannot tell how his manuscripts will be disposed of: I wish they were published.

(*a*) *Mercure Galant* for January 1694. See likewise the *Journal des Savans* of the 8th of Feb. 1694, p. 157.

[*A*] *He was ready to give a second edition of his* HISTOIRE GENEALOGIQUE DE LA MAISON DE FRANCE.] He had published this History, with that of the *Grans Officiers de la Couronne*, in 1674 in II Vol. in 4to. We had before that a large work written by him intitled, *Le Palais de l'Honneur, ou les Genealogies historiques des illustres Maisons de France, & de plusieurs nobles Familles de l'Europe.* This was printed at Paris in 1668. We find there a short account of an infinite number of things relating to Heraldry, the consecration of Kings, solemn entries, the Baptism of the children of France, the funerals of Kings, military orders, &c. There is not so much method in this large volume, as in the two, that followed it. They have all of them need of a new edition revised, corrected, and enlarged; but it is certain, that they have been of great use, and it is inconceivable what prodigious pains this good Fryar was at in amassing together so many names, marriages, births, and dates. Let a man do what he will, if nature inclines us to certain things, there is no preventing the gratification of our desire, tho' it is under a Monk's habit. Father Anselm was born for researches in Genealogy; the little relation, which that study had with the manner of life he devoted himself to, did not hinder him from pursuing his inclination. One of his Brother-Fryars, but not of the Bare-footed Order, ran about night and day after discoveries in Geography (1); this was his particular natural inclination; the habit of an Austin-Fryar made no change in it.

(1) Father Lubin: He died at Paris the 7th of March 1695. See his Elogium in the *Journal des Savans* of the 28th of March 1695.

☞ANTELMI (JOSEPH), was born at Frejus in France the 25th of July 1648. After he had finished his studies he was made Canon of the Cathedral of that City, upon the resignation of Peter Antelmi his uncle. A little piece, which he wrote about that time, and which was never printed, because it was properly but the rough draught of a larger work, *De Periculis Canonicorum*. i. e. "Of the Dangers of Canons," shews that he considered the office of a Canon, and the duties belonging to it, in a much stronger light than is commonly done. In short the discharge of his duty and his application to study engaged his whole attention (*a*). In the year 1680 he published a Latin dissertation upon the foundation of the Church of Frejus [*A*]. His skill in Ecclesiastical affairs was the reason of his leaving Frejus in 1684; for J. B. de Verthamon being appointed Bishop of Pamiers, and having occasion for a person of abilities in order to restore peace to his diocese,

(*a*) *Memoires pour servir à l'Hist. des Hommes Illust.* tom. 5. p. 145, 146. edit. Paris 1728.

[*A*] *A Latin Dissertation upon the Foundation of the Church of Frejus.*] It is intitled, *De Initio Ecclesiæ Forojulienfis Dissertatio historica, chronologica, critica, prophano-sacra. Accesserunt* I. *Præsulum Forojulienfium Nomenclatura Chronologica.* II. *Diatriba de Ecclesia Reienfi & de Monasterio Lirinenfi*: i. e. "An historical, "chronological, critical, profane and sacred Dissertation upon the beginning of the Church of Frejus. "To which are added I. A chronological List of the "Bishops of Frejus. II. A Discourse concerning "the Church of Reia and the Monastery of Lirins." Printed at Aix in Provence 1680, in 4to. Our Author having formed a design of writing a complete History of the City and Church of Frejus, thought proper to publish first this Dissertation, in which he endeavours chiefly to give an account of the antiquity and foundation of that Church. The entire History was in MS. in the hands of the Bishop of Grasse his brother (1). He places the foundation of that Church about the middle of the fourth Century. He extols the merit of five or six of its Bishops, who distinguished themselves in the fourth and fifth Centuries by their learning and the sanctity of their lives; and especially the famous St. Leontius, whom that Church acknowledges for its Patron. He gives likewise an account of the Dispute between Theodorus of Frejus and Faustus Abbot of the Monastery of Lirins, relating to the exemption of that Monastery, which dispute was adjusted in the third Council of Arles. Father Sirmond places that Council in 455, but our Author in 450 or 451. He mentions the original of this Monastery, the Monks of which followed the sentiments of Cassian with regard to grace, as appears from Antelmi. We find in this Dissertation several observations upon the discipline of the Church, particularly the custom observed by the Church of Frejus

(1) *Memoires*, &c. p. 147, 148; and Du Pin, tom. 18. p. 271.

dioceſe, in which the affair of the Regale had raiſed a great deal of diſorder, choſe our Antelmi by the advice of Father la Chaize, (under whom he had ſtudied Divinity at Lyons, and who always preſerved a great friendſhip for him from that time,) and made him his grand Vicar and Official. Antelmi perfectly anſwered the expectation which had been conceived of him. He managed the people's minds with ſo much prudence and addreſs, that the Biſhop upon his arrival in his Dioceſe found the utmoſt peace and tranquillity. However the pains which he was obliged to take for that purpoſe did not prevent him from purſuing his ſtudies in ſuch a manner, that he publiſhed in 1689 ſeveral Diſſertations in Latin upon the Works of St. Leo the Great, and Proſper Aquitanus [*B*], and another upon the Athanaſian Creed [*C*], and wrote ſeveral other works [*D*].

Frejus from the fifth Century of giving the Communion of both kinds to infants immediately after they were baptized; which cuſtom was continued in the Church till the eighth Century. There are likewiſe in this work a great many curious obſervations upon the antiquity, origin, different names, and various fortune of the City of Frejus. Antelmi has not omitted the famous monuments erected by the Romans there, and among the reſt the noble aqueduct of that City, which he gives a deſcription of (2).

(2) Du Pin, ibid.

[*B*] *Several Diſſertations in Latin upon the works of St. Leo the Great and Proſper Aquitanus.*] They are intitled, *De veris operibus SS. Patrum Leonis Magni & Proſperi Aquitani Diſſertationes criticæ, quibus Capitula de Gratia Dei, Epiſtolam ad Demetriadem, nec non duos de Vocatione omnium Gentium libros Leoni nuper adſcriptos abjudicat & Proſpero poſtliminio reſtituit Joſephus Antelmius*; i. e. "Critical Diſſertations "concerning the genuine works of the holy Fathers "Leo the Great and Proſper Aquitanus, in which the "*Capitula* concerning the Grace of God, the Epiſtle to "Demetrias; and the two books of the Vocation of "all the Gentiles, lately aſcribed to Leo, are reſtored "to Proſper by Joſeph Antelmi." Paris 1689, in 4to, pagg. 431. Our Author in carrying on the Hiſtory of the Church of Frejus, was obliged to enter into an examination of the queſtions relating to the Semi-Pelagian doctrine, which was maintained by the Monks of Provence. This engaged him in a diſpute with Father Queſnel concerning the author of the three books abovementioned, which were allowed to be written by the ſame perſon. Father Queſnel aſcribed them upon conjecture to St. Leo; tho' they were generally ſuppoſed to be St. Proſper's, whoſe name they bear in ſeveral MSS. Antelmi on the other hand endeavours to refute his conjectures, and reſtore them to St. Proſper (3). The whole queſtion depends upon a very exact compariſon of the ſtyle and genius of both theſe Writers. There has been a diſpute among the learned, whether the *Capitula* or *Ten Chapters concerning Grace* againſt the Semi-Pelagians, which are publiſhed in the ſecond volume of the Councils, belong to Pope Celeſtinus or St. Proſper. Father Queſnel is the firſt, who aſcribed them to St. Leo. Baronius, Father Sirmond, Father Labbe, who made a Collection of the Councils, and Father Noris, who was afterwards made Cardinal, in his *Hiſtory of Pelagianiſm*, conjectured that Pope Celeſtinus was author of them. The Letter of that Pope prefixed to them inclined them to that opinion. But St. Proſper compoſed them in the year 430, having collected all the authorities of the Popes and Councils, that had condemned Semi-Pelagianiſm; and to give the greater weight and ſanction to this work, he procured an approbation of it from Celeſtinus, that by means of the authority of the See of Rome, he might more eaſily reduce the Monks of Provence, who oppoſed St. Auſtin's doctrine. Antelmi omits nothing in order to preſerve the honour to St. Proſper. He compares in different columns the ſtyle, turn and method of St. Proſper with that of the works in diſpute; and concludes from the conformity between them, that he cannot juſtly be deprived of them. He takes a great deal of pains likewiſe upon the treatiſe *of the Vocation of the Gentiles*. The Author of *the Apology for the Fathers* aſcribes this piece to an African Writer (4); and Mr. Baſnage de Beauval (5) obſerves, that there are a great many difficulties againſt ſuppoſing it to be the work of St. Proſper; and that our Author has endeavoured to clear them with more labour and learning, than the importance of the ſubject deſerved. Antelmi has examined alſo another queſtion relating to two Letters of St. Leo; one addreſſed to Septimius Biſhop of Altino, and the other to Januarius Biſhop of Aquileia. Theſe two Letters are very like each other. Father Queſnel denies that written to the Biſhop of Altino to be genuine; but declares the other written to the Metropolitan of Aquileia to be authentick. Antelmi on the contrary aſſerts, that the latter is ſuppoſititious, and the former genuine. He enters afterwards into a critical examination of the works of St. Leo. He pretends, that the Letters and Sermons under his name are the works of St. Proſper. He affirms, that *the Chronicle of Proſper* belongs to Proſper Aquitanus. Laſtly he gives us a Criticiſm upon St. Proſper's Poems, and promiſes a new edition of all his works (6). Father Queſnel anſwered our Author in a Letter inſerted in the *Journal des Savans* of the 8th and 15th of Auguſt 1689; in reply to which the latter publiſhed the following book: *Deux Lettres de l'Auteur des Diſſertations ſur les Ouvrages de Saint Leon & Saint Proſper a M. l'Abbé . . . . pour ſervir de réponſe aux deux parties de la Lettre du P. Queſnel*; i. e. "Two Letters from the "Author of the Diſſertations upon the works of St. "Leo and St. Proſper to the Abbot . . . . in anſwer "to two parts of the Letter of Father Queſnel." Paris 1690, in 4to. Mr. Du Pin has given the advantage to Father Queſnel in this diſpute. The Biſhop of Graſſe ſaid, that he had in his hands a ſheet of that Author's *Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques*, in which he declared, that he approved of the opinion of Antelmi; but that he ſuppreſſed it at the ſollicitation of Father Queſnel's friends, and printed another, in which he abſolutely declared in favour of the latter (7).

(3) Idem, pag. 271, 272.

(4) *See Mr.* Baſnage de Beauval, *Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Savans*, tom. 7. Art. 9. April 1690. p. 363. edit. Amſterd. 1721.

(5) Ibid.

(6) Du Pin, pag. 272.

(7) *Memoires*, &c. p. 149, 150.

[*C*] *Another upon the Athanaſian Creed.*] It is intitled, *Nova de Symbolo Athanaſiano Diſquiſitio*; i. e. "A new Diſquiſition concerning the Athanaſian "Creed." Paris 1693, in 8vo. Father Queſnel imagined, that this Creed was compoſed by Virgilius Thapſenſis an African Biſhop in the 6th Century, who publiſhed ſeveral other works under the name of Athanaſius, and very often makes uſe of expreſſions employed in this Creed. Antelmi on the other hand has revived the conjecture of Mr. Pithou, that this Creed was drawn up by a Divine of France. His Diſſertation is divided into four parts. In the firſt he adds ſeveral proofs, which are very ſingular, to thoſe, which had been urged before to ſhew that this Creed was not and could not poſſibly be the compoſition of St. Athanaſius. In the ſecond he makes an exact enquiry into the time when this Creed was firſt known, and afterwards publiſhed under St. Athanaſius's name; and tracing it up from the tenth Century, in which Voſſius aſſerted that it began to be known, he places the Epocha of it about the middle of the fifth Century. In the third place he enquires into the Country of the Author of it, and whether he was of Africa or France, and endeavours to confute the ſyſtem of Father Queſnel, who aſcribes it to Vigilius Thapſenſis. The arguments, which he urges againſt it, are as follows: 1. That the treatiſes, in which we obſerve the forms and expreſſions, which are to be found in that Creed, are not certainly the works of Vigilius, even in the opinion of Father Chifflet, who publiſhed them under his name, and yet acknowledged them to be doubtful. Our Author proceeds ſtill further, and brings ſeveral reaſons to ſhew, that they belong to Idatius, and anſwers the arguments of Father Chifflet. 2. Tho' theſe works were written by Vigilius Thapſenſis, yet the conformity between ſome expreſſions in them and thoſe in the Athanaſian Creed, is not a ſufficient proof, that this Creed belongs to the ſame Author, ſince we find expreſſions of the ſame kind in St. Auſtin, to whom no perſon has ever aſcribed it. 3. It is ſaid, that Vigilius having publiſhed

works [*D*]. His conſtitution was very tender and delicate, and he ſoon found the ill effects of his neglect of it; and his health was ſo much altered, that he was obliged at the beginning of the year 1697 to retire to his native air at Frejus. There were ſome hopes that he might have received benefit from a milk-diet; but his diſtemper encreaſing every day, he died at Frejus (*b*), and not at Pamiers, as Mr. Du Pin tells us (*c*), the 21ſt of June 1697 in the forty ninth year of his age. Mr. Du Pin is likewiſe miſtaken in aſſerting, that he was but forty years of age. That eminent Critic gives him this character; that he was a man of great genius, integrity, ſweetneſs of temper, and learning, but that he was too eaſily led away by his conjectures (*d*).

(*b*) Ibid. p. 147.
(*c*) *Nouvelle Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* tom. 18. p. 273. edit. Amſterdam 1711.
(*d*) Ibid.

liſhed ſome of his works under the name of St. Athanaſius and other Fathers, in order to give the greater authority, it is the more probable, that he would give the name of that Saint to the Creed, which he had compoſed. Antelmi anſwers that this cannot poſſibly be ſo, becauſe this Creed appeared at firſt with the Author's name, and not under that of St. Athanaſius. In the laſt part he pretends, that he has diſcovered the French Author of it, who was Vincentius Lerinenſis. The conjectures, which he urges for that purpoſe, are the conformity between the expreſſions and phraſes of that Writer and thoſe of the Creed, and a paſſage, in which he promiſed to retouch more fully the expreſſions, which relate to the confeſſion of the myſteries of the Trinity and the Incarnation. The objection, which naturally ariſes upon this, is, that Gennadius does not mention this Creed in his book concerning the Eccleſiaſtical Writers, in which he ſpeaks of Vincentius Lirinenſis and his treatiſe againſt Hereſies. Antelmi is not much perplexed by this negative argument; and in order to invalidate it, he obſerves, that Gennadius has not mentioned a great many Authors, and has omitted ſeveral of the works of thoſe, whom he gives an account of; as particularly the Expoſition of the Creed by Hilary of Arles, the Author of whoſe Life extols it very highly (8).

(8) Du Pin, p. 272.

[*D*] *Several other works.*] We ſhall give a Catalogue of them. I. *De ſanctæ Maximæ Virginis Callidiani in Forojulienſi Diœceſi cultu & patria. Epiſtola ad V. Cl. Danielem Papebrochium*:" i. e. "Of "the Worſhip and Country of St. Maxima the Virgin in the Dioceſe of Frejus, in a Letter to the "celebrated Daniel Papebroch." This Letter is publiſhed in the Antwerp edition of the *Acta Sanctorum*, 16th of May. II. *De tranſlatione corporis S. Auxilii Epiſtola ad V. Cl. Ludovicum Thomaſſinum de Mazauge*; i. e. "A Letter to the celebrated Lewis Tho-"maſſin de Mazauge concerning the Tranſlation of "the body of St. Auxilius." The Biſhop of Graſſe, who mentions this Letter (9), does not tell us when it was printed. III. *De Ætate S. Martini Turonenſis Epiſcopi, & quorundam ejus geſtorum ordine, anno mortuali, nec non de S. Priccio Succeſſore Epiſtola ad R. P. Ant. Pagium*; i. e. "A Letter to the Reverend "Father Anthony Pagi concerning the Age of St. "Martin Biſhop of Tours, the Order of ſome of his "Acts, and the Year of his death, and concerning "his Succeſſor St. Priccius." Paris 1693, in 8vo. Antelmi and Father Pagi laboured in conjunction upon this work; one of them engaged in the examination of Gregory Turonenſis, and the other in that of Sulpicius Severus (10). *Aſſertio pro unico S. Eucherio Lugdunenſi Epiſcopo. Opus poſthumum. Accedit Concilium Regienſe ſub Roſtagno Metrop. Aquenſi anni* 1285. *nunc primo prodit integrum & notis illuſtratum opera Car. Antelmi deſignati Epiſc. Graſſenſ. Præpoſ. Foroj.* i. e. "An aſſertion that there was but one St. Eu-"cherius Biſhop of Lyons: A poſthumous work. To "which is added the Council of Regium under Ro-"ſtagnus Metropolitan of Aix in the year 1285, "now firſt publiſhed intire, and illuſtrated with notes "by the care of Charles Antelmi elect Biſhop of "Graſſe, and Provoſt of Frejus." Paris 1726, in 4to. This work was the only one that the Biſhop found entirely finiſhed among our Author's MSS. to which he has added a Preface, in which he gives a ſhort account of the life and writings of his brother (11).

(9) In his Preface to Antelmi's *Aſſertio pro unico S. Eucherio, &c.*
(10) *Hiſt. des Ouvrag. des Savans*, Nov. 1692. and *Memoires, &c.* p. 150.
(11) *Memoires, &c.* p. 150, 151.

T.

ANTESIGNANUS (PETER), born, if I am not miſtaken, at Rabaſteins [*A*], a little town in Languedoc, in the Dioceſe of Albi, was one of the beſt Grammarians of the ſixteenth Century. He was ſo zealous in his employment, that he choſe rather to make himſelf uſeful to the youth, by engaging himſelf in explaining thoſe things which perplex them at their firſt entrance into ſtudy, than to raiſe his reputation by clearing of the greater difficulties in authors [*B*]. However he acquired ſuch a reputation, as drew upon

[*A*] *He was born, if I am not miſtaken, at Rabaſteins.*] What inclines me to believe this, is the Epithet *Rapiſtagnenſis*, which he gives himſelf in the title-page of his works. I ſee no City, that can give him this title more properly than *Rabaſteins*; for it is called in Latin *Rapiſtanum*, or *Rapiſtagnum* (1). I imagine that the Printers have made a blunder in the paſſage, where Papyrius Maſſo ſpeaks of this City; they have put *Rupiſtagni incolis* inſtead of *Rapiſtagni incolis* (2). The three radiſhes, which are the arms of *Rabaſteins* (3), induce me to think, that *Papyrius Maſſo*, or the Printers, have put the letter *u* inſtead of *a*.

(1) Catel aſſures us of this in p. 356 of his *Memoires de l'Hiſtoire de Languedoc*. Mr. Baudrand ſpeaks of this city under Rapiſtanum.
(2) In pag. 490 of his *Deſcriptio Fluminum Galliæ*, Paris edition in 1685.
(3) Catel, *Memoires de l'Hiſt. de Languedoc*, p. 356.

[*B*] *He choſe rather to make himſelf uſeful to the youth . . . . than to raiſe his reputation by clearing of the greater difficulties in Authors.*] Let him inform us this himſelf: I ſhall quote his words at length; they ſhew an honeſt and generous mind; and may be a leſſon of morality to thoſe proud ſpirits, who ſeek nothing but the applauſe of ſuch vain perſons as themſelves; and never direct their ſtudies to the advantage of thoſe, who have occaſion for their aſſiſtance. He had juſt told us, that ſeveral learned Commentators had written upon Terence, and then he adds: *Verum pueri novitii, ad quos maxime hujus laboris fructus pertinebat, vix ullum ex accuratis & meditatis iſtorum commentationibus emolumentum percipere potuerunt. Videntur enim viri illi graves incubuiſſe in eam curam & cogitationem, quæ ſibi ſummam dignitatem & gloriam eſſet allatura. Itaque ardua tantum & obſcuriora interpretando explanaſſe contenti, minutiora cætera, quorum doctrina & tractatio præcedere, vel certe conjungi debuerat, leviter attigerunt, ut adoleſcentuli, qui his ſtudiis initiantur, ſe ad cognitionem hujus rei, quam ex communi quadam hominum opinione reconditiſſimam arbitrantur, deſperent poſſe pervenire. Ut igitur eos ab hujuſmodi deſperatione ad ſpem revocarem, ad minima iſta me demittere non recuſavi; neque enim hic difficilia tantum enodavimus, ſed ne unam quidem totius Terentii ſyllabam reliquimus intactam, quam ad unguem non excuſſerimus, idque abſque ulla verborum pompâ aut magnificentiâ, ſed nudis literarum notis, & methodo quam potuimus breviſſimâ & facillimâ. Doctrinæ opinionem affectent alii; ego pro mea virili parte me puerorum & formandis & promovendis ſtudiis omnem meam operam addixiſſe aperte & ingenuè fateor* (4). Compare this with the paſſage of Quintilian, which I quoted in the project of this Dictionary (5); and add to them theſe excellent words of Eraſmus; which relate to the labour he was at in enlarging a Lexicon. *Scimus hoc laboris genus eſſe minime glorioſum, præſertim quum pauci reputant quot autores ſint excutiendi, ut voces aliquot ab aliis præteritas ſeligas. Verum hoc plus debetur illis gratiæ, qui publicæ utilitatis gratiâ non detractant ingloriam ac moleſtiæ plenam induſtriam* (6). That is, "We know that this kind of labour is not a very glo-"rious one, eſpecially ſince but few conſider how "many Authors are to be examined, in order to find "ſome words, which have been omitted by others. "But ſo much the more praiſe is due to them, who "for the ſake of the publick advantage undertake a "work of ſo little glory and ſo great fatigue."

(4) Pet. Anteſignan. *Epiſt. Dedicator. Terent. initio.*
(5) See the end of the 7th paragraph of this *project* at the end of the 4th volume of this Dictionary.
(6) Eraſm. *Præfatione in Lexicon.* It is the 21ſt Letter of the 28th book, pag. 1702. See likewiſe the end of the 1ſt chapter of the 18th book of Pliny's *Natural Hiſtory.*

upon him the envy of others [C]. What he publiſhed upon Terence may convince us, that he was the moſt laborious man in the world [D]. I am of opinion, that he taught a long time at Lyons. The epiſtle before his Terence is dated from that city in Auguſt 1556 (a). He addreſſed it to three brothers, who were his ſcholars. His *Grammar of the Greek Tongue* was printed ſeveral times. He was well enough verſed in Hebrew (b). to merit a place in the *Gallia Orientalis* of Colomeſius; and yet he has been omitted.

(a) *Idibus Auguſti.*

(b) He wrote in that language a letter to Peter Coſtus, which was printed. See the *Epitome Geſneri.*

[C] *He acquired ſuch a reputation, as drew upon him the envy of others.*] This is what he tells in a common place, which is too often inſerted into Epiſtles Dedicatory. He ſays, that thoſe, to whom he dedicated his *Terence*, ſeemed to him the propereſt perſons to ſecure him from the attacks of his enemies: *Digni maxime atque idonei videbamini, qui noſtra à malevolorum morſu fortiter & induſtriè tutari poſſetis* (7). There are ſcarce any compliments more falſe than that. The Critics have no manner of regard to the dignity or capacity of him, to whom a book is dedicated, if it appears to them to be a bad one. The Sieur des Accords rallies very agreeably this notion of being protected by the perſon, to whom a book is dedicated (8). D'Aubigné thought the reflections of this Author ſo juſt, that he choſe to borrow them himſelf, after he had changed them a little, and diſpoſed them in another manner (9).

(7) Anteſign. *Epiſtol. Dedicat.* Terentii.

(8) See the Preface to the *Bigarrures* of *des Accords.*

(9) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory to the *Confeſſion de Sanci.*

[D] *What he publiſhed upon Terence may convince us, that he was the moſt laborious man in the world.*] He publiſhed the Comedies of that Poet in three different methods. Firſt with ſhort notes, and the arguments of every ſcene, and he mark'd the accents upon every word, which had more than two ſyllables, and likewiſe at the ſide of every verſe the manner of ſcanning it. In the ſecond place he publiſhed them with the entire notes of almoſt all the Authors, who had written upon *Terence*. And laſtly he publiſhed them with new marginal notes, and a French tranſlation and paraphraſe of the three firſt Comedies. He puts between crotchets whatever is in the tranſlation, and not expreſſed in the original: he marks with letters all the references from the tranſlation to the Paraphraſe. The *various readings* have likewiſe each their parentheſes, and their notes of reference. It is eaſy to collect from this how patient our Author was. Obſerve that he has given in the two laſt editions of his *Terence* all that was contained in the firſt. Matthew Bon-homme a Bookſeller at Lyons, was the perſon whom he employed in publiſhing this threefold edition. The date of the King's Privilege is in 1556. The laborioufneſs of this Author appears no leſs from his book intitled, *Thematis verborum inveſtigandi ratio*, and from his *Praxis præceptorum linguæ Græcæ*. They are to be found in ſeveral Greek Grammars.

ANTHERMUS, a Sculptor, born in the Iſle of Chios, ſon to Micciades, and grandſon to Malas, who were both of them Sculptors, left behind him two ſons of the ſame profeſſion; one of whom was named Bupalus, and the other Athenis [A]. It was againſt them that Hipponax wrote verſes, which were extremely ſatyrical, to revenge himſelf upon them for giving a ridiculous figure of him, as he was a man of a very odd form (a). I ſhall ſpeak more fully of this in the article of that Poet. See likewiſe the article of BUPALUS.

(a) Plinius, *Hiſt. Nat.* lib. 36. c. 5.

[A] *One of his ſons was named Athenis.*] Suidas calls him ſo (1). He was called *Anthermus* in the editions of Pliny; but Father Hardouin has reſtored *Athenis* in the room of it. See the remarks [C] and [E] of the article HIPPONAX. The Hiſtorical Dictionaries of Charles Stephens, Lloyd, Moreri, and Hofman, call him *Anthermus*, in ſpite of Suidas's authority.

(1) In Ἱππώναξ.

☞ANTHOINE (NICHOLAS) burnt at Geneva in the year 1632, for embracing Judaiſm, was born at Brieu in Lorrain. His father and mother were Roman Catholicks. They took a particular care of his education, and ſent him to Luxemburg, where he ſtudied for five years in the college of that city. From thence he went to Pont-a-Mouſſon, Triers, and Cologne, where he continued his ſtudies under the Jeſuits, till he was twenty years of age. Upon his return to his father, having conceived a diſlike to the church of Rome, he went to Metz, and applied himſelf to Mr. Ferry, a learned reformed Miniſter, who inſtructed him in the Proteſtant Religion; which he publickly embraced, and even endeavoured to convert his relations to it (a). From Metz he was ſent to Sedan to ſtudy Divinity, and from thence to Geneva, where he continued his Theological ſtudies; in the purſuit of which he had the misfortune to fall into Judaiſm [A]; and ſollicited the Jews in divers cities to admit him as a proſelyte among them; but in vain [B]. This induced him to return to Geneva, where he had more acquaintances than any

(a) See *Bibliotheque Angloiſe par M. D. L. R.* tom. 2. Part 1. Art. 9. p. 238; and *Memoirs of Literature*, 2d edit. Vol. 6. Art. 20. pag. 132; from which two pieces written by the ſame Author we have extracted this article.

[A] *In the purſuit of which he had the misfortune to fall into Judaiſm.*] Having applied himſelf particularly to the reading of the Old Teſtament, and finding ſeveral difficulties in the New, which ſeemed to him unanſwerable, he inwardly embraced the Jewiſh Religion about five or ſix years before his trial, which happened in 1632. His firſt doubts concerning the Truth of Chriſtianity aroſe from his comparing the two Genealogies of Chriſt as they are repreſented in the Goſpels of St. Matthew and St. Luke. But when he attempted to examine the paſſages of the Old Teſtament, which are applied to the Meſſiah in the New, he was ſo extremely ſhocked by this application, and it appeared ſo falſe to him, that he renounced Chriſtianity. The Author of the *Bibliotheque Angloiſe* obſerves (1), that it is probable Anthoine is the only Chriſtian, who ever abandoned the Chriſtian Religion upon ſuch a motive.

(1) Pag. 239.

[B] *Sollicited the Jews in divers cities to admit him as a proſelyte among them; but in vain.*] As new notions of Religion very often make more impreſſion upon the minds of men, than thoſe, in which they have been educated from their infancy, he became ſo zealous for Judaiſm, that he reſolved to make a publick profeſſion of it. For which purpoſe he left Geneva, and returned to Metz, where he diſcovered his ſentiments to the Jews of that City, and deſired to be admitted into their Synagogue. But they refuſed him for fear of bringing themſelves into trouble, and adviſed him to go to the Jews of Amſterdam or Venice. Upon this he went to Venice, and deſired the Jews there to circumciſe him; but he was diſappointed, for they told him, that the Senate had prohibited them to circumciſe any perſons, who were not born Jews. Anthoine being extremely deſirous of receiving the ſeal of the Jewiſh Covenant, went to Padua, in hopes that the Jews of that city would be more favourable to him; but they gave him the ſame anſwer. Theſe Jews, as well as thoſe of Venice, told him, that he might be ſaved, without making an open profeſſion of the Jewiſh Religion, *provided he remained faithful to God in his heart.* This made him reſolve upon returning to Geneva (2).

(2) Ibid. p. 239, 240; and *Memoirs of Literature*, Vol. 6. p. 132, 133.

any where elſe. Mr. Diodati Miniſter and Profeſſor in that city, took him into his houſe as tutor to his children. He pretended to go on with his Divinity ſtudies, and was for ſome time teacher of the firſt claſs. Afterwards he diſputed for the Chair of Philoſophy, but without any ſucceſs. All this time he lived outwardly like a Chriſtian; for he confeſſed before his judges, that he had conſtantly received the Communion, but in private he lived and performed his devotions like a Jew. At laſt being weary of the condition, which he was in, and having occaſion for a ſettlement, he deſired a teſtimonial of the Church of Geneva, which was granted him; and he went to the Synod of Burgundy aſſembled at Gex, in order to be admitted into the Miniſtry. He was admitted according to cuſtom, promiſing to follow the doctrine of the Old and New Teſtament, and to conform to the diſcipline and confeſſion of faith of the reformed churches of France. Upon which the Synod appointed him to be Miniſter of the church of Divonne in the country of Gex. Here he ſoon began to be ſuſpected, and falling into a fit of diſtraction uttered ſuch things as increaſed thoſe ſuſpicions [C], ſo that upon the recovery of his ſenſes he was committed to priſon [D]. Mr. Ferry (b), who had converted him to the Proteſtant religion, hearing of the danger he was in, wrote a letter to the Miniſters and Profeſſors of the Church and Academy of Geneva [E]. And Mr. Meſtrezat, a learned Divine of

(b) See Mr. Bayle's article upon this Divine.

[C] *Began to be ſuſpected . . . and uttered ſuch things, as increaſed thoſe ſuſpicions.*] The Lord of the place perceived that he never mentioned Jeſus Chriſt either in his Prayers or Sermons; that he took his texts only out of the Old Teſtament; and that he applied to other perſons thoſe paſſages of the Old Teſtament, which are applied by Chriſtians to Chriſt. This occaſioned great ſuſpicions againſt him; which he being informed of was extremely perplexed, and as he was naturally of a melancholy diſpoſition, he fell into a fit of madneſs in February 1632. This accident was conſidered as a real judgment of God upon him, becauſe it happened the day after he had explained the ſecond Pſalm without applying it to our Saviour. This fit of diſtraction was ſo violent, that he moved upon his hands and feet in his chamber, and exclaimed againſt the Chriſtian Religion, eſpecially in the preſence of ſome Miniſters of Geneva, who went to ſee him. He inveigh'd likewiſe againſt the Perſon of Chriſt, calling him an Idol, &c. and he affirmed that the New Teſtament was a mere fable. He called for a chafing-diſh full of burning coals, and told the Divines, who were in his chamber, that he would put his hand into the fire in defence of his doctrine; and defied them to do the like for their Meſſias. At laſt in a tranſport of madneſs, he eſcaped in the night from thoſe, who guarded him, and ran to the gates of Geneva, where he was found the next morning in the dirt half-naked. Then having pulled off his ſhoes in the name of the true God of Iſrael, he worſhipped him bare-footed, and proſtrate upon the earth, and uttered ſeveral blaſphemies. The Magiſtrates of Geneva ordered him to be carried to an Hoſpital, where the Phyſicians took care of him, and he was viſited by ſome Divines.

[D] *So that upon the recovery of his ſenſes he was committed to priſon.*] His mind was compoſed by degrees; and then he ceaſed from ſpeaking reproachfully of the Chriſtian Religion; but he continued ſtrongly to maintain Judaiſm. After he was thus recovered of his madneſs, he was committed to priſon, where he was detained a conſiderable time before the Magiſtrates took cognizance of that affair. He was viſited there by the Divines, who uſed all their efforts to convince him of the falſity of his doctrine, and the enormity of his conduct, and to reduce him to the Chriſtian Religion; but he perſiſted in his opinions.

[E] *Wrote a Letter to the Miniſters and Profeſſors of the Church and Academy of Geneva.*] It was dated the 30th of March 1632. It is full of good ſenſe, and contains ſeveral particulars relating to the hiſtory of that unhappy man. The reader will not perhaps be diſpleaſed to ſee it at length in the tranſlation of Mr. de la Roche (3). It is as follows: "Gentlemen, and "moſt honoured Brethren. I beg your pardon for the "fault I am going to commit, if you take it to "be ſuch. And indeed I don't pretend to repreſent "any thing to you, but in order to ſubmit it to your "cenſure. I have heard with an unſpeakable grief "what has happened to that poor wretch, who is "amongſt you; and I beſeech you to forgive my "freedom in writing to you about it. I don't do it "altogether without the requeſt of others. Beſides "one muſt not expect a call to preſerve an unfortunate man who runs himſelf into deſtruction; ſince "God and nature, and our ancient acquaintance and "friendſhip, may be a ſufficient motive for me to do "it. To which I add, that having been inſtrumental in bringing him to ſalvation, I think I have "great reaſon to deſire that he may not undo himſelf, and to endeavour with your leave to prevent "it. I thank God, ſince he has thought fit to make "him a new example of human frailty, that he has "brought him amongſt you, that you might prevent "his doing miſchief, and endeavour to reclaim him. "I think, Gentlemen, that mildneſs and patience "will be the moſt proper means to ſucceed in it. I "make no doubt that his illneſs proceeds from a black "and deep melancholy, to which I always perceived "he was very much inclined; eſpecially after he had "ſeduced a young man whom he brought hither "from Sedan, in hopes to get ſomething by teaching him Philoſophy; and then he privately carried "him farther, tho' I had earneſtly deſired him to "ſend him back, and exhorted the young man to return to Sedan, which was M. du Moulin's deſire, "to whom he had been recommended. From that "time he could not bear the light in any room of "a Gentleman's houſe, where I had placed him, being always uneaſy, reſtleſs, and ſilent. Nay, he "had much ado to expreſs himſelf, and it was a hard "matter to make him ſpeak, tho' I had earneſtly "deſired him to be more free, and ſent for him, "and made him dine with me now and then, and "took all poſſible care of him. Which we aſcribed "to the ill ſucceſs he had in a Synod of the Iſle of "France, whither he had been ſent with a Teſtimonial and Recommendation of the Church and Academy of Sedan, notwithſtanding which he did not "appear ſufficiently qualified for the Miniſtry. After "he had inticed away that young man, he writ ſeveral letters to me, wherein he expreſſed a great "grief for it; and in all of them he uſed many "words, which ſhewed his mind was very much dejected, being above all things ſenſible of the reproofs he had received for it. So that I thought "myſelf obliged to write to him now and then, to "clear his mind of thoſe needleſs ſcruples, and of "ſuch an unreaſonable and dangerous vexation, and "to exhort him to apply himſelf to his ſtudy with "chearfulneſs, and a reſolution to do better for the "time to come. It is therefore highly probable, "that his melancholy has been heightened by thoſe "cloudy thoughts, and likewiſe the poverty and want "of many things, into which he fell ſoon after, and "whereof he complained to me in his letter, ſo far "as to mention the temptations, under which his "mind was almoſt ready to ſink. To this I may add "the nature of his ſtudies bent upon the Old Teſtament, on which he writ to me, that he was drawing up a Concordance. However tho' thoſe things "were not the true cauſe of his illneſs, you know, Gentlemen, that there is a ſort of melancholy, in which "the Phyſicians acknowledge Θεῖον τι, which is neither a crime, nor a divine puniſhment, but a great "misfortune. Certainly that which he lies under is "very deplorable; but, Gentlemen, I think I may "ſay, that tho' nature is the inſtrument of God's providence,

(3) *Memoirs of Literature*, pag. 140, &c.

of the Church of Paris, wrote two letters to Mr. Chabrey his brother-in-law, Minister at Geneva, of which we shall give two passages in the note [*F*]. He was mistaken in imagining that Anthoine had been a Monk. While he was in prison, he presented three petitions to the council [*G*]. On the 11th of April 1632 he was brought to his trial. He declared

" vidence, yet all accidents ought not to be looked " upon as punishments, or signs of a wicked life, " nor the madness of that poor wretch as a formal " chastisement for his error, there being so many rea- " sons to believe that it proceeds from the disorder " of the brain and from melancholy. His madness " seems to be only an exorbitant fit of melancholy, which " being allayed by remedies, he appears now in his " former state. And tho' he errs only in the single " point, for which he is prosecuted, there is no reason " to infer from it, that he speaks in cold blood and " with a sound mind. For it is the property of that " sort of melancholy to have but one object, leav- " ing the mind free in all other things, as you know " better than I. There are some who speak upon " any subject with great learning and sedateness, and " have but one grain of madness, which they dis- " cover only by intervals, to those who hit upon " it. I am the more willing to compare that unfor- " tunate man to them, because in that very thing " wherein he pretends to be wise, he appears most " ridiculous; for he says what he would be ashamed " of out of his fit, tho' he were no Christian; since " he denies, as I hear, what the very Heathens and " Jews acknowledge. And therefore it is not a here- " sy but a blasphemy, which proceeds from a mind " rather distempered than perverted. His usual " frights and horrors are in my opinion a certain sign " of it; and there is no reason to ascribe them to a " divine judgment, and to infer from thence that he " is a reprobate. After all, Gentlemen, it is certain " he imposes upon you, when he tells you, that he " believed eight or ten years ago what he believes " now: for since that time, he has not only given " all manner of proofs of his Christianity, but also " brought over to the reformed Religion his eldest bro- " ther, who lives honestly among us; and he has en- " deavoured to work the same effect upon his father, " to whom he has writ many letters, several of which " I have opened: wherein he expressed a great zeal " and a wonderful love for Jesus Christ, and the " Christian truths, that are taught in our churches. " And in order to bring over his relations to our Re- " ligion, he writ to them, that he was ready to die " for it, if God required it of him. Nay, when he " was admitted into the Ministry, he acquainted me " with it in a Letter from Geneva, dated the 29th " of November; being used to call me, as he did " then, his *Dear Ghostly Father*, whom God had been " pleased to make use of, in order to bring him to " the knowledge of the true Religion. And he desir- " ed me to acquaint his relations with it, being fully " resolved for the future to lead a better life than " ever, and to perform his duty to the utmost of his " power. And therefore, Gentlemen, and most ho- " noured brethren, I think he ought not to be believed " in what he says during such a disorder of his mind; " and I hope that if you allow him some time to " recover from his frenzy, as I understand you " do, he will no longer blaspheme, and God will " give you comfort after your labour and patience. " To that end, I wish none may have access to him, " but such as are familiarly acquainted with him, " or for whom he has a particular respect and vene- " ration, and by whom he may be gently used, lest " his mind should be exasperated by too many visi- " tants, or by an unseasonable, tho' just severity. " Gentlemen, give me leave to tell you, that it seems " highly necessary for the edification of the Church, " that this affair should be managed with great pru- " dence. If you make an example of him, it will " doubtless prove extremely prejudicial. I entreat " you to consider the great scandal it will occasion " far and near, and what might be said against the " office and profession of a man converted from Popery, " who has learned to Judaize among us in the most fa- " mous Academies, conversing every day with several " Pastors. Besides Judaism being no dangerous sect, " it does not seem necessary to prevent the ill conse- " quences of it by a publick punishment. Nay per- " haps every body would not approve of it. There " are some extraordinary crimes, for which when the " guilty person is to be punished, it is not done in " publick; and the proceedings are suppressed to clear " the present age from such an infamy, and to leave " no marks of it to posterity. However there is no " need of being too hasty in a thing that may be " done as well in time, and when a delay cannot be " prejudicial, but rather useful. Servetus had a long " time allowed him for his amendment, tho' he had " dogmatized above twenty years in cold blood, and " in several places, both by word of mouth, and in " written and printed books, about things much more " subtle and dangerous. And yet, Gentlemen, you " know the various discourses, that were occasioned " by his execution. I don't say this, because I find " fault with it; on the contrary, I think such perni- " cious errors could not be better suppressed, than by " committing the Author to the flames. But this " man cannot be compared to Servetus; I pray God " to give him a better end. And I beseech you, " Gentlemen, and most honoured Brethren, not to " grow weary in this work of your great charity, " wherein God will direct you to use such remedies " as are necessary to reclaim that unfortunate man, " and to preserve the Church from such an infamy. " This is the design of this Letter, which I humbly " beseech you not to be offended with. Otherwise " I should be sorry to have writ it, excepting the " wishes I have just now made, and my further " prayers to God, that he would plentifully bless you " and your holy labours, increase your Church, and " ever keep your State under his protection. I beg " of you the continuation of your benevolence, being " with great sincerity, &c. FERRY."

[*F*] *We shall give two passages of it.*] His first Letter is dated from Paris, March 12, 1632. *I am troubled for you*, says he in that Letter, *about your Antitrinitarian. The writings of our predecessors* de puniendis Hæreticis, *have not been very edifying, and prove very prejudicial to us in the countries where the Magistrates are our enemies. 'Tis true, the enormity of that man, his blasphemies, his profession of Christianity, and his Ministry, aggravate his crime. May God almighty direct your Magistrates in the matter! If every body had the same thoughts of Monks as I have, none of them should ever be admitted into the holy Ministry. I pray God to remove by the efficacy of his word the scandal occasioned by that profligate man, and to keep you under his protection.* His second Letter is dated from Paris likewise the 30th of March 1632. The following passage is to be found in it. *As for what concerns your Jewish Monk and revolted Minister, the most judicious persons in this city wish he may be confined to a perpetual imprisonment, and not be allowed to see any body, but such as are qualified to reclaim him. They are very much afraid of the consequences of a publick execution, lest it should be inferred from it by our adversaries in these parts, that words spoken against the Pope, (the pretended Vicar of Jesus Christ) or against the Host of the Mass, are likewise blasphemies against Christ, and ought to be punished in the same mannner. For they talk in the same strain; and all supreme Magistrates are Judges of consequences in their jurisdictions.* These two passages, as the Author of the *Bibliotheque Angloise* (4) observes, do a great deal of honour to the memory of Mr. Mestrezat. It appears from them, that this learned Divine did not approve of putting hereticks to death. What he says with regard to the blasphemies of persons, who are heterodox, deserves a particular attention.

(4) Pag. 255, 256.

[*G*] *He presented three petitions to the Council.*] The first is dated the 11th of March 1632, and begins thus: *In the name of the great God of heaven, who is the mighty God of Israel: His holy name be blessed for ever. Amen.* He desires the Council to get some papers concerning his faith restored to him, which he had delivered to a Minister of Geneva by their order, that he might revise, correct, and finish them, before they were produced against him. And then

declared that he was a Jew, beſeeching God that he might die in the Jewiſh religion; that he believed there had been ſuch a man as Jeſus Chriſt, but he knew not whether he had been crucified; that he did not believe him to be God, nor the Son of God, nor the Meſſiah, ſince there is but one God, without diſtinction of perſons, and the time of the Meſſiah was not yet come; that he rejected the New Teſtament, becauſe he found many contradictions in it, and becauſe it did not agree with the Old; that he had entered into the Miniſtry, becauſe the Jews had told him, that he might make an outward profeſſion of any religion without endangering his ſalvation, and becauſe he wanted a livelihood; that when he took the uſual oaths, *it was with a mental reſervation to what was true and reaſonable*; that being ſo far engaged, he could not avoid reciting the Apoſtles Creed, and adminiſtring the Communion; that he never pronounced diſtinctly the Articles of the Creed, which relate to our Saviour; that he took his texts out of the Pſalms, and the Prophet Iſaiah; that it was true, that in February, the day after he had preached upon the ſecond Pſalm, without applying it to Jeſus Chriſt, he fell into a fit of madneſs, as he was ſinging the lxxivth Pſalm (*c*); that he had loſt his ſenſes, when he came to Geneva, and called Jeſus Chriſt an Idol, &c. that it was true he had affirmed, that the paſſages of the Old Teſtament quoted in the New, were ſtrained, and far fetched, *& qu'ils crioient miſericorde*; that he had renounced his baptiſm, and continued to do ſo. He was then interrogated, and in particular concerning his former profeſſions to the contrary, and with regard to his morals [*H*]. On the 16th of April he was

(*c*) *D'où vient, Seigneur, que tu nous as épars.*

then he adds: *Enquire of my life. I have always endeavoured to live in the fear of God, and to ſeek and follow the right way to ſalvation. God diſcovers his ſecret to thoſe who honour him. What I do, is only to give an account of my faith to the glory of God, and for the ſalvation of my ſoul. God knows my heart, and is a witneſs to my integrity and innocence. Don't draw innocent blood upon your heads, nor upon your families, and your city; and God, in whoſe hands we all are, will bleſs you, if you love his holy ways. I beſeech him with all my ſoul to bleſs you, and to touch your hearts; that you may be moved with pity and compaſſion towards me, the poor and afflicted ſervant of the Lord, &c.* He preſented his ſecond petition the day following, which we ſhall inſert at length. " In the name of the Lord, " the God of Iſrael. Magnificent and moſt honoured " Lords, what I am going to repreſent to you, is not " with an intent to avoid death. According to God " I don't deſerve it; for I fear him, I love him, I " bleſs him, and will bleſs and worſhip his holy, " glorious, and adorable name to my laſt breath. Ne- " verthelefs, according to your laws and belief, and " what is commonly objected to me, you will think I " juſtly deſerve it. If God would be pleaſed to do " it, he would ſhew his great wonders by delivering " me, not for my ſake, who am a poor and miſerable " ſinner, but to glorify his great and adorable name, " and that all the earth might know, that he is the " Almighty God, who reigns in the world. I in- " voke his holy name, and implore his grace and " mercy. Whoſoever puts his truſt in the Lord, ſhall " never be aſhamed. Why ſhould we be afraid of " men? God is above all, and nothing comes to paſs " without his permiſſion. Magnificent and moſt ho- " noured Lords, ſince two things are commonly ob- " jected to me. 1. That I have ſtrayed from the " way of ſalvation. 2. That though I were in the " right way to ſalvation, yet having ſuch a belief, I " ſhould not have embraced the office of a Miniſter, " nor come into your city to give you offence; by " your leave I ſhall endeavour to anſwer thoſe two " points in a few words. As to the firſt point, I be- " lieve I am in the way to truth and ſalvation, and " ſhall perſevere in it, till I am ſhewed the contrary " by good reaſons taken from the Old Teſtament. " I worſhip one only God; I endeavour to follow " the law to the beſt of my power; I will fear, " love, and bleſs the holy name of God to the end " of my life. As to the ſecond point, your Lord- " ſhips muſt know that the people of Iſrael refuſed " to admit me among them, and told me, that I " might live every where, and among all nations, in " the fear of God, without diſcovering my opinions. " I have endured a thouſand hardſhips in my way " to Venice, and in that city, where I have been " for ſome time in a very miſerable condition; and " I came away more afflicted ſtill, and more miſe- " rable: nevertheleſs, I always put my truſt in the " Lord. I could not reſolve to live among the Pa- " piſts; for I had ſworn to do it no more, having " a great abhorrence for their idolatry. Beſides, I " was afraid of being charged with inconſtancy. " Nay, had I been diſcovered among them, they " would have been more cruel to me than your " Lordſhips uſe to be towards thoſe who are not ac- " cuſed of any crime, but only proſecuted for religi- " on. I have embraced the Miniſtry, becauſe I " thought I was ſufficiently qualified for it; becauſe I " was far in years; becauſe I was willing to keep houſe, " and perhaps to marry in time; and I had no mind to " diſcover myſelf at that time. How many are mar- " ried, and perhaps have quite another belief than " yours, and yet will not leave and forſake their " children upon ſuch an account? As for what is " ſaid, that I have ſcandalized you and your city by " my ſtrange proceedings, it was through a diſordered " mind. It is not I; I don't know who it was: " God knows it. And therefore I think I deſerve to " be pardoned in that reſpect, ſince it was not I, but " a terrible, dreadful, and ſupernatural power; as " the whole town may witneſs, and no body will be " offended at it. Rather than come and ſurrender " myſelf into your hands of my own motion, I " would have fled to the remoteſt parts of the world. " Magnificent and moſt honoured Lords, have a care " you don't draw innocent blood upon your heads, " and families, and city, by putting me to death; " for perhaps you know not the wonders of God, " the mighty God of Iſrael, and why he has ſo " miraculouſly tranſported me into this town. If " the beginning of it has been miraculous, perhaps " the end will be more miraculous ſtill. I ſhall ne- " ver be aſhamed, becauſe the Lord is my truſt and " my refuge. Let the holy name of the Lord, the " great God of Iſrael, be for ever bleſſed and glo- " rified by all men and in all places. Magnificent " and moſt honoured Lords, if you think I deſerve " to be put to death, and if the Lord God is pleaſed " it ſhould be ſo, his will be done. If you releaſe " me, you will releaſe an innocent ſoul, which fears " the God of heaven. I pray God with all my " heart, that he would be pleaſed to pour his moſt " holy bleſſings upon you, and to move your hearts, " if it be his good will, being, magnificent and moſt " honoured Lords, your moſt humble ſervant and " priſoner, N. ANTHOINE.

[*H*] *He was then interrogated, and in particular concerning his former profeſſions to the contrary, and with regard to his morals.*] He was asked firſt, whether being one day viſited by a certain Lord and a Miniſter, he had not told them, that he believed only in the God of Iſrael, and that what is worſhiped and ſerved by all other nations is as mere idols, adding, that *if this Chriſt be God, let all the curſes of the law and thunder fall upon me; but if he be not, let them fall upon you*; and that this Chriſt is an idol, &c. Anthoine anſwered, that he did not remember this, but that it might poſſibly be ſo (5). They ſhewed him then a confeſſion written with his own hand, but not ſubſcribed by him, which contained

(5) *Bibl. Angl.* p. 263, 264.

was brought again to the bar; and declared, that he had never dogmatiz'd at Geneva; that when he gave the Communion in his church at Divonne, he uſed theſe words, *Remember your Saviour*; that he adminiſtred baptiſm as other Miniſters did; that he was in the way of ſalvation, and reſolved to die for the truth of his doctrine. Upon this the council condemned him on the 20th of April 1632 to be carried to the place called *Plein-Palais*, and there ſtrangled and burnt; which ſentence was executed the ſame day (*d*). It imports, that Nicholas Anthoine *laying aſide all fear of God, was guilty of apoſtacy and high-treaſon, having oppoſed the Holy Trinity, denied our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, blaſphemed againſt his holy Name, renounced his baptiſm to embrace Judaiſm and Circumciſion, and perjured himſelf; which are great and horrid crimes, &c.* Mr. Ferry's letter abovementioned made ſo great an impreſſion upon the Miniſters of Geneva, that they went in a body to the Council, to deſire the Magiſtrates to ſuſpend the execution of the priſoner for ſome time; but it was to no purpoſe. He left ſeveral pieces written with his own hand [*I*]. We ſhall give the reflections of an ingenious Author upon this extraordinary incident [*K*].

(d) *Biblioth. Angl.* p. 266.

theſe words: *I acknowledge and confeſs that Jeſus Chriſt crucified is the true God, Saviour, and Redeemer of the whole world, and that he is the ſame with the Father and the Holy Ghoſt, as to his Eſſence, but diſtinct as to his Perſon.* He replied, that he had been forced to write that confeſſion, but diſowned the doctrine contained in it. Then the famous paſſage of Joſephus (6) concerning our Saviour was alledged againſt him, to which he made no anſwer. This paſſage was probably unknown to him (7). Being asked whether he perſiſted in renouncing of his baptiſm, he ſaid he did. Being exhorted to confeſs whether he had frequented the Brothels at Venice, he anſwered, that he could make no ſuch confeſſion, and prayed God to diſcover his innocence; adding, that the moſt beautiful woman in the world could not have tempted him; and then bending his head, he entreated God to have pity upon him, &c. The author of the *Bibliotheque Angloiſe* obſerves upon this (8), that ſome of the Orthodox imagine that great Hereticks are at the ſame time great ſinners; but thoſe who underſtand human nature ſufficiently, are of a contrary opinion. The firſt Syndic alledged to him ſeveral paſſages out of the Old Teſtament concerning Chriſt; and then the priſoner was recommitted.

(6) Mr. le Clerc has inſerted a curious diſſertation upon this paſſage, which he received from Paris, in the 7th volume of his *Bibliotheque Ancienne & Moderne.*

(7) *Biblioth. Angl.* p. 265.

(8) Ibid.

[*I*] *He left ſeveral pieces written with his own hand.*] Mr. de la Roche in his *Bibliotheque Angloiſe* (9) tells us, that he had ſeen them, and that they are as follows: I. Some paſſages of the Old Teſtament, with a Prayer. II. A Prayer, which he uſed in the evening, before he went to bed, and another Prayer, which he uſed after his Sermons. The ſtyle is almoſt the ſame with that of the Reformed Divines; but he makes no manner of mention of Jeſus Chriſt. Theſe Prayers are compoſed in a ſtrain of great devotion. III. A ſmall paper containing eleven philoſophical objections againſt the doctrine of the Trinity. IV. A long writing, in which the Author makes a confeſſion of his faith, in twelve articles; to which are added the proofs. He ſent this paper to the Council, while he was in priſon, and deſired the Magiſtrates to communicate it to their Miniſters. He ſign'd it the ſame day in which he was executed. Theſe twelve articles are as follows: 1. That there is only one God, without diſtinction of perſons. 2. That there is no other way of ſalvation, than by fulfilling the Law of Moſes. 3. That Circumciſion ought to be practiſed for ever. 4. That the Sabbath ought always to be obſerved. 5. That the diſtinction of clean and unclean meats ought always to ſubſiſt. 6. That ſacrifices will be reſtored. That the temple and city of Jeruſalem will be rebuilt. 8. That the true Meſſiah is to come, and that he will be a glorious, holy, and juſt King, and reſtore the Kingdom of Iſrael. 9. That there is no imputation of Adam's ſin. 10. That there is no predeſtination, by which God has decreed to ſave ſome perſons and to damn others; but that men ſhall be rewarded or puniſhed, according to their actions. 11. That no perſon can make ſatisfaction for us; but that if we ſin, there is room for repentance. 12. That the New Teſtament is not agreeable to the Old.

(9) P. 266, 267.

At the end of this long writing are ſubjoined two others. In the former he pretends to prove that the paſſages of the Old Teſtament, in which there is mention made of a *new Covenant*, ought to be underſtood only of the confirmation of the old Covenant made with Abraham, Moſes and the Fathers. The latter piece is an explication of the 53d chapter of Iſaiah. Anthoine imagined that the Prophet ſpoke there of the pious Iſraelites, who were puniſhed on account of the wicked, and involved in the ſame misfortunes with them. Mr. de la Roche obſerves upon this, that if a literal ſenſe diſtinct from the myſtical were to be admitted in that chapter, that explication would perhaps be the beſt, which could be given of it. Mr. le Clerc, he thinks, has given one very analogous to this in his *Bibliotheque Hiſtorique & Univerſelle.*

[*K*] *The reflections of an ingenious Author upon this extraordinary incident.*] The Author we mean is Mr. de la Roche abovementioned; who obſerves, 1. That Nich. Anthoine was a weak and extravagant man for embracing Judaiſm, becauſe he could not fully reconcile the two Genealogies of Jeſus Chriſt, and ſeveral paſſages of the Old Teſtament alledged in the New (10). It was a misfortune to him that he did not know that a great many Chriſtian Commentators acknowledge a double ſenſe in ſeveral Propheſies, which relate to the Meſſiah. A book like that of Surenhuſius, which was publiſhed in 1713, and intitled, Βιβλος καταλλαγης, *in quo ſecundum veterum Theologorum Hebræorum Formulas allegandi, & modos interpretandi, conciliantur loco ex V. in N. T. allegata*; i. e. "A treatiſe, wherein the paſ-" ſages of the Old Teſtament, quoted in the New, " are vindicated and reconciled, according to the forms " of quoting, and the ſeveral ways of interpreting " the Scripture, uſed by the ancient Hebrew Theo-" logers;" ſuch a book would have prevented his apoſtacy (11). 2. That Mr. Ferry and Mr. Meſtrezat, two of the moſt eminent Divines of the Reformed Churches in France, did not approve of putting him to death. They were only for confining and inſtructing him: *Errantis pœna doceri* (12). 3. That he was perfectly mad and diſtracted when he ſpoke ſo extravagantly againſt the Chriſtian Religion (13). 4. It is ſurprizing, that he ſhould be guilty of ſo much diſhoneſty as to preach every Sunday in a Chriſtian Church, tho' he was a Jew. But this will appear leſs extraordinary if we conſider, that many Jews have acted the ſame part in Spain (14). 5. Thoſe men are to be pitied, who are apt to ſink under any difficulty, that may be raiſed againſt the New Teſtament. One would think the minds of ſuch perſons are wholly taken up with an objection, without conſidering whether it may not be anſwered to the ſatisfaction of a reaſonable man. Let all our enquiries into matters of Religion be attended with great conſideration, uprightneſs of heart, and a profound reſpect of the Deity; and then, as we are bound to think freely, we ſhall alſo think ſoberly, and never publiſh, either directly or indirectly, any opinions inconſiſtent with the good of mankind (15). T.

(10) *Memoirs of Literature*, Vol. 6. p. 154.

(11) *Biblioth. Angloiſe*, pag. 269, 270.

(12) Ibid. and *Memoirs of Literat. ubi ſupra.*

(13) *Memoirs, &c. ubi ſupra.*

(14) Ibid. and *Bibl. Angloiſe, ubi ſupra.*

(15) *Memoirs, &c. ubi ſupra.*

ANTINOE, or ANTINOPLIS [*A*], a city in Egypt upon the Nile [*B*], built or

[*A*] *Antinopolis.*] Mr. Baudrand tells us twice in the ſame page, that Stephanus Byzantinus calls it ſo, I cannot find this either in Pinedo's or Berkelius's edition; but only, that the city Ἀντινόεια, *Antinoïa* was likewiſe called *Adrianopolis.* Moreri has not obſerved that this laſt name and *Adrianople* are not two different names; but he gives them as ſuch.

[*B*] *A city of Egypt upon the Nile.*] Dion Caſſius tells

or repaired by the Emperor Hadrian in honour of Antinous. It was the Capital of Thebais, if we believe an Author of the fourth Century (a). This Author adds, that it was ſo well inhabited, that there were to be ſeen in his time twelve monaſtries of women (b). Ammianus Marcellinus repreſents it as one of the three moſt famous Cities of Thebais (c). It is falſe, that Leo of Africa tells us, that it was called *Anthios* [C]. See the remark [D] of the article ANTINOUS; you will find there ſeveral other particulars concerning this city.

(a) Palladius, *Hiſt. Lauſiac.* cap. 47. *apud* Triſtan. *Comment. Hiſt.* tom. I. p. 541.

(b) Idem, ibid. cap. 137. *apud eundem*, ibid.

(c) Ammian. Marcellin. l. 22. c. 16.

tells us poſitively, that Hadrian built it in the ſame place, where Antinous died. Ὡς ἐ πόλιν ἐν τῷ χωρίῳ ἐν ᾧ τοῦτ' ἔπαθε, συνοικίσαι, καὶ ἐπωνύμως ἀπ' αὐτοῦ: That is, "So that he ordered a city to be built in "the place, where he died, and to be called by his "name" (1). He had juſt before ſaid, that according to the account of Hadrian, this unhappy youth fell into the Nile. Since Hadrian therefore would have the world believe, that Antinous was drowned in that river, it follows then, that the city, which he conſecrated to this favourite, muſt have been ſeated upon the banks of the Nile, and near the place, where he periſhed. Pauſanias tells us expreſly, that this city was ſituated upon the Nile: Ἐπὶ τῷ Νείλῳ πόλις Αἰγυπτίων ἐστὶν ἐπώνυμος Ἀντίνου (2); That is, "There is a city in "Egypt upon the Nile, which received its name "from Antinous." We may conclude from thence, that the ruins, which are to be ſeen ten leagues from the Nile, according to Moreri, are not thoſe of Antinopolis. And we may conclude the ſame thing with much more certainty againſt the ruins of a city, which Mr. Baudrand has placed forty nine leagues from the Nile.

(1) Xiphil. *in Adriano.*

(2) Pauſan. l. 8. p. 244.

[C] *Leo of Africa does not ſay, that it was called* ANTHIOS.] This is another miſtake of Mr. Baudrand. I think I am not miſtaken in aſcribing the occaſion of it to the liberty, which is taken in paraphraſing upon the Authors, which are made uſe of. Let us conſider theſe words of Ortelius, *Anthios hodie dici ex Joannis Leonis Africæ Deſcriptione deprehenditur*: That is, "It appears from John Leo's Deſcrip-"tion of Africa, that it is now called Anthios." Compare them with theſe of Mr. Baudrand, *Nunc in ruinis jacet, Anthios dicta, teſte Leone Africano*: That is, "It now lies in ruins, and is called Anthios, as "we are aſſured by Leo of Africa." You ſee, that if this latter writer had kept exactly within the bounds of the former, he would not have expoſed himſelf to cenſure. Ortelius might have diſputed the point by applying in the beſt manner he could what Leo of Africa ſays; but Mr. Baudrand can have no recourſe to applications and conjectures; he is obliged to ſhew, that this Leo has aſſerted poſitively, that the ancient city of Antinoe is now called *Anthios*. Now this is what can never be proved; for Leo of Africa ſays nothing, but that Anthius was built by the Romans upon the Nile on the ſide of Aſia, and that there are ſtill to be ſeen ſeveral Latin Inſcriptions upon marble (3). He ſpeaks of it as of a very fine city, which is become conſiderable by the induſtry and agreeable humour of the inhabitants; ſo far is he from aſſerting, that it is now intirely in ruins. Mr. Baudrand adds, that it is forty nine leagues from the Nile to the Eaſt. It is not therefore the Anthios of Leo of Africa. Moreri cuts off nine and thirty leagues of this diſtance: *We ſee*, ſays he, *the ruins of it about ten leagues from the Nile.* We have proved in the preceding remark, that Antinopolis was ſituated upon this river.

(3) Leon. African. *Deſcript. Africæ*, lib. 8. fol. 360.

ANTINOUS, the favourite of the Emperor Hadrian, was born at Bithynus (a) in Bithynia. We find nothing relating to his family. His beauty engaged the heart of Hadrian in ſuch a manner, that there never was ſeen a more boundleſs and extravagant paſſion, than that which this Emperor was poſſeſſed of towards this youth. But there never appeared a more outrageous inſtance of it, than after the death of Antinous; for there were no divine honours [A], which Hadrian thought too high for this object of his affections. Some Authors ſay, that Antinous had given him the greateſt mark of love that was poſſible; in ſhort, that he died for him [B]. Others aſſure us, that he was drowned in the Nile, during the reſidence of Hadrian in Egypt, about the year 132 of

(a) This city was called *Claudiopolis.* Xiphil. *in Adriano.*

[A] *The Emperor Hadrian gave him divine honours of every kind.*] I ſhall not inſiſt upon the prodigious number of ſtatues or images, which he raiſed to him almoſt in every part of the world (1). I mean that he built temples, and appointed Prieſts and ſacred games (2), and conſecrated myſterious rites (3) to him. Pauſanias tells us, that the worſhip of Antinous was eſtabliſhed at Mantinea, by the Emperor's peculiar care, becauſe Antinous's country was a Colony of Mantinea (4). Games were celebrated every five years in honour of this favourite; but as for the myſterious rites, which were dedicated to him, they were performed every year. They, who conclude from his having Prieſts appointed him, who took upon them the name Prophets, that he had an Oracle, ſeek myſteries, where there are none (5). Theſe Prophets were the Prieſts, which Antinous had in Egypt in a City of his name (6); a City, which was the Mother-church, and chief of the order in that new kind of worſhip (7). Now in the Colleges of the Prieſts of Egypt, thoſe were called Prophets, who were a kind of Deans and Heads of them. See the proofs of this collected by the learned Henry Valeſius in his notes upon Euſebius (8). There is an Inſcription, in which Antinous is placed upon the ſame throne with the Gods of Egypt, σύνθρονος τῶν ἐν Αἰγύπτῳ Θεῶν (9). The dignity of *Aſſeſſor to the Gods* was much inferior to this. I ſhall not conceal, that the Philoſopher Celſus aſſerts, that the Egyptians would not ſuffer Antinous to be equalled with Jupiter and Apollo (10). Origen maintains the contrary; but I own he brings no proof for his aſſertion, and I cannot underſtand the force of his reaſoning.

(1) Xiphil. *in Adriano.*

(2) Hegeſippus, *apud* Euſebium, *Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. 4. cap. 8.

(3) Pauſan. lib. 8. p. 244.

(4) Idem, ibid.

(5) *See* Caſaubon *And.* Salmaſius, *upon* Spart. *Vit. Adrian.* p. 137, 143.

(6) Hegeſippus, *apud* Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccleſiaſt.* lib. 4. cap. 8.

(7) See remark [D].

(8) Ad cap. 8. lib. 4.

(9) *See* Spanheim. *de Numiſm.* p. 657.

(10) *Apud* Orig. lib. 3. p. 133.

[B] *Some ſay, that he died for Hadrian.*] Hadrian did not mention this; but Dion paid no regard to that Emperor's Hiſtory, in which he read, that Antinous fell into the Nile, and was drowned. He tells us as an undoubted fact, that a magical operation, which Hadrian was engaged in, required that ſome perſon ſhould give up his life voluntarily, and that Antinous accepted of this condition. Xiphilin his Abbreviator has plainly omitted ſome circumſtances, which would explain this myſtery a little; for it is very improbable, that Dion Caſſius ſhould relate ſuch a fact as this in ſo imperfect and abrupt a manner. However that be, we cannot conclude from Xiphilin's account, that Antinous gave up his life either to ſave or prolong that of Hadrian's. We may with more reaſon conclude, that he reſigned it, in order that from the inſpection of his bowels the Soothſayers might diſcover ſome future events, which Hadrian deſired to know. I cannot admit what one of our Antiquaries ſays (11), *that if it was only a curioſity to inſpect the entrails of a youth in a point of Divination, it was not neceſſary to expoſe to ſo cruel an experiment one, whom he loved above all the world: there were other boys of exquiſite beauty in his vaſt Empire, (if beauty was the thing required (12)), who might have been employed in this infamous myſtery.* I cannot, I ſay, admit this objection; for this very writer himſelf acknowledges the inſufficiency of it, by adding immediately after theſe words: *However it is poſſible, that the ſecret of this art of Necromancy required, that he, as he was the peculiar object of the Emperor's affection, ſhould be ſacrificed, in order to make the ſacrifice more effectual.* He ſhould have added, what Dion ſays expreſly, that the victim muſt offer himſelf voluntarily; now the other youths, which the Emperor might have deſigned

(11) Triſtan. *Comment. Hiſt.* tom. 1. p. 541.

(12) This ſhould not have been mentioned in a doubtful manner. See *Apulei Apolog.* p. 301.

of the Christian Æra. However that be, this Emperor shed tears at his death (*b*), and ordered temples and altars to be built for him, which was executed with all the zeal that might be expected from a nation long accustomed to the most shameful flatteries [*C*]. He would have a notion likewise propagated, that Antinous gave forth Oracles. Some of them were dispersed about upon that account; but it was generally believed that they were forged by Hadrian (*c*). He ordered the city where his favourite died to be rebuilt, and to be called by his name [*D*]. He was very well pleased to be told that a new star was seen in heaven, which was the soul of Antinous [*E*], and he professed himself that he saw the star of Antinous (*d*). What is most surprizing in this affair, is, not the profane complaisance, which was paid to the unreasonable humour of this Emperor, which was otherwise ridiculed (*e*); but to see, that a long while after his death they continued the

(*b*) *Muliebriter flevit.* Spartian. p. 135.

(*c*) See the remark [*D*] at the end.

(*d*) Xiphilin. *in Adriano.*

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

designed for this sacrifice, would never have submitted of their own accord. Do we imagine, that there was not a dreadful violence used to those fine young Gentlemen, who were delivered by Heliogabalus to his Magicians? *Cædit & humanas hostias, lectis ad hoc pueris nobilibus & decoris per omnem Italiam patrimis & matrimis; credo ut major esset utrique parenti dolor. Omne denique magorum genus aderat illi operabaturque, quotidie hortante illo, & gratias Diis agente, quod amicos eorum invenisset, quum inspiceret exta puerilia, & excuteret hostias ad ritum gentilem suum* (13): That is, "He offered human sacrifices, and for that purpose "chose out of all Italy the noblest and most beautiful "youths, who had their fathers and mothers living; "I presume, that both the parents might have the "keener sorrow. In short he had about him every "day all sorts of Magicians, who were employed "by him, while he was encouraging them, and giving thanks to the Gods that he had found their "friends, and while he inspected the entrails of the "boys, and examined the victims after the manner "of his country." The Magic of those Ages demanded such sacrifices as these; and St. Justin observes, that they chose such children, whose chastity was never violated: Νεκρομαντικὰς μὲν γὰρ ἢ αἰ ἀδιαφθόρων παίδων ἐπισκίψεις (14); that is, "Their Necromancy, "and inspection of boys of unstained chastity." Upon that foot Antinous would have been a very improper person. To return to Hadrian, we ought I think to suppose, I, That he did not consent to offer up his favourite but upon the most pressing necessity; II, That the desire of avoiding death was a thing of greater importance to him, than the curiosity of discovering future events; I should choose therefore rather to follow Aurelius Victor, than Xiphilin. Aurelius Victor writes thus: *Quæ quidem alii pia volunt religiosaque, quippe Hadriano cupiente fatum producere, cum voluntarium ad vicem magi popposcissent, cunctis retractantibus, Antinoum objecisse se referunt* (15): That is, "Hadrian desiring to prolong his life, when "the Magicians required a voluntary sacrifice in "the room of him, and all refused it, they say that "Antinous immediately offered himself." Add to this these words of Spartian: *De quo* (Antinoo) *varia fama est, aliis eum devotum pro Hadriano asserentibus*: That is, "Of whom (Antinous) there are various re-"ports, some asserting that he devoted his life for "Hadrian."

(13) Lampridius. *in Vita Heliogab.* cap. 8.

(14) Justin *in Apol.* p. 65. *See* Salmasius *upon* Spartian *in Adriano*, p. 136. and Apul. *Apolog.* p. 301.

(15) Aurel. Victor, *in Cæsaribus.*

(16) Spartian. p. 135.

[*C*] *They raised temples and altars to him ..... with all the zeal of a Nation long accustomed to the most shameful flatteries.*] Casaubon ranks among the instances of mean complaisance, which was paid to Hadrian's passion what was done by the Poet Pancrates (17); which was as follows: He shewed to Hadrian, as if it had been a miracle, a flower of the *Lotos*, which was like a rose, and told him that he ought to give it the name of *Antinoian*, and assured him, that it sprung up in a place, which had been sprinkled with the blood of a lion, which Hadrian had killed in hunting. The Emperor was so highly pleased with this discourse, that he ordered a pension to be allowed to Pancrates in the Museum of Alexandria (18). Athenæus does not explain the reason why this Poet would have the name of *Antinous* given to this flower; but it is easy to imagine, that his intention was to do honour to the memory of that favourite. I was for some time of opinion, that this passage of Athenæus had given occasion to a fiction of Moreri, which I have mentioned at the end of this article; but I have changed that notion, since I read those words of a modern Author. *Hadrian ... gave the name of this wretched youth* (Antinous) *to a city of Egypt .... as he did likewise to a star, a flower, to temples, sacrifices, oracles, and games, and in short made a God of him* (19). Those, who compare this passage with the article of Antinous in Moreri, may soon judge whether that writer knew how to make a proper use of the books, which he consulted.

(17) Casaub. *in Spart. Vit. Adriani*, p. 137.

(18) Athen. lib. 15. c. 6. p. 677.

(19) Tristan, *Comment. Hist.* tom. 1. p. 541.

[*D*] *Hadrian ordered the city, where Antinous died, to be rebuilt, and called by his name.*] I have followed the Translator of Xiphilin, who speaks only of it as a city rebuilt, tho' Xiphilin himself uses the word ἀνοικίσαι. Others, who are not so accurate in this point, tell us, that Hadrian built a city of the same name as Antinous: Πόλιν ἔκτισεν ἐπώνυμον Ἀντινόου (20). It was situated in Thebais, and was anciently called *Besa*, which was likewise the name of the particular God, who was worshipped there. Casaubon assures us of this (21), and observes, that the Egyptians left the new name to the Greeks, and continued still to call it *Besa*; but there were some people, who joined the ancient and modern name, and called it *Besantinous*. This is what Helladius did, who was born there (22). I shall not omit to observe, that the tomb of Antinous was there. We learn this from the following words of St. Epiphanius: Ὡς ὁ Ἀντίνοος ὁ ἐν Ἀντινόῃ κεκηδευμένος ἐν τῷ ἰδιαιτέρῳ πλοίῳ κλαυσάντες ὑπὸ Ἀδριανοῦ κατετάγη (23): That is, "After this manner "Antinous, who is buried in the city of his own name, "with a pleasure boat, was ranked in the number of "the Gods by Hadrian." We find in Origen, that there was a report of miracles being performed in the temple of Antinous (24). It is here that Salmasius has placed the pretended Oracle of this false and ridiculous Deity. *Licet in multis*, says he (25), *Græciæ urbibus templa & sacerdotes habuerit Antinous, præcipuè tamen eum coluisse videntur Ægyptii in ea urbe quæ ab ipso nomen accepit, nam ibi sepultus est, ibi oracula per eum reddi credebantur, ibi & prophetas habuit*: That is, "Tho' Antinous had Temples and "Priests in a great many cities of Greece, yet the "Egyptians seem to have worship'd him with the most "peculiar reverence in the city, which took its name "from him, for there he was buried, and there O-"racles were supposed to be given forth by him, and "there he had Prophets devoted to his service.

(20) Hegisipp. *apud* Euseb. *Hist. Eccles.* lib. 4. c. 8. *See likewise* Ammian. Marcellin. lib. 22. cap. 16.

(21) Casaub. *in* Spart. *Vit. Adriani*, p. 138.

(22) Idem, ibid.

(23) *Vide* Photium, *Biblioth.* p. 1596.

(24) Origen. *adversus Celsum*, lib. 3. p. 132.

(25) Salm. *in* Spart. *Vit. Adrian.* p. 143.

What relates to the Oracle is attested by Origen (26), if we read the passage as Salmasius has quoted it: Πεῖσαι θεσπίσαι ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀντινόου πρόσωπα (27) See likewise Scaliger upon Eusebius num 2145, where he does not quote it as Salmasius, tho' Spencer asserts the latter reading in page 44 of his Notes upon Origen against Celsus. Now this is what induced me to say, that it was a pretended Oracle. I had in view these words of Spartian: *Et Græci quidem volente Adriano eum consecraverunt, oracula per eum dari asserentes, quæ Adrianus ipse composuisse jactatur* (28): That is, "And indeed the Greeks worship'd him at the de-"sire of Hadrian, and asserted that he gave out Ora-"cles, which are said to have been forged by Ha-"drian himself."

(26) Origen. *contra Celf.* l. 3. p. 132.

(27) Salmas. *in* Spart. *Vit. Adrian.* p. 143.

(28) Spartian. *in Adriano*, p. 137.

[*E*] *Hadrian was very well pleased to be told, that a new star was the soul of Antinous.*] The same piece of flattery was used towards Julius Cæsar. *Ludis, quas primo consecratos ei hæres Augustus edebat, stella crinita per septem dies continuos fulsit, exoriens circa undecimam horam, creditumque est animam esse Cæsaris in cælum recepti, & hac de causa simulacro ejus in vertice additur stella* (29); That is, "At the time of "the Games, which his [Julius Cæsar's heir] Augustus "first dedicated to him, a Comet appeared for seven "days successively, rising about the eleventh hour, "and

(29) Sueton. *in Cæsar.* cap. 88. See the *Pensees diverses sur les Cometes*, p. 219.

the worſhip of this new Deity. This reverence was ſtill kept up under the Emperor Valentinian (*f*), when the reaſons of flattering the Prince, and dreading a ſevere edict, which eſtabliſhed that worſhip (*g*), were abſolutely ceaſed. It was therefore through an abſurd attachment which people have for every thing, which they find eſtabliſhed, that continued their adoration of Antinous. The Fathers of the Church make a great advantage of this fooliſh ſuperſtition, in order to ſhew the vanity of Paganiſm. It was very eaſy to trace this new Deity to the firſt ſource and reaſons of his Apotheoſis, and by that means to render the origin of all others very much ſuſpected. They ſpoke differently of Antinous, according to the times; they were not ſo imprudent as to mention the infamous occaſion of his deification, when they addreſſed themſelves to Antoninus Pius, the adopted ſon and ſucceſſor of Hadrian, or to Marcus Aurelius, who was adopted by Antoninus Pius, conformably to Hadrian's intention. At that time they touched very lightly upon that ſubject (*b*); but Tertullian, who lived at a greater diſtance of time from it, and under thoſe Emperors, who had not the ſame intereſt in the affair, proceeds much further in his raillery, and is extremely ſevere upon it. Prudentius has ingeniouſly obſerved, that Hadrian's favourite was raiſed to a much higher ſtation than even that of Jupiter himſelf [*F*], ſince Antinous had the honour of ſitting at the table, while Ganymede only ſerved the wine. He might juſtly ſay,

(*f*) Triſt. *Comment. Hiſt.* pag. 543.

(*g*) S. Athanaſius *contra Gent.* and Theodoret in his 7th *Sacred Diſc.* quoted by Triſtan, *Comment. Hiſt.* p. 543, tells us, *that there was an expreſs edict of* HADRIAN *for the worſhip of* ANTINOUS.

(*b*) Juſtin. Martyr. *Apoleg. ad Antoninum Pium.* Athenagoras *ad Marcum Imper.*

——Mediis videor diſcumbere in aſtris
Cum Jove, & Iliacâ porrectum ſumere dextrâ
Immortale Merum (*i*).

(*i*) Statius, Silv. 2. lib. 4. ver. 10.

That is,

"——I ſeem with Jove
" Plac'd in high heaven to taſte the glorious banquet,
" And drink immortal nectar in full bowls,
" Which Ganymede ſtands ready to preſent me.

It is certain that in all ages mankind have paid their court with more care and exactneſs to the Gods of the earth than to thoſe of heaven. I cannot imagine upon what account Moreri has told us, that *Hadrian believed that Antinous was changed into a Flower and a Temple* (*k*); and that he likewiſe raiſed an altar to him. Does not this ſeem to intimate, that he built no temples to him? and is there any more truth in this, than in the metamorphoſis of Antinous into a Flower?

(*k*) See the remark [*C*].

" and was ſuppoſed to be the ſoul of Cæſar, who was " received into heaven; upon which account a " ſtar was added to the head of his ſtatue." Ovid has concluded his *Metamorphoſes* with that of Cæſar's ſoul into a ſtar:

Vix ea fatus erat, media cum ſede Senatus
Conſtitit alma Venus nulla cernenda, ſuiq;
Cæſaris eripuit membris, nec in aëra ſolvi
Paſſa recentem animam, cæleſtibus intulit aſtris.
Dumque tulit lumen capere, atque ignoſcere ſenſit,
Emiſitq; ſinu. Luna volat altius illa
Flammiferumq; trahens ſpatioſo limite crinem
Stella micat. Ovid, lib. 15. Metam. ver. 843.

That is,

" This ſaid, inviſible fair Venus ſtood
" Amid the Senate; from his corps with blood
" Defil'd, her Cæſar's new-fled ſpirit bare
" To heaven, nor ſuffer'd to reſolve to air;
" And as in her ſoft boſom born, ſhe might
" Perceive it take a pow'r, and gather light;
" When once let looſe, it forthwith upward flew;
" And after it long-blazing treſſes drew.

Sandys.

Before this the Greek Poets had uſed the ſame kind of fiction with regard to Berenice's hair. The Emperor Hadrian was too learned not to know all this; and yet he gratified himſelf with a piece of flattery, which wanted the recommendation of novelty. What could be the reaſon, that ſome of theſe flatteries placed this favourite only in the loweſt ſphere of the heavens? in the orb of the moon? Πῶς ὁ τεθνὼς Ἀντίνοος μετῳκίσθη ἐν τῇ σελήνῃ ἀφανὴς καθίδρυται (30); that is, " How " came the beautiful youth Antinous, when he died, " to be placed in the moon?

(30) Tatian. *Orat. contra Græcos.* p. 1.

[*F*] *Prudentius has ingeniouſly obſerved, that Antinous was raiſed to a much higher ſtation than the favourite of Jupiter himſelf.*] His verſes deſerve to be quoted more correctly than they are by Triſtan, in his *Hiſtorical Commentaries upon the Medals of the Roman Emperors* (31), and by Moreri in his *Hiſtorical Dictionary*. We have them thus in the edition of Nicholas Heinſius:

(31) Triſtan, *Comment. Hiſt.* P. 542.

Quid loquar Antinoum cæleſti in ſede locatum?
Illum delicias nunc Divi Principis; illum
Purpureo in gremio ſpoliatum ſorte virili
Hadriani; Dei Ganymedem, non cyathos Dis
Porgere, ſed medio recubantem cum Jove fulcro
Nectaris ambroſii ſacrum potare lyæum,
Cumq; ſuo in templis vota exaudire marito (32.)

(32) Prudent. *contra Symmach.* lib. 1. ver. 271.

That is,

" Why ſhould I mention
" Antinous rais'd to heav'n, the favourite
" Of Hadrian, now diveſted of mortality,
" The Ganymede of this new Deity.
" He ſerves not now the Gods, or bears the cup,
" But ſits with Jove, amidſt th' ætherial banquet,
" And quaffs immortal nectar, and enſhrin'd,
" With his great husband, hears his vot'ries' prayers.

ANTIPATER, by country an Idumean [*A*], illuſtrious by his birth [*B*],

[*A*] *By country an Idumean.*] Euſebius makes him an Aſcalonite (1). *A troop of robbers,* ſays he, *who had plundered the temple near Aſcalon, carried away Antipater with the reſt of their booty into Idumea, where he continued, becauſe his father was not able to pay his ranſom.* What I ſhall mention in the following remark confutes this account. Photius ſeems here a little blameable. Giving an abſtract from *Joſephus,* he aſſures us, that Herod was ſon to Antipater, who had ſerved in the temple of Aſcalon: Ὁ τοῦ Ἀντιπάτρου τοῦ Ἀσκαλωνίτου τοῦ ἱεροδούλου (2). It is not in *Joſephus* that we find this; and yet where is the reader, who does not imagine, that all that Photius ſays is in the books, which he mentions? In another place (3), he ſays that Antipater was of Idumea, and of the city of Aſcalon, and a great enemy to Hyrcanus, out of friendſhip to Ariſtobulus. This laſt error ought not to be imputed to Photius; for all the ſe-

(1) Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 1. cap. 6 and 7, *ex Africano.*

(2) Phot. *Bib.* num. 76. p. 168.

(3) Idem, ibid. num. 238. pag. 969.

birth [*B*], riches, and abilities, very prudently took advantage of the confuſions into which the diſcord between Hyrcanus and Ariſtobulus had plunged Judea. Theſe were two brothers, who were engaged in a conteſt for the High Prieſt's office. Antipater warmly eſpouſed Hyrcanus's party, and engaged Aretas King of the Arabians, and after that Pompey General of the Roman armies ſo far in his favour, that Hyrcanus got poſſeſſion of it (*a*). Under his government Antipater obtained the abſolute direction of all affairs, which he always turned to the advantage of the Romans, whenever he had an opportunity. Upon this account he was honoured with ſeveral important commiſſions by the Generals of that Commonwealth, Scaurus, Gabinius, and Caſſius, who paid great regard to his counſels (*b*). He did a ſignal piece of ſervice to Julius Cæſar, during the war of Alexandria: he brought him proviſions and troops, and ſhewed a prodigious courage and reſolution; ſo that beſides the commendations he received, he obtained of Julius Cæſar the right of a Citizen of Rome, and the adminiſtration of Judea (*c*). The complaints of Antigonus (*d*) had no effect upon his intereſt. His application to buſineſs, and his great abilities, made him ſo conſiderable, that he was equally honoured as if he had been inveſted with the royal authority in form (*e*). The method which he took to ſecure himſelf againſt a change of fortune, by giving to one of his ſons the government of Jeruſalem, and to the other that of Galilee, with the command of the troops, gave juſt grounds to ſuſpect, that he had a deſign to prevent every perſon from being his ſuperior as well in name as in reality. A certain Jew named Malichus, who was full of ſuſpicions, took a reſolution to prevent the evil, and finding no better way than to diſpatch Antipater, poiſoned him (*f*). This action was attended with the moſt flagrant ingratitude in him; for Antipater had done a great many kindneſſes to him, and even ſaved his life (*g*). He left amongſt other children the famous Herod, who was afterwards King of the Jews (*b*).

(*a*) Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. 14. c. 2, *& ſeq.*

(*b*) Ibid. ſc. 9, *& ſeq.*

(*c*) Ibid. cap. 14 and 15.

(*d*) He was ſon to Ariſtobulus.

(*e*) Joſeph. *Antiq.* c. 17.

(*f*) Ibid. cap. 19.

(*g*) Ibid. cap. 18.

(*b*) His wife, named Cypris, was of a noble family in Arabia. Joſeph. *de Bello Judaic.* lib. 1. cap. 6.

quel of his diſcourſe ſhews, that he joins Antipater to Hyrcanus. The Publiſhers, and not the Author himſelf, are accountable for this; but he is chargeable with another miſtake. Aſcalon was not a city of Idumea; and after all it was not Joſephus, who ſaid that Antipater was of Aſcalon. Now Photius pretends here to give us an extract of him.

[*B*] *Illuſtrious by his birth.*] His father named Antipater was Governor of Idumea under Alexander Janneus, King of the Jews. Euſebius calls him *Herod*, and repreſents him as a ſervant belonging to the temple, and ſo poor, that he could not pay the ranſom of his ſon, who was taken priſoner by a band of robbers: Τοῦτον δ' Ἡρώδην τινὲς Ἀσκαλωνίτην τῶν περὶ τὸν νεὼν τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἱερόδουλον καλυμένον γεγονέναι (4): That is, "His father was Herod an Aſcalonite, one of the "ſervants of the temple of Apollo, which is at Aſca"lon." But learned men are agreed, that in this point Euſebius and Africanus, whom he copied, followed bad memoirs; and that we ought to pay greater regard to Joſephus, who aſſures us, that King Alexander, and his Queen, gave the government of Idumea to Antipater, who by a prodigious number of preſents procured the friendſhip of the Arabians and of the inhabitants of Gaza and Aſcalon (5). In another place Joſephus ſpeaking of Antipater the ſon, obſerves, that he was the chief perſon of Idumea as well on account of the antiquity of his family, as of his riches (6). Hegeſippus ſays of the ſame Antipater, that he was illuſtrious in his country upon the account of his anceſtors (7). It has been uſual in every Age to undervalue the birth of thoſe, who have been raiſed by fortune to the higheſt ranks and dignities (8). To conclude, the ambiguity of a paſſage in *Joſephus* has led ſome to imagine, that the grandfather of Herod was not named *Antipater* but *Antipas*.

(4) Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 1. cap. 6. *See* Valeſius upon it.

(5) Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. 14. cap. 2.

(6) Idem, *de Bello Judaic.* lib. 1. cap. 5.

(7) Hegeſipp. *de Excid.* lib. 1. cap. 14.

(8) See remark [*A*] of the article TOUCHET

☞ ANTISTHENES, a Greek Philoſopher, and Founder of the Sect of the Cynics [*A*], was born at Athens. His father was of the ſame name with him, and his mother was a Thracian, as Laertius tells us (*a*), or as Plutarch (*b*), a Phrygian, in whoſe behalf, when he was reproached that ſhe was a foreigner (*c*), he anſwered, *Cybele, the mother of the Gods, was a Phrygian.* He likewiſe ridiculed the Athenians for boaſting of their being natives or *Aborigines*, telling them, that they were not in the leaſt more noble in that reſpect

(*a*) Lib. 6. *in Vitâ Antiſthen.*

(*b*) *De Exilio.*

(*c*) The Author of the *Abregé des Vies des Anciens Philoſophes*, Paris 1726 in 8vo, ſays that ſhe was a *Slave.*

[*A*] *Founder of the ſect of the Cynics.*] After the death of Socrates, of whom he learned the virtues of patience and apathy, he choſe the Cynoſarges, a Gymnaſium at Athens juſt without the gates, as the fitteſt place for his Lectures in Philoſophy (1). It was called ſo upon this occaſion. As Didymus the Athenian was ſacrificing in his own houſe, a white dog, that ſtood by, ſnatched the victim, and running away with it, laid it down in another place. Didymus being very uneaſy at this, conſulted the Oracle, which enjoined him to erect a temple in the place where the dog had laid down the victim, and to dedicate it to Hercules, which was called *Cynoſarges*, ὁ κυνὸς ἀργοῦ ναός; i. e. "the Tem"ple of the white Dog (2)." From hence Antiſthenes and his followers were called *Cynics*; and by thoſe, who diſapproved of their inſtitution, *Dogs*; and Antiſthenes himſelf was termed Ἁπλοῦν; i. e. "the "ſimple Dog (3)." His peculiar aſſertions were theſe; that *virtue may be taught*; that *thoſe are noble, who are virtuous*; that *virtue was ſelf-ſufficient to felicity, and wanted nothing but a Socratic courage*; that *virtue conſiſts in actions, not requiring many words nor much learning, and is ſelf-ſufficient to wiſdom; for all other things have a reference to it.* That *infamy is good, and equal to labour*, and that *a wiſe man ought not to govern the Commonwealth according to the Laws in force, but according to virtue.* That *a wiſe man, in order to have iſſue, may make choice of a beautiful woman, and love her; for a wiſe man only knows what ought to be loved* (4). Diocles (5) adds theſe: That *nothing is new to a wiſe man.* That *a good man deſerves love.* That *virtuous perſons are friends.* That *we ought to procure ſuch aſſiſtants in war, as are powerful and juſt.* That *virtue is an armour, which can never be taken from us.* That *it is better with ſome few good men to oppoſe all the wicked, than with many wicked men to contend with the few good. Obſerve your enemies, for they firſt diſcover your faults. Eſteem a juſt man more than your neighbour. The ſame virtue belongs to man as to woman. Thoſe things are good, which are honeſt, and thoſe ill, which are diſhoneſt. Eſteem all ill things ſtrange to you. Wiſdom is the ſafeſt fortification, for it will neither fall away, nor can be betrayed. In theſe invincible things we ought to build forts by meditation.* Aulus Gellius tells us (6), that he eſteemed pleaſure the greateſt evil; and therefore uſed to ſay, that he had rather be mad than addicted to pleaſure. *Antiſthenes Socraticus ſummum malum* [voluptatem] *dicit: ejus namque hoc verbum eſt,* μανείην μᾶλλον ἢ ἡσθείην. With regard to the particular ſect of the Cynics, if we conſider them, as Laertius obſerves (7), not as a mere form and inſtitution of life,

(1) Laert. *in Vitâ Antiſthenis.*

(2) Suidas.

(3) Laert. *ubi ſupra.*

(4) Idem, ibid.

(5) *Apud* Laert. *ubi ſupra.*

(6) *Noctes Attic.* l. 9. c. 5.

(7) *In Vitâ Metrocli.*

reſpect than ſnails and locuſts (d). Nor had Socrates the leſs eſteem of him on that account; but on the contrary hearing that he had behaved himſelf with great reſolution in the battle at Tanagra; he ſaid of him, that he knew that two parents, who were both Athenians, could not poſſibly beget ſo excellent a perſon (e): He firſt heard Gorgias the Orator, for which reaſon his dialogues were written in a very florid and rhetorical manner. Hermippus in Laertius (f) ſays, that at the Iſthmian Games he uſed to make Orations in honour of, and Invectives againſt the Athenians, Thebans, and Lacedæmonians; but afterwards perceiving that there was a great concourſe from thoſe cities there, he diſcontinued that cuſtom. At laſt the great reputation of Socrates excited his curioſity to go and hear him; and he was ſo charmed with his manner of teaching, that he adviſed all his ſcholars to become his fellow-diſciples under that Philoſopher. As he lived in the Piræum, he was obliged to go every day forty ſtadia to hear Socrates (g). While he was his ſcholar, he affected to wear a mean habit; and having one day turned the torn part of his garment outermoſt, Socrates obſerving it, ſaid to him, *I ſee vanity through a hole* (h); or as Ælian expreſſes it (i), *Do you uſe this oſtentation before us too?* Upon the death of Socrates he was the occaſion of baniſhment to Anytus, and of death to Melitus, who had been the great enemies of that Philoſopher; for ſome young men of Pontus being invited to Athens by the fame of Socrates, met with Antiſthenes, who carried them to Anytus, telling them that he was much wiſer than Socrates; upon which thoſe who were preſent, with great indignation, drove Anytus out of the city, and put Melitus to death (k). We have a great many Apophthegms of his [B]. Laertius tells us, that there were ten tomes

(d) Laertius, *ubi ſupra.*

(e) Idem, ibid. Mr. Stanley in his *Lives of the Philoſophers*, Part 7. p. 404, quotes Laert. *in Vitâ Socrat.* for this particular, which is a miſtake.

(f) *Ubi ſupra.*

(g) Idem, ibid.

(h) Idem, ibid.

(i) *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 9. cap. 35.

(k) Laert. *ubi ſupra.*

life, but as a true ſect of Philoſophy, their character was on. Being aſked by a man what kind of wife he ſhould take, he replied, that if he choſe a beautiful one, ſhe would be common (11); if an ugly one, ſhe would be a torment (12). Hearing that Plato ſpoke ill of him, he ſaid that it was like a King to do well, and be ill ſpoken of. When he was initiated into the Orphic Ceremonies, the Prieſt telling him, that they, who were initiated into thoſe rites, were intitled to many excellent things in the next world: *Why then*, ſays he, *do you not die?* Being reproached that both his parents were not free; *Neither*, ſays he, *were they Wreſtlers, and yet I am a Wreſtler.* When he was demanded, why he had ſo few diſciples, he replied, that he beat them away with a ſilver ſtaff. Seeing an adulterer running away, he ſaid, *Unhappy man, how much danger might you have eſcaped for one half-penny?* He ſaid, according to Hecaton, that it is better to fall among ravens, than flatterers; for thoſe only devour the dead, but theſe the living. Being demanded what was moſt happy for man, he anſwered, to die in proſperity. To a friend complaining, that he had loſt his notes; *You ſhould have writ them*, ſays he, *in your mind, and not in your book.* He obſerved, that as ruſt conſumes iron, ſo does envy the envious man. He ſaid, that thoſe, who would never die, muſt live piouſly and juſtly; and that Cities were then periſhing, when they could not diſtinguiſh the good from the bad (13). When he heard that he had been commended by ſome wicked men, he ſaid, that he was troubled, to think what ill he had done. He ſaid, that the cohabitation of brethren, who agree, is firmer than any wall. That we ought to carry ſuch proviſion with us, as if we ſhould happen to be ſhipwrecked, we might ſwim away with. He anſwered thoſe who reproached him for converſing with wicked perſons, that the Phyſicians did ſo with their patients, yet are not ſick themſelves. He ſaid, that it is abſurd to ſeparate the corn from the weeds, and in war to reject thoſe, who are unſerviceable; yet in a Commonwealth not to extirpate the vicious. Being asked what he had gained by Philoſophy, he anſwered, to converſe with himſelf. At a feaſt to one, who ſaid to him, *Sing*, he replied, *Do you then pipe.* Diogenes demanding a gown, he bid him double his cloak. Being asked what learning is moſt neceſſary, he anſwered, *To unlearn bad things.* He adviſed thoſe, who were provoked by reproaches, to bear it with greater fortitude, than if ſtones were caſt at them. He ridiculed Plato, as being proud; and ſeeing at a ſhow a horſe walking in a ſtately manner, he turned to that Philoſopher, and told him, that he would have acted the part of that horſe very well. He ſaid this, becauſe Plato at the ſame time had commended the horſe. Another time viſiting Plato, as he lay ſick, and looking into the baſon, in which he had vomited, *I ſee here*, ſays he, *the choler, but not the pride.* He adviſed the Athenians to elect aſſes to be horſes, which they thinking to be abſurd; *And yet*, ſaid he, *you chooſe thoſe for Generals, who have*

(11) Κοπρίνα.

(12) Πονηρά.

(13) Laert. *ubi ſupra*, and Stanley, *ubi ſupra*, p. 405.

(8) *See* Stanley's *Lives of the Philoſophers*, Part 7. p. 404. edit. 2. 1687.

What good and ill
Our houſes fill.

They likewiſe rejected the liberal Sciences; and therefore Antiſthenes ſaid, that they, who had acquired temperance, ought not to ſtudy any learning, leſt they ſhould be diverted by other things. They took away alſo Geometry, Muſic, and other ſciences of that kind. And therefore Diogenes ſaid to one, who ſhewed him a watch, that it was an excellent invention againſt ſupping too late; and to one, who entertained him with Muſic;

Wiſdom the greateſt cities does protect;
But Muſic cannot one poor houſe direct.

They affirmed with the Stoics, that to be happy was to live according to virtue, as Antiſthenes aſſerted in his *Hercules*; for, as Mr. Stanley obſerves (9), there is a kind of affinity between theſe two Sects; and therefore the Stoics affirmed the *Cyniſm* to be the neareſt way to virtue; and in that manner lived Zeno the Cittiean. Their diet was ſlender: Their food only ſuch as might ſatisfy nature; their cloaks ſordid. They deſpiſed riches, glory, and nobility. Some of them fed only upon herbs and cold water, living under ſuch ſhelters as they could find, or in tubs, as Diogenes did, who affirmed, that it was the privilege of the Gods to want nothing; and that thoſe, who ſtand in need of the feweſt things, come neareſt to the Gods. They affirmed alſo, according to Antiſthenes in his *Hercules*, that virtue may be acquired by learning, and that it cannot be loſt. That a wiſe man deſerves to be loved, and never ſins, and is a friend to ſuch as are like him, and truſts nothing to fortune. They took away with Ariſto the Chian all things between virtue and vice.

(9) *Ubi ſupra.*

[B] *We have a great many Apophthegms of his.*] He firſt defined ſpeech thus; *Speech is that, which declares that which is or was.* To a young man of Pontus, who came to be his diſciple; and asked him what he muſt bring with him, he anſwered, Βιβλιαρίου καινοῦ, καὶ γραφείου καινοῦ, καὶ πινακιδίου καινοῦ; i. e. "A new book, a new pen, and a new tablet; where the word καινοῦ is equivocal, and ſignifies, when it is divided, καὶ νοῦ, *wit.* The Author of the *Abregé des vies des anciens philoſophes* (10) repreſents this in a different manner, and tells us that Antiſthenes returned this anſwer to the father of the young man, who asked him what his ſon had occaſion for; and that he intimated by that reply, that the mind of the youth ſhould be a mere *Tabula raſa*, without any impreſſi-

(10) P. 265.

tomes of his works [C]. The great number of these was ridiculed by Timon, who, as the same author informs us, called him *an ingenious trifler*. Among the Socratic Epistles there is one under his name [D]. He was a man of great austerity, and lived in a very severe manner. He desired the Gods rather to inflict madness upon him, than give him an attachment to sensual pleasures. He treated his scholars with prodigious severity; and when he was asked the reason of it, he said, that the Physicians used their patients in the same manner. He first doubled his old sordid cloak, and wore it alone without a coat, as Diocles in Laertius affirms. He carried likewise a staff and satchel. Neanthes quoted by the same author says, that he was the first who used a single cloak. Theopompus (*l*) commends him above all the disciples of Socrates, as a man of so agreeable and charming a conversation, that he could draw over any person to whatever he pleased. And this Laertius tells us appeared likewise from his books, and the *Symposium* of Xenophon. He died of sickness. As he lay upon his death-bed, Diogenes came to him, and asked him, whether he wanted a friend. Another time he came to him with a dagger; and Antisthenes crying out, *Who will free me from this pain?* he shewed him the dagger, saying, *This will.* Antisthenes replied, that he meant from his pain, and not from his life (*m*). It is probable that he boasted that Hercules was the first inventor of the Cynic Philosophy; for Ausonius the Poet represents him as speaking to that purpose in one of his Epigrams (*n*). And we find in Laertius, that he proved labour to be good from the examples of Hercules the Grecian, and Cyrus the Barbarian. There were three other persons of this name, one a Philosopher of the school of Heraclitus; another an Ephesian; and the third an Historian of Rhodes (*o*).

(*l*) *Apud* Laert. *ubi supra.*

(*m*) Laert. *ubi supra.*

(*n*) See *Abregé des Vies des Anciens Philosoph.* p. 273.

(*o*) Laert. *ubi supra.*

nothing to recommend them but your votes. Being told, that many praised him, he asked what ill he had done. Being asked by a person, what he should do to be a good and honest man; he replied, by learning of intelligent men, that the vices, which he had, were to be avoided. Hearing a luxurious manner of life highly extolled, *Let the sons of my enemies*, says he, *live delicately.* To a young man, who desired that his statue might be made handsomer than himself; *Tell me*, says he, *if the brass itself could speak, what you think it would boast of?* The other answered, Of its handsome figure. *Are you not ashamed then*, replies he, *to be proud of being like a dumb thing?* A young man of Pontus promised to supply him, as soon as his ship came home laden with salt-fish; upon which he took him to a woman, who sold meal, and filling his satchel, departed: She calling to him for the money; *This young man*, says he, *will pay you as soon as his ship comes home.* Whenever he saw a woman richly dressed, he went to her house, and bid her husband bring out his horse and arms, that if he were so provided, he might allow her those freedoms, being better able to justify the injuries they occasioned; otherwise that he should take off her rich habit. He said, that neither a feast is pleasant without company, nor riches without virtue (14). That those pleasures, which come not in at the door, must not go out at the door, but by incision or purging with Hellebore (15), or by starving (16), in order by that means to punish those surfeits, which we have incurred by a short pleasure. That whoever fears others is a slave, tho' he know it not himself (17). That no covetous man can be a good man, or a King, or a freeman (18). Being demanded what a feast is, he answered, that it was the occasion of surfeits (19). He said that we ought to aim at such pleasures as follow labour, not at those, which go before labour (20). That common executioners are better than tyrants; for the former put only guilty men to death, but the latter the innocent (21). That we ought to wish our enemies all good things but fortitude; for what they possess would fall into the hands of the conqueror, not the owner (22). That we must not contradict again the man, who contradicts us, but instruct him; for a madman is not cured by another's growing mad likewise (23). That a man should always have in readiness his wits or a rope (24). Seeing the Thebans extremely elated with their success at the battle at Leuctra, he said, that they were like boys, who triumph, when they have beaten their masters (25). Hearing a Piper commended, he said, *But he is an ill man; for else he would never have been so good a Piper* (26).

(14) Stobæus, *Serm.* 1.
(15) Idem, *Serm.* 38.
(16) Id. *Serm.* 44.
(17) Id. *Serm.* 50.
(18) Id. *Serm.* 53.
(19) Id. *Serm.* 87.
(20) Id. *Serm.* 117.
(21) Id. *Serm.* 148.
(22) Id. *Serm.* 171.
(23) Id. *Serm.* 212.
(24) Plutarch, *de Stoic. Contrarietatib.*
(25) Id. *in Vitâ Lycurg.*
(26) *In Vitâ Periz.*

[C] *Ten tomes of his work.*] The same Author mentions the titles of them. The first tome contained these. *Of Speech, or of Characters. Ajax, of the Speech of Ajax. Ulysses, or of Ulysses. An Apology for Orestes. Of Lawyers, Isegraphe, or Defias, or Isocrates. Against Isocrates's* Ἀμάντυρον. The second tome contained these: *Of the Nature of Animals. Of Procreation of Children, or of Marriage, Erotic. Of Sophists, Physiognomic. Of Justice and Fortitude, Protreptic* 1, 2, 3. *Of Theognis.* The third tome contained these: *Of Good. Of Fortitude. Of Law or Policy. Of Law, or of the beautiful and just. Of Freedom and Servitude. Of Faith. Of a Guardian, or of trusting. Of Victory, Oeconomics.* The fourth volume contains these: Cyrus. Hercules the Greater, or *of Strength.* The fifth tome; Cyrus, or *of a Kingdom.* Aspasia. The sixth tome; *Truth. Of Dissertation, Antilogic. Sathon, of Contradiction* 3. *Of Dialectic.* The seventh tome; *Of Discipline, or of Names*, 5. *Of Dying. Of Life and Death. Of things after Death. Of the use of Names, or Eristic. Of Interrogation and Answer. Of Opinion and Science* 4. *Of Nature* 2. *Interrogation concerning Nature* 2. *Opinions, or the Eristic. Problems concerning Learning.* The eighth tome contained these: *Of Music. Of Interpreters. Of* Homer. *Of Injustice and Impiety. Of* Chalcas. *Of the Spy. Of Pleasure.* The ninth tome; *Of the Odysseis. Of Minerva's Wand, or of* Telemachus, Helena, *and* Penelope. *Of* Proteus. *The Cyclops, or of* Ulysses. *Of the use of Wine, or of Drunkenness, or of the Cyclops. Of* Circe. *Of* Amphiaraus. *Of* Ulysses *and* Penelope. *Of the Dog.* The tenth tome contained these: Hercules *or* Midas. Hercules, *or of Prudence, or of Strength. The Master or Lover. The Masters or Spies.* Menexenus, *or of Government;* Alcibiades. Archelaus, *or of a Kingdom.*

[D] *Among the Socratic Epistles there is one under his name.*] We shall give it in the learned Mr. Stanley's translation (27). "ANTISTHENES to ARISTIPPUS. It is not the part of a Philosopher to "live with tyrants, and to waste time at Sicilian "feasts, but rather be content with a little in his "own Country. But you esteem it the greatest excellence of a virtuous person to be able to acquire "much wealth, and to have powerful friends, riches "are not good; neither if they were in themselves "good, are they such, being thus obtained; nor can "a multitude of unlearned persons, especially tyrants, "be true friends. Wherefore I would counsel you "to leave Syracusa and Sicily; but if, as some report, you are in love with pleasure, and aim at "such things, as beseem not wise persons, go to "Anticyra, and cure yourself by drinking Hellebore, "for that is much better for you than the wine of "Dionysius. This causeth madness, that assuageth "it. So that as health and discretion differ from "sickness and folly, so much shall you be better than "you are in these things, which you now enjoy. "*Farewell.*" T.

(27) See his *Lives of the Philosophers*, pag. 407.

ANTONIA. See the Article immediately preceding ANTONIUS.

ANTONIANO

ANTONIANO (SILVIO) a Cardinal of great learning, raiſed himſelf from a low fortune by his merit; for he was of mean birth, and his parents were ſo far from being able to ſupport him in his ſtudies, that they wanted the charity of others. It is ſaid that he was born out of lawful marriage; but Joſeph Caſtalio, who wrote his life, has ſhewn the contrary (*a*). However that be, he was born at Rome in the year 1540 [*A*]. He made ſuch a quick and ſurprizing progreſs in his ſtudies, that one can ſcarce credit what is reported of it. At the age of ten years he wrote verſes [*B*] upon any ſubject which was propoſed to him, which were ſo proper and excellent, though pronounced *ex tempore*, that even a man of genius could not have compoſed as good without a great deal of care and time. There was an experiment made of this at the table of the Cardinal of Piſa, when he made a feaſt one day for ſeveral Cardinals. Alexander Farneſe, taking a noſegay, gave it to this youth, and ordered him to preſent it to him of all the company who ſhould come to be Pope. He preſented it to the Cardinal of Medicis, and made an elogium upon him in verſe. This Cardinal, who ſome years after was Pope under the name of Pius IV, imagined that all this was a contrivance, and that the Poem had been prepared before with a great deal of art, in order to ridicule him; ſo that he ſeemed very much diſpleaſed; but they proteſted to him with an oath, that it was an *ex tempore* performance, and deſired him to put the boy upon a trial. He did ſo, and was convinced of the extraordinary talents of the youth, who explained upon the ſpot in elegant verſe every ſubject, which was propoſed to him [*C*]. The Duke of Ferrara coming to Rome to congratulate Marcellus II upon his being raiſed to the Pontificate, was ſo charmed with the genius of Antoniano, that he carried him to Ferrara [*D*], where he furniſhed him with excellent maſters to inſtruct him in all the Sciences. From thence he was ſent for by PIUS IV, who recollecting the adventure of the Noſegay, as ſoon as he was raiſed to St. Peter's Chair, wanted to know what was become of the young Poet. When he had found him out, he brought him to Rome, and gave him an honourable poſt in his palace. After that he made him Profeſſor of Polite Literature in the College at Rome. Antoniano diſcharged this function with ſo much reputation, that on the day when he began to explain the Oration *pro Marco Marcello*, he had for his auditors not only a prodigious number of people, but even five and twenty Cardinals. He was afterwards choſen Rector of the ſame College; and after the death of Pius IV, being poſſeſſed with a ſpirit of devotion, he joined himſelf to Philip Neri, and accepted the office of Secretary to the Sacred College, which was offered him by Pius V. He executed this for five and twenty years, and procured himſelf the character of an honeſt and able man. He refuſed a Biſhoprick which Gregory XIV would have given him, but not the office of Secretary to the Briefs, which was offered him by Clement VIII, who made him his Chamberlain, and afterwards a Cardinal. It is reported, that Cardinal Alexander de Montalto, who had behaved a little too haughtily to Antoniano, ſaid, when he ſaw him promoted

(*a*) *Scripſit Silvii Cardinalis Antoniani Vitam, quem tum rationibus, tum publicarum tabularum teſtimoniis ab eorum calumniis vindicare conatus eſt, qui illum à parente minus juſta uxore genitum aſſerebant.* Nicius Erythræus, Pinacoth. I. p. 167.

[*A*] *He was born at Rome in the year* 1540.] Nicius Erythræus tells us he was born at Rome: *Romæ, humili loco . . . ortus* (1); but le Toppi makes him a native of Caſtelli in Abruzzo, and quotes an Inſcription, written by Mutius Panza, where he is ſaid to be *ex Caſtellorum oppido oriundus* (2). This may mean only that his father was of that place. However that be, I conclude that he was born in the year 1540, from this, that he died, according to father Oldoïni, the 16th of Auguſt 1603, aged ſixty three years (3). Nicius Erythræus does not mention in what year of the Century he died; but only that it was in his Climacteric of ſixty three years. Mr. de la Rochepozai in his *Nomenclator Cardinalium* places his death on the 16th of Auguſt 1604. I chooſe rather to follow Father Oldoïni.

(1) Nicius Erythræus, Pinacoth. 1. p. 36.

(2) Toppi, *Bib. Napolet.* p. 283.

(3) Oldoïni, *Athen. Roman.* p. 605.

[*B*] *At the age of ten years he made Verſes.*] Father Strada, who has inſerted in one of his *Prolufions*, with a great deal of elegance, the account of his adventure, ſays that Antoniano was not then full twelve years of age (4).

(4) Fam. Strada, *Prolus. Acad.* 3. lib. 2.

[*C*] *He made . . . Verſes upon the ſpot upon every ſubject, which was propoſed to him.*] Father Strada tells us, that as the Cardinal of Medicis was thinking upon a ſubject to propoſe to him, the clock, which was in the hall, ſtruck; which was the occaſion of his propoſing a clock for the ſubject of his Verſes. This Author quotes thoſe, which he ſuppoſes Antoniano made *ex tempore*, and adds, that the Cardinal of Trent rewarded him with a gold chain.

[*D*] *The Duke of Ferrara would have him at Ferrara.*] Antoniano pronounced three ſeveral Orations, which were printed (5) with thoſe which he ſpoke at Rome: this inclines me to think, that he was Profeſſor at Ferrara. Nicius Erythræus mentions only the Sciences, which were taught Antoniano there: why were not thoſe mentioned, which he taught? Theſe are not things, which ſhould be ſuppreſſed for fear of prolixity. I have not been able yet to conſult the Life of this Cardinal, written by Joſeph Caſtalio, where we have undoubtedly an account in what ſtation he was at Ferrara, and what year he died, with many other particulars. Much leſs could I ev r find a book, which Mr. Conrart ſent to Mr. de Balzac. It was called *Italian Diſcourſes of the oratorical Philoſopher* (6). Mr. de Balzac had no opinion of them: *It is true*, ſays he (7), *that the Elogium of Cardinal d'Oſſat, and that of Cardinal Silvio Antoniano, are two pieces of pretty good ſenſe, and in which the Author has not ill imitated the compariſons of Plutarch's Lives. The long invective, which he makes againſt the Nobility, is the greateſt effort of his genius. I have obſerved ſeveral fine ſtrokes, and ſomething of his own invention, beſides thoſe, which he borrowed from others, and particularly from the Oration of Caius Marius in the Jugurthine war. I believe however, that without doing injury to his ſubject he might have ſhortened his digreſſion. That common place, which he has extended ſo much, and repreſented with ſuch labour and pomp, ſhould not have been touched upon but by the bye. Beſides by this means he raiſed himſelf very powerful and dangerous enemies. He had no occaſion to diſoblige all the Nobility in the world, to prove that it is no fault to be the ſon of an artificer or countryman.*

(5) By the care of Joſeph Caſtalio in 1610.

(6) See the *Diſſertations* at the end of his *Socrate Chrêtien*, p. 10.

(7) Ibid. p. 47.

" Jerom Ruſcelli in the 7th chapter of his *Rima-*
" *rio* tells us wonderful things of the Talent, which
" Silvio Antoniano, whom he erroneouſly calls *Anto-*
" *nio*, had at *ex tempore* verſification. He gives a
" proof of it, which was ſhewn at Venice in the preſence
" of the Queen of Poland *, Cardinal Trivulcio, and
" the Cardinal of Augsbourg. Antoniano was not
" then ſixteen years of age. The Princes d'Eſt de-
" tained him at Ferrara, where he read publick Lec-
" tures, as the ſame Ruſcelli aſſures us in the paſſage
" above quoted." This note was communicated by Mr. de la Monnoie.

* Bonna Sforza, who in the year 1555 left Poland to retire to Bari in Apulia.

promoted to the purple, that henceforward he would never deſpiſe a man of the caſſock and little band, how low and contemptible ſoever he might appear, ſince it might happen, that he, whom he had deſpiſed, might become not only his equal, but even his ſuperior. Antoniano killed himſelf by too intenſe labour: he ſpent whole nights in writing letters, which occaſioned the ſickneſs of which he died in the ſixty third year of his age. He wrote with ſo great eaſe and fluency, that he never made a blot or raſure; and it is ſaid he preſerved the flower of his virginity his whole life (*b*). See in one of my remarks what relates to his works [*E*]. Cardinal Bentivoglio will furniſh me with a conſiderable ſupplement to this article [*F*]. I find that Antoniano was one of the managers in the diſpute, which was raiſed concerning the precedency of the Patriarchs [*G*].

(*b*) *Ex Jan.* Nicio Erythræ. Pinacoth. 1. p. 36.

[*E*] *What relates to his works is as follows.*] We have theſe books written by him, *De Chriſtianâ Puerorum Educatione*; *Diſſertatio de Obſcuritate Solis in morte Chriſti*; *De Succeſſione Apoſtolicâ*; *De Stylo Eccleſiaſtico, ſeu de conſcribendâ Eccleſiaſticâ Hiſtoriâ*; *De Primatu S. Petri*; *Lucubrationes in Rhetoricam Ariſtotelis & in Orationes Ciceronis*; ſeveral pieces in Verſe, ſome *Sermons*, *Notes* and *Prefaces* upon the Romance of Achilles Tatius, and the *Terence* of Gabriel Faernus (8), a great number of *Letters*, &c. It is ſaid that he had a ſhare in the *Catechiſm of the Council of Trent* (9). With regard to his Letters, they are Apoſtolical Briefs, which he wrote while he was Secretary. I ſhall ſay ſomething of them in the following remark. They are ranked amongſt the Letters, whence the Writers of *Secret Hiſtory* ought to take their extracts (10). The other ſources of that kind of writing are the Letters of the Cardinals Bembo and Sadolet, thoſe of Peter Martyr, &c. We may obſerve, that his book *de Chriſtianâ Puerorum Educatione*, written in Italian at the deſire of Cardinal Charles Borromeo, was printed at Verona, by the care of Auguſtino Valero, Biſhop of that place and Cardinal (11).

(8) *Nomenclat. Cardinal.* p. 178.
(9) *See* Colomies, *Biblioth. choiſie.* p. 36.
(10) Varillas, Preface *des Anecdotes de Florence.*
(11) Poſſev. *Apparat. Sacr.* tom. 2. p. 405, 443.

[*F*] *Cardinal Bentivoglio will furniſh me with a conſiderable Supplement to this Article.*] He ſays, that it was ſtill uncertain whether Antoniano was born at Rome; but there was no doubt that he was educated there from his infancy (12). He was placed by Pius IV in the ſervice of Cardinal Borromeo his nephew; he was Latin Secretary to that Cardinal, attended him to Milan, and returned with him to Rome. He was choſen Secretary to the ſacred College; and filled that poſt with great reputation. He was admitted into the ſtricteſt confidence with Clement VIII, whoſe Briefs he wrote in ſo elegant a manner, that this Pope had no reaſon to envy Leo X his Sadolets and Bembo's. He introduced with a great propriety ſeveral paſſages of Scripture. But he was cenſured for this by a Critic, who was too rigid, and ſaid, that this manner of writing made ſome of the Pope's Letters ſavour more of the Cloiſter, than the Court of Rome, and repreſented the character of a Preacher, rather than that of a ſovereign Pontiff. *Che percio, alcuno di loro ſapeſſero più di clauſtro regolare, che di Corte Eccleſiaſtica, e repreſentaſſero quaſi più la perſona d'un Predicatore, che d'un Pontefice* (13). He laughed at this criticiſm, and replied, that to judge properly of things, there were not too many expreſſions of Scripture in his Letters; that on the contrary, he thought they were not full enough of them, conſidering the character of him, who ſpoke in them, which was that of the ſovereign Paſtor of the Church; and conſidering likewiſe that they were not profane Letters, where the gaiety of thought and expreſſion, which is uſed upon ſecular occaſions, might be employed. *Anzi che alui pareva, che più toſto mancaſſero in queſta parte, havuto reguardo all' eſſere i Brevi Apoſtolici ſcritti dal ſupremo Paſtor della chieſa, e non lettere profane, che haveſſero a luſſureggiare con ſenſi e parole tratte dalle Secrittarie de Principi temporali* (14). He adds, that in the Briefs of Sadolet and Bembo there was not that decorum obſerved, which the Papal Dignity neceſſarily required; and that there are ſome Briefs, wherein Bembo, thro' an affectation of writing pure Latin, ſinks not only into a profane and ſecular manner of expreſſion, but even into Paganiſm itſelf. Antoniano in his laſt ſickneſs was viſited by Clement VIII, and received the Apoſtolical Benediction. He was a man of modeſty, an agreeable converſation, and of a prudence, which even the Spirit of a Court could never pervert (15). He had been in ſeveral Conclaves, and ſpoke of them with a peculiar pleaſure, not without making a great many ſolid reflections upon the vanity of human affairs, *Men*, ſaid he, *fatigue themſelves with a thouſand uneaſy cares to gain their ends; but the Providence of God almoſt always appears ſuperior to them all. Per occaſione d'eſſere ſtato Secretario del ſacro Collegio tant' anni, s'era trovato egli in multi Conclavi, e di quei ſucceſſi diſcorreva con guſto particolare, e monſtrava ſpecialemente in quanti modi vi ſi affatticaſſe l'induſtria humana, ed in quanti vi appariſſe e vi prevaleſſe ordinariamente la Providenza Divina* (16). He meant without doubt that the beſt concerted intrigues, and thoſe, which have been managed with the greateſt care and attention, fail of ſucceſs in the Conclave, on account of ſome unforeſeen conjunctures of affairs. If he meant, by this, that the influence of Providence appears in a peculiar manner in the Aſſemblies, where the Popes are choſen, he is much miſtaken; for in all the Courts of the world, we may obſerve, that the moſt politic ſchemes ſucceed, or are diſconcerted, by certain fortuitous circumſtances of affairs, which may convince us of the truth of that proverb, *Man propoſes, God diſpoſes.*

(12) Bentivoglio *Memorie overo Diario*, Capitolo vii. p. 109. edit. *d'Amſtel. nell' an.* 1648.
(13) Ibid. pag. 111.
(14) Ibid. *Capitolo* vii. p. 112.
(15) Ibid. pag. 113.
(16) Ibid. pag. 152.

[*G*] *He was one of the managers in the diſpute, which was raiſed concerning the Precedency of Patriarchs.*] Read this paſſage, which I have taken from a Letter written by Perenda from Rome the 11th of December 1589. *La Cauſa della precedenza patriarcale non è ancor venuta à fine, & ſe tratta tuttavia nella congregatione delle ceremonie. Si ſcrive, & le ſcritture vanno* per manus, *& ſi come diſſi già il parer della congregatione è contra la pretendenza de gli Arcivescovi e de Patriarchi. Solamente l'Antoniano ſoſtien queſta parte, & ſcrive, & ſtà ſaldo. Sarà un brav' huomo, ſe ſarà teſta tanto che baſti, havendo da contraſtar con Monſignor Illuſtriſſimo Geſualdo* (17). That is, "The cauſe relating to the Precedency of "Patriarchs is not yet concluded, but is ſtill de"bating in the Congregation of the Ceremonies. "Writings are handed about; and it is ſaid the "judgment of the Congregation is againſt the pre"tenſions of the Archbiſhops and Patriarchs. An"toniano alone defends the contrary ſide of the que"ſtion, and writes upon it, and continues firm. "He will ſhew himſelf a brave man, if he makes a "ſufficient ſtand, having the moſt illuſtrious Monſig"nor Geſualdo to contend with."

(17) *Lett. di Gio. Franceſco Peranda*, 1 Part. p. 224. edit. *di Venet. nel* 1604.

☞ ANTONIDES [*A*] VANDER GOES (JOHN) an eminent Dutch Poet, was born at Goes in Zealand the third of April 1647. His parents were Anabaptiſts, and in mean circumſtances. Antonides was four years old when his father and mother went to

[*A*] ANTONIDES.] His father's Chriſtian name being Anthony (in Dutch *Antoni*) he was firſt called *John Antoniſz*, that is, *John ſon of Anthony*, acording to the cuſtom, which was formerly in uſe in ſeveral countries in Europe; but a certain learned man (1), foreſeeing the future glory of our Poet, adviſed him to alter his ſurname into that of Antonides, and to add to it the name of the city in which he was born (2). Thus our Poet came to have a name with a Greek termination. His mother's name was Magdalen Stenaarts, but we know nothing of her family.

(1) We are not told who that learned man was.
(2) Hoogſtraaten, *Life of Antonides.*

to live at Amſterdam, where in the ninth year of his age he began his ſtudies under the direction of Hadrian Junius, and James Cocceius. Abraham de Graaf, a famous Arithmetician, taught him Arithmetick; but his greateſt paſſion was for Poetry, which he in a manner inherited from his father, who had made ſeveral pretty good pieces of Poetry, moſt of them on the marriage of his friends. Antonides firſt exerciſed himſelf in Latin Poetry; he read carefully Virgil, Horace, and the other ancient Poets, and took a delight in comparing them with the modern, as Grotius, Heinſius, &c. By this means he perfected his taſte for Poetry, improved his ſtyle, and enriched his mind with noble ideas. And though the Latin tongue well enough ſuited his poetic genius, yet the glory which the famous Vondel, and before him Sir Peter Cornelius Hooſd had acquired by their Dutch Poems, raiſed his emulation, and animated him to tread in the ſame path. He firſt attempted to tranſlate ſome pieces of Ovid, Horace, and other Ancients; and having formed his taſte and judgment by theſe excellent patterns, he undertook one of the moſt difficult taſks in Poetry, which was a Tragedy entitled *Trazil*, or *The Invaſion of China* [*B*]. Some time after, the peace being concluded between Great Britain and Holland in the year 1667, Antonides wrote a piece entitled *Bellona aan band*; i. e. "Bellona chained," which contains ſeveral hundred verſes, and is ſo elegant, that the famous Vondel confeſſed he would readily adopt it as his own. The applauſe with which this piece was received, excited him to try his genius in ſomething more conſiderable. He thought it would be very glorious for him to ſhew, that thoſe are miſtaken, who think it is impoſſible for any modern, not only to excel, but even to equal the Ancients in Epic Poetry. He undertook a Poem, which he entitled the *River Y* (*a*). We ſhall give an account of that Poem in the remark [*C*]. Antonides's parents had brought him up to the buſineſs of Apothecary; but his great genius for Poetry ſoon gained him the eſteem and friendſhip of ſeveral perſons

(*a*) In Dutch *De Y-ſtroom*. The Y is not properly a River, but rather an Arm of the Zuiderſee, and ſeparates South-Holland from North-Holland; neither does the Dutch word *Stroom*, properly ſignify a River, but in general any great collection of Water, as a *Lake*, &c.

[*B*] *A Tragedy entitled Trazil, or The invaſion of China.*] Antonides was ſo modeſt, as not to permit, that this piece ſhould be publiſhed. Vondel, who was then engaged in a ſubject of the like nature, which was taken alſo from ſome event that happened in China, read Antonides's Tragedy, and was ſo well pleaſed with it, that he declared, that if the Author would not print it, he would take ſome paſſages out of it, and make uſe of them in his own Tragedy, which he did accordingly (3). It was certainly very much to the glory of Antonides, to have written what might be adopted by ſo great a Poet, as Vondel was acknowledged to be by all good judges.

(3) Hoogſtraaten, ibid.

[*C*] *An account of his Poem on the river Y.*] It is well known that the city of Amſterdam is built on the banks of that river, or rather lake, and that a vaſt number of ſhips conſtantly ride in that harbour. The deſcription of that lake is the ſubject of the Poem, which is divided into four books. In the firſt the Author makes a very pompous deſcription of all that is remarkable on that bank of the Y, on which Amſterdam is built. He neglects no ornament that is capable of embelliſhing and diverſifying his ſubject. When he ſpeaks of a certain bridge, called the *New-Bridge*, he repreſents it as the ſeat of fame, and the reſort of the news-mongers; moſt of whom are themſelves the authors of the news which they tell; and publiſh them only, to make the ſtocks riſe and fall, according to their own private intereſt. He deſcribes the chief of theſe news-mongers, ſurrounded with a multitude of attentive hearers, whom he compares to the Court of Dido, in Virgil, flocking round the Trojan Hero, when he related the dreadful calamities of his deſolate country. A little after this, the Poet endeavours to account for the origin of a certain ſhelf of ſand, called Pampus, over which the ſhips muſt be drawn by engines: but his fiction on this occaſion ſeems very odd and unworthy of ſuch a genius as Antonides. He feigns that a diſpute ariſing between the God of the Y and the God of the Amſtel (4), the two Deities prepared to engage in battle; but juſt as they were going to fight, Neptune, to aſſwage the fury of the Y, caſt a vaſt quantity of mud and ſand into his mouth, which threw him into a terrible faintneſs, till he had vomited it up again. This mud and ſand mixed together, produced the *Sand-ſhelf* we have mentioned. Antonides is much happier in the deſcription he gives us of that part of Amſterdam, which is called the *New Iſland*. He compares the quick manner in which the buildings were raiſed there, to the manner in which the walls of Thebes raiſed of themſelves at the ſound of Amphion's lyre: But, continues he, this iſle, with all its ſtately palaces, which one day will ſink by their own weight, ſhall not be known to poſterity, but by the fame and glory it ſhall receive of having been Admiral De Ruiter's dwelling-place. He then takes an opportunity to celebrate that great man's praiſes; and afterwards continues to deſcribe the prodigious buildings, which are upon the Y; and ſpeaking of the Weſt-India houſe, relates the wars, in which that Company has been engaged againſt the Portugueze. He then comes to the ſtore-houſe belonging to the Admiralty, and makes an admirable but dreadful picture of all the inſtruments uſed in war. Then proceeding to the Eaſt-India houſe, a pompous building, he obſerves that it belonged in former times to the greateſt Monarchs only to build a Capitol, or an Eſcurial, but here even Merchants dare to raiſe up to the ſkies a building far ſuperior to the moſt magnificent Palaces. The power and greatneſs of this Company of Merchants might perhaps be called in queſtion, were it not for theſe witneſſes, that the Eaſt ſubmitted to their laws, and they raiſed this prodigious building, which receives the light thro' above three thouſand and three hundred windows, and ſurpaſſes all the pyramids and amphitheatres of antiquity.

(4) A little river, from which the city of Amſterdam takes its name.

In the ſecond book the Poet opens to himſelf a larger field, and takes into his deſign the whole univerſe, as one of his admirers expreſſes himſelf. He begins with the praiſes of Navigation, and deſcribes the large Fleets, that cover the Y as an immenſe foreſt, and thence go to every part of the world to bring home whatever may ſatisfy the neceſſity, luxury, or pride of men. On this occaſion he mentions the bold enterprizes of Admiral Heemskerk, who endeavoured to find a paſſage to the Eaſt Indies thro' the North. He then deſcribes the misfortunes which the riches of the Indies have drawn upon their inhabitants. Here he introduces Attabaliba, who being pleaſed to find that the Dutch are the enemies of thoſe, who have butchered him and his ſubjects, relates to them in very ſtrong terms the cruelties he and his people ſuffered from the Spaniards. The Poet afterwards borrows Pegaſus from the Muſes, and follows the Fleet into the Indies; he flyes over the different countries, which furniſh the Fleet with all their precious merchandiſes, and deſcribes in a lofty ſtyle the countries themſelves, as well as what they produce. Having given the reader an exalted idea of the Dutch trade in the remote parts of the world, he gives a noble repreſentation of the power of the Eaſt-India Company, by deſcribing a ſea-fight, in which the army of the Company gains a compleat victory over the inhabitants of Macaſſar. Thence the Poet returns to the Y, and gives us a deſcription of ſeveral countries over which he flies in his way home. He enters then into a particular relation of the ſeveral valuable

ſons of diſtinction, and eſpecially of Mr. Buiſero, one of the Lords of the Admiralty at Amſterdam, and a great lover of Poetry. He put our Poet in a condition of purſuing his ſtudies at the Univerſity of Utrecht, and generouſly maintained him there, till he had taken his degree of Doctor of Phyſick; and then this noble Mecænas gave him a place in the Admiralty, that he might have more leiſure to follow the Muſes. In the year 1678 he married Suſanna Bermans, a Miniſter's daughter. This young Lady had alſo ſome taſte for Poetry, and her huſband ſaid of her, that ſhe was more beloved by the Muſes than himſelf; but this may perhaps be conſidered as a compliment. However that be, his marriage was celebrated by ſeveral eminent Poets, and the celebrated Peter Francius, a Profeſſor of Eloquence, made ſome Latin verſes on this occaſion, which ſeem to approach very near to the ſtyle of the Ancients [*D*]. Antonides was now employed about a work much more conſiderable than his River Y. In the preface to this Poem he had promiſed the life of the Apoſtle St. Paul, which like Virgil's Æneid was to be divided into twelve books. But in all probability he never finiſhed that deſign, for the publick has only ſeen a few fragments of it. The reaſon he gave for not compleating this

valuable commodities, which from the other parts of the world are carried into Holland as a tribute to the induſtry and courage of the Dutch; and ſpeaking of the wines and other commodities, that are ſent from France, he inveighs with as much ſtrength as good ſenſe againſt the vices, which from that country are propagated thro' Holland.

The third book is an ingenious fiction. The Poet all of a ſudden is carried to the bottom of the river Y; there he ſees the Deity of that river with his Demi-Gods and Nymphs, adorning and dreſſing themſelves to go to a feaſt, that was to be celebrated at Neptune's Court upon the anniverſary of the marriage of Thetis with Peleus. In this fiction the Poet does not follow Ovid, nor any other of the ancient Mythologiſts. He ſuppoſes that Thetis having been formerly married to old Triton, and being tired with the coldneſs of her ſuperannuated husband, retired from Neptune's Court, to bewail her misfortune in a ſad retirement. Neptune and the other Deities of the ſea pitying her, reſolve to annul her marriage, and to unite her for ever to the brave Peleus, on whom they alſo beſtow immortality with everlaſting youth. Thetis gladly accepts this propoſal, and the cold Triton much more delighted with the pleaſures of eating and drinking, than with thoſe which love affords, willingly ſubmits to the decree of the Gods. The memory of this marriage is every year celebrated with great ſolemnity: to one of theſe feaſts it was the God prepared himſelf. The Poet is conducted to it by the Deity of the river, and places himſelf in a corner of Neptune's palace, whence he could ſee every thing without being ſeen. The Gods of the other rivers reſort to this palace, and as they enter, the Poet is informed by his companion of their names, origin, and power. This is deſcribed in ſuch a lively and poetical manner, that one may juſtly affirm it to be the fineſt paſſage of the whole Poem. All the Gods of the moſt famous rivers in the world come to the table, and Thetis by Neptune's command places the God of the river Y above all the others. Several Deities are offended at it, but eſpecially the proud God of the river Seine (5), who having kept his reſentment hid for ſome moments, being heated with wine, breaks out at laſt into very offenſive words againſt the Y; he upbraids him with the ſmall extent of his courſe, the contempt in which it lay for ſeveral ages, and eſpecially the meanneſs of his extraction; he extols on the contrary the vaſt extent of his own ſtreams, and the antiquity of his pedigree; he even pretends that his Fleets are not leſs conſiderable than theſe of the Y, which perhaps, he ſays, are the ſole foundation of the pride of ſo deſpicable a Marſh. He ridicules the name of his enemy, and endeavours to find in the only letter which compoſes that name, an exact conformity with the meanneſs of the God. As ſoon as the river Seine has vented his paſſion, the Y riſes up, and anſwers him with as much eloquence, as mildneſs and modeſty. He calls upon that Deity himſelf as a witneſs of his power; and alledges the teſtimony of all the other rivers in the world, with whom he had entered into a cloſe union and friendſhip by the ſhips he ſends to them. With regard to his extraction, he ſays that the Roman yoke and ſlavery had began to give ſome reputation to the Seine, at a time when the Y ſtill maintained his liberty againſt the ambitious maſters of the world; and that the moſt potent Deities of the waters did not diſdain to enter into an alliance with him. With regard to his ſmallneſs, it is well known, that the heavieſt bodies are not always the ſtrongeſt, and that too extenſive an Empire is often deſtroyed thro' its own greatneſs. He adds, that his name, though compoſed of one letter only, is not for that reaſon to be deſpiſed, ſince Pythagoras had found in the Letter Y an emblem and figure of the fate of human kind. This diſcourſe ſtill more inflames the fury of the God of the Seine; he turns himſelf to the Ebro (6), and calls him a coward, becauſe he tamely ſuffered the pride of a rebellious ſubject, who, ſays he, would ſoon have been forced to undergo the yoke, if my maſter (7) had been his. To this the Ebro gravely replies, that the hatred he was formerly animated with againſt the Y, had been purified by the fire of the war; that he had acknowledged him free; and that with regard to the imputation of cowardice, it was ſufficiently confuted by his victories over the Moors. Laſtly he deſires the God of the Seine to remember how many years his ſtream had been ſubject to the THAMES. Upon this a conteſt ariſes; the God of the Seine falls upon the Deity of the Ebro, who would have been vanquiſhed, if the Thames, the Baltick, and the Y, had not confederated together, and delivered him out of the hands of the Seine, who had already torn off a part of his gown. Neptune at laſt ſuppreſſes the tumult, and maintains the Y in his rank and dignity, as his moſt deſerving favourite. This is a beautiful allegory to repreſent France's invading the Low-Countries, and the triple alliance.

In the fourth and laſt book the Poet deſcribes the other bank of the Y, adorned with ſeveral cities of North-Holland. This would be a very barren ſubject, if the fruitful imagination of the Poet did not ſupply this defect, and draw from the moſt inconſiderable objects the fineſt embelliſhments. When he ſpeaks of Edam (8), formerly called *Y-dam*, that is the *Dike* or *Mole of the Y*, he mentions an ancient ſtory of a Syren being taken near that city by ſome fiſhermen. He transforms her into a Sybil, and makes her deliver a beautiful Oracle concerning all the hardſhips and dangers which the *Batavi* ſhould undergo and overcome, before they could arrive at that power, which the Poet has deſcribed with ſo much beauty and ſtrength. This Oracle or Prophecy contains an abſtract of the whole hiſtory of Holland; and this paſſage is one of thoſe, in which the ornaments of Poetry are diſplayed with the greateſt profuſion. The Syren ends her diſcourſe with a dreadful picture of the ſea-fights, which were once to happen on the coaſt of Holland between England and that Republic. In the cloſe of the work, the Poet addreſſes himſelf to the Magiſtrates of Amſterdam, to whoſe wiſdom the Poet juſtly aſcribes the riches and flouriſhing condition of that powerful city.

If this Poem does not abſolutely claim the epithet of Epic, becauſe with regard to the ſubject and the whole diſpoſition of it it differs very much from the Iliad and the Æneid; yet it is not unworthy of that name, if we conſider the happy invention that runs through it, and the noble thoughts and expreſſions with which it abounds. We dare not prefer this maſter-piece of Antonides to Vondel's beſt pieces, though it be not inferior

(5) On which Paris is ſituated.

(6) One of the chief rivers of Spain.

(7) The King of France.

(8) A city in North-Holland.

this work was, that he durſt not meddle with Theological ſubjects, being perſuaded, that how moderate ſoever he was, it would be impoſſible for him to pleaſe every party. It ſeems, that after his marriage he did not much indulge his poetic genius: His buſineſs prevented him; and within a few years he fell into a conſumption, which, after he had languiſhed under it ſome time, put an end to his life, Sept. the 18th 1684, being then but thirty ſeven years and a few months old, leaving no children behind him. He is eſteemed by the beſt judges, the moſt eminent Dutch Poet after Vondel, whom he in every thing ſtudied to imitate; and indeed he excels him in ſome particulars, as in the ſweetneſs of his expreſſions, and the ſmoothneſs of his ſtyle; but for accuracy and loftineſs he is inferior to his original. It might perhaps be ſaid, that he is in compariſon to Vondel, what Statius is with regard to Virgil. But if we conſider that his genius was ripe very ſoon, and that he was but twenty four years old when he publiſhed his Poem on *The River Y*, it may well be ſuppoſed, that if he had lived long enough to prune the luxuriance of his youthful imagination, to moderate the force of his genius, and to poliſh his ſtyle, he would perhaps have arrived to the utmoſt degree of perfection. It is certain that there are very few Dutch Poems, in which are found ſuch ſtrong, and at the ſame time ſuch eaſy and ſmooth expreſſions, as are to be met with in his *River Y*. Some imagine the great uſe he makes of compound words render his ſtyle turgid and too ſwelling; but others ſay, that if this is a fault, it ſhews however the Poet's fruitful invention. Theſe compound words have a great ſtrength in the Dutch tongue, and ſerve to expreſs at once whole actions, and convey by one ſingle ſtroke the livelieſt and ſtrongeſt images to the mind. The works of our Poet have been printed ſeveral times, either ſeparately, or all together, having been collected by his father Anthony Janſz (*b*). The laſt edition of all his works was printed by Nicholas Ten Hoom at Amſterdam in the year 1714 in 4to, under the direction of David van Hoogſtraaten, one of the maſters of the Latin ſchool in that city, who added to it the life of that famous Poet (*c*). We ſhall give in a note the judgment, which ſome learned Gentlemen have paſſed on Antonides's works [*E*].

(*b*) That is *John's Son*, or *Johnſon*.

(*c*) Extracted from the *Life of Antonides*, by Hoogſtraaten.

rior to them. Mr. Hoogſtraaten thinks, the Poet is too bold, in having formed of his own authority, a great number of compound words; though it muſt be owned, they give a great ſtrength to the Dutch language (9).

(9) *Journal Literaire*, 1714, Mars & Avril, p. 392, &c.

[*D*] *Latin verſes, which ſeem to come very near to the ſtyle of the Ancients.*] The reader will not perhaps be diſpleaſed to find them here.

Calliopen Batavam Batavo conjungere Phœbo,
Et vatem vati nectere gaudet Hymen.
Rottera conjugio quid non ſperabis ab iſto?
Quanta poëtarum mox oritura ſeges?
Dotibus ingenii patrem ſi filius æquat,
Quot natos, vates tot dabit eſſe torus.
Dotibus ingenii referat ſi filia matrem,
Quot natas, vates tot dabit iſte torus.
Altera Pïeridas, proles dabit altera Phœbum;
Parnaſſum referet ingenioſa domus.
At vos æterno ſociati fœdere amantes,
Unum quos ſtudium junxit, & unus amor,
Vivite fœlices, & plures reddite Phœbos,
Et plures olim reddite Pïeridas.

That entitled *Bellona chained*, is not much inferior to it; but it muſt be confeſſed that he, as well as Vondel, mixes ſometimes very low expreſſions amongſt thoſe that are the moſt lofty and ſublime. His periods are alſo frequently ſo intricate, that it is very difficult to find the conſtruction of them. But he makes ſufficient atonement for theſe defects by the ſprightlineſs of his genius, and the inexhauſtible fertility of his imagination. In the collection of his works, publiſhed by Mr. Hoogſtraaten, there are ſeveral Epithalamiums and Elegies; and among the latter, thoſe on the deaths of De Ruiter and Vondel are the moſt perfect. But with regard to the former, we may preſume that the author wrote them in haſte; for the ſame thought is found in all, and the turn of them is not much varied. Sometimes we ſhall find ſix or ſeven of theſe pieces following, which all conclude in the ſame manner, conducting the new married couple to bed, and wiſhing them iſſue after nine months; and all this expreſſed in a very turgid ſtile (11). But as our Poet died young, and compoſed but few pieces, if any, except his River Y, after he was married, it is not unreaſonable to think, that theſe were the fruits of his younger days, when his muſe had not yet acquired that perfection, to which ſhe arrived afterwards.

(11) *Journal Literaire, ubi ſupra*, p. 409, 410.

P.

(10) At the end of the remark [*C*].

[*E*] *The judgment which ſome learned Gentlemen have paſſed on Antonides's works.*] We have obſerved already (10) what is ſaid of his Poem on the River Y.

☞ANTONINUS PIUS (TITUS AURELIUS FULVIUS or FULVUS BOIONIUS) the Roman Emperor, was born at Lanuvium in Italy, the 19th of September in the year of the Chriſtian Æra 86 (*a*). His father's family was originally from Niſmes in Languedoc. His father Aurelius Fulvus, and his two grandfathers were advanced to the higheſt offices at Rome. Arrius Antoninus his grandfather by mother's ſide, was twice Conſul, and a man of great reputation for probity and virtue, and remarkable for having pitied his friend Nerva on account of his being made Emperor (*b*). Our Antoninus was educated firſt under his two grandfathers Arrius Antoninus, and Aurelius Fulvus, and behaved in ſuch a manner towards his relations, that he endeared himſelf to all of them; upon which account he had ſeveral conſiderable eſtates left to him. He was extremely fond of a country life, which however did not prevent him from being preferred to ſeveral offices of importance, which he diſcharged to the ſatisfaction of every perſon. His character in all reſpects is one of the nobleſt that can be imagined [*A*]. He was

(*a*) Jul. Capitolin. *in Vitâ Antonini Pii.* c. 1. edit. Schrevelii, Lugduni Batavorum, 1661.

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

[*A*] *His character in all reſpects is the nobleſt that can be imagined.*] To begin with that, which was of leaſt importance, the advantages of his perſon; he was tall and well made, his voice was agreeable, his countenance majeſtic (1), and at the ſame time had all the marks of humanity and benevolence in it (2). He was facetious, and eaſy in converſation (3). He was exact and diligent in his œconomy, and took great care of his eſtate; but was ſo far from uſurping upon the properties of others, that he was very liberal of his own, and even magnificent in his expences upon all proper occaſions. He lent conſiderable

(1) Capitolin. *in Vitâ Anton.* c. 13.

(2) M. Antoninus's *Meditations* tranſlated by Caſaubon, book 6. cap. 28.

(3) Ibid. book 1. cap. 13.

was Conſul in the year 120; and one of the four Conſular Perſons choſen by Hadrian for the government of Italy, and afterwards Proconſul of Aſia, where he acquired a greater reputation than even his grandfather himſelf. Upon his return to Rome Hadrian gave him

ble ſums at a very low intereſt. He was extremely ſober and temperate; ſo that nature having no occaſion for any diſcharge but at the regular periods, he paſſed whole days together, without moving out of his place (4); and that he might have ſtrength enough for the management of affairs, he took in the morni a little piece of dry bread before he admitted thoſe perſons, who came to pay their compliments to him (5). He never affected any thing extraordinary in his diet, or lodging, and contented himſelf with whatever offered, without being in pain for the luxuries of life (6). He took a reaſonable care of his body without too much adorning or neglecting of it. He preſerved his health, not as a man fond of life, but ſo far as was expedient to prevent the neceſſity of having recourſe to Phyſicians (7). He had an excellent genius, great learning and politeneſs, and a very powerful eloquence; and at the ſame time was a man of prodigious application (8). He was ſubject to exceſſive pains of the head; and yet after thoſe were over, he returned freſh and vigorous to his affairs (9). He was maſter of great ſagacity, and took care for the moſt inconſiderable events, with a mind that was always calm and ſerene; and he never acted any thing without the advice of his friends. He examined all that was propoſed to him with prodigious attention, and enquired into the bottom of affairs, without being amuſed by appearances, reſolving to underſtand the whole, before he determined to act. But he continued firm and inflexible in what he had once reſolved upon after ſufficient deliberation. He was no leſs exact in obſerving the manners and diſpoſitions of men, than in the conduct of affairs (10). He was not at all ambitious of honours and preferments (11); and Hadrian, when he gave him the title of Cæſar, ſaid, that he knew that he was a man, who of all others was leaſt ſollicitous to have a ſhare in the Government, and was ſo far from wiſhing to obtain the ſovereign power, that he received it with reluctance (12). When he exhibited the publick ſpectacles, and in all the publick buildings, congiaries, and other things of that nature, he regarded only what he thought it was his duty to do, without conſidering the judgment, which men might paſs upon it. For he was very far from that abſurd vanity, which leads men to be fond of the applauſes of the people, and to endeavour to procure them by low and ſervile flattery, and condeſcenſions to them. He was averſe from flattering others, or ſuffering others to flatter him (13). He was never the leaſt jealous of thoſe, who were diſtinguiſhed for their eloquence, their knowledge of the laws, or any other eminent qualification; and always readily yielded them the ſuperiority, and contributed to the utmoſt of his power, that every one of them might appear conſpicuous in their profeſſion (14). He obſerved with the greateſt exactneſs all the Roman laws and cuſtoms, but without ſeeming to affect an oſtentatious attachment to them (15). He was religious without any tincture of ſuperſtition (16). The Hiſtorians obſerve, that he always performed himſelf the ſacrifices and other acts of Religion, unleſs he was indiſpoſed, and ſhewed through the whole a ſtrong regard and veneration for the Deity (17). Reineſius (18) mentions an inſcription of the year 143 upon a monument, which the Senate and people of Rome had erected to the honour of this Emperor, on account of his care and peculiar reſpect for all the publick ceremonies. This inſcription commends him likewiſe for having joined the greateſt goodneſs and benevolence with the ſtricteſt regard for juſtice. As he was very exact in ſtudying the real characters of men, and conſequently choſe none but perſons of the moſt ſolid merit for his friends, ſo he was firm and conſtant in his friendſhips, without ever relaxing the leaſt in his regards for them. He never hearkened to any ſuggeſtions againſt them; he was never jealous or ſuſpicious, or ready to reproach them for the ſlight faults, which they might commit. There were but few things which he concealed from them; and thoſe were never any affairs relating to the State (19). But what added the greateſt grace to all theſe noble qualities of Antoninus, was that there was nothing of exceſs or oſtentation in his conduct; nothing mean, or affected, nothing unbecoming or ſingular, in ſhort nothing that ſavoured of the Declaimer or Sophiſt. Every thing ſhewed him to be a man of the moſt conſummate character, firm, and ſerious, always equal, always great, maſter of himſelf, and worthy of the ſuperiority over others; without the leaſt violence, impetuoſity or irregularity, and actuated by the moſt perfect rules of wiſdom. It was remarkable, that he knew extremely well when to ſhew himſelf reſolute and firm, and when to uſe condeſcenſion and mildneſs; for his natural diſpoſition was eaſy and gentle. He was grave and ſteady, without appearing like ſome perſons of a ſevere and moroſe temper, and without being inflexible to entreaty. On the contrary he was generous and humane to every body, and even to ill men, whom he was contented with reſtraining from doing miſchief, without puniſhing them with the ſeverity, which they deſerved. When Hadrian conſulted him upon any point, he was always for the moſt favourable advice; and after he was raiſed to the Empire, he was never known to do an act, which ſhewed the leaſt inhumanity and rigour (20). When he was Proconſul of Aſia, he lodged at Smyrna in the houſe of Polemon the Sophiſt, becauſe it was the beſt in that city. The Sophiſt, who was then abſent, and who was of an harſh temper, as ſoon as ever he returned, and found his houſe filled with people, began to clamour extremely, as if he had been driven out of his own habitation; ſo that Antoninus reſolved immediately to leave it, tho' it was late at night, and to remove to another. Polemon ſome years after came to Rome, and went to pay his compliments to Antoninus, who was then Emperor. Antoninus received him with the utmoſt civility, and only put him in mind in a merry and agreeable manner of what had paſſed at Smyrna. For when he ordered an apartment to be prepared for him, he added, that no body ſhould oblige him to remove out of it. An Actor likewiſe complaining, that Polemon had forced him out of the theatre at noonday, and appealing to him for juſtice; he replied, that he had forced him out of the houſe at midnight, and yet he had not appealed (21). We have many other inſtances of the goodneſs of his temper under the higheſt provocations. Viſiting Valerius Omulus, and admiring among other things the porphyry pillars in his houſe, he asked whence he had them; upon which Omulus, inſtead of conſidering it as an honour, that the Emperor ſhould commend the ornaments of his houſe, anſwered him bluntly, that he ought to be deaf and dumb at another man's houſe. Antoninus ſhewed no manner of reſentment at this, and upon many other occaſions bore extremely well the ill manners of this Omulus. *Inter alia etiam hoc civilitatis ejus præcipuum argumentum eſt, quod quum domum Omuli viſens, miranſque columnas porphyreticas, requiſiſſet unde eas haberet; atque Omulus ei dixiſſet,* Quum in domum alienam veneris, & mutus & ſudrus eſto, *patienter tulit. Cujus Omuli multa joca ſemper patienter tulit* (22). Having ſent for Apollonius, the Stoic Philoſopher, from the Eaſt, in order to be Preceptor to M. Aurelius, Apollonius brought with him ſeveral of his diſciples; and when he arrived at Rome, Antoninus ordered him to come to him, to receive the young Prince under his care; but he anſwered, that it was the ſcholar's duty to come to his Maſter. The Emperor only ſmiled at this odd humour of the Stoic, who had condeſcended to come from the Eaſt to Rome, and yet would not go from his houſe to the palace. However he ſent Aurelius to hear his Lectures (23). Yet with all theſe eminent virtues he did not eſcape cenſure; for Julian the Apoſtate in his *Cæſars* (24) reproaches him for having indulged his paſſions with regard to women, tho' at the ſame time he commends his Government; and there was a publick report, that he had raiſed Fabius Repentinus to the office of Prefect of the Prætorium upon the recommendation of a miſtreſs of his. *Sed Repentinus famoſâ voce percuſſus eſt, quod per concubinam Principis ad præfecturam veniſſet* (25). Julian (26) likewiſe animadverts upon him for being too exact in things of little conſequence.

(4) Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 2. Part 2. p. 499. edit. Bruxelles 1711.
(5) Capitol. *ubi ſupra, and* Victor *in Vitâ Anton. Pii.*
(6) Antoninus's *Medit.* lib. 1. cap. 13. and lib. 6. cap. 28.
(7) Ibid.
(8) Tillemont, p. 500.
(9) Anton. *Medit. ubi ſupra.*
(10) Tillem. p. 500, 501, *and* M. Anton. *Meditat.* B. 6. cap. 28.
(11) Antonin. *Meditat.* B. 1. c. 13.
(12) Dion Caſſius, lib. 69.
(13) Anton. *Meditat.* lib. 1. cap. 13. and l. 6. cap. 28; *and* Tillemont, pag. 501.
(14) Anton. *Meditat.* B. 1. cap. 13.
(15) Ibid.
(16) Ibid. B. 6. cap. 28.
(17) Pauſan. lib. 8.
(18) *Inſcript.* p. 308. edit. Lipſiæ and Francof. 1682.
(19) Anton. *Meditat.* B. 1. cap. 13; and B. 6. cap. 28.
(20) Tillem. p. 502, 503.
(21) Philoſtrat. 25. p. 533, 534.
(22) Capitol. c. 11.
(23) Idem, cap. 10. and Lucian. *de Vitâ Demonact.* p. 552. *apud* Tillemont, pag. 503.
(24) Tom. 2. edit. Petav. Paris 1630.
(25) Capitol. c. 8.
(26) *Ubi ſupra.*

him a place in his council, in order to conſult him in the adminiſtration of affairs (c). That Emperor upon the death of L. Ælius Verus Cejonius, whom he had adopted, reſolved to adopt our Antoninus in his room [B], which was executed the 5th of February 138, upon this condition, that he ſhould likewiſe adopt M. Annius Verus, his wife's nephew, who was afterwards called M. Aurelius, and L. Commodus, the ſon of L. Verus Cejonius deceaſed (d). Hadrian dying the tenth of July following he was raiſed to the Empire, and had the title of Pius given him by the Senate [C]. We have no particular or regular account of the tranſactions of his reign, ſince Capitolinus has written in a very confuſed manner; and we have only an abridgment of Dion Caſſius's Hiſtory by Xiphilin now remaining. So that we have nothing but a general idea of his conduct and government, which is a great and noble one [D]. He took prodigious care of the

(c) Idem, ibid. and 3.

(d) *See* Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Empereurs*, tom. 2. Part 2. pag. 507. edit. Bruxelles 1711.

[B] *Reſolved to adopt our Antoninus in his room.*] Some Authors write (27), that Hadrian adopted him for his ſucceſſor on account of his filial piety, having obſerved one day that he ſupported his father or father-in-law, who was infirm with old age, as they came into the Senate; which appears to have been his uſual cuſtom. This regard to ſo near a relation was no very conſiderable action with reſpect to him. But Hadrian had many other ſtrong proofs of his merit (28), and adopted him, becauſe he thought him a perſon well qualified for the Empire, and very able to ſupport him, when his body or mind ſhould decline thro' age. Antoninus after his adoption gave very conſiderable largeſſes to the army and people out of his own private eſtate, and paid all that Hadrian had promiſed for that ſolemnity. The Cities upon thoſe occaſions uſed to offer to the Princes very large ſums of money inſtead of crowns. But he remitted the whole to the cities of Italy, and half of it to the reſt. He contributed likewiſe very liberally to the works which Hadrian had undertaken, and acted with the utmoſt deference and obedience to him as long as he lived (29), except when that Emperor wanted to put an end to his own life, or ordered the execution of others (30).

(27) Capitol. c. 4. *and* Aurel. Victor.

(28) Tillem. p. 506.

(29) Capitol. cap. 4.

(30) Spart. *in Vitâ Adriani*, c. 24.

[C] *Had the title of Pius given him by the Senate.*] Mr. Tillemont (31) tranſlates this word by the French *bon* or *good*, becauſe that word properly ſignifies the tenderneſs and affection mingled with reſpect, which we obſerve in perſons of good temper towards thoſe who are related to them, as parents, children, and likewiſe towards their country. Antoninus had always diſcharged this duty towards all his relations; and it is ſaid, that the care which he took in aſſiſting his aged father-in-law and Hadrian in his ſickneſs contributed to the procuring him this ſurname (32). Several other reaſons are mentioned beſides this; as particularly his reſcuing ſeveral perſons from the reſentments or frenzy of Hadrian; his innate mildneſs and good temper; his regard for religion; and, according to Dion Caſſius (33), becauſe when ſeveral complaints were made to him againſt thoſe who had managed affairs under Hadrian, and divers of them were accuſed by name, he refuſed to hear all thoſe complaints, and ſaid, that he ought not to begin his reign with actions, which were invidious and diſagreeable. He is ſtiled Pius even in the medals of the year 138, and all the ſucceſſive ones; and it is particularly by this glorious title that he is diſtinguiſhed in hiſtory. Pauſanias (34) tells us, that he deſerved not only this title, but likewiſe that which was antiently given to Cyrus of *Father of Mankind*. The Games which he appointed at Puteoli in honour of Hadrian, were called Pia (35). Commodus and the reſt of the Emperors who ſucceeded him, aſſumed the ſame title of Pius, which only ſerved for the moſt part to ſhew the world more conſpicuouſly how unworthy they were of it.

(31) Pag. 508.

(32) Idem, ibid.

(33) Lib. 70.

(34) Lib. 8.

(35) Spanheim *de Præſtantiâ & uſu Numiſmat.* lib. 8. *apud* Tillemont, p. 509.

[D] *A general idea of his conduct and government, which is a great and noble one.*] He lived in the ſame manner after he was Emperor as he had done, while he was a private perſon, or rather he ſhewed himſelf to have been an excellent man, while he continued in a private ſtation, and his merit appeared ſtill greater, when he was advanced to the Empire. He raiſed the Imperial dignity by his condeſcenſion and familiarity with others. He admitted his friends to his preſence with the utmoſt freedom. He would ſuffer none but his ſlaves to wait upon him. He treated the Senate with the ſame regard, as he himſelf deſired to meet with from the Emperors, when he was a Senator. He gave an account of every thing that he did both to the Senate and the People. When he asked for the Conſulſhip and other offices for himſelf and his ſons, he ſollicited for them like a private perſon (36). Marcus Antoninus tells us (37), that it was this Emperor, who after he had adopted him, diveſted him of all pride and vain-glory, and reduced him to the opinion, that it was poſſible to live in the court without a troop of guards and followers, magnificent apparel, torches, ſtatues, and other circumſtances of pomp and grandeur; but that a man may contract himſelf almoſt to the ſtate of a private perſon, and yet for all that not become the more baſe or remiſs in thoſe publick affairs, in which power and authority are requiſite. He lived with his friends, as Capitolinus informs us, as if he had not been Emperor; he converſed, walked, and diverted himſelf with them; he invited them to his publick and private feaſts, and went himſelf to viſit them, and whenever they were prevented by any buſineſs from giving him their company at his table or in his journies, he was not at all offended at it, or abated the leaſt of his friendſhip for them, being willing that they ſhould enjoy a full liberty of acting according to their own convenience. He would not ſuffer either his friends or his freedmen, whom he treated with a great deal of ſeverity, to abuſe their intereſt with him; and he never gave them an opportunity to do it, becauſe he did every thing immediately himſelf, and in the view of the world. He gave audience to all who came to propoſe any thing for the publick advantage. He was pleaſed when any good advice was offered him, and did not ſhew the leaſt impatience that his own opinion ſhould be freely oppoſed, and bore, without complaining, the hard imputations which were caſt upon his conduct. He paid the greateſt honour to true Philoſophers, and ſuffered thoſe, who were only in appearance ſuch, without reproaching them with their hypocriſy. He took ſo particular a care of all the people of his Empire, that it was evident he conſidered them all as really belonging to himſelf, and compoſing one great family, of which himſelf was the head (38). He knew exactly the ſtate of the Provinces and the revenues of them. He recommended to the Governors to act with lenity in collecting the taxes, and whenever they appeared faulty, he obliged them to give a ſtrict account of their adminiſtration. He heard very favourably all perſons who came with any complaints to him, and found no manner of pleaſure in enriching himſelf by the oppreſſion of his ſubjects; ſo that all the Provinces flouriſhed under his reign (39). He was a great lover of juſtice, and no conſideration could ever prevent him from giving every perſon his right. He made a great many excellent regulations in the Law, with the advice of ſeveral eminent Civilians, Vinidius or Vindius Verus, Salvius Valens, Voluſianus Metianus or Mæcianus, Ulpius Marcellus, and Jabolenus, who are almoſt all of them famous for the fragments, which are ſtill remaining of their writings. It is ſaid, that it was he who appointed, that no man, who had been acquitted of a crime, ſhould be tried again for it (40). He choſe thoſe for Governors of Provinces, who appeared to him to be lovers of juſtice as well as himſelf; and when they had diſcharged their duty in a proper manner, he rewarded them by peculiar honours and preſents, and did not recall them for ſeveral years, or even till they deſired it, which was the caſe of Orphitus Prefect of Rome. Gavius Maximus, who was a perſon of great exactneſs, was twenty years Prefect of the Prætorium (41). But with regard

(36) *See* Capitol. *in Vitâ Antonini Pii, apud* Tillem. p. 510.

(37) Lib. 1. cap. 14.

(38) Capit. 1. *ubi ſupra.*

(39) Idem, ibid.

(40) Tillemont, p. 512.

(41) Capitol. *ubi ſupra.*

the management of the publick revenues [E], but was extremely generous in the diſtribution of his own eſtate, upon all proper occaſions [F]. He never put any Senator to death; but having convicted one of parricide, who confeſſed his crime, and the laws of nature not ſuffering ſuch a perſon to live, he ordered him to be baniſhed to a deſolate iſland (e). Attilius Tatianus and Priſcianus were accuſed of having formed conſpiracies againſt him; the latter of whom killed himſelf, and the former was proſcribed by a decree of the Senate, and was the only perſon puniſhed in that manner under Antoninus, who always took a particular care of his ſon, and would not ſuffer any enquiry to be made after thoſe who had been engaged in either of theſe conſpiracies (f). And when the Senate was very urgent with him for that purpoſe, he anſwered, he was not willing it ſhould be ſeen that there were a great many perſons who did not love him (g). He had very few wars during his reign [G], and thoſe he carried on by his Lieutenants. He never engaged in any but upon abſolute neceſſity, having an averſion to the ſhedding even of his enemies blood. He was fond of peace, and even in war preferred the reputation of juſtice to all the advantages which might be gained by victory. He was more intent upon preſerving the bounds of his Empire than extending them (b). And he often

(e) Capitol. c. 8.

(f) Idem, c. 7.

(g) Victor. *in Vit. Anton. Pii.*

(b) Tillemont, p. 520.

regard to thoſe officers, whoſe conduct was exceptionable, he was ſatisfied with only removing them from their employments, without ſhewing any other mark of ſeverity towards them (42).

(42) Dion. Caſſ. lib. 70.

[E] *He took prodigious care of the management of the publick revenues.*] He employed the income of his great eſtate in liberalities to his friends and ſoldiers; but he took prodigious care of the diſtribution of the publick money; ſo that he leſſened his own private fortune, and left the treaſury extremely rich. He was very careful of the proviſions, and extended his exactneſs to the things of the leaſt importance. He took away the penſions, which Hadrian had given to a great many perſons of no conſequence, and ſaid that it was an unworthy thing, or rather a cruelty, to ſuffer the Commonwealth to be conſumed by thoſe, who were not of the leaſt ſervice to it. He retrenched among other penſions that, which had been given to one Meſomedes a Lyric Poet, who was eſteemed by Hadrian, becauſe he had written Verſes in honour of his favourite Antinous. Caracalla afterwards raiſed a monument to this Poet. We find by Euſebius and Suidas, that he was a Cretan. There are ſome of his verſes ſtill extant (43). Antoninus ſold all the uſeleſs goods, and even the lands belonging to the Crown, being ſatisfied with his own eſtates, when he went into the country. He never would take any long journey, becauſe he thought that the preſence of the Court was always a charge to a Province, whatever care the Emperor might take to retrench the expences of it. This gave him an opportunity of receiving advices from all the ſeveral Provinces of the Empire, as he reſided generally at Rome, which was the center of it.

(43) Tillemont, p. 514.

[F] *Generous in the diſtribution of his own eſtate upon all proper occaſions.*] His prudent management never expoſed him to the imputation of avarice, becauſe he ſhewed ſufficiently upon all occaſions how little love he had for money. He refuſed the eſtates, which were left him by thoſe, who had children of their own. He reſtored to the children the eſtates, which had been confiſcated on account of their fathers crimes, except in thoſe caſes, wherein it is neceſſary to make ſatisfaction to the Provinces, which had been plundered by them. Confiſcations were much more rare under him than under any other Emperor. He abſolutely removed informers. He was always ready to remit the taxes, whenever there was occaſion. Thoſe perſons, who had obtained for themſelves the right of Roman Citizens, were not always able to procure it for their children, who ſtill continued Greeks, according to Pauſanias's expreſſion (44); and in that caſe the father could not leave them his eſtate, but was obliged to give it to ſtrangers, if he had no relations who were Citizens, or elſe the Treaſury ſeized it. But Antoninus ordered that the children ſhould be intitled to the inheritance, having more regard to the laws of humanity, than to thoſe, which had been ſo favourable to the avarice of the Emperors. His care in retrenching uſeleſs expences, was deſigned chiefly to enable him to ſupply thoſe, which were ſerviceable or neceſſary. He beſtowed privileges and penſions in all the Provinces upon Philoſophers and Teachers of Rhetoric. He gave many noble preſents to the Roman people and the army. He maintained a company of young Ladies in honour of his wife. He ſupplied the Senators and Magiſtrates with money to diſcharge their ſeveral employments. He furniſhed the expence of the publick ſpectacles. It is ſaid, that he gave the right of a Colony to the City of Antioch (45). He was by no means fond of building; however he raiſed ſeveral publick edifices at Rome and in the parts adjacent, particularly the Port of Cajeta, and that of Terracina, which he repaired, and the tomb of Hadrian, which he finiſhed. He built likewiſe ſeveral new edifices at Puteoli. He gave money to ſeveral Cities for the repairing of old buildings, or raiſing of new ones, particularly in Greece, Ionia, Syria, and Carthage. He made the town of Pallantium in Arcadia a free City, and exempted it from tribute, becauſe it was reported, that Evander with a part of the inhabitants of that place had formerly built a city where Rome afterwards ſtood. The misfortunes, which happened under his reign, ſhewed the extent of his liberality, by the care, which he took in repairing the loſſes, which were occaſioned by them. For there was at Rome a famine, an inundation of the Tiber, and a fire, which made great devaſtation. The Cities of Narbonne in Gaul and Antioch in Syria, and the Forum of Carthage were likewiſe burnt; and there raged a peſtilence in Arabia. During the famine he bought a great quantity of corn, wine, and oil, and diſtributed them to the people. at his own charge. The apprehenſion of a famine once excited a tumult among the people againſt him, and they even proceeded ſo far as to caſt ſtones at him. However inſtead of puniſhing this ſedition, he only gave an account of his conduct to the people in order to appeaſe them. The Cities of Cos and Rhodes, with ſeveral others in Lycia and Caria, being overthrown by an earthquake, Antoninus procured them all to be rebuilt, not only by encouraging the inhabitants to uſe their endeavours, but by contributing himſelf very conſiderably for that purpoſe. There was likewiſe in his time a great earthquake in the Helleſpont, which opened a paſſage to the ſea in the midſt of the land, and entirely overthrew the city of Cyzicum with its temple, which was at that time the largeſt and moſt beautiful in the world (46).

(45) Tillemont, p. 514, 515.

(46) Idem, 516, 517.

[G] *Very few wars during his reign.*] Some writers inform us, that he was engaged in no war during the twenty three years which he reigned; and they make uſe of this inſtance to ſhew, that it is not peace and eaſe, which corrupt men, but the perverſeneſs of their own diſpoſition. It is true, he never commanded in perſon, but there happened ſome wars under his reign. The Moors took up arms in Africa, but he drove them out of their own territories, and obliged them to fly to the furtheſt parts of Libya among the people of Mount Atlas (47), and reduced them to the neceſſity of deſiring peace (48). The Brigantes, a people of Britain, having made an incurſion upon the country ſubject to the Romans, Lollius Urbicus the Governor of that Province ſubdued them; and the principal honour of this victory was aſcribed to our Emperor, though he reſided at Rome all that time. He took away from them the greateſt part of their country, and made a new wall of turf to prevent the Barbarians from incurſions. Hadrian had made one before this; but it is ſaid, that Antoninus's wall was much

(44) Lib. 8.

(47) Pauſan. lib. 8.

(48) Capitol. *in Vitâ Anton. Pii.*

often made uſe of Scipio's expreſſion, that he choſe rather to ſave one citizen than kill a thouſand enemies (*i*). By this conduct he made himſelf univerſally revered and eſteemed in that age, and admired by poſterity [*H*]. In the year 139 he reſolved to marry his daughter Annia Fauſtina to M. Aurelius, who ſucceeded him in the Empire (*k*), and in 141 his own wife Fauſtina died, whoſe behaviour is repreſented to have been very looſe and irregular. Antoninus obſerved this with great regret, and endeavoured as much as poſſible to conceal it from publick infamy. However he deified her after her death, and erected temples to her, and paid her all the honours that ſuperſtition could direct him to (*l*). In 147 he gave the Tribunitial and Proconſular Power to M. Aurelius; and we are informed by the Alexandrian Chronicle, that the ſame year he remitted all the publick debts, and burnt all the papers relating to the ſecurity of them, which had been preſerved in the Treaſury. He ſhewed a prodigious regard for M. Aurelius, whereas he acted in a different manner with reſpect to L. Verus, having obſerved the vicious turn of his diſpoſition (*m*). This great and good Emperor died about the ſeventh of March 161, having lived ſeventy three years, and reigned twenty three years, ſeven months, and ſixteen days after Hadrian's death (*n*). We ſhall mention ſome of the circumſtances which attended his death [*I*]. He was univerſally lamented; and the people regretted the loſs of

(*i*) Capitol. c. 9.

(*k*) Tillem. p. 525.

(*l*) Id. p. 527.

(*m*) Idem, pag. 532.

(*n*) Idem, pag. 541.

much larger in extent, and carried on to the middle of Scotland between the Gulfs of Forth and Clyde, which are called by other writers Edinborough and Dombritton. Camden endeavours to prove this by ſeveral inſcriptions. There are ſome medals of Antoninus, in which he has the title of *Britannicus*; and there are others which mention Britain under his third Conſulſhip, that is after the year 139, and before 145, and in the tenth year of his Tribuneſhip, that is in 147. Father Pagi upon very ſlight grounds places the war in Britain under the year 140 (49). He managed ſeveral wars by his Generals againſt the Germans, Dacians, and many other nations, and ſtopped the incurſions of the Alans, and ſuppreſſed a rebellion of the Jews (50), which was undoubtedly the ſame war which was carried on in Judea at the time that Juſtin Martyr had a conference at Epheſus with Trypho after the year 150 (51). It is ſaid, that Antoninus permitted the Jews to circumciſe their own children, but not thoſe of other nations, under the penalty of being ſubjected to the laws made by Hadrian againſt Eunuchs. The manner in which the Jews ſpeak of him ſhews, that notwithſtanding their rebellion he was very mild and favourable to them. There was at that time at the mouth of the Boryſthenes, or a little above it a Greek city, named Olbia, very famous among the Antients. This city, which was then probably a free and independent Commonwealth, having made war againſt the Tauroſcythians, who are ſuppos'd to have been the Scythians that inhabited the Tauric Cherſoneſus and the adjacent country, Antoninus ſent the Roman troops to their aſſiſtance, who defeated the Tauroſcythians, and obliged them to give hoſtages to the Citizens of Olbia (52).

(49) Tillem. p. 518, 519.

(50) Capitol. *ubi ſupra.*

(51) Juſtin. *Dialog.* p. 217, 227. edit. Paris 1636.

(52) *See* Arrian. *de Ponto*, Baudrand *Diction. Geogr. and* Capitol. *apud* Tillem. p. 520.

[*H*] *Univerſally rever'd and eſteem'd in that age, and admired by poſterity.*] He never engaged in any war but upon abſolute neceſſity, and in ſelf-defence (53). He was always fond and deſirous of peace. By this humanity of diſpoſition he was not only beloved by his ſubjects, who conſidered him as their father and protector rather than as their maſter, but likewiſe by all the foreign Princes and nations, who were ſtruck with admiration of his goodneſs and equity. His power and his virtue filled them with the moſt profound veneration for him. And therefore as he never made war from a ſpirit of ambition upon thoſe who continued in peace, ſo the other nations were neither able nor willing to interrupt this tranquillity, which was more honourable to him than the moſt ſhining triumphs in war (54). We are aſſured that no Emperor had ever ſo great an authority among foreign nations as he. An Hiſtorian tells us, without explaining himſelf further, that by his authority alone he induced King Abgarus to leave the Eaſt. *Abgarum regem ex orientis partibus ſolâ autoritate deduxit* (55). This was the common name of the Princes of Edeſſa (56); and Epiphanius (57) cites a verſe of that time, which repreſents this Abgarus to have been a perſon of great virtue. He ſtopped by his letters alone the King of the Parthians, who had juſt made himſelf maſter of Armenia; and this Prince having deſired, that the regal throne which Trajan had taken, ſhould be ſent back to him, Antoninus abſolutely refuſed it (58). His character for juſtice procured him to be

(53) Pauſan. lib. 8. *and* Capitol. *ubi ſupra.*

(54) Eutrop. Dio. lib. 70, *and* Aurel. Victor, *apud* Tillemont, pag. 521.

(55) Capitol. c. 9.

(56) Caſaub. *in Capitolin.*

(57) *Apud* Tillemont, p. 521.

(58) Capitol. cap. 9.

Judge among the foreign Kings; and ſeveral barbarous nations laid down their arms in order to ſubmit their diſputes to his determination, and to execute his deciſions. He was arbitrator of the conteſt between Rhimethalces and his Tutor, and reſtored the former to the Kingdom of Boſphorus, which the latter had probably deprived him of. He received Embaſſies likewiſe from Hircania, Bactria and India. Pharaſmanes King of Iberia came to viſit him at Rome, and paid greater regard to him than he had done before to Hadrian. The Ladi, a people of Cholcis, received a King from him, whoſe name was Pacorus. He gave Princes likewiſe to the Armenians and Quadi, as we learn from ſome medals which are placed under the year 139. The noble qualifications of this Emperor, and the manner in which he governed the Empire, have occaſioned him, as we obſerve in the text of this article, to be compared by moſt of the Hiſtorians to Numa, whoſe character nearly reſembled his on account of the peace which he generally enjoyed, and the care which he took of religious affairs. Others are of opinion that he ought not to be compared to Numa, or any other Prince, ſince he was ſo much ſuperior to all mankind in virtue. There was nothing but what was commendable in his character, as Capitolinus informs us; and Pauſanias tells us, as we obſerved before, that he deſerved to be ſtiled the Father of Mankind. He was ſo greatly admired by poſterity, that it is ſaid, the people and the army would never conſider any perſon as Emperor, if he had not the name of Antoninus, ſo that his ſucceſſors aſſumed it for near an age after, and the Romans paid a greater veneration to it than even to thoſe of the Gods themſelves. Severus appointed that all the Emperors ſhould aſſume it as well as that of Auguſtus, either becauſe he thought Titus Antoninus to have been the happieſt of all Princes, or becauſe it was he, or rather Marcus Antoninus his ſucceſſor, who firſt preferred him. This name, even after it had been diſhonoured by the infamous Caracalla, was ſo highly eſteemed, that the Emperor Macrinus gave it to his ſon Diadumenus, for fear that thoſe who bore that name ſhould take the advantage of it, and revolt againſt him. Alexander Severus refuſed it out of modeſty, though the Senate, who conſidered it as a mark of the ſupreme power as well as that of Auguſtus, were very importunate with him to accept it. Alexander excuſed himſelf by ſaying, that he was apprehenſive that his conduct would not anſwer the dignity of ſo illuſtrious a name. It is ſaid that the Egyptians had an Æra or Epocha, which they began with the reign of Antoninus, where the Greek *Faſti* publiſhed by Mr. Dodwel likewiſe begin, which, according to that learned writer, were probably written by Theon, a Philoſopher of great eminence at Alexandria about the end of the fourth Century (59).

(59) Tillem. p. 522, 523.

[*I*] *We ſhall mention ſome of the circumſtances which attended his death.*] He fell ſick after having eaten too much cheeſe at ſupper, which occaſioned a vomiting, attended with a fever, that proved fatal to him in a few days. The third day of his ſickneſs he gave all the neceſſary orders that Marcus Aurelius might ſucceed him without any difficulty, and recommended the Empire and his daughter to him. In his

of him as much as if he had been cut off in the flower of youth (o). His body was interred with prodigious pomp and magnificence in Hadrian's tomb, and M. Aurelius and L. Verus pronounced a panegyric upon him (p). He was ranked among the Gods by the Senate with the general consent and approbation; and all the honours, which had been before bestowed upon the best Princes, were paid to his memory (q). All people were unanimous in extolling his piety, clemency, genius and integrity. He was almost the only Emperor who ever reigned without any civil or hostile blood being shed on his account. And he was justly compared to Numa, with regard to his good fortune, piety, and religion (r). He had the honour of having the Emperor Gordian for his Historian [K]. Several Orations were published under his name, which were generally thought not to be his; though Marius Maximus the Historian cited by Capitolinus (s) was of the contrary opinion. He is said to have worked several miracles after his death [L]. St. Austin (t) mentions a Rescript of the Emperor Antoninus inserted in the Gregorian Code, in which it was determined, that an husband should not prosecute his wife for adultery, unless he had set her himself an example of conjugal chastity; and that if it was discovered that both of them had been criminal, they should both be punished; it being unjust, as that Prince observes, that an husband should oblige his wife to maintain her fidelity to him, when himself had broken his own to her. Baronius ascribes this (u) to our Emperor; and tells us, that the same thing is to be found in Ulpian.

(o) Capitol. c. 12.
(p) Idem, *in Vitâ Anton. Philos.* cap. 7.
(q) Idem, *in Vitâ Anton. Pii*, c. 12.
(r) Idem, ibid.
(s) Cap. 11.
(t) *De adult. Conjugiis*, tom. 6. edit. Paris 1586. *apud* Tillemont, p. 543.
(u) *Annal. ad ann.* 161

delirious fits his whole talk was of the public affairs, and of the King, who had incurr'd his resentments. For Vologeses King of Parthia was then making preparations for the war, which he soon after declar'd against the Romans. A little before he died he gave to the Tribune for the watch-word, *Æquanimitas*, that is, *Tranquillity of Mind*, and then turning himself, as if he had sunk into a calm sleep, expired. He left his own private estate to his daughter, and proper legacies to all his friends and domestics (60).

(60) Capitol. *in Vit. Titi Anton. Pii, & Anton. Philosoph.*

[K] *He had the honour of having the Emperor Gordian for his historian.*] This Emperor, when he was young, wrote a beautiful poem intitled *Antoninias* in thirty books, in which he celebrated the lives and wars of Antoninus Pius and Philosophus, with all their publick and private actions. But this work is not now extant. *Scripsit præterea quemadmodum Virgilius Æneidos, Statius Achilleidos, & multi alii Iliados, ita etiam ille Antoniniados, hoc est Antoninum Pium & Antoninum Marcum, versibus disertissimis, libris xxx, vitam illorum, & bella & publicè privatimque gesta perscribens. Et hæc quidem puerulus* (61).

(61) Idem, *in Vit. Gordian.* cap. 3.

[L] *He is said to have worked several miracles after his death.*] Baronius (62) mentions a Greek inscription, supposed to have been taken from the temple of Æsculapius at Rome, which contains divers pretended miraculous cures, which were ascribed to the remedies that had been revealed by this imaginary Deity. The first is said to have happened in the time of the Emperor Antoninus, but the inscription does not mention which of those Emperors particularly. Justin Martyr, who was at that time very eminent in the church, observes, according to Mr. Tillemont (63), that it is not difficult for the Devil, when God is pleased to permit him, to discover remedies for the diseases, which himself had inflicted, in order to procure himself the admiration of the vulgar; and as Baronius remarks (64) that he might oppose false Miracles to the true ones, which were then worked by the Christians.

T.

(62) *Ad ann.* 139. § 4.
(63) P. 543.
(64) *Ubi supra.*

ANTONINUS PHILOSOPHUS (MARCUS AURELIUS) the Roman Emperor, was descended from an ancient and noble family, which was traced up as high as Numa (a). His father Annius Verus died during his Pretorship (b). Antoninus was born at Rome the 26th of April in the year of the Christian Æra 121 (c), while his grandfather was the second time Consul (d). We find, that he was called by several names [A] till he was adopted into the Aurelian family, when he assumed that of Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. His father dying while he was very young, he was educated by his grandfather, who procured him the best masters in every science, under whom he made a prodigious progress, and shewed the strongest marks of an excellent genius and a virtuous disposition [B]. Dion Cassius informs us (e), that he was related to the Emperor Hadrian, to whom he was very dear from his infancy, and who gave him, when he was but

(a) Capitol. *in Vitâ Antonini Pii*, c. 1.
(b) Ibid.
(c) Tillemont, *Hist. des Emper.* tom. 2. Part 2. p. 559. edit. 2. Bruxelles 1711.
(d) Capitol. *ubi supra.*
(e) Lib. 69.

[A] *Called by several names.*] When he was adopted by his grandfather by the father's side, he received his name M. Annius Verus; and Hadrian the Emperor instead of Verus used to call him *Verissimus*, on account of the rectitude and constancy of his mind (1). He has likewise this name given him in the apology of Justin Martyr (2). When he was adopted by Antoninus Pius he assumed the name of M. Ælius Aurelius Verus, because Aurelius was the name of Antoninus's family, and Ælius that of Hadrian's, into which he enter'd (3). When he became Emperor, he left the name of Verus to Lucius Commodus his adopted brother (4), and took that of Antoninus, under which he is generally represented in history. But he is distinguished from his predecessor Titus Antoninus, either by the name of *Marcus*, or the sirname of *Philosophus*, which is given him by the general consent of writers; for we do not find that he received it by any publick act, or the authority of the Senate (5).

(1) Dion. Cass. lib. 69. p. 779. edit. Wechel. 1606, *apud* Tillemont, *Hist. des Empereurs*, tom. 4. p. 559.
(2) *Apol.* 2. p. 53. edit. Paris 1636.
(3) Tillemont, *ubi supra.*
(4) Capitol. *in Vitâ Veri Imperat.* c. 4. *inter Hist. Augustæ Script.* edit. Lugduni Batav. 1661.
(5) Tillemont, *ubi supra.*

[B] *Shewed the strongest marks of an excellent genius and a virtuous disposition.*] From his earliest infancy he behaved himself in so good a manner, that all his relations were highly fond of him. He assures us himself (6), that he had never been wanting in his duty to his father and mother, or any of his relations and friends; but he represents this with a great deal of modesty, by observing that they were all of them so good, as never to give him occasion to shew any marks of the ill humour which was natural to him. He had so grave and serene a turn of mind, that it is said neither joy nor grief ever made any alteration in his countenance (7). Annius Verus his grandfather, who adopted him, had him educated at his house by a Lady, whom he kept as his mistress. But Marcus Aurelius thanks the Gods, that he continued but a short time under so bad an education. It is probable that Hadrian would have him at his own palace. He acknowledges, that he owed the preservation of his chastity to the Gods (8); and Aristides the orator observes (9), that many persons indeed commend that virtue, but that he only was thought really to possess it, because he had been always superior to the charms of pleasure, which others are slaves to. While he was still very young he recommended to those who had the care of his estate, that they should act with mildness and humanity (10). He had warm sentiments of religion, which led him into all the mysteries of the pagan superstition. For when he was but eight years old, Hadrian placed him among the Salii or Priests of Mars, where he applied himself very industriously to

(6) *De seipso*, lib. 1. c. 14. edit. Lond. 1643.
(7) Tillem. pag. 561.
(8) Idem, ibid.
(9) Orat. 9.
(10) Tillem. *ubi supra.*

but ſix years of age, all the honours which his tender years were capable of. When he was ſixteen years of age he reſigned to his ſiſter Anna Cornificia, whom he had married to Numidius Quadratus, all the eſtate which had been left him by his father; and being adviſed by his mother to reſerve a part of it for himſelf, he told her that he ſhould be willing that ſhe ſhould give all her eſtate to his ſiſter, ſince he had a ſufficient fortune from his grandfather Annius Verus (*f*). Hadrian upon the death of Cejonius Commodus, whom he had adopted, in order to mitigate the ſenſe of his loſs, and at the ſame time to provide a worthy ſucceſſor for the Roman Empire, turned his eyes upon our Marcus Aurelius. But as he was then not eighteen years of age, and conſequently too young for ſo important a ſtation, he fixed upon Antoninus Pius, whom he adopted upon this condition, that the latter ſhould likewiſe adopt M. Aurelius, and Lucius Commodus, the ſon of Cejonius, who was then but ſeven or eight years old, and Hadrian's grandſon by adoption. Theſe adoptions were very probably executed the 25th of February A. D. 138 (*g*). Our young Prince was ſo far from being elated by this honour, that he received the account of it with a kind of terror and regret. Being aſked the reaſon of this, he urged the variety of inconveniences and difficulties which neceſſarily attend the poſſeſſion of the Government (*h*). The year following Hadrian appointed him Queſtor, though he had not yet attained the age preſcribed by the Laws (*i*). After Hadrian's deceaſe he married Fauſtina the daughter of Antoninus Pius [*C*], by whom he had ſeveral children [*D*]. In the year 139 he was inveſted with new honours by the Emperor Pius, amidſt

(*f*) Idem, pag. 568.

(*g*) Idem, pag. 568, 569.

(*h*) Capit. c. 5.

(*i*) Tillemont, p. 569.

to learn all their ceremonies. This diſpoſition continued in him during the whole courſe of his life; for before he began the war againſt the Marcomanni, he reſtored the worſhip of the Gods with great ſolemnity, and deferred his departure in order to perform all the proper ceremonies. This expoſed him to the ridicule of the Pagans themſelves; and there is a diſtich ſtill extant, in which the white oxen are introduced wiſhing that he might not return victorious, leſt he ſhould deſtroy the whole race of them in ſacrifices (11). However, we find that he condemned ſuperſtition in others, and thought that thoſe perſons ought to be confined to the iſlands, who made uſe of the name of the Deity to raiſe terrors in weak minds. He baniſhed a man, who was accuſed of having foretold a revolt. He prohibited likewiſe the people of Peluſium the worſhip of Serapis on account of the crimes, which were committed in thoſe myſteries. Nay, he profeſſes himſelf to be very incredulous with regard to what is ſaid concerning magic, enchantments, and other pretences of that nature (12). He was inſtructed very early in Learning and Philoſophy under the moſt eminent maſters, whom he always conſidered as perſons to whom he was extremely oblig'd, and whom he rewarded afterwards in a generous manner (13). The moſt diſtinguiſhed of them for eloquence were Herodes Atticus, and M. Cornelius Fronto, whom he raiſed to the Conſulſhip (14). He was very fond of the knowledge of antiquity; and he made collections from the writings of the Ancients to ſerve him in his old age. Aurelius Victor highly prefers him to Antoninus Pius with regard to eloquence. And yet he informs us himſelf (15), that he abandoned very ſoon the ſtudy of Rhetoric, Poetry, and other things of that nature; nay, that he had made little advantage of the time which he had employed in them; and he thanks Heaven, that he had no natural diſpoſition towards thoſe arts, becauſe he might otherwiſe perhaps have attached himſelf to them. He applied himſelf to the law very early under L. Volufius Metianus (16) or Mæcianus (17); which was of great advantage to him, when he had occaſion to adminiſter juſtice after he was Emperor, becauſe he was under no neceſſity of recurring to the Lawyers themſelves (18). Athenagoras in his *Apology for the Chriſtian Religion* (19), obſerves, that M. Aurelius was perfect in all kinds of learning, eſpecially in the opinions of the Philoſophers. And in reality his chief ſtudy was that of Philoſophy (20). From the twelfth year of his age he took the habit of a Philoſopher, that is the Greek *pallium* or cloak, and he inur'd himſelf to ſo ſevere a courſe of life, that he lay upon the ground. However, his mother's importunity obliged him at laſt to make uſe of a little bed, which he covered with ſkins (21). He thanks heaven (22), that ſince he was ſo extremely delighted with Philoſophy; he had not fallen into the hands of thoſe, who inſtead of the ſtudy of morality apply themſelves only to eloquence, like the Sophiſts, or to forming Syllogiſms and contemplating the Stars. He ſtudied the Peripatetic Philoſophy under Claudius Severus (23), whom he made Conſul in the year 163 (24); but he applied himſelf with more vigour to that of the Stoics under Apollonius Chalcedonius (25), whom Antoninus Pius had ſent for to Rome for that purpoſe (26), and likewiſe under Sextus Chæronenſis, the nephew of Plutarch, Junius Ruſticus, Claudius Maximus, and Cinna Catullus (27). Euſebius adds (28) to theſe Baſilides of Scythopolis, and as it ſeems Arrian likewiſe, the celebrated diſciple of Epictetus. He remarks himſelf (29) ſeveral important maxims for the conduct of life, which he had learned of Ruſticus, Apollonius, Sextus, Catullus, and Maximus. And he ranks among his maſters (30) Diognetus, who had engaged him in a love for Philoſophy, Bacchius, Tandaſides, and Marcian, Alexander the Platoniſt, and another Alexander the Grammarian, and Fronto, who had taught him eloquence. He always ſhewed the greateſt regard for his tutors, even after he was Emperor (31). He made ſo great a progreſs in Philoſophy, that he wrote Dialogues, while he was very young. But having learned this talent of Diognetus, he was adviſed by Ruſticus to diſcontinue that employment, becauſe there was more oſtentation in it than real advantage to a perſon of his rank (32). He was very aſſiduous in hearing the lectures of theſe Philoſophers, becauſe he was willing to learn ſomething of them; but in other reſpects he was perſuaded that there were very few, who were really Philoſophers, and conform'd themſelves to their own dictates; having found by experience, that moſt of them were not only avaricious and ſelf intereſted perſons, but likewiſe had no other deſign but to diſpute, and were actuated by a ſpirit of vanity, malignity and jealouſy (33).

(11) Idem, pag. 561, 562.

(12) Idem, pag. 562, 563.

(13) Capit. c. 3. and M. Antonin. *de ſeipſo*, lib. 1. cap. 14.

(14) *Vide* Caſauboni *Not. in* Capitol. *Vit. Anton.* c. 2.

(15) *De Seipſo*, lib. 1. c. 4. & 14.

(16) Capitol. cap. 3.

(17) Caſaubon. *in eundem locum* Capitol.

(18) Ariſtid. *Orat.* 9.

(19) P. 6. edit. Paris 1636.

(20) Capitol. c. 2.

(21) Idem, ibid.

(22) *De Seipſo*, lib. 1. c. 14.

(23) Capitol. c. 3.

(24) *See* Tillemont, p. 565.

(25) Capitol. cap. 2.

(26) Id. *in Vit. Anton. Pii*, cap. 10.

(27) Id. *in Vitâ Anton. Philoſ.* cap. 3.

(28) Chronic. *ad ann.* 146.

(29) *De Seipſo*, lib. 1. p. 5, 7, 11, 19.

(30) Ibid. p. 5 and 9.

(31) Tillemont, p. 565, 566.

(32) Id. p. 566.

(33) Galen. *Prognoſt.* tom. 3. p. 460. *apud* Tillem. *ubi ſupra.*

[*C*] *Married Fauſtina the daughter of Antoninus Pius.*] By the Emperor Hadrian's orders, when he was but fifteen years of age, he had the daughter of L. Cejonius Commodus betrothed to him (34), who is ſuppoſed to be the ſame Lady that is called Fabia in ſome paſſages of the hiſtorians; and on the other hand that Emperor had appointed, that Antoninus Pius ſhould give his daughter Annia Fauſtina to young Lucius (35). But after Hadrian's death, as Lucius was then but an infant, Antoninus Pius propoſed to M. Aurelius that he ſhould marry his daughter. He deſired ſome time to conſider of it, and at laſt reſolved upon it, and married Fauſtina in the year 146 at the furtheſt. But this marriage was far from being happy on account of the diſorderly conduct of Fauſtina and her ſon Commodus. And it appears that Fabia's character was not much more regular (36).

(34) Capitol. cap. 4.

(35) Tillem. p. 569.

(36) Idem, ibid.

[*D*] *By whom he had ſeveral children.*] He had a daughter by her in the beginning of the year 147, who probably was Lucilla, married about the year 164 to L. Verus, and afterwards to Pompeianus. He had ſeveral other daughters, three of whom were living in 193. Caracalla put one of them to death in 212, who was then very old, and had been extremely honoured by all the Emperors out of regard to her father's memory (37). He had likewiſe ſeveral ſons.

(37) Id. p. 570.

amidſt which he conducted himſelf in ſuch a manner as endeared him to that Prince and to the whole Empire [E]. Upon the death of Pius in the year 161 he was obliged by the Senate to take upon him the Government, in the management of which he made Lucius Verus his Collegue [F]. This was the firſt time that the Romans ſaw their Empire poſſeſſed by two Princes in conjunction, which was ſo ſurprizing a circumſtance, that ſome perſons fixed upon it as a new Æra (k). The ſame day he took upon him the name of Antoninus, which he gave likewiſe to Verus his Collegue, and betrothed his daughter Lucilla to him (l). The two Emperors went after this to the camp, where they promiſed a conſiderable ſum of money to the ſoldiers, and having performed the funeral of Pius, they pronounced both of them a panegyrick upon him (m). They diſcharged the Government together in a very amicable manner. Marcus Antoninus endeavoured by all proper methods to gain the love of the people, and Lucius Verus acted with the utmoſt modeſty and deference to his judgment and direction; ſo that the former in his *Meditations* (n) highly commends his brother's friendſhip and affection for him. It is ſaid (o), that ſoon after Antoninus had performed the Apotheoſis of his father Pius, petitions were preſented to him by the Pagan Prieſts, Philoſophers, and Governors of Provinces, in order to excite him to perſecute the Chriſtians, which he rejected with the utmoſt indignation [G]. But the happineſs which the Empire began to enjoy under the two brothers, was interrupted

(k) Id. p. 576.

(l) Capit. c. 7.

(m) Tillemont, p. 777.

(n) Lib. 1. c. 14.

(o) *See* Dr. Stanhope's Latin Tranſlation of Dacier's *Life of M. Antoninus*, printed at London in 4to, 1697, p. 7.

Commodus, who ſucceeded him in the Empire, and Antoninus Geminus were twins. They were born the 31ſt of Auguſt 161 in the Palace, their father being then Emperor, who often took Commodus in his arms, and preſented him to the ſoldiers, to recommend him to their protection. The Aſtrologers promiſed the ſame duration of life to theſe two children; but Antoninus died about four years after. He had another ſon in 163 named Severus, or rather Verus, who died in 170. Several medals give him the name of Annius Verus, to which ſome modern authors add that of Sextus upon the authority of Galen. Others believe, that this Sextus was a fourth ſon of M. Aurelius (38). Veriſſimus, whom Herodian (39) repreſents as the only brother of Commodus, becauſe that hiſtorian knew nothing perhaps of the others, who died before in their infancy, is probably Annius Verus, the name of Veriſſimus being likewiſe given him, as it had been to his father. And this agrees with what Herodian adds, that Veriſſimus died very young (40). We find in inſcriptions Titus Aurelius Antoninus, and T. Ælius Aurelius, ſon of M. Aurelius and grandſon of T. Antoninus. They muſt both have been born before the year 161, and before Commodus, as well as Fauſtina their ſiſter. For M. Aurelius is only ſtiled Cæſar in thoſe inſcriptions, tho' his wife Fauſtina has the title of *Auguſta*. Beſides Antoninus Pius has not the title of *Divus* given him, which ſhews that he was not then dead. But if theſe inſcriptions are the epitaphs of thoſe Princes, as it is very probable, their death muſt be placed as well as their birth before the month of April 161. This agrees with a letter, which Marcus Aurelius wrote, while he was yet Cæſar, to the city of Smyrna after the year 144, and evidently before 159, in which he thanks them for the compliment, which T. Atilius Maximus the Proconſul had ſent him in their name on the birth of his ſon, *tho' the affair*, ſays he, *has had a different event*; which words plainly intimate that the child was then dead (41).

(38) Id. p. 571.

(39) Lib. 1.

(40) Tillemont, p. 571.

(41) Idem, pag. 571, 572.

[E] *Conducted himſelf in ſuch a manner as endeared him to that Prince and the whole Empire.*] In the midſt of all the honours which he was poſſeſſed of, he ſtill applied himſelf to his ſtudies. But his chief care was to behave with the utmoſt ſubmiſſion to the Emperor Pius, and to regulate all his actions, words, and thoughts, according to his will and example (42). During twenty three years, which Antoninus Pius reigned, he was never but two nights abſent from him (43). He received all perſons with the ſame civility, as if he had been but a private man. He viſited his friends when they were ſick; he was conſtantly preſent at the ſchools of the Profeſſors; and he read perpetually the Greek and Latin Orators and Philoſophers. And unleſs he was with the Emperor, he always appeared in a plain brown habit (44), and without the torch, which it was the cuſtom to carry before the Cæſars and Emperors (45). There were ſome perſons who endeavoured to render him ſuſpected by Pius; but that wiſe Prince rejected their ſuggeſtions with the utmoſt contempt and indignation, ſince the probity and modeſty of M. Aurelius placed him above all the efforts of their malice. And the Emperor had ſo great a confidence in him, that he never beſtowed any poſts of importance without conſulting him (46). Ariſtides, in his ninth Oration, which is an Elogium upon Antoninus Philoſophus, tells us, that before he was raiſed to the Empire, he put a ſtop to ſeveral diſorders which were committed in the Government, in *which many points*, ſays he, *were conducted in ſuch a manner, as was neither prudent nor juſt, but full of haughtineſs, violence and inſolence*. And this Sophiſt ſeems afterwards to endeavour to decry the government of Pius, in order to raiſe the character of Philoſophus. But as Mr. Tillemont obſerves (47), in this caſe, he pays a greater regard to the cuſtom of Orators than to Truth; for it appears from the Hiſtorians, that the former was equal to the latter with regard to moderation and the care of the people. We ſhall add one inſtance of the humanity of temper for which both thoſe Emperors were diſtinguiſhed. M. Aurelius, upon the death of his tutor, could not refrain from tears, which expoſing him to the raillery of the Courtiers, Pius commended him for it, and ſaid, that neither Philoſophy, nor the Imperial Power ſhould prevent any perſon from feeling the affections of human nature. *Inter argumenta pietatis ejus & hoc habetur, quod quum Marcus mortuum educatorem ſuum fleret, vocareturque ab aulicis miniſtris ab oſtentatione pietatis, ipſe dixerit:* permitte *(inquit)* illi ut homo ſit; neque enim vel Philoſophia vel imperium tollit affectus (48). It is evident from the whole courſe of our Emperor's life, that he derived from the principles of the Stoics that equality of temper, which they aſcribe to their wiſe man under all circumſtances, and not ſuch a ſeverity, as repreſents tenderneſs and compaſſion as a crime.

(46) Capitol. c. 6.

(47) Id. p. 573.

(48) Capitolin. *in Vitâ Anton. Pii*, c. 10.

[F] *He made Lucius Verus his Collegue.*] Ariſtides in his ſixteenth Oration expatiates very amply upon this Act of M. Antoninus, which he repreſents as one of the greateſt that was ever done by any Prince, and upon the union of the two Emperors, which did not prevent the unity of the Empire, ſince there was but one will ſituated in two bodies and two ſouls. He tells us, that this was an example which they exhibited to the whole world, in order that mankind might have even Emperors to teach them that unanimity which ought to influence them, and that they might conſider one another as brethren, and remove all conteſts and diviſions, and give way to each other, and in ſhort ceaſe their diſputes about things, which are ſo prodigiouſly below the value of an Empire, and eſpecially the Empire of the Romans. Dion Caſſius (49) ſays, that the reaſon of his chooſing Lucius Verus for his Collegue, was that he might have leiſure to purſue his ſtudies, and on account of the ill ſtate of his health. For Lucius was of a ſtrong and vigorous conſtitution, and conſequently more capable of the fatigues of war.

(49) Lib. 71.

(42) Capitol. *in Vit. Anton. Philoſ.* c. 5.

(43) Idem, c. 7.

(44) Μυανδύας φαίας.

(45) *See* Dion. Caſſ. p. 721, 722. edit. Valeſ. Paris 1634.

[G] *Which he rejected with the utmoſt indignation.*] They had requeſted him to grant them leave to inflict puniſhments upon the Chriſtians, who had been ſecured before by the clemency of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius. Our Emperor, whoſe averſion to cruelty was

rupted in the year 162 by a dreadful inundation of the river Tiber, which deſtroyed a prodigious number of cattle, and occaſioned a famine at Rome (*p*). This calamity was followed by the Parthian war, and at the ſame time the Catti ravaged Germany and Rhætia; and an inſurrection was apprehended from the Britons, againſt whom Calphurnius Agricola was ſent, and Aufidius Victorinus againſt the Catti. But it was thought proper that Lucius Verus ſhould go in perſon to oppoſe the Parthians, while Antoninus continued at Rome, where his preſence was neceſſary [*H*]. During this war with the Parthians about the year 163 or 164 he ſent his daughter Lucilla to Verus, having before promiſed her to him in marriage, and attended her as far as Brunduſium; reſolving to have conducted her to Syria, if it had not been objected to him by ſome perſons, that his deſign of going into the Eaſt was to claim the honour of having finiſhed the Parthian war; upon which he immediately returned to Rome (*q*). The Romans having gained a victory over the Parthians, who were obliged to abandon Meſopotamia, the two Emperors triumph'd over them at Rome in the year 166, and were honoured with the title of Fathers of their Country (*r*). But this year was fatal on account of a terrible peſtilence which ſpread itſelf over the whole world [*I*], and a famine, under which Rome laboured. The Marcomanni, and many other people of Germany, likewiſe took up arms

(*p*) Tillemont, p. 579.

(*q*) Idem, pag. 588, 589.

(*r*) Id. p. 593.

was equal to that of his predeceſſors, and who followed their ſteps in every thing that was commendable, was deaf to their entreaties, and reſolved to interpoſe his authority for the protection of the Chriſtians by writing a letter to the common Aſſembly of Aſia, which was then held at Epheſus. Euſebius has preſerved this letter (50), which is as follows. "I "know, ſays he, that the Gods themſelves take "care that ſuch men do not lie concealed. For it is "much more proper for them to puniſh thoſe who "refuſe to worſhip them, than it is for you; for you "add a greater confirmation to the doctrines of thoſe "againſt whom you are enraged, by accuſing them "as impious perſons; becauſe it is a much greater "gratification to them to be tried and condemned "to death for the ſake of their Deity, than to con"tinue ſecure from danger. By this means they be"come victorious, being reſolved to loſe their lives "rather than ſubmit to do what you command. But "with regard to earthquakes, which either have or "do happen, it is proper to give you ſome advice, "ſince your minds are dejected upon ſuch accidents, "and to urge you to compare your own caſe with theirs. "It is certain, that they place a greater confidence in "their God upon ſuch occaſions. But you are guilty "of great errors in your conduct all the while, and "neglect the Gods, and diſregard the proper ceremo"nies of religion, and the worſhip of the immortal "Being; while you baniſh the Chriſtians, who reverence "him, and perſecute them even to death. Several of the "Governors of the provinces have given my Divine "Father an account of theſe men; and his anſwer to "them was, that they ſhould not be injured in any "manner, unleſs they appeared to attempt any thing "againſt the commonwealth. I have likewiſe re"ceived accounts from many perſons concerning them, "to whom I anſwered agreeably to my father's con"ſtitution in that point. If any man ſhould ſtill con"tinue to diſturb any one of them merely for being "a Chriſtian, let the accuſed perſon be acquitted, "tho' he ſhould really prove to be ſo; and let the "accuſer be puniſhed." Valeſius obſerves upon this paſſage of Euſebius, that this hiſtorian was miſtaken in aſcribing the letter abovementioned to Antoninus Pius, ſince it was evidently written by Marcus Antoninus, as appears by the inſcription of it, in the firſt year of his reign, when he was the third time Conſul. See the *Faſti of Onuphrius ad annum Urbis* 914. The author of the Alexandrian Chronicle was ſenſible of this miſtake of Euſebius, but he err'd in placing it under the 10th year of M. Antoninus. John Zonaras has adopted Euſebius's error; for he tells us, that Juſtin Martyr preſented his apology for the Chriſtians to Antoninus Pius, who was ſo highly affected by it, that he ſent an edict to the common aſſembly of Aſia, to prevent any Chriſtian from being puniſhed, and that the accuſed ſhould be diſmiſſed, and the accuſer puniſhed. Father Halloix in his notes upon the life of Juſtin Martyr (51), aſſerts, that this letter belongs to Antoninus Pius, but his reaſons ſeem very inconcluſive, as appears from Valeſius (52). Mr. Echard in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (53) has fallen into the ſame error.

(50) *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 4. c. 13.

(51) Cap. 5.

(52) *In Annot. ad* lib. 4. c. 13. *Eccleſ. Hiſt. Euſeb.*

(53) Vol. 2. B. 3. c. 12. pag. 475. edit. 2. in 8vo 1710.

[*H*] *Continued at Rome, where his preſence was neceſſary.*] He ſhewed there many inſtances of his goodneſs and wiſdom, being wholly employed in promoting the advantage of mankind; in rewarding merit, and drawing over ill men by generoſity and forgiveneſs. He paid greater honour to the Senate than any of his predeceſſors, and treated the people in the ſame manner, as they had been, while they enjoyed their liberty. He frequently referred to the Senate thoſe cauſes, which uſed to be determined by the Emperors. And to do greater honour to it in its members, he commiſſioned thoſe, who had been in poſts, to decide affairs. He appointed Senators to be patrons of cities. He raiſed ſuch of them to conſiderable employments, as were neceſſitous, and at the ſame time men of character. When any accuſation was preferred againſt them, he examined it privately before it became publick, and would not permit the Knights to be preſent at ſuch trials. He came regularly to the Senate like an ordinary Senator. He applied himſelf vigorouſly to the adminiſtration of juſtice, making great uſe of the advice of his Prefects and Lawyers, and eſpecially of that of Scævola (54). When he heard any cauſes (which he conſtantly did even in the midſt of the wars, if he had any leiſure,) he granted the advocates a conſiderable time, and he was very exact in interrogating the parties, and examining them, ſo that he was ſometimes ten or twelve whole days upon one cauſe (55). Ariſtides tells us (56), that even thoſe, who were condemned by him, were obliged to own that his ſentences were juſt. He generally abated ſomething of the puniſhments preſcribed by the laws. But in great crimes he was abſolutely inexorable. He puniſhed faults without hating thoſe who were guilty of them, having no other view than to correct either the delinquents themſelves, or others by their example (57). A Pretor having executed his office in a very exceptionable manner, he would not deprive him of it, but ſuſpended him from the exerciſe of it (58). Notwithſtanding this mildneſs, we find that he obliged the people of Nice to ſend every year to Rome a certain quantity of corn, by way of Mulct upon them for having beaten to death one of their fellow citizens, whoſe name was Hipparchus, a man of an extraordinary genius. This fine continued to the time of Conſtantine, who remitted it (59).

(54) Capitol. c. 10, 11, 12.

(55) Dion. Caſſ. lib. 71.

(56) *Orat.* 9.

(57) Idem, ibid.

(58) Capitol. cap. 12.

(59) Tillem. p. 587.

[*I*] *This year was fatal on account of a terrible peſtilence, which ſpread itſelf over the whole world.*] It was brought from the Eaſt by the Roman army; and it was ſaid to have been a judgment inflicted upon them for their treachery towards the city of Seleucia, which had admitted them as friends, and yet they burnt it to the ground, and deſtroyed a prodigious multitude of men (60). As the ſoldiers were plundering a temple of Apollo in Seleucia, according to Ammianus Marcellinus (61), or in the country of Babylon, in which Seleucia was ſituated, according to Capitolinus (62), they found a little coffer of gold, conſecrated by magical ceremonies; which being opened, there iſſued forth ſuch a peſtilential vapour, as infected all Parthia, and afterwards the whole world. However, thoſe who wrote at that time, before this plague had paſſed from Parthia to the Roman Empire, tell us (63), that it began in Ethiopia, from whence it ſpread thro' Egypt into the greateſt part of Parthia,

(60) Id. p. 594.

(61) Lib. 23.

(62) *In Vitâ Veri*, c. 8.

(63) Lucian. *Hiſt.* p. 355. *apud* Tillemont, *ubi ſupra.*

arms againſt the Romans, to oppoſe whom the two Emperors marched in perſon, and reduced the Barbarians to deſire peace [*K*]. However they renewed the war the year following, which obliged the two Emperors to march againſt them; but Lucius Verus was ſeized with an apoplectic fit and died at Altinum. In the year 170 Antoninus made vaſt preparations againſt the Germans [*L*], and proſecuted the war with prodigious vigour. While he reſided at Sirmium in Pannonia he ſhewed an inſtance of great generoſity to Herodes Atticus [*M*]. In 174 a very extraordinary circumſtance happened, for during his war with the Germans his army was unfortunately encloſed by the Quadi in a very diſadvantageous place, where there was no poſſibility of procuring water. The Romans were involved in the moſt dreadful exigence imaginable; they were diſpirited with their fatigue and wounds, oppreſſed with heat and thirſt, and incapable of retiring or engaging the enemy; when in an inſtant the ſky was covered with clouds, and there fell a prodigious quantity of rain. The Roman army immediately applied themſelves to quench their thirſt, when the Barbarians came upon them with ſuch fury, that they would undoubtedly have been defeated, if they had not been relieved by a violent ſhower of hail, and a ſtorm of lightning, which fell upon the enemy, without the leaſt annoyance to the Romans, who by this means gained the victory. In this manner Dion Caſſius relates

thia, and eſpecially at Niſibis. This plague ſeemed to follow Verus from province to province, and in proportion as he marched towards Rome, it advanc'd likewiſe (64). It reached even Gaul and as far as the Rhine. In ſhort, it diſperſed itſelf over the whole world, and made a prodigious ravage among mankind for ſeveral years. It deſtroyed armies, and depopulated provinces, eſpecially Italy, according to Oroſius, who deſcribes it more amply than the other writers (65). *Galen*, who began then to diſtinguiſh himſelf in the practice of phyſick, mentions it in divers paſſages of his writings. It cut off ſeveral perſons of eminence. The bodies of the poor were carried out in carts, and the Emperor ordered them to be buried at the publick charge (66). Alexander, who pretended to be the prophet of Æſculapius in Paphlagonia, had given out a verſe, which intimated that Apollo would remove this peſtilence; and many perſons wrote this verſe over their doors, imagining that Apollo would prevent the plague from entering their houſes. But Lucian aſſures us (67), that in thoſe houſes there died the greateſt number of people their abſurd confidence in Apollo very probably inducing them to neglect the neceſſary precautions. There was likewiſe another impoſtor, who declared publickly at Rome, that the end of the world was near, and that fire would fall from Heaven as ſoon as he had thrown himſelf off a tree in the *Campus Martius*, and was turned into a ſtork; and accordingly he caſt himſelf down, and let a ſtork fly out of his boſom. This fraud was managed by him in concert with ſome others, who had reſolved to ſet fire to the city and plunder it. He confeſſed the whole ſcheme when he was brought before the Emperor, who had the generoſity to pardon him. *Plano cuidam, qui diripiendæ urbis occaſionem cum quibuſdam conſciis requirens, de caprifico arbore in campo Martio concionabundus, ignem de cœlo lapſurum, finemque Mundi affore diceret, ſi ipſe lapſus ex arbore in ciconiam verteretur; quum ſtatuto tempore diciciſſet, atque ex ſinu ciconiam emiſiſſet, perducto ad ſe atque confeſſo veniam daret* (68).

(64) Capitol. *ubi ſupra.*

(65) Lib. 7. cap. 15.

(66) Capitol. *in Vit. Anton. Philoſ.* c. 13.

(67) *Pſeudomantis*, p. 488, 489. edit. Paris 1615.

(68) Capitol. *ubi ſupra.*

[*K*] *Reduc'd the Barbarians to deſire peace.*] The war, in which he was engaged againſt them, is repreſented by the hiſtorians as the moſt formidable, which was ever heard of, and they compare it to the Punic wars. All the barbarous nations from Gaul to the extremity of Illyricum towards the Eaſt united againſt the Romans. They took and plunder'd divers cities and provinces, and defeated ſeveral armies (69). The approach of the two Emperors ſtruck ſome terror upon thoſe who were in arms. When they were come to Aquileia, moſt of their Kings retired beyond the Danube with their forces, and even killed thoſe who had engaged them in the war. The Quadi, who had loſt their King, promiſed not to crown him, whom they had choſen in the room of the former, till they had gained the conſent of the Emperors. Thus all things were diſpoſed towards a peace, and moſt of the Barbarians ſent Embaſſadors either to the Emperors or the Roman Generals to deſire pardon for their revolt. Verus, who had quitted the pleaſures of Rome with great reluctance, was impatient to return immediately upon this. But Antoninus, who was perſuaded, that the Barbarians pretended only to be inclined towards peace, out of apprehenſion of the Roman armaments, thought it was neceſſary to march nearer them; and having continued ſome time at Aquileia to give the proper orders, while Lucius was only employed in his diverſions, he paſſed over the Alps with him, and ſettled whatever was expedient for the ſecurity of Illyricum and Italy, and then returned to Rome (70).

(69) Tillemont, p. 597.

(70) Id. p. 600, 601.

[*L*] *Made vaſt preparations againſt the Germans.*] The importance of this war made this very neceſſary. The peſtilence which ſtill continued having conſiderably leſſened the number of his forces, he inliſted the ſlaves, (as had been done in the time of Hannibal,) the gladiators, and even the banditti of Dalmatia and Dardania. He found likewiſe ſome Germans, who for pay would conſent to fight againſt their own nation. But the treaſury being exhauſted by ſuch vaſt expences, and he being unwilling to load the people with new taxes, expoſed to ſale for two months together all the rich furniture of the crown, the ſtatues and pictures of value, and even the ſilk cloaths of his Empreſs, and a great number of pearls, of which Hadrian had made a private collection. By this means he raiſed money ſufficient to give the people an extraordinary largeſs that year, to ſupport the war againſt the Marcomanni for five years, and to purchaſe again afterwards part of what he had ſold then (71).

(71) Idem, pag. 607; and Capitolin. c. 17.

[*M*] *Shewed an inſtance of generoſity to Herodes Atticus.*] There happened a prodigious conteſt between this Herodes and the city of Athens, which was ſupported then by the two Quintilii, who were extreamly beloved by the Emperor, and governed Greece at that time. It was imagined likewiſe that Antoninus had ſome reaſon to be diſpleaſed with Herodes; and he was generally inclined to favour the people. He received Demonſtratus, who was deputed from the Athenians, with great civility, and took particular care that he ſhould have every thing neceſſary granted him. The Empreſs Fauſtina likewiſe eſpouſed their cauſe, and a little daughter of three years of age, which ſhe then had with her, amidſt her fondneſſes and careſſes of her father, threw herſelf at his knees, and begged him with her liſping voice to preſerve the city of Athens. Beſides this, a thunderbolt had fallen upon the place where Herodes lodged, and killed two young daughters of Alcimedon his freedman, whom he had brought up, and was extremely fond of. All theſe circumſtances threw Herodes into ſuch a fury, that when the day came, in which the affair was to be heard before the Emperor, he was incapable of ſaying any thing, which might have been expected from the moſt eloquent man of all Greece, but began a violent declamation againſt the Emperor himſelf without any manner of diſguiſe, ſo far as to reproach him for having abandoned him to a woman and an infant of three years old. And when Baſſeus the Prefect of the Pretorium told him, that ſuch a manner of acting might endanger his life, he replied, that a man of his age had nothing to fear, and then went away immediately. Antoninus heard all this without ſhewing by the leaſt geſture, that he was at all affected by it. And when Herodes was gone, he only told the advocates of the Athenians, that they might alledge their reaſons, without troubling themſelves whether

(s) Lib. 71.

(t) Tillemont, p. 628, 629, 630.

lates the ſtory (s). This wonderful event is aſcribed to the prayers of the Chriſtians [N]. In 175 Antoninus made a treaty with ſeveral nations of Germany, and acted with great mildneſs even towards thoſe whom he had ſubdued (t). Soon after this Avidius Caſſius Governor of Syria revolted from the Emperor, who concealed the news of it for ſome time, till at laſt he was obliged to declare it to his ſoldiers, in a ſpeech full of moderation, wherein he only reproached Caſſius for making ſo ill a return for the friendſhip he had ſhewn him, and ſhould continue to do, as he hoped to prove to the world by his manner of treating him, when he had reduced him. But this war was concluded by the death of Caſſius, who was killed by a Centurion named Anthony (u). The Emperor ſhewed the utmoſt

(u) Dio. lib. 71.

ther he agreed to it or not. He heard them without ſaying any thing himſelf, and ſhed tears when they came to ſpeak of the methods, by which they pretended that Herodes and his freedmen had oppreſſed the people. However it is ſaid, that he did not paſs any ſentence againſt him, but only againſt his ſervants, upon whom he inflicted a very ſlight puniſhment, and even exempted Alcimedon from it, imagining him to have ſufficiently ſuffered by the death of his two children. After this Herodes having written to him to complain, that he did not receive letters from him any longer, whereas before this he had frequently done him that honour; the Emperor wrote to him a long anſwer, full of proteſtations of friendſhip, and even made him excuſes, that he was oblig'd to condemn thoſe perſons, who were his dependents (72).

(72) *Philoſtrat. de Vit. Sophiſt.* 27. p. 558. edit. Paris 1608. *apud* Tillem. p. 615, 616.

[N] *This wonderful event is aſcribed to the prayers of the Chriſtians.*] It is particularly celebrated by Tertullian (73), Euſebius (74), Julius Capitolinus (75), Themiſtius in a diſcourſe to Theodoſius (76), St. Jerom (77), St. Gregory Nyſſen (78), Claudian (79), and the Alexandrian Chronicle, which copies Euſebius. Baronius mentions an image, which he tells us is to be found at Rome in the famous pillar of Antoninus, among the other great actions, which that Emperor performed in the war againſt the Marcomanni (80); and Themiſtius (81) ſpeaks of another, which he had ſeen relating to that ſurprizing event. The Pagans and the Chriſtians, as Mr. Tillemont informs us (82), have equally acknowledged the truth of this prodigy; but the former have diſſented from the latter with regard to the cauſe of it. Dion Caſſius refers it (83) to the power of an Egyptian Magician named Arnuphis, who was in the Emperor's retinue; and other writers, as Suidas, aſcribe it to one Julian, who was originally deſcended from Chaldea, and was likewiſe a Magician, and is ſaid to have been the author of ſeveral books, as well as his father Julian; and ſeveral other writers (84) place one Julian among the celebrated Magicians. Capitolinus, Themiſtius, and Claudian, in the paſſages abovecited, aſcribe it to the Emperor himſelf. In Antoninus's pillar the Glory of it is aſcribed to Jupiter the God of rain and thunder (85), as Tertullian tells us (86) the Pagans always uſed to do, whenever the ſervants of the true God had obtained rain from Heaven by their prayers and faſtings. But the Chriſtians, as appears from Euſebius (87), affirmed that God granted this favour at the prayer of the Chriſtian ſoldiers, who were in the Roman army, who deſired this upon their knees, agreeably to their manner of praying, ſays that hiſtorian, and as St. Gregory obſerves (88), after they had ſeparated themſelves from the reſt of the army. The firſt authority which Euſebius alledges in proof of this, is that of Apollinarius Biſhop of Hierapolis, who was contemporary with this miracle. But as Mr. Tillemont remarks (89), it were to be wiſhed, that the hiſtorian had cited Apollinarius's own words. However, we ſhall ſtate the arguments in favour of this miracle, as they are repreſented in the abovementioned Mr. Tillemont, who tells us, that the Chriſtians, whoſe prayers ſaved the Roman army in this exigence, belonged to the legion called Melitene, or, as Xiphilin tells us (90), the legion, which was raiſed or ſtationed at Melitene, a city in leſſer Armenia upon the banks of the river Euphrates; which is very probable, for the legions generally took their names from the provinces, in which they were quartered (91). And St. Gregory Nyſſen aſſures us (92), that the legion, which obtained this victory, had been ſtation'd in a city near Cappadocia. He adds, that they had received the Chriſtian faith by means of a viſion; which, as Mr. Tillemont ſays, makes probable what Xiphilin obſerves, that this legion was entirely compoſed of Chriſtians. It was probably the twelfth legion, which Titus had fixed in the city of Melitene in the year 70 (93), and which was plac'd about the year 130 in Cappadocia (94), under which the leſſer Armenia might then be included. And the *Notitia* of the Empire a long time after fixes the twelfth legion at Melitene. It was diſtinguiſhed by the name of the *Thundering Legion* (95); and Apollinarius tells us, according to Euſebius (96), that the legion of Melitene received that title from the Emperor as a reward for this miracle. Xiphilin aſſerts the ſame (97); and Onuphrius in his Faſti (98) confirms it, and affirms that till Antoninus's time there was never any mention of the Thundering Legion. But we find by an inſcription, that the twelfth legion had that title under Trajan (99). Euſebius remarks as a very extraordinary thing, that this legion ſubſiſted in his time (100); and it produced then the forty martyrs of Sebaſte, who were ſo celebrated in the church (101). But the moſt conſiderable evidence of the truth of this miracle, is the letter, which the Emperor himſelf wrote, according to Tertullian (102), and which is ſaid to be the ſame, which Dion Caſſius tells us (103) he ſent to the Senate upon his victory. Tertullian aſſures us, that in this letter he aſcribed this prodigy to the prayers of the Chriſtians, tho' he ſpoke with ſome kind of doubt, (*Chriſtianorum forte militum precationibus impetrato imbre*) not venturing to ſpeak more poſitively, that he might not deſtroy the Pagan ſuperſtition. Mr. Tillemont obſerves, that by the manner, in which Tertullian ſpeaks of this letter, and urges it againſt the Pagans, there is no reaſon to doubt but that he had ſeen it, and that conſequently whatever he relates is ſufficiently authentic. Euſebius in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* cites this from Tertullian; but in his *Chronicle* mentions it only as a thing, which was reported, and ſays, that every one may determine upon this as he thinks proper: Ἀλλὰ ταῦτα μὲν ὅπῃ τις ἐθέλῃ τιθέσθω. But St. Jerom in tranſlating this paſſage, ſays poſitively that it was then extant. Oroſius (104) and Xiphilin (105) only tell us, that it was believed to be extant in their time, without mentioning that they had ſeen it. We have indeed at preſent a letter aſcribed to Antoninus Philoſophus concerning the victory, which he had gained by means of the Chriſtians. It is publiſhed in Greek at the end of the apologies of Juſtin Martyr, and in Latin in Onuphrius's *Faſti* (106) and Baronius (107), tranſlated, according to their accounts, from the Greek text, which was a tranſlation before from the original Latin. They received them both as authentic; tho', as Mr. Tillemont obſerves (108), it is very difficult to follow their opinion. For not to inſiſt upon the barbarous and almoſt unintelligible ſtyle of this letter, eſpecially in the Greek, it informs us, that this miracle happened when the Germans were three or four leagues diſtant from the Romans; that the army conſiſted but of four legions, which are named there, without any mention of the twelfth, which is ſtiled the *Thundering Legion*, or the legion of *Melitene*; that the Chriſtians, who were in the army, were averſe to the uſe of arms: and it commands, that the Chriſtians who were proſecuted, ſhould be acquitted, even tho' they perſiſted in their religion, and their accuſers be burnt alive. Scaliger in his *Notes* upon *Euſebius*'s *Chronicon* (109) obſerves ſeveral other marks of forgery in it, which would be too long to mention, and from which he makes no difficulty to conclude, that this piece is abſolutely ſpurious, and was not written even till after the time of Juſtinian. He has been followed in this by other writers; and Mr. Tillemont acknowledges (110), that it is not eaſy to anſwer the reaſons, which he alledges, or the others, which might be added to them. Mr. Echard in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (111) inſiſts very ſtrongly upon the authority of the letter of Antoninus,

(73) *Ad Scap.* c. 4.
(74) *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* l. 5. c. 5.
(75) *In Vit. Anton. Philoſ.* c. 24.
(76) P. 191. b. edit. Harduin. Paris 1684.
(77) *Chron.*
(78) *De Quadr. Martyr. Orat.* 2. tom. 3. edit. Paris 1638.
(79) *De ſexto Honorii Conſulat.*
(80) Baron. *Annal. ad ann.* 176. § 24. edit. Ant. 1612.
(81) *Orat.* 15. p. 191. b. *apud* Tillem. p. 620.
(82) Pag. 621. Art. 16.
(83) Lib. 71.
(84) Porphyr. *Vit.* p. 80. *apud* Tillem. *ubi ſupra.*
(85) Baron. *ubi ſupra.* § 24, 25.
(86) *Ad Scap.* c. 4.
(87) *Ubi ſupra.*
(88) *Ubi ſupra.*
(89) Pag. 622.
(90) *Epit. Dion.* lib. 71.
(91) Rom. Ill. p. 57. edit. Amſtelod. 1657.
(92) *Ubi ſupra.*

(93) Joſeph. *de Bello Jud.* lib. 7. cap. 4.
(94) Dion. l. 55.
(95) Idem, ibid.
(96) *Ubi ſupra.*
(97) *Epit.* Dion. lib. 71.
(98) P. 233. c. edit. Heidelberg. 1588.
(99) Baron. *ad ann.* 176. § 19. Scaliger. *Not. in Euſeb. Chron.* p. 233. edit. Lugduni Batav. 1658. *apud* Tillem. p. 623.
(100) *Eccl. Hiſt.* lib. 5. cap. 5.
(101) Gregor. Nyſſen. *ubi ſupra.*
(102) Apol. c. 5.
(103) Lib. 71.
(104) *Hiſt.* l. 7. c. 17.
(105) *Ubi ſupra.*
(106) Pag. 234.
(107) *Ad ann.* 176. § 22.
(108) *Notes ſur les Empereurs M. Aurele & L. Verus*, Not. 15. tom. 2. Part 3. p. 982.
(109) P. 223. *See* Pagi's *Critica in Annales Baronii, ad ann.* 174. § 2.
(110) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 983.
(111) B. 3. cap. 13. *ad ann.* 174.

utmoſt lenity towards thoſe who had been engaged in his party [O]. Tertullian obſerves, that no Chriſtian was found involved in that, or any other attempt againſt the perſon or authority of Antoninus (*w*). The Emperor immediately after this conferred the Conſulſhip upon Pompeianus, who had married his daughter Lucilla, the widow of Lucius Verus, and made his own ſon Commodus Tribune, at the requeſt of the Senate (*x*). He carried him along with him into the Eaſt, together with his wife Fauſtina, who died ſuddenly at the foot of Mount Taurus, in a town called Halala, which he afterwards made a Colony, and built a temple to her there (*y*). We ſhall not enter into the character of that Lady here; but only obſerve, that ſhe was unworthy of being the daughter and wife to two ſuch great men as Antoninus Pius and Antoninus Philoſophus, the latter of whom, notwithſtanding her ill conduct, paid the greateſt honours to her memory. Antoninus in the year 176 viſited Syria and Egypt, and though the inhabitants of Alexandria had complimented Caſſius in the higheſt manner, yet he treated them with the utmoſt humanity, and lived in Egypt only as a Citizen and a Philoſopher. All the Eaſtern Nations received inſtances of his moderation and wiſdom (*z*). The Kings of thoſe countries, and even Embaſſadors from Parthia came to viſit him, and he renewed the peace with them (*aa*). He ſtaid ſeveral days at Smyrna [P], and after he had ſettled the affairs of the Eaſt, he went to Athens, where he was initiated into the myſteries of Ceres, and entered alone into

(*w*) Tertullian, *ad Scapul.* c. 2. p. 85, 86. *apud* Tillemont, pag. 642, 643.

(*x*) Tillemont, p. 644.

(*y*) Capitol. cap. 26.

(*z*) Tillemont, p. 649.

(*aa*) Idem, ibid.

toninus, cited by Tertullian, *within twenty ſix years after*, as he obſerves, *and in a ſolemn apology in behalf of Chriſtianity, which he durſt not have done, had not the thing been paſt diſpute. The miſtake*, continues he, *about the* Thundering Legion, *the ſpurious* letter *now remaining, and the additions made to this ſtory in after ages, can do no real prejudice to the truth of the hiſtory itſelf.* Mr. *Wotton*, in his notes at the end of his life of this Emperor, has likewiſe examined this point, and determines in favour of the miracle. But this queſtion has been debated with great accuracy between the learned Mr. Moyle and Mr. K. in a courſe of letters publiſhed in the ſecond volume of Mr. Moyle's works, in which that Gentleman endeavours to explode the ſtory of the *Thundering Legion*; which occaſioned Mr. Whiſton to publiſh an anſwer in 1726, entitled, *Of the Thundering Legion; or of the miraculous Deliverance of Marcus Antoninus and his army upon the prayers of the Chriſtians.*

[O] *Shewed the utmoſt lenity towards thoſe, who had been engaged in his party.*] He would not put to death nor impriſon, nor even ſit in judgment himſelf upon any of the Senators, who had been involv'd in Caſſius's revolt; but he referred them to the Senate, fixing a day for their appearance, as if it had been a mere civil affair (112). Tiberius indeed would have ſent them to the Senate, that they might have been condemned with greater rigour, than he durſt have uſed himſelf; but ſuch cruel hypocriſy was far from the diſpoſition of Antoninus (113). For he wrote to the Senate to deſire them to act with indulgence rather than ſeverity; not to ſhed the blood of any Senator or perſon of quality, or of any other perſon whatſoever; but to allow this honour to his reign, that even under the misfortune of a rebellion none had loſt their lives, except in the firſt heat of the tumult. "And I wiſh, ſaid he, that I could even reſtore to "life many of thoſe who have been killed; for it "is never thought well of, that a Prince ſhould re"venge his own injuries. And though he does no"thing but what is juſt, yet he is conſidered at leaſt "as too ſevere." *Utinam poſſem multos etiam ab inferis excitare. Non enim unquam placet in imperatore Vindicta ſui doloris; quæ etſi juſtior fuerit acrior videtur* (114). He deſired then that they would pardon Caſſius's wife, and ſon-in-law, and children, or rather treat them as innocent perſons, ſince they had done nothing which could render them criminal; and that they would leave them what he had given them, that is, above half of their father's and mother's eſtate, with all the moveable goods, and the liberty of going whither they thought proper, in order that they might be living examples of the mildneſs of the Senate (115). He deſired likewiſe in general, that all the Roman Senators and Knights, who were privy to the revolt, ſhould be exempted from death, proſcription, and infamy, and in ſhort from all preſent and future penalties, and even from the diſgrace of their crime. He extended this favour to thoſe, who had already been puniſhed; moving that thoſe, who were baniſhed, ſhould be recalled, and thoſe, who had been proſcribed, ſhould have their eſtates reſtored. Themiſtius in his ſeventh oration propoſes the behaviour and moderation of the Emperor upon this occaſion, as a model for

(112) Dion. Caſſ. edit. Val. p. 717.

(113) Tillem. *Hiſt. des Emp.* tom. 2. Part 2. p. 637, 638.

(114) *Vulcat. Gallican. in Vit. Avidii Caſſii, inter Hiſt. Aug. Scriptores*, c. 12.

(115) Idem, ibid. and Capitol. *in Vit. Anton. Philoſ.* c. 26.

Princes. And this rebellion of Caſſius ſerved to raiſe his character for lenity, and to ſhew that nothing was capable of ſurmounting it; neither the greatneſs of their crime, who had taken arms againſt his own and his ſon's life, nor the apprehenſion, that the pardon, which he extended, would induce others to the ſame attempts. He was far from inventing falſe conſpiracies, that he might have a pretence to puniſh the innocent, ſince he pardoned an inexcuſable crime in ſo many men of the higheſt rank, and ſo many foreign Princes, without taking any revenge either by himſelf or the Senate, or under the pretext of any other faults (116). Nay it is ſaid, that he did great ſervices to many of thoſe who had attempted againſt his life (117). Ariſtides the Sophiſt in his *ninth Oration* has not omitted this virtue of the Emperor, and makes uſe of it to ſhew, that he was not only exempt from all violence of temper, but likewiſe through an extraordinary greatneſs and generoſity of ſoul was ſuperior to envy, which cannot ſuffer any thing great in others, and to that timidity and meanneſs of ſpirit, which leads men to take exceſſive precautions againſt evils, which may be apprehended. What fortified him particularly againſt ſuch baſe fears, which occaſion real misfortunes to prevent imaginary ones, was, that he was perſuaded that the Univerſe being governed by the juſtice and wiſdom of the Deity, a Prince never falls under the power of his enemies without his own demerit. This he proved to have been the caſe of all the former Emperors. And with regard to Galba, who ſeemed to have been the moſt innocent of thoſe, who had been killed, he appeared to be extremely avaritious; "which, *ſaid* "*he*, is an enormous vice in an Emperor." *Nam de Pertinace* (118) *& Galba paria ſentiebat, quum diceret in imperatore avaritiam eſſe acerbiſſimum malum* (119). In ſhort, he obſerv'd, that neither Auguſtus, nor Trajan, nor Hadrian, nor his father Antoninus Pius could be deſtroyed by the attacks of the rebels, tho' they were very numerous, and were never puniſhed but againſt the conſent or knowledge of thoſe Emperors (120).

(116) Dion. *Excerpt.* p. 718, 721. ed. Valeſ.
(117) Id. *Hiſt.* lib. 71.

(118) This muſt be an error in the Hiſtorian, or the manuſcript copies of his hiſtory; for Pertinax ſucceeded Commodus the ſon of Antoninus.
(119) Vulcat. Gallican. *in Vit. Avid. Caſſii*, c. 8.
(120) Idem, ibid.

[P] *He ſtaid ſeveral days at Smyrna.*] While he continued at Smyrna, he was viſited by all the perſons of diſtinction there. But Ariſtides the Sophiſt, many of whoſe orations are ſtill extant, and who was very eminent for his eloquence, was three days without paying his compliments to the Emperor. At laſt he was introduced to him by the two Quintilii, and told him, that the reaſon of his not waiting upon him before, was, becauſe he was engaged in the compoſition of a piece. Antoninus was pleaſed with the frankneſs of his declaration, and deſired to hear it read to him; which Ariſtides agreed to on condition, that his ſcholars ſhould be admitted, and have the liberty of clapping their hands by way of applauſe. The Emperor ſmiling granted the favour immediately, and entertained a very great regard for the Sophiſt from that time (121). We have a panegyric of his upon Antoninus, written after the revolt of Caſſius, and the conqueſt of the Germans, when the Empire, which had been before agitated by ſo many commotions, enjoyed a perfect tranquillity (122). This coincides with the preſent year; but it does not appear, that the oration was pronounced before the Emperor.

(121) Philoſt. *de Vitis Sophiſtar.* 35. p. 579. d. edit. Paris 1608, *apud* Tillemont, p. 649, 650.
(122) *Ariſtid. Orat.* 9.

into the moſt ſecret place (*bb*). He conferred divers honours upon that city, and appointed publick Profeſſors there [*Q*]. From thence he returned to Rome with his ſon Commodus, whom he choſe Conſul for the year following, though he was then but in the ſixteenth year of his age, having obtained a diſpenſation for that purpoſe. On the 27th of November the ſame year he gave him the title of *Imperator*; and on the 23d of December he entered Rome in triumph with Commodus, on account of the victories gained over the Germans (*cc*). Dion Caſſius tells us (*dd*), that he remitted all the debts which were due to himſelf and to the publick treaſury during forty ſix years, from the time that Hadrian had granted the ſame favour, and burnt openly all the writings which related to thoſe debts. He made very noble preſents to ſeveral cities, and particularly to that of Smyrna, which had been overthrown by an earthquake after his departure from it (*ee*). He applied himſelf likewiſe to correct many enormities, and introduced ſeveral excellent regulations [*R*]. In the year 171 he left Rome [*S*] with his ſon Commodus, in order to go in perſon againſt the Marcomanni and other barbarous nations, and the year following

(*bb*) Idem, pag. 650.

(*cc*) Id. pag. 652, 653.

(*dd*) Lib. 71.

(*ee*) Tillem. p. 654.

[*Q*] *Conferred divers honours upon that city, and appointed publick Profeſſors there.*] Dion Caſſius tells us (123), that he ſettled conſiderable ſtipends upon the Profeſſors in every one of the Sciences. We find by other authors that there were Profeſſors there in every Sect of Philoſophy, particularly that of the Stoics, the Peripatetics, the Platoniſts, and Epicureans; and when one of theſe Profeſſors died another was elected in his room by perſons of the greateſt judgment and learning, with the Emperor's conſent. But it ſeems that this eſtabliſhment was made before the Athenians preferred their complaints againſt Herodes Atticus in the year 175, becauſe the Emperor had left to him at firſt the choice of the Profeſſors in Philoſophy. However he thought proper to chooſe himſelf Theodorus the Sophiſt to teach Rhetoric there, with a noble ſtipend, which he ſettled upon him (124). Adrian of Tyre held the ſame Chair, when Antoninus came to Athens, and it was this Emperor who had given it to him on account of the reputation which he had for eloquence. He had the curioſity to hear him declaim, and being highly ſatisfied with his performance, made him ſeveral conſiderable preſents, and beſtowed peculiar immunities and privileges upon him and his family (125). It was probably on account of this eſtabliſhment of Profeſſors at Athens, that Ariſtides in his ninth Oration tells us, that Antoninus had raiſed by new honours Greece and the Sciences of Greece, which before had been extremely deſpiſed and neglected, and had loſt the prerogatives and privileges which were annexed to them.

(123) Lib. 71.

(124) Tillemont, p. 650, 651.

(125) Idem, pag. 651.

[*R*] *To correct many enormities, and introduced ſeveral excellent regulations.*] He moderated the expences, which were laid out upon Gladiators (126); and he would not ſuffer them to fight but with ſwords which were blunted, like foils, ſo that their ſkill might be ſhewn without any danger of their lives (127). It appeared how averſe he was from ſhedding blood from a particular inſtance, that when a ſlave had taught a lyon to devour men with extraordinary fury, he would by no means view that ſpectacle, the cruelty of which was ſo highly entertaining to others. And when the people were very importunate that the maſter of the lyon ſhould be made free, he proclaimed by an Herald that he had not deſerved his liberty. He cleared up the obſcurities of the laws, and mitigated by new decrees the rigour of the old laws. We find in the pandects and other books of the Law ſeveral traces or remains of a great number of decrees, which he made, with a deſign rather to reſtore the ſtudy of the antient Law, than to introduce a new ſcheme (128). He was the firſt, according to Capitolinus (129), who appointed, that the names of all the children, who were born of Roman Citizens, ſhould be regiſter'd within thirty days after their birth; and this gave him occaſion to eſtabliſh publick regiſters in the Provinces. He renewed the conſtitution firſt made by Nerva, that no ſuit ſhould be carried on againſt the dead, but within five years after their deceaſe. He made a decree, that all the Senators ſhould have at leaſt a fourth part of their eſtate in Italy. Aurelius Victor tells us, that he gave to all indifferently the right of being citizens of Rome. The Civilians follow this author; and from the manner in which Caſaubon ſpeaks, it ſeems that he made an expreſs conſtitution for granting that right to all the ſubjects of the Empire. But this conſtitution, which is only juſt mentioned by Ulpian in the Digeſt, was made by Antoninus Caracalla, as may be concluded both from Ulpian's ordinary manner of expreſſion, and the direct authority of Dion Caſſius (130). And we learn from the Hiſtory of the Martyrs at Lyons related by Euſebius (131), that in the year 177, which was but two or three years before Antoninus's death, the Roman Citizens were ſtill diſtinguiſhed from others. He would not ſuffer, that the ſame baths ſhould be common to both ſexes; and he made ſeveral regulations, in order to reform the luxury of the Ladies, and to remove the diſorders of the young perſons of quality. *Lavacra mixta ſubmovit. Mores matronarum compoſuit diffluentes, & juvenum nobilium* (132). His example was likewiſe a ſtronger inducement than all the Laws to reduce many perſons from their debaucheries, and irregular purſuits of pleaſure, and violent paſſion for riches (133). What is moſt admirable is, that he knew how to regulate the ſoldiers themſelves, who were accuſtomed to receive a great deal, and to demand ſtill more, and were inſolent enough to render themſelves formidable to every perſon, who refuſed to gratify their avarice. He fixed abſolutely what they were to receive, even in a leſs proportion than what was granted them before, and he accuſtomed them not to hope for any thing more, except upon extraordinary occaſions. He reduced them to ſuch a ſtrict and laborious manner of life, as is proper for ſoldiers, and obliged them to employ themſelves ſo conſtantly in the exerciſe of their arms, that they had no leiſure for any thing elſe. This ſeverity was a prodigious relief to the treaſury and the people, and of great advantage to the army itſelf (134). And yet notwithſtanding this ſtrictneſs of diſcipline, which he maintained, they had an extraordinary regard and affection for him. It was with a particular view to correct the irregularities and debauchery of the ſoldiers in Syria, that he gave the command of them to Avidius Caſſius, being perſuaded, as he wrote at that time, that they could not be governed except by the antient diſcipline, and that it was neceſſary to reſtore the primitive manners of the Romans, in order to ſupport the Empire (135). We find in Capitolinus an account of ſeveral regulations eſtabliſhed by him. Papirius Juſtus made formerly a collection of the decrees of Antoninus and L. Verus, which is ſometimes cited in the Digeſt among the antient Civilians (136).

(126) Capitol. *in Vitâ Anton. Philoſ.* c. 27.

(127) Dion. *Excerpt.* p. 718. ed. Valeſii.

(128) Tillemont, p. 671.

(129) *Ubi ſupra*, cap. 9.

(130) Tillem. p. 671, 672.

(131) *Hiſt. Eccl.* lib. 5. c. 1.

(132) Capitol. *in Vit. Anton. Phil.* c. 23.

(133) Ariſtides, *Orat.* 9.

(134) Idem, ibid.

(135) *See* Tillem. p. 673; *and* Capit. *in Vit. Anton.* & Vulcat. Gallic. *in Vit. Avid. Caſſi.*

(136) Gothofredi, *Prolegomena in Codic.* Theod. p. 183. ed. Lugduni 1665.

[*S*] *In the year* 178 *he left Rome.*] Before he departed he took a ſolemn oath in the capitol, that ſince he had been raiſed to the Empire, no Senator had been put to death by his order, or even with his knowledge: and that he would have pardoned the rebels, if they had not been killed before he heard of it. *Ante tempus ſanè mortis priuſquam ad bellum Marcomannicum rediret, in Capitolio juravit, nullum Senatorem ſe ſciente occiſum; quum etiam rebelles dixerit ſe ſervaturum fuiſſe, ſi ſciſſet* (137). He would not make uſe of the publick treaſure in order to ſupply himſelf with the money neceſſary for the war, till he had asked leave of the Senate, telling them that a Roman Emperor had no property of his own, but that all belonged to the Senate and people (138). It was obſerved, that as he was going to this war, from which it was feared that he would not return, the Philoſophers, who were with him, deſired him to explain to them the moſt difficult and obſcure parts of the

(137) Capitol. *ubi ſupra*, c. 29.

(138) Dion. Caſſ. lib. 71.

lowing gained a considerable victory over them (*f*); so that he would have absolutely subdued them in a very short time, if he had not been seized with a disease [T] which put an end to his life the 17th of March, A. D. 180, after he had reigned nineteen years and ten or eleven days after the death of Pius, and lived fifty eight years, ten months and twenty two days (*gg*). The whole Empire regretted the loss of so valuable a Prince, and paid the greatest honours to his memory. He was ranked among the Gods, and every person had a statue of him in their houses. His *Meditations* have been extremely admired by all good judges (*U*). His character is perhaps the most perfect of any of the

(*ff*) Idem, pag. 659.

(*gg*) Idem, pag. 660. Capitolinus, c. 18, says, he died in the 18th year of his reign, and the 61st of his age.

the different schemes of Philosophy, as if they were apprehensive, that the solution of those difficulties would be absolutely lost to the world by his death. He immediately agreed to their request, and discoursed with them upon these subjects for three days together (139).

(139) Tillemont, p. 638.

[T] *Seized with a disease.*] Dion Cassius pretends (140), that he knew it for certain, that the physicians hastened his death to gratify Commodus; and that Antoninus, tho' he discovered it himself, yet concealed his knowledge of it to the last, except when the Tribune came the last time to desire him to give the word, and he said to him; *Go at sun-rise; for my own part, I am going to lie down.* He lay sick several days; and it seems to have been a contagious distemper, which then raged in the army, so that, according to Capitolinus (141), he had some difficulty to prevent his son and his friends from abandoning him; which induced him, as that author tells us, to abstain from food, and by that means he increased his disease. Two days before his death, he assured his friends, that he did not desire to live, because the ill conduct of his son had render'd life uneasy to him (142). However, he recommended him to the soldiers (143); and we have an excellent discourse of his in Herodian (144), in which he desired his friends to assist him with their advice, and directed his son in what manner he ought to govern. He lived but a day and a night after this speech (145). He charged his friends to make him sensible, that *not all the riches and honours in the universe were sufficient to satisfy the luxury and ambition of tyrants; nor their strongest guards and armies able to defend them from the hatred and insults of their subjects. That no tyrannical Princes ever enjoy long and peaceable reigns, but only such as by their clemency gain the hearts of their people. That it was not they, who served out of constraint, but such as obeyed voluntarily, that would continue faithful in all trials, and free from either flattery or treachery. And lastly, that it was exceedingly difficult, and yet highly necessary for those Princes to set bounds to their passions, who had none to their power.* The seventh day of his sickness, he sent for his son again alone, and dismissed him very soon, for fear that he should be seized with the distemper; and then having covered his head as if he were going to sleep, he expired the night following (146). Tertullian tells us (147), that he died at Sirmium, but the two Victors say at Vienna in Austria. The father abovementioned rallies the High Priest of Cybele, who prayed the 24th of March for Antoninus's preservation, because his Demon had not discover'd to him that he died before on the 17th of that month.

(140) Lib. 71.

(141) Cap. 28.

(142) Ibid.

(143) Dion. Cass. lib. 71.

(144) Lib. 1. cap. 8.

(145) Ibid.

(146) Capitol. *ubi supra.*

(147) Apol. cap. 25. *apud* Tillem. p. 661.

[U] *His meditations have been extremely admired by all good judges.*] The style of this work is simple and negligent; and yet, as Mr. Tillemont observes (148), persons of the best sense and judgment admire the natural and unaffected beauty of it, and think it comparable to the most excellent performances in all Heathen antiquity. Nicephorus Callistus likewise mentions it with great commendation, and intimates that he composed it for the use of his son Commodus; but this does not appear from the book itself. Some writers, and particularly Vossius (149), have doubted, whether we have the work intire, or only some particular extracts from it, because the sentences are almost every where independent of each other, without any apparent order; and the construction sometimes is not compleat. But the best Criticks are generally of opinion, that Antoninus left them in this imperfect manner, because they were only observations written for his own use, without any design of being published. It is probable, that he composed the first book in the midst of the wars, in the country of the Quadi, while he was incamped upon the river Gran, if the passage, where he seems to intimate this, be not a mark

(148) P. 674.

(149) *De Hist. Græc.* lib. 2. cap. 24.

added to signify something else (150). He finished the second book at Carnutum, where Eutropius tells us, that he kept his court for three years, during his first war against the Marcomanni. And it appears, that he wrote this work before the death of Faustina, whom he represents as then alive, and ready to lie in (151), that is, before the year 175 (152). This book of Antoninus must not be confounded with another, which was published under his name, and translated into several languages, under the title of *Horologium Principum*: for the latter was written originally in Spanish by Anthony Guevara, a Spanish Bishop, and Counsellor to the Emperor Charles V (153). Suidas says, with regard to Antoninus's meditations, that *he having deserved in all things the commendations of a perfect Philosopher, &c. wrote concerning the course of his own life twelve books.* There have been several editions of this book in Greek and Latin, two of which were printed before the year 1635, when the learned Meric Casaubon, then Batchelor of Divinity, and Prebendary of Canterbury, published a second edition of his translation of that work into English, dedicated to Dr. W. Laud, Archbishop of Canterbury. This translation is esteemed very accurate and judicious, and was particularly valued by the late Lord Shaftsbury, the author of the *Characteristics*. The preface of Casaubon is full of excellent sense and knowledge of the ancient Philosophy; and will furnish us with some extracts, which will not prove unentertaining to the reader. He observes there, that with regard to Christianity, it has been the opinion of many persons, that, *Matters of faith and the sacraments only excepted, there is nothing in the whole Gospel, which is not* juris naturalis, *and most agreeable to human reason. For my part,* continues he (154), *as I would not take upon me to maintain their opinion precisely true in all points and circumstances; so I must needs say, if we esteem that natural, which natural men of best account by the meer strength of human reason have taught and taken upon them to maintain as just and reasonable, I know not any evangelical precept or duty belonging to a Christian's practice, (even the harshest, and those that seem to ordinary men most contrary to flesh and blood, not excepted,) but upon due search and examination, will prove of that nature.* The author proceeds afterwards in this manner (155). " Of " all books in this kind that ever have been writ- " ten by any Heathen, I know not any which either " in regard of itself (for the bulk thereof;) or in re- " gard of the author, deserves more respect than " this of *Marcus Antoninus*.... The chiefest sub- " ject of the book is the vanity of the world and " all worldly things, as wealth and honour, life, &c. " and the end and scope of it to teach a man how " to submit himself wholly to God's Providence, and " to live content and thankful in what estate or cal- " ling soever..... In the author of it two main " things I conceive very considerable.... first, that " he was a very great man, one that had good ex- " perience of what he spake; and secondly, that he " was a very good man, one that lived as he did " write, and exactly (as far as was possible to a na- " tural man) performed what he exhorted others to. " For the first, I have always thought that it was not " without God's especial Providence, that of all them, " that once were the peculiar people of God, he was " chosen to write against the vain pleasures and " delights of this world, who of all the rest had had " most knowledge and experience of those things, " that he did write of.... How much more should " that confession of Antoninus move us! dilated here " by him, and inlarged into twelve books, and " briefly expressed and summed up in these words of " his eighth book: πεπείρασαι πρὶ πόσα πλανηθείς, εὑδα- " μῶν ὄψει τὸ εὖ ζῆν· ὐκ ἐν συλλογισμοῖς, ὐκ ἐν πλούτῳ, " οὐκ

(150) M. Antonin. *De Scipso*, l. 1. c. 14. *apud* Tillem. pag. 675.

(151) Ibid. l. 9. c. 3.

(152) Tillem. p. 675.

(153) Voss. *ubi supra.*

(154) Preface, p. 3.

(155) Ibid. p. 52 & *seq.*

the Heathen Emperors in all the branches of it [*W*]. And yet he could not escape the attacks of envy; for it was said that his Philosophy had rendered him too grave and serious,

" οὐκ ἐν δόξῃ, οὐκ ἐν ἀπολαύσει, σὺ μενεῖ. *Thou haſt* " *already had ſufficient experience, that of theſe many* " *things about which thou haſt hitherto wandred, thou* " *couldſt not find happineſs in any of them; not in* " *ſyllogiſms and logical ſubtilties; not in wealth; not* " *in honour and reputation; not in pleaſure; in none* " *of all theſe.* Of Antoninus, I ſay, a mere Heathen, led by human reaſon only; Antoninus, a man " for worldly wealth and greatneſs ſo far greater " than Solomon, as Lord and maſter I dare ſay of " more great Kingdoms, than Solomon was of great " towns in all his Kingdom; Antoninus a man for " his goodneſs and wiſdom, by all men during his " life, had in that honour and reputation as never " man either before him was, or (that we know of) " ever after him." *But his goodneſs was the ſecond conſideration. It hath ever been the complaint of all ages; there hath ever been ſtore enough of men that could ſpeak well, and give good inſtructions: but great want of them, that either could, or ſo much as endeavoured, to do as they ſpake, and taught others to do. And what is the good, that ſuch can do? The only good I can conceive, it, that they perſuade men as much as in them lies (and they go very effectually about it,)* " *that τὸ εὐσεβὲς τοῦτο καὶ ὅσιον παρὰ τοῖς πολλοῖς ἀνθρώποις* " *καλέσαιτον, καταψευσαμένῳ ἴδιον ἀλαζόνων ἀνθρώπων ἢ σοφιστῶν, ἢ τὸ ὅλον τερατευτῶν εἰς φόβον καὶ ἐπίσχεσιν τῶν ἀδικεῖν.* That all this that we call virtue and godlineſs, ſo much ſpoken of amongſt men, are but words and empty ſounds; that there is no ſuch thing really exiſtent indeed as piety and juſtice, but that it is a meer figment of ſome cunning jugglers and impoſtors, or at the beſt a pretty device of law-makers and founders of commonwealths, to keep ſilly people in awe and fear. *Can any man think otherwiſe (if otherwiſe he be not better grounded) that ſhall hear them ſpeak, and then look upon their actions? Such therefore in my judgment might deſerve far more thanks, if they did forbear, and would rather loſe the commendations of either a ſmooth tongue or a ready pen, than to incur both the juſt ſuſpicion of being Atheiſts themſelves, and the certain guilt and crime of having made many others ſo.*

" Be it therefore ſpoken to the immortal praiſe and " commendation of the famous Antoninus, that as " he did write, ſo he did live. Never did writers ſo conſpire to give all poſſible teſtimony of " goodneſs, uprightneſs, innocency, and whatſoever " could among Heathens be moſt commendable, as " they have done to commend this one. They commend him, not as the beſt Prince only, but abſolutely as the beſt man and beſt Philoſopher that " ever was. And it is his proper commendation, " that being ſo commended, he is commended without exception. If any thing hath ever been talked againſt him, the hiſtorians mention it but as a " talk; not credited by them nor by any, that ever " were of any credit.... His meditations were his " actions. His deeds (ſo ſtill you remember him a " man and a Heathen) did agree with his ſentences; " Ὅτι οὐ προσποιητὸς ἀλλ' ἐξ ἕξεως πάντα ἔπραττε πρόδηλον, &c. And again, ὡς ἀληθῶς ἀγαθὸς ἀνὴρ ἦν, καὶ οὐδὲν προσποιητὸν εἶχε &c. *That he did not only as he ſpoke, but what he did, he did it out of mere love to virtue. That it was a clear caſe, which no man doubted of, that he was in very deed a good man; ſo incapable was he of any diſſimulation.* So " Dio of him, and ſo others." Caſaubon ſhews afterwards (156) the erroneouſneſs of Xylander's verſion; and obſerves (157), with regard to the obſcurity in ſome parts of Antoninus, that *the chiefeſt ground of it is, that he having been all his life time an indefatigable ſtudent, and ſo read a world of writers of all ſorts, his manner is in theſe his books, as he read any thing that made for his preſent purpoſe, cloſely and briefly to allude unto it by ſome ſhort meditation upon it; ſometimes barely to excerpt ſome words, which either he had an eſpecial liking unto, or afterward intended further to meditate upon, without any mention of the place or author, from whence they are taken.*

" Now many of theſe authors being quite periſhed, " many of his alluſions ſo cloſe and obſcure, that " though the authors be yet extant, yet it is not eaſy " to find from whence, or of whom, nor to what intent or purpoſe; it muſt not be wondered, if not " only many places ſeem obſcure, but ſome alſo of little " worth and uſe, becauſe it doth not appear, what " further uſe Antoninus had of them in his mind. " However to them that are any thing verſed in the " writings of antient Philoſophers, Stoics eſpecially, " there will not occur many ſuch places. If a man " take but Arrianus and Seneca, and compare them diligently with Antoninus, he will find a marvellous " conſent, and many obſcure ſhort places of Antoninus, illuſtrated and explained by their larger diſcourſe.... And as for ſuch places, which may " give offence as repugnant to our Chriſtian faith, " and impious, as when he ſeemeth to ſpeak doubtfully of God, and his Providence, and to aſcribe " all things to fatal neceſſity, and the like.... the " reader muſt further be intreated not to judge of " his opinions by one or two ſhort paſſages here and " there occurrent, which whether they be his or no " (as we have already ſaid) is hard to determine; " but to have reſpect to other more large and peremptory paſſages concerning the ſame purpoſe elſewhere to be found. As for example, concerning " God and his Providence, to *B.* 2. *Num.* 8; *B.* 6. " *Num.* 39; and concerning fatal neceſſity not only " to the ſame *B.* 2. *Num.* 8, but alſo to divers other " places, as *B.* 8. *Num.* 6. 27. 30. 32. 46. &c. by " which places as it doth plainly appear, that he " doth exclude all manner of neceſſity from human " wills and actions; ſo doth it appear by other " paſſages, as *B.* 8. *Num.* 33. that he did not altogether " exclude from all Divine Providence not even thoſe " actions of men, that are moſt contrary to the " will of God: from which place moreover may " appear what it is that he often calls εἱμαρμένην, " *Fate*, or *Deſtiny*; which to his meaning is no " other than God's Sovereign Power and Providence " in ordering the matters of the world, not ſubject " either to oppoſition or mutability; as by Hierocles " in his *De Providentiâ*, by *Plotinus*, by *Alexander* " *Aphrodiſæus*, and generally by all *Ariſtotle* his Greek " Interpreters, as *Simplicius*, *Themiſtius*, *Philoponus*, " and many others it is interpreted. To which purpoſe he doth alſo expound the word *Fortune*, *B.* 1. " *N.* 17. by which other places, which otherwiſe perchance might be miſtaken, (as *B.* 1. *N.* 14. laſt " words) muſt be expounded. And herein you muſt " know that Antoninus takes no more liberty to himſelf in uſing this word in the ſenſe he doth, than " *Plato* did, who although he diſputes at large in his " tenth book *de Legibus*, that even the leaſt things happen by Providence, and thinks it great impiety for " a man to doubt of it, yet where he ſpeaks of the " uncertainty and inſtability of all worldly affairs, " even of thoſe, that are ſettled with the beſt wiſdom and diſcretion of men, he uſeth theſe and " the like expreſſions: ὄντων μὲν μηδὲν τοιοῦτον μηδὲν, τύχας δ' εἶναι κυρίας ἅπαντα τὰ ἀνθρώπινα πράγματα; *that good laws oftentimes avail but little, for that in very deed it is chance and fortune, which for the moſt part is all in all in worldly affairs*, &c. " that is, in regard of us men, and of the ſecondary " cauſes, not in regard of God. In which ſenſe the " uſe of the word even unto us Chriſtians is allowed " by the beſt ſchoolmen (158)." Caſaubon obſerves then, that Antoninus recommends prayers as very powerful and effectual to virtue in his 9*th Book Num.* 40.

In the year 1697, Dr. Stanhope, afterwards Dean of Canterbury, publiſhed in 4to an Edition of this Emperor's Meditations, with a new Latin tranſlation, and the various readings and parallel places added to the margin, and with a Commentary by Gataker, and the ſelect Annotations of Dacier and Antoninus's Life tranſlated from the French into Latin; which edition was dedicated to John Lord Somers then Lord High Chancellor of England.

[*W*] *His character is perhaps the moſt perfect of any of the Heathen Emperors in all the branches of it.*] He was very careful of the management of the publick money, retrenching all unneceſſary expences, being unwilling to load the people. He leſſened the charges which were laid out upon Gladiators

(156) Ibid. pag. 15, & *ſeq.*

(157) Ibid. p. 21.

(158) Aquin. 1. qu. 22. art. 3, &c.

ous, and he was even accuſed of pride, and want of familiarity among his friends. Nay it was urged that he was leſs open and ſincere than Antoninus Pius, though he affected the contrary; in ſhort, that his virtues were rather feigned and forced than natural (*bb*). But Dion Caſſius (*ii*) defends him with regard to the laſt objection, by ſhewing that his whole behaviour was uniformly and invariably good under all circumſtances. The only defect which could reaſonably be objected to him, was perhaps an exceſs of goodneſs towards thoſe who deſerved a more ſevere treatment [*X*]. The Emperor Julian in his *Cæſars* (*kk*), which is a Satyr upon the Roman Emperors, gives him the nobleſt character, and places him above Trajan, Auguſtus, Cæſar, and Alexander; and repreſents this as his maxim, that it is the chief duty of a man and a Prince to imitate the

(*bb*) Capitol. c. 29.
(*ii*) Lib. 71.

Gladiators and Actors. But he was always ready to contribute every thing proper upon all ordinary or extraordinary occaſions. He aſſiſted perſons of real merit and character in their neceſſities, and ſupported ſeveral cities, which were involved in any misfortune, or in danger of being ruined. We obſerved in the text of this article, that he advanced a very large ſum to the city of Smyrna; and he did the ſame with regard to Carthage, which had ſuffered by a fire, to Nicomedia, which had been demoliſhed by an earthquake, Epheſus, and ſeveral other cities. He took particular care of the proviſions, and the reparation of the ſtreets of Rome, and of the great roads of the Empire. He furniſhed the Romans with thoſe publick ſpectacles, which they were ſo extremely fond of, to prevent any imputation upon him, that he deſigned to deprive them of their diverſions, and reduce them to a philoſophical manner of life. He remitted ſeveral taxes, when he thought there was occaſion for it. While he was Emperor he refuſed ſeveral eſtates which were left him by will. In the adminiſtration of juſtice, he never favoured the intereſts of the Treaſury. He rejected all the advices which were given him to enrich the Exchequer; and he ordered the Prefect of Rome and other officers to puniſh the receivers of taxes, who demanded the leaſt above what was due by Law. He was above all things averſe to the imputation of avarice, and he vindicated himſelf from it in a great many of his Letters. Nay he juſtified himſelf from it either in perſon or in writing, whenever he found that any of his actions were diſapproved of. For he was extremely jealous of his reputation, and took prodigious pains to inform himſelf of what was ſaid of him, not with a deſign to proſecute others, as many of his predeceſſors had done, (for on the contrary he gave every one a full liberty of thinking and ſpeaking what they thought proper;) but in order to correct what he found there was reaſon to except againſt in his conduct (159). As the moſt inconſiderable circumſtances may greatly injure the reputation of a Prince, he never did any thing without ſufficient precaution and deliberation. He never acted in a negligent and precipitate manner, but conſidered well whatever he ſaid or wrote, and ſometimes ſpent whole days upon matters, which did not ſeem to require ſo ſtrict an attention (160). Julian therefore in his *Cæſars* repreſents him as a perſon of prodigious gravity, of a compoſed countenance, who ſpoke little, and knew when it was proper to ſpeak as well as to be ſilent. He was not haſty in believing the advantageous things which were told him of perſons, when they were recommended to poſts and employments, and did not think that the truth was to be obtained without a very long and particular enquiry. *Suffragatoribus non cito credidit; ſed ſemper diu quæſivit quod erat verum* (161). The Imperial dignity did not produce in him the leaſt haughtineſs or arrogance. He treated all ſorts of people as his equals; and he permitted perſons of quality to be ſerved in the ſame manner as himſelf, and to have the ſame officers. He received all, who applied to him, with the utmoſt civility, and would not ſuffer his guards to hinder *any* perſon from having acceſs to him (162). For he did not place his grandeur in converſing with but a few people, under pretence of drawing the greater reſpect to himſelf, but in imitating the Deity, and making the whole world ſenſible of the effects of his benevolence and paternal care of them. So that there was no occaſion for a Maſter of the Ceremonies to introduce a perſon to him; it was ſufficient to have merit, or to ſtand in need of his favour (163). Though he had all the advantages of ſtudy and experience, yet he never undertook any thing either in war or the adminiſtration of the Empire, without conſulting with perſons of rank who attended him; and frequently ſaid, that it was more juſt that he ſhould follow the advice of ſo many perſons of merit, who had a regard for him, than that they ſhould all of them be obliged to ſubmit to his will alone. *Semper ſanè cum optimatibus, non ſolum bellicas res, ſed etiam civiles, priuſquam faceret aliquid, contulit. Denique ſententia illius præcipua ſemper hæc fuit; Æquius eſt, ut ego tot & talium amicorum conſilium ſequar, quam ut tot & tales amici meam unius voluntatem ſequantur* (164). In his own writings he acknowledges, that he had learned ſomething of every perſon (165).

(159) Tillem. p. 668, 669.
(160) Dion. Caſſ. lib. 71.
(161) Capitol. cap. 29.
(162) Tillem. p. 670, *and* Herodian l. 1. c. 3.
(163) Ariſtid. *Orat.* 9.
(164) Capitolin. cap. 22.
(165) M. Anton. *De Seipſo*, lib. 1. cap. 1, 2, 11.

[*X*] *An exceſs of goodneſs towards thoſe who deſerved a more ſevere treatment.*] It was ſaid, that his deſire to appear mild and generous degenerated even into ſoftneſs, ſo that he ſhewed more indulgence than was proper to thoſe whoſe ill conduct he condemned (166). He thought that it was ſufficient for him to be exempt from any fault; and indeed if we credit Dion Caſſius (167), he never committed any. But he imagined, that he ought to ſuffer thoſe of others to paſs with impunity. He ſaid, that as it was impoſſible to make men ſuch as one would wiſh they were, it was neceſſary to take them as they are, and make the beſt uſe of them that is poſſible. For this reaſon he eſteemed, commended, and employed thoſe of the beſt character; but Avidius Caſſius ſaid of him (168), that while he acted the Philoſopher, and diſcourſed about clemency, juſtice, and other points of ſpeculation, he ſuffered the Provinces to be plundered by thoſe whom he had made Governors, for fear of being thought ſevere. Caſſius particularly mentions a Prefect of the Pretorium, who was very poor when he obtained that poſt, and yet became of a ſudden enormouſly rich. *Marcus Antoninus philoſophatur, & quærit de clementia, & de animis, & de honeſto, & juſto, nec ſentit pro republicâ.... An ego Proconſules, an ego Præſides putem, qui ob hoc ſibi a ſenatu & ab Antonino Provincias datas credunt, ut luxurientur, ut divites fiant? Audiſti Præfectum Prætorii noſtri Philoſophi, ante triduum quam fieret, mendicum & pauperem, ſed ſubitò divitem factum. Undè, quæſo, niſi de viſceribus reip. provincialiumque fortunis?* His weakneſs in this reſpect appeared particularly with regard to his relations, whom he certainly loved to exceſs, without conſidering that a Prince owes the chief regard to his people in general. He was too indulgent to his wife Fauſtina, whoſe ſcandalous behaviour reflected ſome diſgrace even upon himſelf. Nay he was rallied before his face in the open Theatre for raiſing to conſiderable poſts thoſe perſons who had injured the honour of his family, after he had indiſputable proofs of the charge againſt them (169). Beſides he was in ſome meaſure blameable for his fondneſs to his ſon Commodus, whoſe crimes were ſo execrable, that Capitolinus ſays (170), that this Emperor would have been happy, if he had not had ſuch a ſon. He took indeed great care of his education and inſtruction (171); and furniſhed him with all the proper rules of conduct, and placed him under the beſt maſters he could procure from all parts by the nobleſt rewards (172). But Commodus, notwithſtanding all this care, could not bear with any perſons about him, who oppoſed his vicious inclinations, and was extremely obſtinate, ſo that he even fell ſick, in requiring that thoſe, whom his father had removed, becauſe they encouraged him in his irregularities, ſhould be brought back to him. Antoninus complied with this unreaſonable demand, and by that means Commodus made his father's court a ſcene of all kinds of debauchery (173).

(166) Vul. Gall. *in Vitâ Avid. Caſſii.* cap. 14.
(167) Lib. 71.
(168) Vulcat. Gallic. *ubi ſupra.*
(169) Capitol. cap. 29.
(170) Cap. 18.
(171) Dion. Caſſ. lib. 71.
(172) Lamprid. *in Vitâ Commodi*, c. 1.
(173) Tillemont, T. p. 665.

the Deity, by putting himſelf into ſuch a ſtate as to want but a few things himſelf, and to ſerve others to the utmoſt of his power (*kk*).

(*k*) P. 13, 14, 22, 23, 41, 49, 52, 53. *ex edit. Petavii, Paris* 1630.

ANTONINUS, Biſhop of Epheſus, was contemporary with St. Chryſoſtom, and lived in the latter end of the fourth Century. Several Biſhops being aſſembled at Conſtantinople with St. Chryſoſtom, Antoninus was accuſed before them of divers crimes [*A*], and eſpecially of Simony. His accuſer was one Euſebius Biſhop of Valentinopolis. St. Chryſoſtom endeavoured at firſt to ſtop the proſecution. He repreſented to him, that when a perſon was ſwayed by anger or envy, it was eaſy for him to accuſe, but not always to prove the charge; he therefore earneſtly beſought Euſebius to withdraw his accuſation; but finding him obſtinate in his deſign, he deſired Paul Biſhop of Heraclea, who ſeemed to favour Antoninus, to compromiſe the matter between the two parties, and endeavour to make them friends. In the mean time he went to church with the other Biſhops, for this happened on a Sunday; Euſebius followed them, and in preſence of all the people he preſented Chryſoſtom with a paper, in which was written his charge againſt Antoninus, and entreated the Biſhops not to let the matter paſs unexamined. St. Chryſoſtom ſeeing the accuſer's importunity, and fearing an inſurrection of the people, received the paper, and after divine ſervice he called Euſebius before him, and the other Biſhops, and again deſired him to drop the proſecution [*B*]; but Euſebius refuſing to comply with his deſire, the accuſation was read; whereupon the Biſhops were of opinion, that in order to diſpatch this affair, it was proper to begin with enquiring into the truth of the moſt heinous charge, that of Simony, becauſe if Antoninus was found guilty of that crime, there would be little room to doubt of all the reſt, ſince *the love of money is the root of all evil* (*a*). Antoninus was accuſed, that he made it his conſtant practice to receive from thoſe whom he ordained, more or leſs money, according to the greater or leſs income of the church to which they were preferred. This then was to be the ſubject of the enquiry: Antoninus was firſt examined, but he ſtrongly denied the fact; next to him were examined thoſe, from whom he was accuſed of having received money; but none of them would own they had given him any; which indeed is not ſurpriſing, ſince if they had owned it, they would have been their own accuſers; for if it be Simony to receive money for the holy things, it is no leſs Simony to give money for them. The Biſhops finding that they could not bring Antoninus, nor any of his accomplices, to a confeſſion of their crime, called for the witneſſes, before whom it was ſaid that the money had been given; but they being in Aſia, as it was pretended, could not appear; whereupon Chryſoſtom offered to go himſelf into Aſia to enquire thoroughly into that affair. But Antoninus, whoſe guilty conſcience made him diſlike ſo upright and impartial a judge, did by his ſecret intrigues at court prevent the Prelate's journey [*C*], and promiſed that he would himſelf ſend for the witneſſes, being in hopes that this would give him time either to bribe or frighten them, ſo that they would not appear againſt him. Chryſoſtom having got the hint of this, reſolved with the other Biſhops that ſome of them ſhould be ſent into Aſia, to examine the witneſſes. Accordingly three Biſhops were choſen, namely Syncletius Biſhop of Trajanopolis, Heſychius of Parium (*b*), and Palladius (*c*) of Helenopolis. It was ordered, that if the parties did not come to *Hypæpa* (*d*) within two months to proſecute their cauſe, they ſhould be excommunicated; this city being thought the moſt conveniently ſituated, as well for the parties as for the Judges. Syncletius

(*a*) 1 Tim. vi. 10.

(*b*) An ancient city in Myſia.

(*c*) The ſame who wrote St. Chryſoſtom's life, and from whom we have taken this account.

(*d*) A city in Lydia, near the borders of Ionia; it is now called *Ipepa*, in Natolia.

[*A*] *Antoninus was accuſed of divers crimes.*] Theſe crimes were, 1. That he had melted down the holy veſſels. 2. That he had taken a marble ſtone, which ſtood in the entry of the *Baptiſtery* (1), and had placed it in his own baths. 3. That he had cauſed the pillars, which had a long time belonged to the church, to be carried into his dining-place (2). 4. That his boy having committed a murder, he ſtill kept him in his ſervice, without having ever puniſhed him. 5. That he had ſold for his own uſe the lands, which Baſilina the Emperor Julian's mother had given to the church. 6. That having left his wife, he returned to cohabit with her, and had ſome children by her (3). The ſeventh crime, with which he was charged, was that of Simony, as we have obſerved in the text of this article.

(1) That part of the church, in which they baptized.

(2) This I take to be the ſenſe of the Greek word Τρίκλινος.

(3) Palladius, *Dial. de Vita Chryſoſt.* p. 126.

[*B*] *Chryſoſtom deſired him to drop the proſecution.*] He very zealouſly repreſented to him, how dangerous it was to accuſe a perſon, when we are in a paſſion; that then it is eaſy to act without due conſideration; and to write or ſpeak a great many things, which it is afterwards impoſſible to prove. "If then, ſaid "Chryſoſtom to Euſebius, you know perfectly the "truth of thoſe things, which you now lay to Anto- "ninus's charge, we don't refuſe to hear you; but if "you are not able to prove thoſe crimes, we won't "preſs you to carry on your proſecution. It is ſtill "time for you to chuſe which part you will act; "but when your libel ſhall have been read; when "your accuſation ſhall be publickly known; "when it ſhall appear upon the church regiſter; it "will be too late for you to withdraw your charge, "and being a Biſhop you will not be permitted to ask "pardon for your raſh accuſation (4)." The Greek words of this laſt ſentence are; οὐκ ἔτι σοὶ ἔξεσται, ἐπισκόπῳ ὄντι, ζητεῖν ἀδειλητίονα: The word ἀδειλήτιον is in the Latin *abolitio*, which ſignifies *pardon*, or *amneſty*. But perhaps the ſenſe here is, that Euſebius having once begun a proſecution, could not hope to have it ſtopped, and all the proceedings annulled, if he could not prove his charge; but that in ſuch a caſe he muſt be acknowledged a ſlanderer, and ſuffer the penalties decreed by the Canons againſt ſuch as calumniate their brethren.

(4) Idem, pag. 128, 129.

[*C*] *Antoninus did by his ſecret intrigues at court prevent the Prelate's journey.*] He went to one of the Emperor's miniſters, whoſe lands he took care of in Aſia (5), and begged of him to hinder Chryſoſtom's journey, promiſing to produce himſelf the witneſſes, that were wanted againſt him. The miniſter granted his requeſt, and ſent Chryſoſtom an order to ſtay at Conſtantinople; repreſenting to him, that it was not proper, that he who was their Biſhop and the Paſtor of their ſouls, ſhould leave the city at a time when they were in great danger of tumults and troubles (6). Theſe tumults and troubles they feared from Gaina's revolt, who being born a Goth, had taken the part of the Romans, and was by degrees promoted to the poſt of General of the horſe; and wanted to raiſe himſelf ſtill higher. We ſhall give an account of him in its proper place.

(5) By which it appears, that our Biſhop minded ſome other things beſides his flock.

(6) Palladius, *ubi ſupra*, p. 131.

Syncletius then and Palladius went immediately to Smyrna; but Heſychius, who was Antoninus's particular friend, feigned to be indiſpoſed, that he might be excuſed from accompanying his collegues. As ſoon as they arrived at Smyrna, they gave notice of it to the parties; but Antoninus and Euſebius had already been reconciled together [D] before the Biſhops were arrived in Aſia; however they went to Hypæpa, and to amuſe their judges, they pretended that the witneſſes had been obliged to go on different journies for their own private affairs. The Judges then aſked Euſebius how much time he wanted before he could produce his witneſſes, promiſing they would wait for them. Euſebius thinking the Biſhops would ſoon be tired with the heat of the country, (for it was then the middle of the Summer,) ſaid, that he wanted forty days, and that within that time he would bring his witneſſes, or ſubmit to the penalties of the Canons. Thereupon he was diſmiſſed, in order to bring his witneſſes; but inſtead of going after them, he went privately to Conſtantinople, where he kept himſelf concealed, whilſt the Biſhops were waiting for him. The forty days being paſſed, and no witneſſes appearing, the Prelates wrote to all the Biſhops of Aſia, that Euſebius was excommunicated, either for calumny, or for having deſerted the cauſe he had undertaken, and having waited thirty days more, they returned to Conſtantinople, where meeting Euſebius, they ſharply upbraided him for what he had done. Euſebius ſaid he was ſick, and again promiſed, that he would produce the witneſſes in a ſhort time; but he ſtill delayed, till at laſt Antoninus died, which put an end to this whole affair (e). However it appeared afterwards that Antoninus had not been unjuſtly accuſed, as we ſhall ſhew in a remark [E].

(e) Palladius, *Dialog. de Vitâ S. Joh. Chryſoſt.* cap. 13, 14. pag. 126—133.

[D] *Antoninus and Euſebius had already been reconciled together.*] This is not much to Euſebius's honour, eſpecially ſince he ſtill feigned to carry on the proſecution. But what Palladius tells us, is ſtill more diſhonourable both for Euſebius and for his adverſary; he ſays, that, "having perſuaded one another, the one by "gold, the other by an oath, they were become friends." Οἱ δὲ πείσαντες ἀλλήλους, ὁ μὲν χρυσίῳ, ὁ δὲ ὅρκῳ, φίλοι γεγόνασι (7), which words may ſignify, that one gave money, and the other made an oath; that is, Antoninus bribed Euſebius with preſents, who in return promiſed upon oath that he would not proſecute his charge. This I take to be the ſenſe of the Greek words, but the tranſlation in Emericus Bigotius's Edition of Palladius, is very obſcure and equivocal; *Illi autem cum ſe mutuo corrupiſſent, partim auro, partim jurejurando, amici facti ſunt.*

(7) Idem, ibid. p. 132.

[E] *It appeared afterwards, that Antoninus had not been unjuſtly accuſed.*] Not long after his death, the clergy of Epheſus, and ſeveral Biſhops of Aſia ſent a letter or decree (8) to St. Chryſoſtom, in which they declared upon oath, that they had for ſome time been governed very irregularly, and that their law had been neglected; therefore they earneſtly deſired him to come to them, to reſtore their churches, which had been long afflicted, partly by the followers of Arius, and partly by thoſe, who, tho' they boaſted to be Catholicks, yet were entirely ſwayed by avarice, and an unbounded luſt of power; ſeveral of them having bought the Epiſcopal See with money. Chryſoſtom being willing to aſſiſt them, went to Epheſus, where he aſſembled ſeventy Biſhops out of Aſia, Caria, and Lydia. Euſebius came before them, and begged to be again admitted to the communion of the church. Some Biſhops were of opinion, that he being a calumniator, his requeſt muſt not be granted. To which he replied, that the determination of Antoninus's cauſe had been delayed only by the abſence of the witneſſes, but that he could now produce them; and tho' Antoninus was dead, yet thoſe were ſtill alive, who had given money for their ordination. Upon this the Synod thought it juſt to enquire further into this affair. Six Biſhops were accuſed by Euſebius of having given Antoninus money to be ordained by him. They at firſt denied the charge, but ſeveral witneſſes being called in, ſome of them Laymen, ſome Clergymen, and ſome Women, who ſpecified what money had been given, by whom, and at what time and place, the accuſed Biſhops were obliged to confeſs themſelves guilty. The only excuſe they could plead for themſelves was, that they thought this a common practice, and authoriſed by cuſtom, and that they could not therefore be accuſed before the Emperor's Court. They prayed that they might keep their churches, or that the money they had given might be reſtored to them; for, ſaid they, ſome of us have even ſold our wives ornaments and cloaths. Chryſoſtom anſwered that he would ſpeak to the Emperor in their behalf, and the Synod ordered that the money they had given to Antoninus, ſhould be repaid them by his heirs, and that they ſhould not take the Sacrament with the other Prieſts, for they were no longer to be conſidered as Prieſts (9). We may conclude from a circumſtance in this account, that Clergymen were at that time to be tried before ſecular Judges, at leaſt for ſome crimes, as particularly that of Simony; ſince theſe Biſhops wanted Chryſoſtom's interceſſion with the Emperor, and were afraid of the Βαλεντήσιον, which was a Temporal Court.

(8) The Greek word is Ψήφισμα, which ſignifies properly a *decree*.

(9) Idem, ibid. p. 133—137.

P.

ANTONIA, a Roman family, which, according to an antient tradition, is ſaid to have deſcended from Anton the ſon of Hercules (a), produced two branches, one a Patrician, with the ſirname of Merenda, and the other a Plebeian, with ſcarce any ſirname. We do not find that the Patrician branch continued long, or produced any perſons mentioned in hiſtory, but T. Antonius Merenda, and Q. Antonius Merenda. The former was one of the *Decemviri*, who were diſſolved on account of the tyrannical and cruel behaviour of Appius Claudius, in the year 304 of Rome, and one of thoſe who baniſhed themſelves voluntarily, and whoſe eſtates were confiſcated, after the trial of Appius Claudius and Sp. Oppius (b). The latter was military Tribune in the year 333 of Rome (c). But the Plebeian branch continued a long time, and flouriſhed in very great luſtre and reputation [A]; for beſides the honour of having twice received the poſt of General of the Horſe, ſix times the Conſulſhip, once the Cenſorſhip, and three times the glory of a Triumph (d), that family appeared in the perſon of Mark Antony the Triumvir Miſtreſs

(a) Plutarch. *in Marc. Antonio*, p. 917.

(b) Livius, l. 3. p. 28.

(c) Idem, lib. 4. p. 88.

(d) *See* Glandorpii, *Onomaſtic.* p. 66.

[A] *The Plebeian branch continued a long time, and flouriſhed in very great luſtre and reputation.*] We muſt remember that Marcus Antonius the Orator, who died in the year 667, was the firſt, who brought into this family the honour of the Conſulſhip, and thoſe of a Triumph and Cenſorſhip.

Miſtreſs of one half of the Empire. We ſhall give particular articles of the chief perſons of this antient family [*B*].

[*B*] *It was an ancient family.*] Thoſe, who are men of the greateſt reading, and have the largeſt collections, and materials deſigned for the preſs, ſometimes fall into the ſtrangeſt miſtakes of memory imaginable. Father Vavaſſor is an inſtance of this, in his excellent Diſcourſe of the burleſque ſtyle, where he cenſures Photius for having ſuppoſed that Antonius Diogenes, Author of a Romance, lived very near the time of Alexander the Great: Οὐ λίαν πόρρω τῶν χρόνων τοῦ Βασιλέως Ἀλεξάνδρου (1). He alledges ſeveral reaſons againſt this, of which he thinks this the ſtrongeſt, that the family Antonia was not then ſubſiſting in the world, nor the name of it either made or known: *Neque, quod graviſſimum eſt, tum nata gens Antonia, aut facta vox, aut audita temporibus illis* (2). Nothing is more falſe than this. We have produced upon the authority of Livy one Titus Antoninus, one of the Decemviri, in the year 304 of Rome, and one Quintus Antonius a military Tribune about thirty years after. We find in the ſame hiſtorian one Marcus Antoninus, made General of the Horſe by the Dictator Cornelius Rufinus, in the year 421. Now it is certain, that Alexander died in the year 430. I do not alledge the tradition mentioned by Plutarch; becauſe it may be very juſtly replied to me, that it is as improbable, Anton, the ſon of Hercules, was the original of the family Antonia in Italy, as Cocceius Nerva was that of the family of Coſſé in France.

(1) Phot. *Bibliotb.* num. 167. p. 364.

(2) Vavaſſ. *de ludicra Dictione* p. 148.

ANTONIUS (MARCUS) the Orator, was the greateſt ornament of his family. At his firſt entrance into the ſervice of the commonwealth, he gave a noble proof of his merit, which deſerves to be mentioned. He had obtained the Queſtorſhip of the Province of Aſia, and was gone as far as Brunduſium to embark, in order to take upon him his office, when his friends ſent him word that he was accuſed of inceſt, and that Caſſius the Pretor, who was the ſevereſt Judge in the world, ſo that his Tribunal was ſtiled *the Rock of the Accuſed*, had got that cauſe before him. Marcus Antonius might have taken advantage of the Law, which forbids any accuſations to be admitted againſt thoſe who were abſent in the ſervice of the Commonwealth, but he choſe rather to juſtify himſelf in form; and for that purpoſe he returned to Rome, and proſecuted his cauſe, which he gained with prodigious honour (*a*). Sicily fell to his lot while he was Pretor, and he cleared the Seas of the pirates which infeſted that coaſt. He was made Conſul with A. Poſthumius Albinus in the year of Rome 653, and he ſtopped all the turbulent deſigns of Sextus Titus, the Tribune of the People, with great reſolution and ſucceſs. Some time after he was made Governor of Cilicia, under the title of Proconſul, where he performed ſuch noble exploits, that he received the honour of a triumph. I ſhall not omit to obſerve, that in order to improve his prodigious talent of eloquence, he became in ſome meaſure a ſcholar to the greateſt men at Athens and Rhodes, in his voyage to Cilicia, and his return to Rome. He performed after this the office of Cenſor with a great deal of glory, having carried his cauſe before the people againſt Marcus Duronius, who had preferred an accuſation of bribery againſt him, in revenge for Marcus Antonius's having eraſed his name out of the liſt of the Senators, which that wiſe Cenſor had done, becauſe Duronius, while he was Tribune of the People, had abrogated a Law, which reſtrained immoderate expences in feaſts (*b*). He was one of the greateſt Orators that ever appeared at Rome, and the occaſion, according to the teſtimony of Cicero, who was an excellent judge in theſe points, that Italy might juſtly boaſt herſelf to rival even Greece itſelf in the art of eloquence. He defended among other perſons Marcus Aquilius, and moved the judges in ſo ſenſible a manner by the tears he ſhed (*c*), and the ſcars he ſhewed upon the breaſt of his client, that he gained his cauſe. We may ſee very fully the character of his eloquence, and of his action, in the book which I quote (*d*). He never would publiſh any of his pleadings [*A*], that he might not, as he ſaid, be proved to have urged in one cauſe what was contrary to that which he had ſaid in another. The morality of the bar did not at that time conſider it as any ſhame for a man to contradict his own arguments in favour of his client,

(*a*) Valer. Maximus, lib. 3. cap. 7. num. 9. He mentions in lib. 6. cap. 8. the conſtancy of a ſlave of this Mark Anthony, in denying that his maſter was guilty.

(*b*) Glandorp. *Onomaſtic.* pag. 68. *ex Epitome Livii, Cicerone, &c.*

(*c*) Cicero *de Orat.* lib. 2. cap. 47. & *in Verrem V. initio.*

(*d*) Idem *in Bruto* cap. 37, & *de Oratore.*

[*A*] *He would never publiſh any of his pleadings.*] This fact, and the reaſon of it are two things ſo remarkable as to deſerve that I ſhould give the proofs of them. Cicero and Valerius Maximus are my authorities. Cicero ſays thus: *Hominem ingenioſum M. Antonium aiunt ſolitum eſſe dicere, idcirco ſe nullam unquam orationem ſcripſiſſe, ut ſiquid aliquando non opus eſſet ab ſe eſſe dictum, poſſet ſe negare dixiſſe* (1): That is, "It "is reported, that the excellent orator M. Antonius "uſed to ſay, that he never publiſhed any oration upon "this account, that whenever any thing had been "better not ſaid, he might deny that he ſaid it. Let us now hear *Valerius Maximus*: *Jam M. Antonio tenuitatem conſilium eſt, qui idcirco ſe aiebat nullam orationem ſcripſiſſe, ut ſiquid ſuperiore judicio actum, ei quem poſtea defenſurus eſſet, nociturum foret, non dictum à ſe affirmare poſſet: qui facti vix pudentis tolerabilem cauſam habuit, pro periclitantium enim capite non ſolum eloquentiâ ſuâ uti, ſed etiam verecundiâ abuti erat paratus* (2): That is, "We muſt pardon Mar"cus Antonius, who uſed to ſay, that he publiſhed "none of his orations for this reaſon, that if any "thing ſaid in any former cauſe might be injurious "to any perſon, whom he ſhould afterwards undertake to defend, he might then ſafely affirm, that "he never ſaid ſo. Tho' ſuch an action was ſcarce "juſtifiable, yet he had ſome excuſe for it; for he "thought it was neceſſary to abuſe not only his elo"quence but even his modeſty when the life of a perſon "in danger called for it." I imagine no body will be ſo unreaſonable as to object againſt my tranſlation of the word *ſcribere*. Every intelligent reader will underſtand that Marcus Antonius does not mean, that he pleaded *extempore*, and never wrote any thing of what he ſpoke before the Judges; for if that had been his meaning, he would have given a very impertinent reaſon of his conduct, ſince his only deſign was to prevent his own arms from being turned againſt him. He might prevent this as effectually, whether he wrote his pleadings or not, ſo that he did not publiſh them. A manuſcript hid in a cheſt can never be alledged againſt a man at the bar, as a proof that he once maintained an opinion quite oppoſite to what he advanced then. Such a perſon would deny it with the ſame aſſurance, as if he had pleaded only *extempore*, and have no manner of apprehenſion, that they would oblige him to produce the original of his pleading. He would have ſeveral infallible methods of

(1) Cicero *in Oratione pro Cluentio*, cap. 50.

(2) Val. Max. lib. 7. cap. 3. num. 5.

client. The precaution of this Advocate is neceſſary to perſons of his profeſſion [B], and yet it is not always capable of ſaving their honour [C]. He affected to be thought no

of ſecuring himſelf. We may conclude therefore, that the point in queſtion is not about the writing and not writing a ſpeech, which is pronounced, but about the publiſhing, or not publiſhing it. If there was any need of proofs in ſo clear a point, I could produce two very ſtrong ones. The firſt ſhall be taken from a paſſage in Cicero, where Brutus complains, that M. Anthony had publiſhed nothing but a very ſmall piece: *Vellem aliquid Antonio præter illum de ratione dicendi ſanè exilem libellum.... libuiſſet ſcribere* (3). He uſes here the word *ſcribere*. I ſhall take my ſecond proof from the ſame oration of Cicero, in which the fact mentioned above is found; for Cicero intending to ſhew, that Marcus Antonius had not taken ſo much precaution, as he imagined, argues not that there was any poſſibility of obliging an advocate to produce the original of his pleading, but that there were ſome hearers, who remember'd a long while, what they heard an advocate ſay: *Perinde quaſi quid a nobis dictum aut actum ſit, id niſi literis mandaverimus hominum memoriâ non comprehendatur* (4).

(3) Cicero *in Bruto*, cap. 44.

(4) Cicero *Orat. pro Cluent. Capit.* 50, & *ſeq.*

[B] *The precaution of this advocate is neceſſary to thoſe of his profeſſion.*] I remember a letter publiſhed in 1685, in which the cauſes of the contradictions of authors are examined into (5). The advocates are rallied there in the following manner: "We have "ſometimes the pleaſure of hearing in the ſame week "an advocate pleading for a husband againſt his "wife, and for a wife againſt her husband. If he "has a very warm imagination, in his former plead- "ing he ſpeaks of nothing but the power of huſ- "bands; he founds it upon nature, reaſon, the word "of God, and cuſtom. He quotes the Scriptures, "the Fathers, Lawyers, and Travellers. He declaims "againſt women, and reaſons only from general pro- "poſitions. But two days after, we have no more "of this. He eſpouſes quite different maxims; he "treats the authority of the husband as an uſurpation; "he runs over the Scriptures, the Code, Natural "Philoſophy, Hiſtory, and Morality, in favour of "women, ſtill reaſoning upon general propoſitions; "for a man of ſtrong genius thinks that he proves "nothing, if he does not affirm or deny without ex- "ception; and conſequently if he engages in main- "taining oppoſite intereſts, he cannot avoid contra- "dicting himſelf." We muſt confeſs that an advocate, who ſhould publiſh a pleading upon the privileges of the women, full of the fire of his imagination, would be very eaſy to be confuted, if he ſhould likewiſe undertake to defend the privileges of husbands. There would be no occaſion but to refer to his own book. Our orator Marcus Antonius took care to avoid this grand inconvenience, and to reſerve to himſelf the liberty of contradicting his own arguments, by maintaining one thing one day, and the reverſe of it the next, according to the intereſts of his clients. It would be eaſy to ſhew, that the advocates are not the only perſons who uſe this method; the controverſial Divines follow their example, as they have to deal with different people (6). Bellarmin, when he writes againſt the Enthuſiaſts, maintains that the ſcriptures are full of the characters of Divinity; but againſt the Proteſtants, he argues that they are obſcure, and want the authority of the church (7). A Miniſter, whom I ſhall not name, maintains againſt the Romiſh Church, that the characters of Divinity ſhine throughout the Scriptures; but when he writes againſt Mr. Pajon, he talks another language (8). This privilege ought to be left entirely to the Poets and Orators. "They very frequently ſay things which "are contradictory to each other in different places, "according as they ſuit their purpoſe. *Nos Poëtarum more, uti ſe res dederit, ita vel populi vel eruditorum hominum ſententiam noſtro quodam jure ſequimur, atque alias, ſi ſit, opus, aliter de eadem dicimus*, That is, "We like the Poets, have a peculiar pri- "vilege of following the opinions of the vulgar or "of the learned, as the ſubject requires, and of ſpeak- "ing differently upon the ſame point, whenever there "is occaſion; ſays the excellent Signior Della Caſa, "Archbiſhop of Benevento in one of his letters to

(5) It is the 2d of the *Nouvelles Lettres contre le Calviniſme de Maimbourg.* A REFLECTION upon the contradictions of Authors.

(6) See the remark [M] of the Article (JOHN) ADAM.

(7) See the attempt of the Jeſuit Mulhuſinus in his *Auctarium primum Speculi miſeriarum Patei*, to ſolve this contradiction. See likewiſe the remark [D] of the article BELLARMIN.

(8) See the *Supplement* to the *Commentaire Philoſophique*, and p. 207 and 216 of Mr. Saurin's *Anſwer to that Commentary.*

"Victorius: and Euſtathius in his comment upon "verſe 181 of the ſecond Book of the Odyſſey, and "upon the 243d verſe of the twelfth Book of the "Iliad, obſerves that Homer ſays in thoſe paſſages "things with relation to Auguries, which were con- "trary to what he had ſaid in other places; and "this he calls τὸ ἀμφοτερόγλωσσον. I have ſaid there- "fore in theſe firſt paſſages of my Poems, which I "have quoted, that an old Poet was a very ſcanda- "lous character, becauſe that was proper for my ſub- "ject. But this does not hinder me from aſſerting "the contrary in other places, where there is occa- "ſion (9)." I love ſuch ſincerity as this; and ſhould be glad to find the ſame in Bellarmin and the Miniſter, whom I ſpoke of; but this is a thing not to be expected. We ſhall preſently ſee what Cicero ſays upon the right of advocates, with reſpect to the liberty of contradicting themſelves. See the remarks [H] and [I] of the article of BALDUS.

(9) It is Mr. Menage who ſpeaks this in his *Anti-Baillet*, tom. 2. p. 174, 175.

[C] *The precaution, which he made uſe of, is not always capable of ſaving the honour of Advocates.*] We have ſeen (10) Cicero's obſervation, that the memory of the hearers is very much to be apprehended by advocates, who contradict themſelves (11). If he had given us inſtances of this, he would have much more ſtrongly convinced us, that the precaution of Marcus Antonius was to no purpoſe. But it muſt be confeſſed, that what he adds is very proper to juſtify the conduct of this orator. It is as follows. Marcus Brutus, who accuſed L. Plancius, when the latter was defended by L. Craſſus, brought in two perſons that read aloud ſeveral paſſages, which he had ſelected from two orations of L. Craſſus, in one of which he had raiſed the authority of the Senate to a prodigious height, and in the other as much depreſſed it. This gave the orator ſome uneaſineſs, and obliged him to prepare excuſes for it from the difference of the times and occaſions, which had required of him theſe two ſorts of principles (12). *Ego vero*, ſays Cicero (13), *in iſto genere libentius cum multorum tum hominis eloquentiſſimi & ſapientiſſimi L. Craſſi autoritatem ſequor, qui cum L. Plancium defenderet, accuſante M. Bruto, homine in dicendo vehementi & callido, quum Brutus duobus recitatoribus conſtitutis ex duabus ejus orationibus capita alterna inter ſe contraria recitanda curâſſet, quod in diſſuaſione rogationis ejus quæ contra Coloniam Narbonenſem ferebatur quantum poteſt de autoritate Senatus detrahit; in ſuaſione legis Serviliæ ſummis ornat Senatum laudibus, & multa in Equites Romanos quum in eâ oratione aſperius dicta recitâſſet, quo animi illorum judicum in Craſſum incenderentur, aliquantum eſſe commotus dicitur. Itaque in reſpondendo primum expoſuit utriuſque rationem temporis, ut oratio ex re & causâ habita videretur.* Cicero was far from diſapproving the part which L. Craſſus fixed upon on this occaſion; for he found himſelf in the ſame circumſtances; for they having repeated a paſſage out of one of his orations, which was very contrary to an argument which he had in hand, he anſwered, that the oration, of which they recited part, did not contain the expreſſions of his real ſentiments; and that what a man ſays in the character of an advocate is not to be conſidered as if he had aſſerted it as a witneſs; in ſhort, that it is the language of the cauſe, and not of the orator. This is intelligible enough: we are to ſpeak according to the intereſt of the cauſe, and the preſent conjuncture, and not according to our own private opinions, *Ego ſi quid ejuſmodi dixi, neque cognitum commemoravi, neque pro teſtimonio dixi: & illa oratio potius temporis mei quam judicii & auctoritatis fuit... Errat vehementer ſi quis in orationibus noſtris, quas in judiciis habuimus, autoritates noſtras conſignatas ſe habere arbitratur. Omnes enim ille orationes cauſarum & temporum ſunt, non hominum ipſorum aut patronorum. Nam ſi cauſæ ipſæ pro ſe loqui poſſent, nemo adhiberet oratorem: nunc adhibemur ut ea dicamus, non quæ noſtrâ autoritate conſtituantur ſed quæ ex re ipſâ cauſâque dicantur* (14). Add to this theſe words, which Cicero puts into the mouth of Marcus Antonius the orator: *Oratoris omnis actio opinionibus non ſcientiâ continetur; nam & apud eos dicimus qui neſciunt, & ea dicimus, quæ neſcimus ipſi: ita & illi alias aliud*

(10) Above in quotation (4).

(11) It is equally to be feared by preachers, when they are ſo far from contradicting themſelves, that from time to time they repeat almoſt word for word the ſame Sermons.

(12) *See* Cicero's *Orat. pro Cluent*, cap. L. & *ſeq.* and again more plainly *de Oratore* cap. LV. how he revenged himſelf upon Brutus, by bringing three readers.

(13) Cicero, *Orat. pro Cluentio*, cap. LI.

(14) Idem, ibid. cap. 50.

iiſdem

no ſcholar [*D*]. His modeſty, and his other qualifications, as a man of virtue, rendered him no leſs dear to a great number of illuſtrious perſons, who were his friends, than his eloquence made him the admiration of the whole world. He was unfortunately killed during thoſe bloody confuſions which was raiſed by Marius and Cinna at Rome. He was diſcovered in the place where he had hid himſelf, and ſoldiers were ſent immediately to diſpatch him. His manner of addreſſing them had ſuch an effect upon them, that no body, but he who commanded them, had the cruelty to kill him, not having heard his diſcourſe, but being juſt entered into the chamber, and enraged that his ſoldiers had not executed his orders (*e*). His head was expoſed *pro Roſtris*, i. e. *before the Roſtrum*, a place which he had adorned with his triumphal ſpoils (*f*.) This happened in the year of Rome 667. He left two ſons, whom I am going to mention.

(*e*) Plutarch. *in Mario*, p. 431. Valer. Maxim. lib. 8. cap. 9.

(*f*) Cicero *de Oratore*, lib. 3. cap. 3.

iiſdem de rebus & ſentiunt & judicant, & nos contrarias ſæpe cauſas dicimus, non modo ut Craſſus contra me dicat aliquando, aut ego contra Craſſum, quum alterutri neceſſe ſit falſum dicere, ſed etiam ut uterque noſtrûm eadem de re alias aliud defendat, quum plus uno verum eſſe non poſſit. Ut igitur in ejuſmodi re, quæ mendacio nixa ſit, quæ ad ſcientiam non ſæpe perveniat, quæ opiniones hominum & ſæpe errores aucupetur, ita dicam (15). I aſſure my ſelf, that the greateſt part of my readers will be ſo well pleaſed to ſee, that theſe two great orators had the ſame principles, and know ſo exactly the weak ſide of their profeſſion, that I ſhall be excuſed for whatever may ſeem too great a digreſſion in this remark. We may obſerve that theſe principles are ſtill ſubſiſting. Compare the pleadings of Mr. Erard againſt the Dutcheſs of *Mazarine*, with the anſwer to the *Factum* of that Lady. And read in particular theſe words of the anſwer: *Mr. Erard ſpoke to the Dutcheſs of Mazarine of the events of that time after the manner in which ſhe ought then to have conſidered them. Afterwards the different times and events have changed our ſentiments and expreſſions.*

(15) Cicer. *de Orat.* iib. 2. c. 7.

[*D*] *Our Marcus Antonius affected to be thought no ſcholar.*] If I am not miſtaken, this was not ſo much out of modeſty as policy. He ſaw himſelf eſtabliſhed in the glorious reputation of a great orator; and might not he then imagine, that the world would admire him more, if they thought this eloquence of his was owing entirely to the ſtrength of his genius, than if they ſuppoſed it to be the fruit of a long application to the ſtudy of Greek authors? He had another reaſon; he believed the people would be more touch'd by orations, if they conſidered them as the production of nature only, and not of art. They are apt to ſuſpect thoſe, who are acquainted with all the ſubtilties of their profeſſion. With regard to the Judges, he thought nothing more proper to produce a good effect, than to make them believe, that he pleaded without any preparation, and to conceal from them carefully all the artifice of Rhetoric, which he made uſe of in order to ſerve his cauſe. But after all he was learned, and not unacquainted with the beſt Grecian authors. We may prove this from ſeveral paſſages of *Cicero*. *Magna nobis pueris, Quinte frater, ſi memoria tenes, opinio fuit L. Craſſum non plus attigiſſe doctrinæ, quam quantum prima illa puerili inſtitutione potuiſſet, M. autem Antonium omnino omnis eruditionis expertem atque ignarum fuiſſe..... Quum nos . . . ea diſceremus quæ Craſſo placerent, & ab his doctoribus, quibus ille uteretur, erudiremur, etiam illud ſæpe intelleximus . . . . illum & Græcè ſic loqui nullam ut noſſe aliam linguam videretur, & doctoribus noſtris ea ponere in percontando, eaque ipſum omni in ſermone tractare, ut nihil eſſe ei novum, nihil inauditum videretur. De Antonio verò quanquam ſæpe ex humaniſſimo viro patruo noſtro acceperamus, quemadmodum ille vel Athenis vel Rhodi ſe doctiſſimorum hominum ſermonibus dediſſet, tamen ipſe adoleſcentulus, quantum illius ineuntis ætatis meæ patiebatur pudor, multa ex eo ſæpe quæſivi. Non erit profectò tibi quod ſcribo hoc novum, (nam jam tum ex me audiebas) mihi illum ex multis variiſque ſermonibus nullius rei, quæ quidem eſſet in his artibus, de quibus aliquid exiſtimare poſſem, rudem aut ignarum eſſe viſum. Sed fuit hoc in utroque eorum ut Craſſus non tam exiſtimari vellet non didiciſſe quam illa diſpicere, & noſtrorum hominum in omni genere prudentiam Græcis anteferre. Antonius autem probabiliorem hoc populo orationem fore cenſebat ſuam, ſi omnino didiciſſe nunquam putaretur. Atque ita uterque ſe graviorem fore ſi alter contemnere, alter ne noſſe quidem Græcos videretur.* This is the exordium to his ſecond Book *de oratore*. Add to this what he ſays there of himſelf (16), that he never read the Greek authors, but for diverſion; and that he underſtood not a word in their books of Philoſophy, *Verbum profitis nullum intelligo, ita ſunt anguſtis & conciſis diſputationibus illigati*: that he never meddled with the Poets, whoſe language was far from human, but confined himſelf to the hiſtorians and orators, who had adapted themſelves to thoſe, who were half learned: *Videantur voluiſſe eſſe nobis, qui non ſumus eruditiſſimi, familiares.* In the ſequel of that Book it is no longer Cicero, who ſpeaks, and we find Marcus Antonius amongſt other things ſpeaking as follows: *Ego iſta ſtudia non improbo, moderata modo ſint: opinionem iſtorum ſtudiorum & ſuſpicionem artificii apud eos, qui res judicent, oratori adverſariam eſſe arbitror; imminuit enim & oratoris autoritatem, & orationis fidem* (17). That is, "I do not diſapprove of thoſe ſtudies, ſo "they be but moderately purſued; I imagine, that "the reputation of them, and the ſuſpicion of arti"fice, do ſome injury to the orator in the opinion "of the Judges; for they leſſen his authority, and "the credit of his oration." This was the foundation of the conduct, which Cicero attributes to him: *Erat memoria ſumma, nulla meditationis ſuſpicio; imparatus ſemper aggredi ad dicendum videbatur, ſed ita erat paratus, ut judices illo dicente nonnunquam viderentur non ſatis parati ad dicendum fuiſſe* (18): That is, "He had a prodigious memory, and no "ſuſpicion of any previous meditation; he always "ſeemed to begin to ſpeak without preparation, and "yet he was ſo well prepared, that the Judges ſome"times, when he was ſpeaking, ſeem'd not ſuffici"ently prepared to anſwer." I remember to this purpoſe a remark of Mr. Daillè upon the difference, between *acting the orator, and being an orator* (19). This remark is excellent.

(16) Idem, ibid. cap. 14. See likewiſe cap. 19.

(17) *De Oratore*, lib. 2. cap. 37.

(18) Idem, *in Bruto* cap. 37.

(19) Daille, *Reponſe au P. Adam*, 3d Part. p. 156.

ANTONIUS (MARCUS), eldeſt ſon to the preceding, had the ſirname of *Creticus* (*a*). He never raiſed himſelf beyond the Pretorſhip, but executed that office with ſuch an extent of authority as was very uncommon, for having the commiſſion for importing of corn, this gave him the whole command of the Seas (*b*). This was a privilege which he obtained by the intereſt of the Conſul (*c*) Cotta, and of the faction of Cethegus (*d*); but this occaſioned no murmuring among the people, as it would have done if he had been a perſon of greater merit [*A*]. It is ſaid that he ſuffered himſelf to be corrupted by bad counſels,

(*a*) Plut. *in M. Antonio*, pag. 915.
(*b*) Patercul. lib. 2. cap. 31.

(*c*) I ſhall examine in the article of CETHEGUS whether Cotta was Conſul, when Mark Antony received this commiſſion.
(*d*) Aſcon. Pedian. *in Orat. Ciceron. contra Verrem*, p. 113.

[*A*] *The people would have murmur'd to ſee him have the whole command of the ſeas, if he had been a perſon of greater merit.*] Velleius Paterculus has ſuggeſted this thought to me. It is in a paſſage, where he relates that Pompey obtained a commiſſion two years after, which made him almoſt abſolute maſter of the whole earth. This was not granted him without oppoſition, whereas there was nothing ſaid againſt the decree, which had put the ſame kind of power into the hands of Marcus Antonius. The reaſon

counſels, in committing extortion in the Provinces. He was guilty of a great deal of injuſtice that way (*e*). His extortions in Sicily are repreſented in a few words by Cicero (*f*). The war of Crete, the ſucceſs of which he imagined would be ſo eaſy, that he carried fewer arms in his Fleet, than chains for the conquered (*g*), proved ſo unfortunate to him, that he fell ſick at the diſappointment and died. He had no power to reſiſt the mortifying reflections which tormented his mind, when he ſaw, that the enemies having taken ſeveral of his ſhips had hung up the Roman ſoldiers upon the maſts, and rowing about with this ſpectacle, triumphed with the greateſt inſolence over the Commonwealth in a thouſand different places. By Julia his ſecond wife [*B*] he had three ſons, Marcus Antonius, Caius Antonius, and Lucius Antonius (*h*), whom I ſhall give an account of hereafter.

(*e*) Idem, ibid. p. 113. See likewiſe p. 37.

(*f*) Cicero *Orat.* 3. *in Verrem*, cap. 91. See likewiſe *Orat. in Verr.* 2. cap. 3.

(*g*) Florus, lib. 3. cap. 7.

(*h*) Glandorp. *Onomaſtic.* p. 73.

I ſhall have ſeveral errors to take notice of [*C*], and perhaps the Elogium, which Plutarch has given to our Antonius [*D*] may be conſidered as one.

ANTONIUS

reaſon of this was, that they thought him a perſon, who could never make himſelf formidable; but in Pompey they found ſo much merit and ſuch abilities, as made him formidable to the publick liberty. *Idem hoc ante biennium in M. Antonii prætura decretum erat; ſed interdum perſona, ut exemplo nocet, ita invidiam auget aut levat. In Antonio homines æquo animo paſſi erant; raro enim invidetur eorum honoribus, quorum vis non timetur; contra in iis homines extraordinaria reformidant, qui ea ſuo arbitrio aut depoſituri aut retenturi videntur, & modum in voluntate habent* (1). This is a fine text for the writers of political commentaries. I ſhall leave it to them almoſt entire; and only content myſelf with this ſhort obſervation. It is complain'd, that the ſame things, which ought to raiſe a man to conſiderable poſts, prevent his obtaining them. *Eſtamos à tiempo*, ſays *George de Monte Mayor*, *qui me mererer la Coſa, es principal parte para no alcançarla:* That is, as the Preſident *du Vayer* expreſſes it, "In this age, nothing ſo much hinders "men of virtue from gaining eſtates and honours, "as to merit them (2)." This complaint is too often well founded; but there are ſome circumſtances when it has no force in it. For to merit a poſt, it is not ſufficient to have the qualifications neceſſary to fill it in a proper manner; beſides this it is requiſite, that theſe qualifications ſhould not have certain defects joined to them, which may lead a man to make an ill uſe of the reputation, which he has acquired by diſcharging his poſt with all the ability and ſucceſs imaginable. The mixture of thoſe defects may properly ſpeaking, render thoſe unfit for a poſt of importance, who are otherwiſe the beſt qualified for it. It is not therefore always injuſtice to refuſe ſome men the poſts, of which they are very capable; it is only a neceſſary precaution and prudence, eſpecially in commonwealths. Eminent abilities inſpire a ſpirit of ambition. If you ſuffer thoſe, who poſſeſs them, to do conſiderable ſervices to their country, you raiſe this fire of ambition more and more: the reputation which they gain by diſcharging a great poſt in a proper manner, inſpires them with a deſign to make an ill uſe of their credit, and ſhews them, that it will be eaſy to raiſe themſelves higher. They try their fortune; they aſpire ſometimes to ſovereignty; and whether they ſucceed or not, they occaſion a thouſand diſorders, which would have been avoided by giving thoſe poſts to men of a moderate degree of merit.

(1) Vell. Paterc. lib. 2. cap. 31.

(2) *See* Pierre Matthieu at the end of his Preface to the *Hiſtoire de la Paix.*

[*B*] *Julia, his ſecond wife.*] She was daughter to Julius Cæſar who was Conſul in the year of Rome 664, and ſiſter to another Julius Cæſar who was Conſul in 690. Her virtue and merit equalled her with the moſt illuſtrious Ladies of her time: Ταῖς ἀρίσαις τότε & σωφρονεσάταις ἰσάμιλλος; That is, "She was com-"parable to the moſt excellent and virtuous Ladies of that age (3). She was not very happy in her husbands; for after the death of Marcus Antonius Creticus, ſhe married Publius Cornelius Lentulus, who was one of the accomplices of Catiline's conſpiracy, and puniſhed with death for that crime. What ſhe did to ſave Lucius Cæſar her brother, deſerves admiration (4). He was proſcribed during the Triumvirate, and concealed himſelf at her houſe. The ſoldiers went to ſearch for him, in order to kill him; but ſhe placed herſelf at the door, and declared they ſhould not enter till they had killed her, who was mother to that Marcus Antonius, whoſe orders they wanted to execute. This made them retire (5). The

(3) Plutarch. *in M. Antonio, init.* pag. 916.

(4) Idem, ibid.

(5) Idem, ibid. p. 924.

firſt wife of our Antonius was named Numitoria; ſhe was daughter to Quintus Numitorius Pullus. She is called the daughter of a traytor in the Philippics of Cicero (6).

(6) Taken from Glandorp. p. 74, 75.

[*C*] *I have ſome errors to take notice of.*] Thyſius, Profeſſor of Eloquence in the Univerſity of Leyden, has a Note, which may give us but a mean opinion of his learning. This Note is upon the following words of Lactantius. *De Neptuni ſorte manifeſtum eſt, cujus Regnum tale fuiſſe dicimus, quale M. Antonii fuit infinitum illud imperium, cui totius oræ maritimæ poteſtatem Senatus decreverat, ut prædones perſequeretur, ac mare omne pacaret* (7). That is, "It is very plain "concerning Neptune's Lot, whoſe Empire we ſay "was ſuch an one as that infinite Empire of M. "Antonius, who had the command of all the ſea-"coaſt given him by the decree of the Senate, that "he might deſtroy the pirates, and clear all the "ſeas of them." Thyſius pretends, that inſtead of Antonii, we ought to read Pompeii, which reading is in ſeveral good manuſcripts; and upon this occaſion he tells us, that Pompey was called Neptune, and ſeveral of his ſtatues adorned with the Enſigns of that Deity. He is miſtaken in this point; for there is no queſtion but that Lactantius, who was a perfect maſter of Cicero, had in his eye the following paſſage in his oration againſt Verres, where he ſays, *Poſtquam Marci Antonii infinitum illud imperium ſenſerant* (8), That is, "When they were ſenſible of that in-"finite power of Marcus Antonius;" or theſe words in the next oration, *Ita ſe in iſto infinito Imperio Marcum Antonium geſſiſſe, ut &c.* That is, "Mar-"cus Antonius behaved himſelf ſo in that infinite "power of his, that, &c." One of Voſſius's ſons might have prevented this falſe note of the Leyden Profeſſor; for he obſerves in a Book printed thirteen years before Thyſius's Lactantius, that Thomaſius was very much miſtaken in putting Pompeii inſtead of Antonii in his Edition of that Father: and he proves this by the authority of Cicero and that of Paterculus (10). I ſhall add, that he ſuppoſes Florus ſpeaks of the ſame Antonius, where he ſays, *Quum ille* (Pompeius) *res in Aſia gerens eo quoque præfectum miſiſſet Antonium in alienâ Provinciâ inclitus fuit* (11): That is, "While he (*Pompey*) commanded in Aſia, he ſent "thither the Prefect Antonius, and ſo had a great in-"fluence in another man's Province." He ſhews that Florus has confounded this Antonius with Octavius, who according to Plutarch (12) and Dion (13) was ſent to the iſland of Crete by Pompey, when Metellus commanded there. There is more reaſon for this, than to ſay, that we ought to correct in Plutarch the ſirname of *Criticus* given to this Marcus Antonius, and to read it *Creticus*. I cannot tell what Edition of Plutarch he made uſe of; but I find Κρητικὸς in the Francfort Edition of 1620, and that of Paris in 1624. I wiſh he had taken the pains to examine an error in Chronology, which ſeems to be in Paterculus. That hiſtorian tells us that there were but two years between the commiſſion given to Marcus Antonius, and that to Pompey; and yet Aſconius Pedianus relates, that Marcus Antonius obtained it by the intereſt of a Conſul named Cotta. I ſhall touch upon this difficulty in the Article of CETHEGUS.

(7) Lactant. lib. 1. cap. 11. pag. 34.

(8) Cicero *Orat.* 2. *in Verr.* cap. 3

(9) Idem, *Orat.* 3. *in Verr.* cap. 91.

(10) Gerardus Voſſius *Not. in Vell. Paterc.* pag. 55. edit. 1639. He quotes Cicero *Verrinâ* 1. inſtead of *Verrina* 2. and 3. dd. ll.

(11) Flor. lib. 3. cap. 7, and not cap. 8, as Gerard Voſſius quotes it.

(12) Plutarch. *in Pompeio.*

(13) Dio. l. 36.

[*D*] *Perhaps the elogium, which Plutarch has given to our Antonius may be conſidered as an error.*] "Mar-"cus Antonius, ſays he (14), was a man of virtue "and ſincerity, and very liberal. But as he was "not rich, his wife prevented him from indulging the "generoſity

(14) Plut. *in M. Antonio, init.* p. 915, 916.

ANTONIUS (CAIUS) brother to the preceding, was a man of ſuch irregular conduct, that he and his eldeſt brother were more worthy to be the uncle and father of Antonius the *Triumvir*, than to be the ſons of the great man who gave them life. This Caius Antonius bore arms under Sylla in the war againſt Mithridates, and raiſed ſuch diſturbances in Achaia, that upon the account of this, and ſeveral other crimes which were alledged againſt him, he was afterwards expelled the Senate by the Cenſors. However he was raiſed to the Conſulſhip in preference to Catiline, who was one of his competitors; but he gained this poſt with much leſs honour than Cicero did, who in ſpite of all the contrivances of Caius Antonius and Catiline to exclude him, was declared Conſul with the unanimous conſent of the people, whereas Antonius had but a few voices more than Catiline (*a*). It was during his Conſulſhip that the conſpiracy of Catiline broke out, which was oppoſed by Cicero with great warmth and reſolution. His Collegue had the command of the army which was ſent againſt Catiline, and obtained a complete victory by means of his Lieutenant General Petreius; for with regard to his own ſhare in it, he was prevented by a real or pretended ſickneſs from being preſent at the battle. Dion Caſſius ſays it was only a pretended one, and that he being apprehenſive leſt Catiline ſhould diſcover ſome very important ſecrets concerning him, would not appear againſt him in perſon (*b*). After the victory he conducted his troops into Macedonia, and was defeated by the Dardanians. He governed that Province for three years with ſo much violence and extortion, that the Senate, offended at his conduct, ſent a ſucceſſor in his room. At his return to Rome he was accuſed by Marcus Cælius, and though Cicero undertook his defence, yet he was convicted and baniſhed. Some are of opinion that he lived fifteen years in the Iſland of Cephalonia, and that Marcus Antonius, his nephew who became very powerful at Rome, when the aſſaſſins of Julius Cæſar were obliged to leave it, recalled him from his baniſhment [*A*]. He died ſome time after, broken with age and troubles, and left only one daughter, whom he ſaw divorced from her huſband Marcus Antonius the Triumvir, a little after their marriage, upon pretence of her gallantry with Dolabella (*c*).

(*a*) Aſconius Pedianus *in Orationem Ciceronis in togâ candidâ contra Anton. & Catilin. in fine*, pag. 153.

(*b*) Dio, lib. 37, *ad annum Romæ* 692.

(*c*) See the remark [*G*] of the article FULVIA, and Glandorpii *Onomaſtic.* p. 75, 76.

" generoſity of his temper. He had no money in " his houſe one day, when a friend came to borrow " of him; however, he thought of an expedient to " help him. He order'd water to be brought him " in a ſilver goblet, under pretence of ſhaving himſelf. " He lather'd his beard with it, and then ſending " away his ſervant, gave the goblet to his friend. " The whole family was in diſorder, and ſearching " for the goblet that was miſſing; his wife was in a " prodigious paſſion, and juſt going to put all the " ſlaves to the rack, when he prevented her, by con- " feſſing what he had done, and begged her par- " don." Ὡμολόγησε συγγνώμην ἔχειν δεηθείς (15). Plutarch is not right in repreſenting the character of this man; he makes him liberal, whereas he ſhould have ſtiled him prodigal. Salluſt has been juſt in his character of him. *M. Antonius perdundæ pæcuniæ genitus; vacuuſque curis niſi inſtantibus* (16); That is, " Marcus Antonius was a man formed for " laviſhing away of money, and never troubled him- " ſelf with any cares, till they came upon him." I ſhall not conceal, that Cicero denies, what the common opinion aſcribes to this M. Antonius. It is ſaid, that he kept no account of his income or expences. *Audimus aliquem tabulas nunquam confeciſſe; quæ eſt opinio hominum de M. Antonio falſa, nam fecit diligentiſſimè* (17). That is, " We have heard of " ſome, who never kept any account; which is the " common opinion concerning M. Antonius, but en- " tirely falſe, for he kept a very exact one.

(15) Idem, ibid. p. 916. A.

(16) Salluſt. *in Fragm. Hiſtor.* lib. 3. p. 446.

(17) Cicero *Orat.* 1, *in Verrem*, cap. 23.

[*A*] *Marcus Antonius his nephew. . . recalled him from baniſhment.*] There are ſome difficulties relating to the time when he was recalled, which ſhall be examined in the Remark [*H*] of the Article FULVIA.

ANTONIUS (MARCUS) one of the Triumvirate, was grandſon to Marcus Antonius the Orator, and ſon to Marcus Antonius Creticus. Moreri has ſpoken ſo fully of him, that I ſhall excuſe myſelf from enlarging upon him. The errors, which I have collected upon this head will be taken notice of either in the article of FULVIA, or ſome other place.

The only thing which I ſhall add concerning him is, that he publiſhed a treatiſe concerning his Drunkenneſs [*A*].

[*A*] *He publiſhed a treatiſe concerning his drunkenneſs.*] This is a fact, which the modern writers make no mention of; and yet it is a very remarkable one, and to be found in Pliny (1): *Tergilla Ciceroni M. F. binos congios ſimul haurire ſolitum ipſi objicit: Marcoq; Agrippæ à temulento ſcyphum impactum. Etenim hæc ſunt ebrietatis opera. Sed nimirum hanc gloriam auferre Cicero voluit interfectori patris ſui M. Antonio. Is enim ante eum avidiſſime apprehenderat hanc palmam, edito etiam volumine de ſuâ ebrietate, quo patrocinari ſibi auſus, approbavit planè (ut quidem arbitror) quanta mala per temulentiam terrarum orbi intuliſſet. Exiguo tempore ante prælium Actiacum id volumen evomuit; quo facilè intelligatur ebrius jam ſanguine civium, & tanto magis eum ſitiens:* That is, " Tergilla " reproached Cicero the ſon of the orator, with be- " ing uſed to drink two gallons at once, and that " he threw a cup at Marcus Agrippa, when he was " drunk. For theſe are the effects of drunkenneſs. " But Cicero ſeem'd deſirous to take away the glory " in this reſpect from Marcus Antonius, who ſlew his " father; and had been ambitious of this honour " before him, having publiſhed a book concerning " his drunkenneſs; in which endeavouring to vin- " dicate himſelf, he plainly approved in my opinion " all the evils which he had brought upon the world by " his exceſs. A little time before the battle at Ac- " tium he vomited out (EVOMUIT) this book, by " which it appears he was drunk with the blood of " his fellow citizens, and yet ſtill thirſted after more." I am ſurpriz'd that Plutarch has ſaid nothing of ſuch an extraordinary particular, and that Suetonius has omitted the mention of it.

(1) Plinius, lib. 14. *ſub. fin. cap. ult.*

☞ ANTONIUS (MARCUS) the Triumvir. Mr. Bayle having given an account of his family, we proceed to give one of his perſon and actions. Antonius was very handſome in his youth, for which reaſon he was very much beloved by Curio, a Senator, but a man who indulged himſelf in all manner of vice. To attach Antonius more and more

more to him, he admitted him to all his diverſions, and by feaſting, drinking, and all ſorts of debauchery, he made him contract ſuch heavy debts, that his own father forbad him his houſe. However Curio was ſo generous as to bail Antonius for two hundred and fifty talents, that is, according to the moſt moderate computation (*a*), forty ſix thouſand eight hundred and twelve pounds, ten ſhillings of our money. Antonius became afterwards familiarly acquainted with Clodius, but growing ſoon diſguſted with him, he went into Greece, where he exerciſed his body in military labour, and his mind in the ſtudy of eloquence, in which he followed the Aſiatic ſtile and manner, which was then in vogue, and admirably ſuited to his elevated genius and unbounded ambition. The Proconſul Gabinius going into Syria, invited Antonius to ſerve under him; but Antonius, though ſtill very young, ſcorned to follow him as a private ſoldier, whereupon Gabinius gave him the command of the cavalry, and ſent him againſt Ariſtobulus, who was then endeavouring to raiſe a rebellion among the Jews, in order to ſhake off the yoke of the Romans (*b*). Antonius acted with great prudence and courage on this occaſion; he gained a complete victory over the Jews, and took Ariſtobulus himſelf priſoner (*c*). Some time after, Gabinius being reſolved to reſtore Ptolomy, ſurnamed *Auletes* (the Piper) to the throne of Egypt [*A*], Antonius went before him with the cavalry, and in a ſhort time made himſelf maſter of Peluſium. The taking of this city not only gave the army a free paſſage into Egypt, but alſo afforded to Ptolomy great hopes of ſucceſs. Antonius ſhewed on this occaſion, that he had a tender and compaſſionate diſpoſition; for Ptolomy being enraged againſt the inhabitants of Peluſium, on account of their revolt, ordered that they ſhould be all put to death, but Antonius interceded for them, and ſaved their lives. Plutarch is the author who relates this particular (*d*); and the Abbot de S. Real very juſtly obſerves (*e*), that this inſtance of Antonius's temper and moderation ought not to have been diſguiſed and miſrepreſented; however we muſt add, that Plutarch aſcribes this to Antonius's love of fame. He performed afterwards ſeveral glorious actions, which gained him the reputation of a great General. When the civil war broke out, Curio took Cæſar's party, and prevailed with his friend Antonius to do the ſame, for which the latter was made a Tribune of the People, in which employment he did Cæſar a very great ſervice [*B*]. But finding the Senators very much exaſperated againſt that General, who was then in Gaul, and being himſelf driven out of the Senate by the Conſul Lentulus, he went ſecretly with Q. Caſſius, both diſguiſed in a ſlave's habit, to Cæſar's camp. As ſoon as they arrived, they cried, that nothing was now done right at Rome; that the Tribunes of the People were no more permitted to ſpeak freely, but that whoever dared to appear in favour of juſtice and equity was perſecuted, and in danger of his life. Cæſar hearing this, marched immediately into Italy; and this, according to Plutarch, is the reaſon why Cicero ſays (*f*), that as Helen had been the cauſe of the Trojan war, ſo Antonius had been the promoter of the civil war among the Romans (*g*). As Plutarch cenſures Tully for this, we ſhall examine his reaſoning in a remark [*C*]. Cæſar having made

(*a*) That of Mr. Brerewood, in Dr. Prideaux's Preface to his Connexion.

(*b*) Plutarchus in Anton. *Oper.* tom. 1. p. 916. ed. Paris 1624.

(*c*) Joſeph. *Antiq. Jud.* lib. 14. cap. 11.

(*d*) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 917.

(*e*) *Conſiderations ſur M. Antoine: Dans ſes Oeuvres*, tom. 1. p. 400. ed. de la Haye, 1726.

(*f*) *In Secunda Philippica.*

(*g*) Plutarch. *ubi ſupra.*

[*A*] *Gabinius intended to reſtore Ptolomy to the throne of Egypt.*] Gabinius having plundered Syria, of which Province he was Proconſul, reſolved to go into Media. He had already paſſed the river Euphrates, when Ptolomy came to him with a letter from Pompey their common friend and Protector, who had been lately choſen Conſul for the following year (1). Pompey in his letter deſired Gabinius to hearken to the propoſals which Ptolomy was to make him, in order to be reſtored to his Kingdom. Ptolomy offered Gabinius for him and his army ten thouſand talents, that is, about one million eight hundred ſeventy two thouſand and five hundred pounds ſterling money. Tho' ſo large a ſum made a very great impreſſion upon Gabinius, yet he at firſt ſcrupled to comply with the King's requeſt, becauſe moſt of the Officers of the army were againſt it. But Antonius greatly delighted with glorious enterpriſes, and being deſirous to pleaſe Ptolomy, prevailed with Gabinius to undertake the expedition (2). This was nevertheleſs contrary to the laws and the religion of the Romans; for by the laws no Governor was permitted to go out of the limits of his Province, nor to undertake any war of his own accord (3); and in the book of Sibyls were found the following words. "If a King of Egypt comes to you for help, "you may grant him your friendſhip, but you ſhall not "aſſiſt him with any troops (4)." But Gabinius thought, that the more the thing was unlawful, the more money he ſhould receive for it (5).

(1) Viz. for the year of Rome 702, 51 before Chriſt.

(2) Plutarch. *in* Anton. *Op.* tom. 1. p. 916.

(3) Dion. Caſſ. lib. 39. p. 130. edit. Steph. 1592. Fol.

(4) Ibid. p. 109.

(5) Ibid. p. 131.

[*B*] *In which poſt he did Cæſar a very great ſervice.*] Curio received a letter from Cæſar to the Senate, in which Cæſar gave an account of what he had done for the Commonwealth, and juſtified himſelf from all the crimes that were laid to his charge, promiſing alſo to disband his army, and to lay down his poſt, provided Pompey would do the ſame, becauſe it would be unjuſt, that he be forced to unarm, whilſt Pompey continued at the head of his troops. This letter he received the very day that L. Cornelius Lentulus, and C. Claudius Marullus entered upon their Conſulſhip (6); upon which he reſolved not to deliver it to them before they were come into the Senate, becauſe he feared that they would not communicate it if they received it privately. Yet the Conſuls deferred a long while the reading of that letter, till at length they were compelled to it by Q. Caſſius Longinus and M. Antonius, both Tribunes of the people. The letter being read, none of the Senators were of opinion that Pompey ſhould disband his army; which is not ſurpriſing, ſince he was then with it near the gates of Rome. With regard to Cæſar, they all except Curio, and one Cæcilius, voted that he ſhould be obliged to diſmiſs his ſoldiers. However the Tribunes found means to prevent the Senate from making a decree about this affair, that day and the following. But at laſt the decree was made, Cæcilius and Curio were eraſed out of the liſt of the Senators, and went with Antonius and Caſſius to the camp of Cæſar (7). Plutarch relates this particular in a different manner. He tells us (8), that the queſtion was put in the Senate, whether Cæſar or Pompey ſhould disband his army; that the majority being for Cæſar's diſmiſſing his ſoldiers, Antonius propoſed, that they both ſhould be obliged to it; to which all the Senators unanimouſly conſented, greatly praiſing Antonius for this hint; but the Conſuls would not agree to this, and Antonius having made ſome other propoſals in behalf of Cæſar, was driven out of the Senate by the Conſul Lentulus.

(6) The firſt day of the year 705 ſince the building of Rome; 48 before the Chriſtian Æra.

(7) Dion Caſſius lib. 41. p. 171, 172.

(8) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 918.

[*C*] *Whether Antonius has been the promoter of the civil war as Tully aſſerts.*] Here follows Cicero's words, *Tu, tu, inquam, M. Antoni, princeps C. Cæſari omnia perturbare cupienti, cauſam belli contra patriam inferendi dediſti. Quid enim aliud ille dicebat? Quam*

cauſam

made himſelf maſter of Rome, appointed Lepidus Prætor of the city, and gave Antonius the government of Italy, with the command over the legions there, in which poſt he ſoon gained the love of the whole army [*D*]; but what was ſtill more to his honour, and to Cæſar's advantage, was, that Antonius aſſiſted him powerfully on ſeveral occaſions, and with ſuch ſucceſs, that twice, when Cæſar's army had been put to flight, he rallied the ſcattered legions, led them again againſt the enemy, and gained the victory. This raiſed his reputation ſo high, that he was reckoned the beſt General next to Cæſar, who confided ſo much in him, that in the battle at Pharſalia, which was to determine Cæſar's fate, he gave the command of the left wing of his army to Antonius, whilſt he himſelf led the right (*b*). Cæſar having gained a complete victory over Pompey was ſoon made Dictator, when to acknowledge the ſervices he had received from Antonius, he made him General of the Horſe [*E*], though he had not yet been Prætor. Cæſar keeping the Dictatorſhip a whole year, Antonius was alſo during that time maintained in his poſt of General of the Horſe, which made the Augurs murmur very much; for they ſaid, that no perſon was allowed to keep that poſt above ſix months; but they were ridiculed for complaining of this little grievance at a time when they themſelves had granted the Sovereign Power to Cæſar for a year (*i*). Antonius being General of the Horſe, exerted his power with the utmoſt violence. For though he aſſembled the Senate, and thereby maintained a ſhadow of liberty, yet by the ſword he wore, by the multitude of ſoldiers that always attended him, and by all his actions he ſufficiently ſhewed, that the Sovereign Power was now lodged in one perſon only (*k*). He gave a remarkable inſtance of his tyrannical ſpirit in the tumults which were occaſioned at Rome by L. Trebellius and P. Cornelius Dolabella, both Tribunes of the People. The latter a young man, who was reſolved to make himſelf famous by diſtreſſing the State, had endeavoured to publiſh a certain law for the relief of poor debtors, intending thereby to engage the peoples favour. Trebellius, the other Tribune, who was of the Nobles's party, oppoſed this Law as much as lay in his power. This diſpute often occaſioned great bloodſhed, notwithſtanding a decree of the Senate, by which all perſons were forbidden to bear arms (*l*). Dolabella deſired Antonius, who had always been his friend, to aſſiſt him in his deſign; and he had ſo much the more reaſon to hope he would grant his requeſt, that Antonius himſelf had always affected a great popularity, and that the Law propoſed by Dolabella, was

(*b*) Idem, ibid. p. 919.

(*i*) Dion Caſſius, lib. 42. p. 219.

(*k*) Idem, ibid. p. 222.

(*l*) Idem, ibid. p. 223.

cauſam dementiſſimi ſui conſilii & facti afferebat, niſi, quod interceſſio neglecta, jus Tribunitium ſublatum, circumſcriptus eſſet Antonius?——Ut igitur in ſeminibus eſt cauſa arborum, ſic hujus luctuoſiſſimi belli ſemen tu fuiſti. Doletis treis exercitus populi Romani interfectos terfecit Antonius: deſideratis clariſſimos civeis; eos quoque eripuit vobis Antonius: auctoritas hujus ordinis afflicta eſt afflixit Antonius: Omnia denique quæ poſtea vidimus, (quod autem mali non vidimus) ſi recte ratiocinabimur, uni accepta referemus Antonio. Ut Helena Trojanis, ſic iſte huic reip. cauſa belli, cauſa peſtis atque exitii fuit (9). That is, "Thou, thou, I ſay, "Marcus Antonius, art the firſt, who gave Cæſar "cauſe to make war againſt his country, at a time, "that he was already deſirous of embroiling the "ſtate. For what did he ſay himſelf? What did "he alledge as the cauſe of the deſperate council "he took? Why; the contempt which was ſhewn "for the oppoſition of the Tribunes; the aboliſhing "of the Tribunitian right; the hindring M. Antonius from performing his office.——As then the "origin of a tree is in its ſeed, ſo thou haſt been "the ſeed of the deplorable war. Ye mourn, O "Romans, for the loſs of three of your armies; "'tis Antonius has murthered them: you miſs the "moſt eminent of your citizens; 'tis Antonius depriv'd "you of them: the dignity of this order is deſtroyed, "'tis Antonius deſtroyed it. In a word, whatever "we have ſuffered, (and what evils have we not ſuffered?) muſt, if we reaſon right, be laid to the "charge of Antonius. As Helen was the cauſe of the "Trojan war, ſo was this man the cauſe of our misfortunes and our ruin." Thus far Cicero; let us hear, what Plutarch anſwers. He tells us, that if Cæſar had not been already determined to make war upon his country, he would not have been eaſily induc'd to it, merely by ſeeing Antonius and Caſſius come to him in the habit of ſlaves, and flying to him for ſhelter in an hackney carriage; but that this might have given him a pretence to begin the war, to which he was urged by his own unbounded ambition (10). But it is plain that this is not anſwering Tully's charge againſt Antonius. He does not ſpeak of their diſguiſe as ſlaves, nor of a hackney carriage, but aſſerts, that Cæſar pretended he made war againſt Rome, becauſe the Tribunitian dignity had been violated in the perſon of Antonius, who was denied the liberty of exerciſing the power of his office. Now by Plutarch's own account, given in the foregoing remark, it appears, that Antonius thought he had reaſon to complain on this account, which he really did; and Tully, ſuppoſing this complaint might be well grounded, (tho' he is far from granting it,) yet ſays, that it could not juſtify Antonius, ſince no one can juſtly take up arms againſt his own country. *Cum omnino nulla*, ſays he, *juſta cauſa cuiquam eſſe poſſit contra patriam arma capiendi.* Now if Antonius had furniſhed Cæſar with a ſpecious pretence for beginning the war, as it is plain he did, why could not Tully ſay, that he was the cauſe, (though not the only cauſe) of his country's ruin? Plutarch therefore had no reaſon for cenſuring Cicero on this account, and for aſſerting downright, as he does, that *he told a falſity*, περιφανῶς ψευδόμενος (11).

(9) Cicero, *in Philip.* 2.

(10) Plutarch. *vide infra.*

(11) Idem, ibid.

[*D*] *Antonius ſoon gained the love of the whole army.*] This is not ſurprizing, ſince he uſed to exerciſe and take his meals with the ſoldiers, and make them preſents, as often as his circumſtances would permit him (12). This is an infallible method to gain the ſoldiers love. But what Plutarch adds, ſhews that this love was not ſo general, as he at firſt inſinuates; for he tells us (13), that Antonius was hated by ſome, becauſe out of ſloth and negligence he did not take care to have juſtice done to thoſe that had been wronged; and always received with anger and paſſion thoſe who addreſſed him; and laſtly becauſe he had a very ill character on account of his adulteries.

(12) Idem, ibid.

(13) Ibid.

[*E*] *Cæſar made Antonius General of the Horſe.*] This is what Dion Caſſius (14), and the Abbreviator of Livy (15) expreſly tells us. But Plutarch ſays he made him a Tribune of the people, Δήμαρχον, and ſent him to Rome. And to ſhew that this cannot be an error of the tranſcriber, it muſt be obſerved, that Plutarch explains at the ſame time the prerogatives of a Tribune; for he tells us that this Magiſtrate is the next under the Dictator, and in his abſence the firſt and almoſt only Magiſtrate; that the power of the Tribune ſtill ſubſiſts under a Dictator, tho' that of all other Magiſtrates be then abrogated; and therefore Plutarch muſt be miſtaken, ſince it would not have been a great honour and reward for Antonius to be only made a Tribune, which poſt he had already filled before.

(14) Lib. 42. p. 219.

(15) L. Flori, *Breviar.* l. 113.

was very much to the people's advantage. Trebellius on the other ſide endeavoured to diſſuade Antonius from it. But perhaps he would not have ſucceeded, if Antonius at that very time had not been told, that there were ſtrong reaſons to ſuſpect that his wife was too familiar with Dolabella. This exaſperated him extremely againſt his friend; he was divorced from his wife, who was the daughter of C. Antonius his uncle, and reſolved to oppoſe Dolabella (*m*). He gave Trebellius leave to ſend for a party of ſoldiers, and Dolabella being alſo aſſiſted by his friends, Rome became the Theatre of a very bloody war. All this happened in the year 707 from the building of Rome (*n*), and 146 before Chriſt. This tyrannical behaviour of Antonius, together with his diſſolute life [*F*], was, according to Plutarch (*o*), the reaſon why the next year Cæſar did not admit him his Collegue in the Conſulſhip, but choſe Æmilius Lepidus. However two years after (*p*) he was made Conſul, when Cæſar enjoyed that honour for the fifth time. This was the laſt year of that Uſurper's life, who was killed the fifth of March. It was thought his death was haſtened by an imprudent, or perhaps invidious action of Antonius; for when Cæſar was celebrating the *Lupercalia* (*q*), cloathed in his triumphal garments, ſitting in the publick place to ſee the races, Antonius ran up to him, and placed a crown on his head, as tho' he offered him the Kingdom. Cæſar feigning to reject it, Antonius inſiſted upon it for ſome time, but at laſt he deſiſted, ſeeing the people were pleaſed with Cæſar's refuſal [*G*]. This crown was afterwards put upon one of Cæſar's ſtatues, but was taken away by ſome Tribunes, with great acclamations of the people, for which reaſon Cæſar depoſed thoſe Magiſtrates. This confirmed Caſſius and Brutus in the reſolution they had taken to kill the Tyrant. They aſſembled their moſt particular friends, with whom they adviſed whether it was proper to admit Antonius into their conſpiracy. Moſt of them were of opinion to admit him; but Trebonius repreſented to them, that it was not probable Antonius would come into their meaſures; "For, ſaid he, when we went to meet "Cæſar on his return from Spain, Antonius and I lodged together; I took that op- "portunity to hint ſomething to him of this deſign, in order to know his thoughts; "he underſtood me very well, though he did not make it appear; however he kept "the ſecret faithfully, without diſcovering to Cæſar any thing of what I had hinted to "him (*r*)." This ſhewed that Antonius was not diſpoſed to enter into a conſpiracy againſt his benefactor, though he was alſo unwilling to betray his friend. It was afterwards propoſed to kill Antonius himſelf, as well as Lepidus; but Brutus oppoſed it, by repreſenting that an action performed for the publick good ſhould be free from all imputation of ſelf-intereſt; that if Antonius and Lepidus were killed, the Romans would be apt to believe that the conſpirators had wreſted the power out of Cæſar's hands only to take it into their own, and not to reſtore the publick liberty (*s*). This conſideration ſaved Antonius's life. When he heard that Cæſar was killed he was ſeized with a terrible apprehenſion, and putting on the diſguiſe of a ſlave he hid himſelf during the night; but hearing the next day that the conſpirators were retired into the Capitol, and that Lepidus was in the Market-place, he aſſembled the Senate in the Temple of Veſta, to deliberate upon the preſent ſituation of the Commonwealth. Several different opinions being propoſed in the Senate, Cicero, in an elaborate Oration, perſuaded them to bury in an eternal oblivion all that had paſſed; and a decree was made accordingly, to which Antonius himſelf conſented out of policy (*t*) [*H*]. He alſo ſeemingly reconciled himſelf with Brutus and

(*m*) Plutarch. *ubi ſupra*, p. 919.

(*n*) Dion Caſſ. *ubi ſupra*, pag. 224.

(*o*) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 920.

(*p*) A. U. 710, 43 before Chriſt.

(*q*) A feaſt inſtituted to the honour of PAN.

(*r*) Idem, ibid. p. 921.

(*s*) Idem, ibid. and Dion. Caſſ. lib. 44. p. 282.

(*t*) Dion, ibid. p. 281--291.

[*F*] *His diſſolute life.*] Plutarch gives us (16) ſeveral inſtances of this. He tells us, that Antonius was deteſted by all good and ſober men, for his luxury, and extravagance; and for his drunkenneſs, and debaucheries; that he uſed to go to the weddings of Pantomimes, and the moſt profligate fellows: that having once paſſed the night in drinking and rioting at the wedding of one Hippias, he appeared the next morning before the people in a very unbecoming condition (17): that one Sergius, a Pantomime, was in great favour with him, as well as Cytharis, a woman of the ſame rank, with whom he was in love, and whom he uſed to carry with him in his litter, attended with a multitude of people. In ſhort, it was thought inſufferable, that whilſt Cæſar was expoſed to all the hardſhips and dangers of war, Antonius ſhould thus ſecurely wallow in all manner of pleaſures and luxurioufneſs. This diſſolute life of the General of the Horſe, had a fatal influence upon the ſoldiers, who thought they might follow his example, indulge themſelves in all ſorts of crimes, and freely rob and plunder whatever came in their way.

(16) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 919, 920.

(17) See alſo Tully's *Second Philippic.*

[*G*] *The people were pleaſed with Cæſar's refuſal.*] Plutarch makes on this occaſion the following reflection: "It is to be wondered, ſays he (18) that "thoſe, who tamely ſubmitted to the Kingly power, "ſhould be afraid of the name of a King, as being "deſtructive of their liberty." And indeed Cæſar wanted nothing but the name of a King. But mere names ſtrongly affect the multitude, who flatter themſelves, that as long as names ſubſiſt, the things ſignified by them alſo ſubſiſt. They had Conſuls, Tribunes, and a Senate; this was enough to perſuade them that the commonwealth was ſtill in being: but if Cæſar had took the name as well as the power of a King, they would immediately have found, that their liberty was deſtroyed. Cæſar therefore acted very wiſely, when he refuſed the title of King. We may add, that tho' this notion of the people may be abſurd in itſelf, yet it would be of great uſe to thoſe, who were willing and ſhould have it in their power to reſtore the commonwealth. As long as the ancient names were ſtill in uſe, as long as there were Conſuls, Tribunes of the people, and a Senate, ſome hopes were left that one time or other the nation would recover its liberty. But if once theſe names were out of date, if once the Kingly government had been ſettled, the very notion of liberty would have been loſt, and it would have become almoſt impoſſible to deſtroy tyranny. Therefore thoſe Patriots, who did not yet deſpair of the commonwealth, were in the right to oppoſe the name of a King, tho' they very well knew the thing ſignified by it, was already eſtabliſhed.

(18) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 921.

[*H*] *Antonius himſelf conſented out of policy.*] He was jealous of Lepidus, who having an army at command, and being very much beloved by his ſoldiers, began to ſhew that he was reſolved to revenge Cæſar's death. Antonius who had no army, was afraid, leſt

and Caſſius, and gave them his ſons for pledge of his ſincerity. Caſſius went that ſame day to ſup at Antonius's houſe, who during ſupper aſked him, whether he ſtill wore a dagger under his gown; yes, replied Caſſius, and a very large one, in caſe you ſhould attempt to invade the Sovereign Power. Every thing was now very quiet; the conſpirators received of the people the honourable name of *Tyrannicides*, (the killers of the Tyrant), and ſeemed to be free from all danger. But the reading of Cæſar's will ſoon occaſioned new troubles. He had adopted Octavius for his ſon, and left legacies not only to Antonius, but even to D. Brutus, and to ſeveral others of thoſe who had been concerned in the conſpiracy againſt him. He alſo left his gardens on the Tyber for the uſe of the people, and ordered that every one of them ſhould receive thirty drachms, (that is, about nineteen ſhillings of our money) according to what Octavius himſelf ſaid; or according to others, ſeventy five drachms, (that is, about forty ſeven ſhillings.) The people began to be moved at the gratifications Cæſar made them, and Antonius did not let this opportunity ſlip; he ſoon improved it to his own advantage; he ordered Cæſar's murthered body, together with his bloody garments, to be carried into the publick Forum, and there he harangued the people [*I*] with ſo much ſtrength, and with ſuch an affected grief and concern, that he ſoon raiſed their fury to ſuch a height, that they immediately went in queſt of the conſpirators, being reſolved to kill them; and even complained of the Senators for not having puniſhed the murtherers. This ſudden change of the people altered entirely the ſituation of the State; Antonius in a moment became powerful, and now flattered himſelf that he ſhould eaſily get into the place which Cæſar had filled. But his haughty behaviour towards Octavius made him ſoon loſe all the advantage which his concern for Cæſar had procured him. For as ſoon as Octavius had heard that Cæſar was killed he haſtened to Rome, and went immediately to wait upon Antonius, as having been a particular friend of his father; but Antonius received him in a very proud manner, not that he deſpiſed him, but becauſe he feared him, ſays Velleius Paterculus (*u*); and when Octavius ſpoke to him of Cæſar's will, he anſwered him, that he was mad, and that thoſe were not his friends who adviſed him, young as he was, to take upon him the heavy taſk of executing Cæſar's laſt will. But Octavius ſtill inſiſting upon it, did exaſperate Antonius to ſuch a degree, that he did him all the diſſervice that lay in his power, oppoſed him in the proſecution of the Tribuneſhip (*w*), and even charged him with having made an attempt upon his life (*x*). This created ſuch a miſunderſtanding between them, that though they were at firſt ſeemingly reconciled, yet they only kept their hatred ſecret, till an opportunity ſhould offer to diſcover it openly. Antonius indeed appeared to

(*u*) *Hiſt. Rom.* lib. 2. cap. 60. edit. Mattaire, Lond. 1718.

(*w*) Plutarch. *ubi ſupra*, p. 922.

(*x*) Vel. Paterc. ibid.

leſt Lepidus, by the ſpecious pretence of puniſhing Cæſar's murtherers, ſhould make himſelf maſter of the people, and arrive at the ſame power which Cæſar had; therefore he prevailed upon him to ſubmit to the Senate's decree (19). But it is ſurprizing that Lepidus ſhould be ſo eaſily perſuaded. However, Dion himſelf hints the reaſon of it. He tells us, that the conſpirators promiſed the ſoldiers, that they ſhould be permitted to keep all the money Cæſar had granted to them, which was alſo confirmed by the Senate's decree; the ſoldiers hearing this, were not ſo much attached to Lepidus, as they were before; ſo that he might fear, that if he undertook any thing, he ſhould not be well ſupported by his army; and this perhaps was the reaſon, why he was ſo eaſily prevailed upon by Antonius.

(19) Idem, pag. 291.

[*I*] *He harangued the people.*] Dion has given us (20) Antonius's oration, or perhaps made one for him, after his own manner, according to the cuſtom of the ancient hiſtorians. However that be, this oration contains ſeveral things, which deſerve to be taken notice of. He firſt ſpeaks of Cæſar's Anceſtors, of his education, his ſtrength of mind, his behaviour towards his friends and his enemies; he then expatiates upon what Cæſar had done for the commonwealth; his actions in Spain, and in Gaul. After this he comes to a more delicate point, Cæſar's war againſt Pompey, and gives it as favourable a turn as was poſſible; avoiding to hint at Cæſar's ambition, he endeavours to lay all the blame of the civil war on Cæſar's adverſary. "When he perceived, ſays he, that Pompey, having left his native ſoil, was raiſing a "Kingdom for himſelf in Macedonia; when he ſaw, "that this man was reſolved to carry there your "riches; when he knew that he was arming your "own ſubjects againſt you; and was ready to employ the Roman money againſt the Romans themſelves, he firſt endeavoured to diſſuade him from "his undertaking, and promiſed him moſt ſolemnly, "that he would again live with him as he had "done before. But when nothing could prevail upon "Pompey; when he had broken thro' all ties, even "thoſe of alliance and affinity; when he had begun "a war againſt yourſelves, it was time for Cæſar to "reſiſt him, and thus the civil war broke out." Thus Antonius knew how to varniſh over Cæſar's ambition; he was however ſenſible, that this was too odious a ſubject to enlarge upon. "But "let us leave this matter, ſays he, Cæſar himſelf did "not glory in this, and hated the neceſſity which had "obliged him to undertake ſuch a war." He then expatiates on Cæſar's clemency, for having pardoned all thoſe, who had born arms againſt him. He comes afterwards to the honours conferred upon Cæſar by the Senate's decree; and adds, the people themſelves had given him the glorious title of *Father of their Country*. But being ſenſible that all this would not make a very ſtrong impreſſion upon his hearers, who did but too well know by what motive Cæſar had acted, he makes at laſt a tragical deſcription of his death, being perſuaded that this would engage the unthinking multitude. "This Father of his Country, "ſays he, this High-Prieſt, this Sacred Perſon, this "Hero, this God has ſuffer'd death! He died, alas, "not decayed by ſickneſs, or old age; not by wounds "received in battle; not by any ſudden accident; "but here, within the walls of the city, this man "has been betrayed, who could ſafely conduct our "armies into Britain: he has been treacherouſly killed, "in this very city, which he had inlarged; in the "Senate Houſe, when he himſelf had built another "for the Fathers; this famous warrior has been killed "unarm'd; he, who had often been a Judge, has "been murthered before the Judges Tribunal, by "Magiſtrates, when he himſelf was a Magiſtrate; "by his own citizens, tho' when he happen'd to fall "into the ſea, none of his enemies dared to attack him. "What availed thee, O Cæſar, thy clemency, thy "ſacred power, and the wholeſome laws thou haſt "made? Unhappy man! the dogs are polluted by "thy blood; and here, here is thy tainted garment, "which ſeems to have been made only, that thou "ſhouldſt be murthered in it." It is not difficult to gueſs how ſuch a diſcourſe muſt have affected the wavering multitude, which eaſily paſſes from the utmoſt indignation and hatred, to the greateſt pity and compaſſion.

(20) Ibid. p. 292, &c.

to have the greateſt power, becauſe he was ſtill Conſul; but Octavius had the favour of the people, partly becauſe he had promiſed to perform Cæſar's will, and partly becauſe the people were offended at Octavius's unbounded power, and bore it very impatiently, whereas they thought it was prudently done to aſſiſt the weaker againſt the ſtronger; for they loved neither of them, but intended to deſtroy Antonius by the means of Octavius, being in hopes that it would afterwards be eaſy to cruſh him alſo (*y*). It is not ſurpriſing therefore if a civil war ſoon broke out between Octavius and Antonius. The latter left Rome and went into Gaul (*z*) with as many troops as he could aſſemble; whereupon the Senate met, and Cicero ſpoke in the ſtrongeſt manner againſt Antonius, who was very wittily defended by Q. Fufius Calenus [*K*]. Theſe debates having laſted a long time, the Senate could not come to any reſolution that day, but on the next, Octavius's faction prevailing, the Senate decreed, among other things, that Embaſſadors ſhould be ſent to Antonius, commanding him to leave Gaul, to diſband his army, and to retire into Macedonia. Antonius anſwered, that he was ready to comply with the Senate's requeſt, provided his ſoldiers received the ſame gift, that was allowed to thoſe of Octavius, and Caſſius and Brutus were made Conſuls [*L*]. The Senate, far from accepting theſe conditions, declared Antonius an enemy of his country (*aa*). Thus, according to Dion Caſſius, the Senators themſelves became the occaſion of the war, as we ſhall ſhew in a remark [*M*]. Antonius had been in hopes that D. Brutus would yield to him the Province of Gaul, but finding himſelf diſappointed, he undertook the ſiege of Mutina (*bb*), whither D. Brutus was retired. Octavius being apprehenſive leſt Antonius ſhould make himſelf maſter of that city,

(*y*) Dion. lib. 45. p. 312, 313.

(*z*) He did not paſs the Alps, but ſtaid in that part of Italy, which was called *Gallia Cis-Alpina*.

(*aa*) Dion. ibid. p. 317—357.

(*bb*) A city in Gallia Cis-Alpina, now called Modena.

[*K*] *Antonius was wittily defended by Q. Fufius Calenus.*] This advocate begins the defence of his client, with obſerving, that if Antonius had committed any crime, the Senate being then aſſembled only that every one might give his opinion, and not to harangue; this was not a proper time to accuſe him, but this, ſaid he, ſhewed, that Cicero was only prompted by his malice and hatred againſt Antonius. He then enters into a bitter invective againſt the accuſer. Afterwards he comes more directly to the point in queſtion, and asks Cicero, "if Antonius had committed ſo many crimes when a Tribune of the "people, when a General of the horſe, when a Conſul, why didſt thou not accuſe him before this "time? for if thou didſt then think thoſe actions "criminal, and yet connived at them, where was "thy love for thy country? And if thou didſt not "think them criminal, why doſt thou now cavil at "them?" This reaſoning might indeed affect thoſe who do not reflect; but Cicero could eaſily have anſwer'd, that it was not ſafe then to accuſe Antonius, ſupported as he was by Cæſar: that ſuch an occaſion would then not only have been unſucceſsful with regard to the State, but even pernicious to thoſe, who ſhould have undertook it: That a true Patriot will expoſe himſelf to danger, when he may hope to ſerve his country ſucceſsfully, tho' he ſhould periſh in the attempt; but when there is no probability of ſucceſs, he muſt prudently wait for a more favourable opportunity.—Cicero had charged Antonius with having treſpaſſed againſt the laws, by keeping the dignity of General of the horſe a whole year. To which Calenus replies, that this had been decreed by the Senate, with the people's conſent; and that if the circumſtances of the State were then ſuch, that it was neceſſary to deviate a little from the common practice, this could not be objected as a crime to Antonius. But, ſaid Cicero, he has made an ill uſe of his power. "Why? He bought Pompey's eſtate. But how ma-"ny perſons are there, that buy other people's eſtates? "Why are they confiſcated? Why are they put up "by auction, if it be a crime to buy them?" He then pretends to ſhew, that Antonius was in a manner a check upon Cæſar's ambition, and hindred him from putting himſelf the crown upon his head, as he intended to do. But how does this agree with what is related above of Antonius, and what Calenus himſelf ſays, that Antonius put a crown upon Cæſar's head? Let us ſee in what manner he juſtifies this action. "When Antonius perceived, ſays he, that Cæſar "would make himſelf maſter of the Commonwealth, "he prevented him from effectuating his deſign, by "offering him that very ſame thing, which he ſo "earneſtly deſir'd. For when men have a mind to "execute a bad deſign, they are never more effectu-"ally diſſuaded from it, than when thoſe, who have "reaſon to fear it, pretend they are pleaſed with "it. For tho' theſe men in their conſcience cannot "believe that others ſpeak ſincerely, yet thinking "that their ill views are diſcovered, ſhame and fear "prevents their proſecuting them. Antonius was per-"fectly appriſed of this. Therefore he choſe a day "of publick rejoicing, that he might have more li-"berty to rally Cæſar's ambition, under pretence of "mirth and diverſion: He alſo choſe the Fo-"rum, the very place where the people's liberty "appeared in its greateſt luſtre; that this might fill "Cæſar with ſhame and confuſion. He pretended to "act by the people's command, that Cæſar might "reflect, that there was no decree, no acclamation of "the people; that therefore it was not likely, the "people would accept a King (21)." Thus Calenus pleads Antonius's cauſe; and it muſt be owned that the turn he gives to the crowning of Cæſar, has ſomething very ingenious and ſubtle in it. Antonius knew that Cæſar would gladly have received the title of King, and to diſſuade him from purſuing that deſign he crowns him publickly, and by this action diſcovers to him the ſenſe of the people, which he durſt not openly declare. But how does it appear, that theſe were Antonius's views? Is it not more reaſonable to think, either that he had a mind to try what the people would ſay or do; or that being himſelf very ambitious, and deſirous to ſucceed Cæſar, he was reſolved to render him odious to the people, in caſe he had accepted the Crown?

(21) Ibid. pag. 235, &c.

[*L*] *That Caſſius and Brutus were made Conſuls.*] He had two things in view, when he made this demand; firſt to ingratiate himſelf, with theſe two aſſerters of the publick liberty, and prevent their joining with Octavius. Secondly, to render Octavius himſelf odious to the people; for he knew very well, that he would not make thoſe Conſuls who had kill'd his father (22), (for thus Octavius called Cæſar, by whom he had been adopted.) Now this would give Antonius a ſpecious pretence, to repreſent Octavius as a man, who aimed at the ſovereign power, and was reſolved to enſlave his country, ſince he refuſed to admit thoſe to the higheſt poſts in the Commonwealth, who had delivered it from ſlavery.

(22) Ibid. p. 354.

[*M*] *The Senators themſelves became the occaſion of the war.*] They ought, ſays Dion Caſſius (23), to have placed at the head of the Commonwealth a man, who had well deſerved of the publick, and to have ſupported him with all their power. Inſtead of that they armed ſome men to oppreſs others; and afterwards intended to oppreſs the former alſo; by which conduct none were their friends, and they made them all their enemies: for men eaſily forget the good offices, but never the injuries they receive. They think it a diſgrace if they ſhould acknowledge that they want the ſupport of others; and as to injuries, they look upon it as a weakneſs not to revenge themſelves. This was the reaſon, why the Roman Senate, favouring at one time one perſon, then another, ſupporting a man, and then declaring him an enemy of the State, was expoſed to ſo many misfortunes, which they might have avoided, had they been

(23) Ibid. p. 156.

city, came with the Conſul A. Hirtius to force Antonius to raiſe the ſiege. Antonius finding it would be very difficult for him to take Mutina, left his brother L. Antonius before the city, and march'd directly againſt Octavius. During ſome days there happen'd only ſome ſkirmiſhes between them, in which neither could boaſt of having any great advantage over the other; but at laſt Octavius's German cavalry turning againſt him, Antonius gained a complete victory; and hearing that C. Panſa the other Conſul was coming againſt him, he reſolved to prevent him, and ſetting out in the night he ſurprized him near Bologna, wounded him, killed ſome of his ſoldiers, and obliged the reſt to retire within the walls of the city. But this happineſs did not laſt long, for he was ſoon after vanquiſhed in his turn, tho' both the Conſuls who fought againſt him, periſhed on that occaſion (*cc*). Antonius fled in great confuſion, wanting even the neceſſaries of life; and that man, who not long before wallowed in riches, and abounded in every thing that was luxurious and delicate, was now obliged to content himſelf with wild roots and weeds for his ſuſtenance, and had for his drink nothing but muddy water. Theſe hardſhips he ſuffered with great courage and conſtancy of mind; his only hopes were now in Lepidus, whom he had always reckoned among his friends, having been very ſerviceable to him in the time of Cæſar. He reſolved therefore to go to the army which Lepidus commanded, and gathering together the few troops he had left, he went and pitched his camp near that of Lepidus; but finding that he was not ſo kindly received as he expected, he reſolved to run all hazards, and advancing near Lepidus's camp, dreſſed in a mourning habit, and ſhewing all poſſible marks of the utmoſt affliction, he began to harangue the ſoldiers; but Lepidus, fearing the effect of his perſuaſive eloquence, order'd the trumpets to be ſounded. But this ſerved only more and more to move the ſoldiers compaſſion for Antonius; they ſent Lælius and Clodius to him, and encouraged him to attack Lepidus's camp, promiſing him that a great many of them would aſſiſt him, and even kill Lepidus, if he deſired it. Antonius rejected this laſt propoſal, but accepted the firſt, and accordingly he went to Lepidus's camp, was received by the ſoldiers, and in a moment became maſter of the whole army. Though he had reaſons to complain of Lepidus, yet he did not ſhew him any reſentment, but called him his father [*N*], and left him the honour and title of General, though he had himſelf all the power and authority. By this unexpected ſucceſs he alſo gained the favour of Plancus, who was not far off with a powerful army, and declared for Antonius, who, having left ſix legions under the command of Varius in Gaul, marched directly into Italy with ſeventeen entire legions and ten thouſand horſe. This ſudden change of Antonius's fortune obliged Octavius to enter into a confederacy with him and Lepidus [*O*] (*dd*); and thus the famous Triumvirate was formed [*P*]. The conditions of it were terrible, and are a dreadful inſtance of the many crimes into which an unbounded ambition will draw thoſe that are entirely ſwayed by it. Octavius conſented to the murther of Cicero, to whom he was obliged in the ſtrongeſt manner, and owed all his power. Antonius gave up Lucius Cæſar his uncle to Octavius, and Lepidus did not ſcruple to ſacrifice Paulus his own brother. It is true neither L. Cæſar, nor

(*cc*) Dion, l. 46. p. 357—560.

(*dd*) Plutarch. *ubi ſupra*, pag. 923, 924.

been conſtant to the intereſt of one perſon only. This is a very juſt reflection, but the queſtion is, whether it was in the power of the Roman Senate to act in that manner; for it is certain, they were obliged to yield to thoſe who had the army on their ſide, and were not at liberty to promote the true intereſt of the Commonwealth.

[*N*] *Called him his father.*] Antonius had already before this time experienced how much he ſtood in need of Lepidus's favour and ſupport. For not long after Cæſar's death, when Antonius himſelf was maſter of Rome, he dreaded Lepidus's power; and to engage him in his intereſt, he married his daughter to Lepidus's ſon, and procured to Lepidus himſelf the poſt of High-Prieſt; and the better to compaſs that deſign, he deprived the people of the power they had of making High-Prieſts, and lodged it in the college of the Prieſts themſelves, and by them had Lepidus inſtalled in his office, in which inſtallation he neglected moſt of the ceremonies, which were anciently obſerved (24).

(24) Dion, lib. 45. p. 305.

[*O*] *The ſudden change of Antonius's fortune obliged Octavius to enter into a confederacy with him and with Lepidus.*] This is what Plutarch intimates; but Dion Caſſius relates this affair in a very different manner. He tells us (25), that Antonius after his defeat went to Lepidus, who not only refuſed to have any converſation with him, but wrote a letter to the Senate filled with accuſations againſt Antonius; that though indeed he did not endeavour to drive him away, yet he did not entertain him; and if he permitted him to incamp in his neighbourhood, and to converſe with his ſoldiers, yet he did not ſpeak to him himſelf, till hearing that Octavius had made an agreement with him he reſolved to enter into the ſame confederacy with both. But Velleius Paterculus agrees perfectly with Plutarch in this particular, and adds, that Juventius Laterenſis, a man whoſe death anſwered to the manner in which he had lived, earneſtly entreated Lepidus not to join himſelf with Antonius, who had been declared an enemy of the Commonwealth; but that not being able to perſuade Lepidus, he drew his ſword, and killed himſelf (26). He ſays afterwards (27), that Lepidus was alſo declared an enemy of the Commonwealth; which intimates that he was united with Antonius, before Octavius came to any agreement with him.

(25) Lib. 46. p. 368, 369.

(26) Vell. Paterc. lib. 2. cap. 63.

(27) Ibid. cap. 64.

[*P*] *Thus the famous Triumvirate was formed.*] Dion Caſſius gives us a very particular and exact account of it. Antonius and Lepidus having made an agreement by letters with Octavius, whilſt he was at Rome, and they ſtill in Gaul, they ſet out for Italy, with the beſt part of their army; for they did not much truſt in Octavius's faith, and were not willing to owe their ſecurity to his kindneſs, but rather to their own ſtrength. They alſo hoped, that Octavius and the Romans being awed by their army, would accept all the conditions, they ſhould propoſe. Octavius met them near Bologna, as well attended as they were, for he no more truſted them, than they did him. But none of them had occaſion to employ their ſoldiers; for tho' they hated one another mortally, yet having almoſt the ſame number of troops, and being reſolved to make uſe of one another to revenge themſelves of their reſpective enemies, they concluded a feigned peace between them three. For that purpoſe, they went upon an iſland ſituated in the river which flows near Bologna, attended each with an equal number of ſoldiers, whom they left at a diſtance, and coming up to one another, before they entered into

nor Lepidus's brother were murthered, no body daring to touch them, becauſe they were ſo nearly related to the Triumvirs; but this does not excuſe thoſe who had conſented to their death. Their cruelty went ſo far, that Rome became the theatre of the moſt horrid cruelties imaginable, and there was no end to the proſcriptions. Antonius was charged with moſt of the murthers that were committed at that time: but, ſays the Abbot de S. Real (*ee*), Fulvia his wife was rather to be accuſed of them than he, for, prompted by avarice, cruelty, or revenge, ſhe committed a thouſand enormities, of which her huſband was accuſed, though he often was ignorant of them; inſomuch, that once his ſoldiers having brought him the head of a man, who was one of thoſe that had been proſcribed, and whom they had killed, as they thought, by his orders, *alas! poor man*, ſaid he, *I did not know him, nor did I ever ſee him.* When the Triumvirs found their power ſufficiently ſettled at Rome, they reſolved to cruſh the party of Brutus and Caſſius, which ſtill ſubſiſted, and daily increaſed. Octavius and Antonius went into Macedonia, and there they ſoon came to a battle near the city called Philippi. Octavius commanded that part of the army which fought againſt the wing in which Brutus was, and Antonius engaged againſt Caſſius. Brutus routed Octavius's army, took his camp, and purſued him ſo cloſely, that he narrowly eſcaped being taken. But Antonius got a complete victory over Caſſius, who thinking Brutus had alſo been vanquiſhed, ordered his ſlave to kill him. Plutarch adds (*ff*), that ſome affirm'd Antonius was not preſent during the battle, but only came when his army was purſuing the enemy; but other authors aſcribe the honour of the victory to his conduct and courage. A few days after this battle Brutus reſolved to try his fortune again; he engaged againſt Antonius, who gained a complete victory over him, and had alone the glory of it; for Octavius being then ſick, could not be preſent in the engagement. Brutus deſpairing now of ever reſtoring the publick liberty, killed himſelf [2]. Thus ended the party of Brutus and Caſſius, the remains of Pompey's faction. But this did not reſtore the publick tranquillity, nor was the civil war by this means ſuppreſſed. The Sovereign Power does not admit of any partnerſhip. The Triumvirs were too ambitious, and hated one another too much to be long united. After the battle of Philippi, Antonius went into Aſia, in order to raiſe money for his ſoldiers, to whom he had promiſed very large ſums. During his abſence Fulvia his wife quarrelled with Octavius, Fulvia pretending that the lands which had been granted to Antonius's veteran ſoldiers had not been given to them; and Octavius complaining that Fulvia and Lucius Antonius detained the legions that were to be yielded to him (*gg*). But the real cauſe of this war was, that Octavius had deſpiſed her addreſſes to him (*hh*). However this war did not laſt long; Fulvia and L. Antonius were obliged to leave Italy. Antonius was at that time in Aſia, where he indulged himſelf in all the luxury and pleaſures, which the country afforded in abundance, whilſt Octavius was fighting againſt Fulvia's party. Antonius had the moſt ſplendid court that ever was ſeen [*R*]. The Kings and Princes of Aſia, the Ambaſſadors of the nations allied or tributary to the Romans, came to his levee, and acknowledged no other Sovereign but him in the Eaſt. Queens and Princeſſes ſtrove who ſhould win his heart, and

(*ee*) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 416. Dion, lib. 47. p. 378.

(*ff*) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 925.

(*gg*) Dion, lib. 48. p. 410.

(*hh*) See the article FULVIA.

any diſcourſe; they ſhook one another's cloaths, for fear there ſhould be ſome dagger hid among them; ſo ſtrong were their mutual diſtruſt and ſuſpicion. Then they enter'd upon the ſubject, for which they met. They agreed, that they ſhould all three have the government of the State, not during life, but for five years only; that they ſhould manage every thing according to their own will and pleaſure, that they ſhould have the power to confer all places and honours on whom they pleaſed, without being obliged to wait for the conſent of the Senate or the People: That Octavius ſhould have the government of Africa, Sardinia, and Sicily; Lepidus that of Spain, and *Gallia Narbonenſis*; and Antonius all the reſt of Gaul; that is, Gallia *Cis-Alpina*, and *Trans-Alpina*, (part of Italy and France;) Laſtly, they conſented to put their reſpective enemies to death. When this agreement was made, the ſoldiers of Antonius, probably at his inſtigation, demanded that Octavius, tho' he had already a wife, ſhould yet marry the daughter of Fulvia, Antonius's wife, whom ſhe had by Clodius her firſt husband; to which Octavius conſented, being perſuaded, that this would be no obſtacle to the deſign, he had already formed againſt Antonius; for he had before him the example of Julius Cæſar, who did not ſcruple to make war againſt Pompey, notwithſtanding the latter had married his daughter. Before this meeting, when Antonius endeavoured by letters to draw Octavius to his ſide, he uſed to repreſent to him how much he was hated by the party of Pompey, which was ſtill ſubſiſting, notwithſtanding Pompey's death. He made him conſider how ſtrong that party was grown, and how Brutus and Caſſius were ſupported by Cicero's zeal and intereſt; and threatned him that if he refuſed to agree with him, he would join his troops with thoſe of Brutus and Caſſius, who commanded already ſeventeen legions. Laſtly, to raiſe Octavius's emulation, he added theſe words, *You are more obliged to revenge the death of a Father, than I that of a Friend only* (28).

(28) Vell. Paterc. *ubi ſupra*, cap. 65.

[2] *Brutus killed himſelf.*] As ſoon as Antonius heard it he went to the place where Brutus lay, and gently reproached him with the death of C. Antonius his brother, who was put to death by Brutus's order, to revenge the murther of Cicero. However, Antonius acknowledged, that Hortenſius rather than Brutus was to be charg'd with his brother's death; and therefore order'd Hortenſius to be killed upon Brutus's tomb: and ſeeing that the corps of this great man had been ſtripped quite naked by the ſoldiers, he threw his own rich coat of armour over it, and appointed a ſtately funeral for it (29). The Abbot of S. Real adds, that Antonius had ſome obligation to Brutus, who ſaved his life, when the other conſpirators were of opinion that he ſhould be killed with Cæſar. This indeed is true; but when Brutus oppoſed the killing of Antonius, it was not out of any kindneſs or eſteem for him, but only out of a view to his own glory, that the publick might not think it was the love of power, and not the deſire of reſtoring the liberty of Rome, that prompted him to kill the tyrant (30).

(29) Plutarch. *ubi ſupra*, pag. 225.

(30) Dion, l. 44. p. 282.

[*R*] *The moſt ſplendid court that ever was ſeen.*] We ſhall tranſlate here the deſcription, which the Abbot de S. Real gives of it, with ſome remarks on his reflections. "There, ſays he (31), we ſee "Antonius paſs his ſentence without appeal and in "a ſovereign manner, concerning the ſtates and the "lives of Kings. He depoſes ſome, eſtabliſhes others, "and no perſon on earth dares to controul him; "even the Senate, to preſerve a ſhadow of authority, "confirms

(31) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 412, &c.

and by the moſt coſtly preſents endeavoured to get a favourable look from him; but the famous Cleopatra had at laſt the honour to inſpire him with the moſt violent paſſion. The occaſion of his ſeeing her was this. Antonius preparing himſelf to make war againſt the Parthians, ſent orders to Cleopatra to meet him in Cicilia, in order to give an account of her conduct, for ſhe was accuſed of having aſſiſted Caſſius againſt him. Cleopatra obeyed [S], and when ſhe arrived, Antonius ſent her word to come and meet him; but ſhe anſwered, that it was more proper for him to come to her. He complied with her requeſt, being willing to ſhew her ſome civility and kindneſs. As ſoon as he ſaw her, it was not in his power to reſiſt her charms; ſhe entertained him in the moſt magnificent manner, and he in his turn endeavoured to ſurpaſs her in ſplendor (*ii*). What Hiſtorians relate of their profuſion is ſcarce credible. Who would not be aſtoniſhed at their extravagance, when Cleopatra diſſolved a pearl of an immenſe bigneſs and an exorbitant price, having laid a wager with Antonius, which of them ſhould give the other the moſt coſtly entertainment? And who would not wonder at Antonius's folly, who made a preſent of a city to his cook, becauſe he had dreſſed a diſh to his liking (*kk*). Plutarch relates another inſtance, which ſhews ſtill more how laviſh Antonius was of his treaſures [T]. Whilſt Antonius was indulging his paſſion with his dear Cleopatra, the war which Fulvia his wife had began againſt Octavius ſtill went on, though ſhe had been obliged to retire out of Italy. Antonius hearing this was awaked out of his lethargy; he went into Greece, where he met his mother and his wife, and finding Octavius was become publickly his enemy, he entered into a confederacy with Sextus Pompeius (*ll*), who was ſtill maſter of Sicily. He then went into Italy, in order to fight Octavius, who was then in Gaul; and hearing of Antonius's arrival haſtened to him. Servilius one of Octavius's Generals had at firſt ſome advantage over Antonius, having ſlain in a battle a great number of his ſoldiers. But Fulvia, who had been the author and promoter of this war, dying about this time, Octavius and Antonius, whoſe forces were almoſt equal, ſoon came to an agreement. Octavius had for his ſhare Sardinia, Dalmatia, Spain and Gaul; and Antonius had all the Provinces ſituated beyond the Ionian Sea. One of the conditions of this new peace was, that Antonius and Octavius ſhould together attack Pompey, though the former had but lately made an alliance with him, and promiſed upon oath that he would aſſiſt

(*ii*) Plutarch, *ubi ſupra*, p. 928.

(*kk*) S. Real, *ubi ſupra*, p. 420.

(*ll*) The ſon of Pompey the Great.

" confirms thoſe Kings, whom he is pleaſed to eſta-
" bliſh; ſuch as Darius in Pontus, Pharnaces in Idu-
" mea, Herod in Judea, Amyntas in Piſidia, Polemon
" in Cilicia &c. Antonius commanded Antigonus,
" King of the Jews, to be publickly beheaded; a
" puniſhment unheard of before with regard to Kings,
" but which is a glaring inſtance of that exorbitant
" power, which Antonius exerciſed. How ſplendid
" does that court appear to me! With how much
" majeſty was he always ſurrounded. Above all, I
" am delighted when I think that the antichamber of
" Marcus Antonius, a citizen of Rome, was conſtanly
" filled with a multitude of Kings and Sovereigns,
" who wait for the moment in which they may ad-
" dreſs and make their court to him. We may ſafe-
" ly ſay, that the moſt exalted notion we can form of
" his grandeur, is ſtill far remote from the truth.
" Julius Cæſar himſelf, who was the only Sovereign,
" did never enjoy the ſupreme power in ſuch a de-
" gree of perfection; and Octavius who govern'd in
" the weſt with the ſame power, was neither ſo ab-
" ſolute at Rome, becauſe he was obliged to have
" ſome regard for the Senate and for the people;
" nor lived in ſo ſplendid a manner, being un-
" der a neceſſity to ſpare the treaſury in a city,
" where the people were uſed ſeverely to cenſure
" thoſe who embezzled the publick money, tho' they
" were never ſo powerful. Whereas Antonius com-
" manded a large army in one of the richeſt coun-
" tries of the world, and which had long been uſed
" to ſlavery, and to ſuffer oppreſſions from their
" governors. What added ſtill more luſtre to Antonius's
" glory was, that his Lieutenants fought every where
" under him with a conſtant ſucceſs." Thus far that ingenious author. And it muſt be owned that he has much reaſon to be pleaſed with the glory that ſurrounded Antonius, if true glory conſiſts only in a boundleſs power, attended with all the outward pomp and magnificence, which ſtrikes and awes an unthinking multitude: Thus the greateſt tyrant may arrive at the greateſt glory. But if true glory conſiſts in doing good to mankind, in maintaining and reſtoring public peace and liberty, we muſt confeſs, that Antonius would have acted in a much more glorious manner, if he had employed his wealth and power to reſtore his native country to its ancient liberty. But ſome men born under a deſpotic authority have no notion of liberty, and conſequently of true glory; and this was the caſe of the Abbot of S. Real.

[S] *Cleopatra obeyed.*] As ſoon as Dellius, whom Antonius had ſent to her, ſaw her, and heard her talk, he concluded from her beauty, and from her artful diſcourſes, that it would be impoſſible for Antonius to condemn her; but that ſhe would ſoon have an entire influence over him. He therefore began to make his court to her, and adviſed her to adorn herſelf in the moſt elegant and beautiful manner, aſſuring her, that ſhe had nothing to apprehend from Antonius, who was, ſaid he, the moſt tender and good natur'd man in the world. Cleopatra knowing by experience, how powerful her charms had been, when though a girl, ſhe made Cæſar and Pompey her ſlaves, was perſuaded that being now much better skilled in the art of managing men, it would be an eaſy matter for her, to gain Antonius's heart. She took with her the moſt ſplendid ornaments, and the richeſt preſents, and went to meet the Triumvir. She embarked in a galley adorned with purple ſails, and ſilver oars; the ſtern covered with gold brocade; her maidens dreſſed like Cupids, herſelf lying in a golden bed, in the manner in which Venus aſleep is painted. All this was attended with Symphony, which, the weather being calm, was eaſily heard; whilſt the moſt fragrant perfumes ſpread a delicious fragrance on the ſhore. All the people ran to ſee that glorious ſight, and Antonius was left alone on his tribunal, where he was ſeated to determine the cauſes of Kings and Princes. The whole army raviſhed with admiration, cried out, that Venus was come to meet Bacchus, and Antonius was not diſpleaſed with the compariſon (32).

[T] *Another inſtance which ſhews how laviſh Antonius was of his treaſures.*] Plutarch tells us (33), that a certain Phyſician, called Philotas, being at Alexandria on his ſtudies, made an acquaintance with one of Antonius's cooks, and deſired to ſee the preparations that were making for one meal only. Being admitted into the kitchen, he ſaw among a variety of other things, eight entire wild boars, which were on the ſpit; which made him wonder at the vaſt number of perſons Antonius muſt have invited. At this the Cook ſmiled and ſaid, he expected only about a dozen gueſts; but that Antonius would be ſerved at a moment's warning; and ſometimes delayed his ſupper, and ſometimes haſtened it; ſo that the Cook muſt have a ſupper ready for almoſt every hour in the day.

(32) Plutarch, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 926, 927.

(33) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 928.

assist him against Octavius; but his unbounded ambition did not permit him to be true to the most sacred engagements. Antonius then married Octavia, Octavius's sister, as a pledge of the friendship that was now renewed between them [*U*]. Antonius returned soon after to his beloved Cleopatra, and again lived with her at Alexandria, where he indulged himself in the same luxury and pleasures as he had done before. This was shewing the utmost contempt for the wife he had but lately married, and even for Octavius himself, who took hold of this pretence to inveigh bitterly against Antonius, and to begin the war again. Octavia knowing the danger in which her husband was, resolved to go and meet him; she embark'd for Alexandria, but Antonius commanded her to wait for him at Athens, where he went to her. She did all that lay in her power to reclaim him [*W*], but to no purpose; the pleasures of Egypt had a greater influence over his corrupted heart, than all the reasons and tender entreaties of his loving wife. He sent her back to Rome, and was determined, at all events, to stay with his royal mistress (*mm*), and thus the war between him and Octavius became unavoidable. They did not want a shew of reason to cast the odium of the war upon one another, but it must be owned, that Antonius's behaviour gave Octavius a fair pretence to attack him [*X*]. Before they came to a decisive engagement, several things passed among the people, in the Senate, and between the contending parties, which it would be too long to mention particularly. At last they engaged in a fight at Actium, in which Antonius, if he had not been blinded by his passion, would have found, that all Cleopatra's pretended fondness and love for him was nothing but craft and policy. That Princess had fitted out a fleet of sixty ships to assist Antonius, as he thought, but when his ships were engaged in battle against those of Octavius, all of a sudden Cleopatra's ships advanced between the two fleets, and sailed away towards the Peloponnesus. Antonius surprized at this, and thinking this happened contrary to Cleopatra's intention, left his fleet, and pursued the ship which carried Cleopatra with as much speed, as though it had been that of Octavius himself. By his flight he gave Octavius an opportunity to gain a complete victory. When Cleopatra knew Antonius was coming after her, she gave orders that he should be received in her ship, and so he was accordingly, but for some days they did not see one another; at last by the intercession of Cleopatra's women, Antonius consented to speak to her, then to dine with her, and at last to enter into the same familiarity as before (*nn*). They went together to Alexandria. Antonius, ashamed of his last defeat, resolved to try his fortune again; he and Cleopatra made great warlike preparations, as though they intended to attack Octavius by sea and land. But in the mean time they took such measures, that if they were vanquished, they might take a refuge in Spain; and to amuse Octavius, they sent Embassadors to him to propose articles of peace, but at the same time to bribe his army if possible.

(*mm*) Plutarch, *ubi supra*, p. 940. Dion, lib. 49. p. 470.

(*nn*) Plutarch, *ubi supra*, pag. 946. Dion, lib. 50. p. 503, &c.

[*U*] *A pledge of the friendship that was now renewed between them.*] This was at least what the Romans hoped; they thought that a woman, adorned with so many perfections as Octavia was, would at last settle Antonius's inconstant mind, and thus remove all causes of division between him and Octavius. But those, who were more clear sighted, were persuaded, that Antonius would still continue to lead the same life as he had begun, and that the most delicate pleasures, would soon cloy a man of his temper, as soon as they became lawful and necessary. And tho' he had lived at Rome in the most strict union with his wife, yet Octavius and he would never have wanted pretences to renew their disputes; since the Empire of the universe could not satisfy the ambition of two men, who governed it together. It was necessary that one of them should yield to the other; and indeed their union lasted only till Octavius had taken proper measures to renew the war (34).

(34) S. Real, *ubi supra*, pag. 427, 428.

[*W*] *She did all that lay in her power to reclaim him.*] She represented to him, in the most tender and affectionate terms, his own interest, that of his children, and of the whole Empire. She described to him the formidable power of Octavius, who only wanted a fair pretence to declare openly against him, and who employed all sorts of artifice to alienate from him the hearts of his old friends. She earnestly entreated him for his own sake to leave Cleopatra, that his enemies might no more have this pretence, to inveigh against him. All this was said, with such a gentle and charming air, that Antonius began to be moved. He was not so blind but he could see his own faults, and knew the dangers to which he exposed himself; but he followed his unhappy fate, and the tender entreaties of the most faithful and beautiful wife, were not powerful enough to make him avoid the abyss into which he was running headlong. Octavia's arrival made a terrible impression upon Cleopatra. She had heard her commended as the most accomplished woman in the Empire; she feared her beauty, and the reasons of her voyage, which were very strong, and likely to prevail upon Antonius; When she was told, that this dangerous rival had had a private conference with Antonius, she spoke as a mad person, and in the violence of her passion, either real or feigned, she offered to kill herself. And when she saw Antonius wavering and in suspence, the different parts she acted are inconceivable; she dispersed immense sums of money, either in making presents to Antonius's friends, and to those who had some influence over him, or to spies, that they might endeavour to discover his real sentiments, and most secret transactions, and acquaint her with them (35). She was served according to her wishes; and Antonius resolved to stay with her.

(35) Idem, ibid. p. 429, 430.

[*X*] *They did not want a shew of reason to cast the odium of the war upon one another, but Antonius's behaviour gave Octavius a fair pretence to attack him.*] Antonius said, that Octavius had deprived Lepidus of the Magistracy, and had kept for himself alone the Provinces and Armies, which had belonged to Lepidus, of which Antonius pretended he should have his share. Octavius on the contrary complained, that Antonius kept to himself the government of Egypt, tho' he had not obtained it by lot, as was the custom; that he had killed Sextus Pompeius; that he had taken King Artavasdes by treachery, and put him in chains to the great dishonour of the Roman name; that he had bestowed great Kingdoms on Cleopatra, and on the children whom he had by her. But what most exasperated the people against Antonius, was the will he had made, which falling into the hands of Octavius, he read it publickly, to render his enemy more odious. By his will he made exorbitant gifts to the children whom he had by Cleopatra; and order'd that after his death, his corps should be buried at Alexandria with that of Cleopatra. This raised the people's indignation to a terrible height, and made them believe whatever was said against Antonius, and especially, that if he were victorious, he would give Rome to Cleopatra, and transfer the Empire into Egypt (36).

(36) Dion, lib. 50, p. 479, 481.

poſſible. Whilſt they ſeemed to act thus in concert, Cleopatra, without Antonius's knowledge, ſent Octavius a preſent of a golden ſcepter and crown, and royal chair, thereby intimating that ſhe preſented him with the Kingdom; this ſhe did out of policy, that if Octavius would not be reconciled to Antonius, he might at leaſt treat her in a gentle manner. Octavius having received thoſe preſents ſent no anſwer to Antonius, and publickly threatened Cleopatra, and commanded her to lay down her arms, and to leave her Kingdom; but he let her know ſecretly that he would pardon her, and leave her her Kingdom, if ſhe would put Antonius to death [Y]. Cleopatra did not ſtay long before ſhe reſolved to betray again her too fond and blind lover. She delivered up Peluſium to Octavius, though it ſeemed as if he took it by force. Antonius hearing that his enemy was maſter of Peluſium, reſolved to meet him whilſt he was marching towards Alexandria. Accordingly he fell upon his cavalry, which being tired was ſoon vanquiſhed: this raiſed his hopes again, he attacked Octavius with his infantry, and was routed in his turn; thereupon he haſtened to his fleet, either to run the riſque of a ſea fight, or to retire into Spain. But Cleopatra hearing this obliged the fleet to retire before Antonius arrived, and went herſelf into a ſepulchre (*oo*), as though ſhe had been afraid to fall into Octavius's hands; but her real intention was to entice Antonius to come into the ſame place, that ſo he might be eaſily taken by Octavius's army. Antonius, though he ſuſpected the treaſon, yet his love was ſtill ſo great that he could not be perſuaded, and almoſt pitied Cleopatra's condition more than his own. This obliged Cleopatra to make Antonius believe ſhe was dead; ſhe ſent one of her attendants to tell him ſhe had killed herſelf, being perſuaded that this would engage him to do the ſame. She was not diſappointed in her expectation; for as ſoon as Antonius heard ſhe was dead, he deſired one of his ſlaves, whoſe name was Eros, to kill him [Z], as he had promiſed to do, if ever Antonius's affairs were in a deſperate condition. Eros drawing his ſword killed himſelf inſtead of his maſter, who thereupon took up the ſword and run it through his body. The wound did not kill him upon the ſpot, but left him time enough to hear that Cleopatra was ſtill living; whereupon, though he had loſt a great deal of blood, yet he would be carried to the place where Cleopatra was; and as he could not get by the door, which was made in ſuch a manner, that being once ſhut it could not be opened again, he was lifted up to the top by the ſame ropes, by which the workmen uſed to draw the ſtones that ſerv'd for this building, which was ſtill open at the top, being not yet finiſhed. Cleopatra herſelf helped with two of her attendants to draw Antonius up, and took him in [*AA*], and in a few moments he died in her arms (*pp*). Thus ended that famous man, of whom it is ſaid, that it was not eaſy to determine, whether his good or his bad qualities rendered him more conſpicuous (*qq*). The Abbot of S. Real ſeems to have undertaken his defence; but with how much reaſon or truth will eaſily be determined by thoſe, who examine carefully the whole courſe of his life. However, we ſhall conſider in a remark a particular paſſage of that celebrated writer [*BB*].

(oo) The ſepulchres in Egypt were very large buildings; as for inſtance, the Pyramids.

(pp) Dion, lib. 50. p. 511—515. Plutarch, *ubi ſupra*, p. 950, 951.

(qq) S. Real, *ubi ſupra*, p. 414.

ANTONIUS

[Y] *He promiſed to leave her her Kingdom if ſhe would put Antonius to death.*] He did more ſtill, for Antonius and Cleopatra having ſent him ambaſſadors a ſecond and a third time, he ſent at laſt one of his freedmen to Cleopatra, who ſpoke to her in his name very graciouſly, and even inſinuated to her, that he was in love with her; hoping that this would prevail upon a woman, who wanted to be beloved by all men. Nor was he diſappointed in his hopes (37), as will appear by the text of this article.

(37) Idem, lib. 51. p. 513.

[Z] *He deſired one of his ſlaves to kill him.*] "It "is now time, ſaid he, my dear Eros, for you to "perform the promiſe, you made me formerly; I "expect from your faithful hand a happy ſtroke, which "will put an end to this life, and to the torments "I endure." And ſeeing, that Eros had killed himſelf. "Is it poſſible, cried Antonius, that I ſhould "ſtill learn what is my duty, from a woman (38), "and from a ſlave (39).

(38) Cleopatra, whom he thought had killed herſelf.

(39) S. Real, *ubi ſupra*, p. 436.

[*AA*] *Cleopatra took him in.*] As ſoon ſhe ſaw him, ſhe could not forbear ſhedding tears; "Don't cry, "Madam, ſaid Antonius; my life has not been ſuch, "that I ought to bluſh, for any thing I have done. I "dye, having been the firſt of the Romans; I have "been vanquiſhed, becauſe I have been faithful in the "love I had for you. I have been vanquiſhed, I thank "the Gods, it is a Roman who vanquiſhed me; no "baſe action can be imputed to me, and there is no-"thing in my defeat that can diſgrace me. I die "loaded with honours, triumphs, and victories, in "the arms of the moſt accompliſhed Princeſs in the "world, the only perſon I adore (40)." Thus he gloried in that very thing which had been the cauſe of his ruin: and this the Abbot de S. Real admires as a great and heroic ſentiment.

(40) Ibid. p. 437.

[*BB*] *We ſhall conſider a particular paſſage of that celebrated writer* (de S. Real)] Marcus Antonius the "Triumvir, ſays he (41), knew his firſt wife's cri-"minal converſation with Dolabella; and nevertheleſs "he always continued his particular friend." How does this agree with what Plutarch relates? He tells us (42), that when Cæſar had been made Conſul for the fifth time, he was reſolved to abdicate the Conſulſhip in favour of Dolabella, and communicated his deſign to the Senate, but that Antonius oppoſed it with the utmoſt vigour, and even ſaid a great many ill things of Dolabella. The occaſion upon which Plutarch ſays this directly contradicts the Abbot de S. Real's aſſertion; for it is immediately after he had told us, that Antonius ſuſpected Dolabella of having a criminal converſation with his wife. But that ingenious Abbot fond of paradoxes, had undertaken Antonius's defence; but there is reaſon to doubt, whether he was ſerious in it. For after having ſpoken of the murther of Cicero, he adds (43), "All the other murthers, which Antonius "committed during the whole courſe of his life, were "not owing to a cruel and ſanguinary diſpoſition; "neceſſity only prompted him to thoſe violent actions. "Such was the death of Amantias, who ſuſtained "with a few rebels the party of Marius at Rome after "the death of Cæſar. Antonius put this Amantias to "death, by the authority he had as a Conſul, in order "to gain the favour of the Senate, which he wanted in "the circumſtances he was then in." But if neceſſity, and ſuch a neceſſity as ariſes from a man's unbounded ambition, is ſufficient to excuſe the moſt cruel action, there is no tyrant, whoſe apology may not eaſily be made. When a man puts himſelf willingly in ſuch circumſtances, that he cannot ſupport himſelf but by acts of cruelty, he is juſtly accountable for them all, and neceſſity will never excuſe him before an impartial judge. And this was the caſe of Antonius, of Octavius, and of all tyrants in general.

(41) *De l'Infidelité des Femmes*; in tom. 1. p. 470.

(42) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 921.

(43) Pag. 417.

P.

ANTONIUS (CAIUS) brother to the preceding, ſerved under Julius Cæſar in the war againſt Pompey, and was obliged for want of proviſions to ſurrender himſelf to the enemy with the troops which he commanded in Illyricum (*a*). After the death of Cæſar, and while himſelf was Prætor, and Marcus Antonius his brother Conſul, he was ſent into Macedonia with the decree of the Senate, which gave the government of that Province to Marcus Antonius. But with all his care and expedition he was prevented by Brutus and taken priſoner (*b*). At firſt Brutus treated him with great reſpect, and left him the enſigns of his Prætorſhip; but when he found that Caius Antonius had attempted to draw off the army to his party, he placed him under a ſtrong guard, and afterwards put him to death, when he had heard of the proſcriptions of the Triumvirate, the murder of D. Brutus, and that of Cicero, &c. Marcus Antonius, after the battle at Philippi, having got Hortenſius into his power, ſacrificed him in revenge for his brother's death. Cicero ſpeaks ſometimes of C. Antonius in his *Philippics*, but always to his diſadvantage (*c*).

(*a*) Glandorp. *Onomaſt.* p. 80, *ex Cæſare, Lucano Pharſal.* lib. 4. *Eutropio.*

(*b*) He was taken by Hortenſius, who delivered him up to Brutus.

(*c*) Glandorp. *Onomaſt. ex* Plutarcho *in M. Antonio, &c.*

ANTONIUS (LUCIUS) brother to the preceding, had all the vices of his brother the Triumvir, without any of his virtues. However he did not want courage. He was Tribune of the People the ſame year that Cæſar died, while his brother Marcus was Conſul, and his other brother Caius Prætor. He was Conſul in the year of Rome 713, and triumphed the firſt day of his Conſulſhip on occaſion of a victory which he pretended he had gained over ſome of the inhabitants of the Alps, though he had performed nothing worthy of a triumph, and never had executed any poſt in their country. But Fulvia wife to Marcus Antonius, and mother-in-law to Octavius Cæſar, who had an abſolute power at Rome then, procured him that honour by her intereſt alone. This haughty Lady, being impatient to revenge herſelf upon Octavius, who had divorced her daughter, induced Lucius Antonius to take up arms againſt him, under pretence of protecting the inhabitants of the country, whoſe lands had been aſſigned to the ſoldiers. Having brought the troops which he had raiſed into Rome by night, he obliged Lepidus one of the Triumvirate to retire, made a ſpeech to the people, and declared to them, that he was reſolved, according to his brother's intention, to aboliſh the Triumvirate. This promiſe of his filled the whole city with joy. Upon this he was declared Imperator, and marched againſt Octavius Cæſar; but not daring to keep the field, he ſhut himſelf up in Peruſium, where he defended himſelf, till he was obliged by want of proviſions to ſurrender. Octavius afterwards gave him his liberty, but we have no further account of him from that time (*a*).

(*a*) Glandorp. *Onomaſt.* p. 81, *ex* Dione, &c.

ANTONIUS (MARCUS JULIUS) ſon to the Triumvir by Fulvia, was taken into ſuch high favour by Auguſtus, after the conqueſt of Egypt, that he was raiſed from one poſt to another, till he came to the Conſulſhip in the year of Rome 744. He married Marcella, daughter to Octavia, and by this means being ſon-in-law to the ſiſter of Auguſtus, for whom that Emperor had a prodigious regard, he gained the firſt place in his favour next to Agrippa, ſon-in-law to Auguſtus, and the ſons of the Empreſs. But he proved very ungrateful to his benefactor, for he was one of the firſt who debauched his daughter Julia, which, added to ſome ſuſpicions of his having engaged in a conſpiracy, was the occaſion of his being condemned to death. There are ſome Hiſtorians who write that he killed himſelf, to prevent the infamy of his ſentence (*a*). He had ſtudied under the Grammarian L. Craſſitius (*b*), and wrote a Poem of twelve books in heroick verſe (*c*), with ſeveral treatiſes in proſe. It is to him that Horace addreſſes the 2d Ode of his 4th Book. He left one ſon, who was then very young, named Julius Antonius. The Emperor ſent away this youth to Marſeilles, under the ſpecious pretence of his ſtudies. The funeral honours which he paid him were very extraordinary; for he procured a decree of the Senate, that his bones ſhould be placed in the tomb of Octavius (*d*). This ſeems to be the end of the antient and conſiderable family Antonia, which Tacitus obſerves was an illuſtrious one, but unfortunate, *Multa claritudine generis, ſed improſperâ* (*e*). I ſhall now give a collection of Moreri's errors concerning this family [*A*].

(*a*) Vell. Paterculus lib. 2. cap. 100.

(*b*) Sueton. *de Illuſtrib. Grammat.* cap. 18.

(*c*) Intitled *Diomedea*. *Vetus Interpres Horat.* in Od. 2. lib. 4.

(*d*) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 4. cap. 44.

(*e*) Idem, ibid. Tacitus ſays this on occaſion of the death of L. Julius Antonius, which happened in the year of Rome 778.

ANTONIA

[*A*] *I ſhall now give a collection of Moreri's errors concerning this family.*] 1. This family ſhould not have been mentioned under the letter M on occaſion of Marcus Antonius; both he and his family ought to have been placed under the letter A. 2. It is wrong to ſay, that the family of Antonia was famous among the nobility of Rome, for it is plain that ſuch a manner of expreſſion intimates, that they were diſtinct from the Plebeian families; which is falſe. The Tribuneſhip of the people, which Marcus Antonius was poſſeſſed of at the beginning of the war between Cæſar and Pompey is alone ſufficient to prove beyond contradiction, that the family Antonia was Plebeian; for he was made Tribune of the people, without having procured himſelf to be adopted by a Plebeian; he was not obliged to uſe the ſame expedient as Clodius, who wanting to be choſen Tribune of the people had recourſe to ſuch adoption (1). I confeſs that the Antonius's were at firſt Patricians: this appears from the offices of Decemviri and military Tribunes, which were conferred upon them at a time, when the Plebeian families had not obtained an admiſſion to the firſt poſts of honour in the commonwealth. But whether the Antonius's, who appeared with ſuch luſtre in the ſeventh age of Rome, were not deſcended from the ſame ſtock as thoſe, who bore the ſirname of *Merenda*; or whether they paſſed in a manner which we know nothing of, from the rank of Patricians to that of Plebeians, as it happened to ſome other families; it is certain that their family was Plebeian in the time of Marcus Antonius the orator, who firſt raiſed it. 3. It is groſs ignorance to ſay, that this family *was divided into two branches the Merenda's and the Marcus's.* The word *Marcus* is a *Prænomen.* Now *Prænomina* are only to diſtinguiſh perſons: that, which diſtinguiſhes the branches is called *cognomen*, and fills the third place, as Cæſar, Scipio, &c. (2). IV. It is not certain, that Q. Antonius Merenda, a military Tribune about the year 322 of Rome, was ſon to T. Antonius Merenda, Decemvir

(1) Cicero, *Orat. pro Domo ſuâ ad Pontific.* cap. 13.

(2) Caius Julius Cæſar, Publius Cornelius Scipio, &c.

ANTONIA, eldeſt daughter of Marcus Antonius [*A*] by Octavia (*a*), was a Lady whoſe virtue and beauty made her prodigiouſly admired (*b*). She married Druſus ſon to Livia and brother to Tiberius, by whom ſhe had ſeveral children (*c*); but there were only three who ſurvived Druſus, namely, Germanicus, Claudius, who was afterwards Emperor, and Livilla, who was wife to Tiberius's ſon. Antonia, who was left a young and beautiful widow, received the addreſſes of the greateſt perſons; but ſhe rejected them all, and was an example of *Continence* [*B*] ſo much the more glorious, as ſhe lived in a court extremely debauched. Tiberius, though he was a man of a very ſtern and cruel temper, had a great reſpect for this Lady; which ſhews, that ſhe knew how to join to her

(*a*) She was ſiſter to Auguſtus.

(*b*) Σωφροσύνη καὶ κάλλει διαφέρουσα. Plutarch. *in Anton.* p. 955, E.

(*c*) Sueton. *in Claud.* cap. 1.

cenvir in the 303. V. It is falſe that Titus Livius makes mention of M. Antonius Merenda, General of the horſe to P. Cornelius the Dictator. He calls him ſimply M. Antonius. VI. Marcus Aurelius Creticus was not killed in the battle. Aſconius Pedianus leaves no room for doubt upon this point. *Indicto Cretenſibus bello*, ſays he (3), *male re geſta ibidem periit*. That is, "Having made war upon the Cretans, and failing of "ſucceſs he died there." VII. Inſtead of ſaying that Marcus Antonius the Orator *never wrote any of his Orations*, he ſhould have ſaid that he never publiſhed any (4). VIII. His anſwer to thoſe, who aſked him the Reaſon of his conduct in that point, is miſrepreſented; for he did not reply, *that he was unwilling to furniſh arms to thoſe, who might convict him of ſpeaking badly*. He had no apprehenſion with regard to his words or phraſes; I mean, leſt he ſhould be reproached with barbariſms, or falſe grammar; and yet this is what Moreri imputes to him, as every one muſt confeſs, who can underſtand the ſenſe of an author; but Marcus Antonius was jealous of this, that ſome perſon might prove from his own writings, that he was inconſiſtent with himſelf, and had refuted four years before the pleading, which he was then upon. See the remarks [*B*] and [*C*] of the article MARCUS ANTONIUS the Orator, where I have ſpoken fully of the occaſion of Advocates contradicting themſelves, and maintaining one thing one day, and at another time the reverſe, according to the different intereſts of their Clients. IX. Beſides, Moreri puts a very abſurd anſwer into the mouth of Marcus Antonius; for one may write a pleading without furniſhing arms to the criticks, if it be but kept in one's cabinet. X. M. Aquilius was not already condemned, when Antonius *undertook his cauſe*. XI. The Judge did not confeſs, *that he, who had ſo often expoſed his life for the ſafety of the Commonwealth, ought not to have loſt it with ſo much diſhonour*. If Moreri had known, that Aquilius would have been condemned but to baniſhment at moſt (5), he would not have ſuch a rhetorical aggravation to his Style. XIII. What a confuſion there is in ſaying, that *Marcus Antonius was Conſul, Cenſor in the year* 626 *of Rome with A. Poſthumius, and in* 657 *with L. Valerius, &c.* There is worſe than confuſion in it: there are ſeveral falſities likewiſe. Marcus Antonius was Conſul with Poſthumius Albinus in 655, and Cenſor with L. Valerius Flaccus in 657 (6).

(3) Aſc. Pedian. *in Cicer. Divinat.* p. 37. edit. Lugdun. in 12°. He ſays *in Verrem de Præt. Urb.* pag. 87. *Cretæ mortuus*, that is, *he died in Crete.*

(4) See above remark [*A*] of the article ANTONIUS the Orator.

(5) *Quum mihi M. Aquilius in civitate retinendus eſſet.* It is Marcus Antonius who ſays this in the 2d book of *Cicero de Oratore*, cap. 45.

(6) Plinius, l. 8. cap. 7. Sigonius and Calvinus place this Conſulſhip in the year 634, and the Cenſorſhip two years after.

[*A*] *Eldeſt Daughter of Marcus Antonius.*] Suetonius and Plutarch contradict this aſſertion of mine: the former in expreſs terms (1); the latter after an implicit manner; for he ſays nothing with regard to this point, but only mentions the marriage of one of the two Antonia's with Domitius, before that of the other with Druſus (2). Now as Suetonius wrote after Tacitus, and he ſeems to refute him ſometimes, is it not more proper to give him the preference, and to ſuppoſe, that he took the contrary ſide of the queſtion, only becauſe he had rectified the error of Tacitus? Beſides are the words of Plutarch of no Weight? Let every one determine as he pleaſes. I have followed Tacitus, without pretending to diſpute with thoſe, who chooſe to follow Suetonius. There are two paſſages in Tacitus, one in the XLIV chapter of the IV book of his *Annals*, the other in the LXIV of his XII book of the ſame *Annals*, where the wife of Domitius is named *Minor Antonia*, i. e. *the younger Antonia*. I find that Lipſius determines neither way (3), and Glandorp prefers the Opinion of Tacitus to that of Suetonius (4). There is a reaſon in favour of Tacitus, but it is not concluſive. It may be ſaid, that Druſus, who being ſon to a powerful Empreſs was one of the higheſt Rank in Rome, had the eldeſt of the two ſiſters; but it may be anſwered that Antonia was given to him as ſhe was the moſt beautiful. Now this is a right of ſeniority much more agreeable to the taſte of a young Prince, (and there is no occaſion to be a young Prince to have ſuch a taſte,) than that which is founded upon the greater number of years. Druſus, as he was ſuperiour in quality, had probably the choice, and without doubt he choſe the moſt beautiful of the two ſiſters, whether ſhe was the eldeſt or not.

[*B*] *Antonia, who was left a young and beautiful widow . . . . was an example of continence.*] What is ſaid of her huſband is ſtill more ſurprizing; that he kept his conjugal faith in the ſtricteſt manner. *Druſum etiam Germanicum, eximiam Claudiæ familiæ gloriam, patriæque rarum ornamentum, & quod ſuper omnia eſt, operum ſuorum pro habita ætatis magnitudine, vitrico pariter ac fratri Auguſtis, duobus Reipublicæ divinis oculis, mirificè reſpondentem, conſtitit uſum Veneris intra conjugis* (5) *charitatem clauſum tenuiſſe* (6). That is, "It is certain, that Druſus Germanicus, the glory of "the Claudian family, and the ornament of his "country, and what is ſuperior to every thing elſe, "equal in his great Actions, in proportion to his age, "to the Auguſtus's, his father-in-law and his brother, "who were the two divine lights of the Common-"wealth; it is certain, I ſay, that he confined all his "deſires and affection to his own Lady." That in ſuch a court as Auguſtus's the ſon-in-law to the Emperor ſhould content himſelf with his own wife like a mere citizen, is certainly a very extraordinary caſe; and it is to no purpoſe to ſay, that Antonia was ſo young and fine a lady, that Druſus could not have found a more beautiful object. For how many Princes, and noblemen, and others of lower quality are there, with regard to whom this reaſon is abſolutely falſe? But to return to Antonia. Valerius Maximus thus continues his diſcourſe. *Antonia quoque fœmina laudibus virilem familiæ ſuæ claritatem ſupergreſſa amorem mariti egregia fide penſavit; quæ poſt ejus exceſſum forma & ætate florens cubiculum ſocrus pro conjugio habuit, in eodemque toro alterius adoleſcentiæ vigor extinctus eſt, alterius viduitatis experientia conſenuit.* That is, "And "his wife Antonia, a Lady who ſurpaſſed the fame of "the great men of her family, returned this affection "of her huſband with the ſtricteſt fidelity; for after "his deceaſe, tho' ſhe was then in the flower of her "age and beauty, ſhe conſidered the chamber of her "mother-in-law as a marriage, and in the ſame bed "the vigour of his youth was extinguiſhed, and her "widowhood grew old." The chaſtity of Antonia found panegyriſts even in Judea. Joſephus deſerves particularly to be quoted; who tells us, that Auguſtus ſolicited this Lady to marry again, but ſhe perſiſted in her refuſal, and preſerved her reputation entire in her widowhood. This is a very uncommon inſtance; for we find ladies of quality enough, who live ſeparate from their huſbands, or never marry again, tho' they are courted; but do they live free from ſcandal? are not their gallantries every where talked of? That is the point: *hoc opus, hic labor eſt*; "Here is the dif-"ficulty." There are people ill-natured enough to ſay, that there are ſome, who practiſe what Luther is accuſed of having given leave to huſbands to do: *Si nolit uxor*, ſaid he, *veniat ancilla*; that is, "If your wife "refuſes, call the maid." They take the reverſe of it: *Si nolit, ſi deſit maritus, veniat famulus*; that is, "If "your huſband refuſes, or you have none, take your "ſervant." They have miſunderſtood the words of Luther. The words of Joſephus relating to Antonia are as follow. Τιμᾶσθαι δ' ἦν Ἀντωνίαν Τιβερίῳ ὡς τὰ πάντα συγγενείᾳ τε αἵματος; Δρούσου γὰρ ἦν ἀδελφοῦ τῷ αὐτῷ γυνὴ, καὶ ἅμα τοῦ σεμνοτάτου, νέα γὰρ χηρεύειν παρῃτήσατο γάμῳ τὸ ἀνῆκον τῷ πρὸς ἕτερον, καίπερ τοῦ σεβασμοῦ καλουσαντος τὴν γαμετὴν, καὶ λειπόντων ἀσυλλογίστως διετέλεσε αὐτῇ τὸν βίον (7). That is, "Antonia was in great eſteem with "Tiberius, p. 632, C.

(1) *Germanicus C. Cæſaris pater Druſi, & minoris Antoniæ filius.* Suet. *in Calig.* cap. 1. See likewiſe the ſame author in *Claud.* cap. 1. *Ex Antonia majore patrem Neronis procreavit* (*Domitius.*) Suet. *in Nerone* cap. 5.

(2) Plut. *in Marc. Anton.* p. 955.

(3) Lipſius *in Tacit. Annal.* lib. 12.

(4) Glandorp. *Onomaſt.* p. 67.

(5) See the verſes in remark [*G*].

(6) Val. Maxim. lib. 4. cap. 3.

(7) Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. 18. cap. 8.

her chaſtity another virtue, which was not ſo well underſtood by the chaſte Agrippina her daughter-in-law, I mean prudence and ſweetneſs of temper. It was this Antonia who diſcovered to Tiberius the deſigns of Sejanus [C]. The Emperor was not ungrateful after ſo important a piece of ſervice done to him (d). Pliny tells us a very remarkable particular concerning this Antonia, that ſhe never ſpit (e). He tells us likewiſe that ſhe was very fond of a fiſh, and put her ear-rings upon it; upon which account there was a great reſort to her country-ſeat to ſee this curioſity (f). This Lady was unfortunate in her family. It is certain her ſon Germanicus had all the compleat qualifications which might be wiſhed for in a preſumptive heir of the Empire, and he was the delight of the people of Rome; but even this aggravated the affliction of Antonia, when he was taken off by an unexpected death. She was not in a condition to walk as a mourner when the funeral rites of Germanicus were performed [D]. Her other ſon was ſo diſagreeable to her, and appear'd ſo ſtupid, that ſhe treated him as a monſter [E], and an unfiniſhed lump of a man, and uſed him as a compariſon, when ſhe had a mind to repreſent any one as a blockhead. Her daughter was another ſort of monſter; ſhe attempted the honour and life of her huſband, and carried her attempts ſo far, that ſhe was convicted of adultery, and of having poiſoned her huſband. The miniſter of vengeance to whom ſhe was delivered was her own mother, who ſhut her up in a chamber, where ſhe let her die of hunger [F]. The children of Germanicus, which were brought up by Antonia, gave her no ſmall uneaſineſs. She had a particular care over their conduct; but her care ſerved to no purpoſe but to make her an eye-witneſs of their enormous diſorders. She ſurprized Caligula one day in the act of inceſt with his ſiſter (g): this wretch had not then left off his youth's habit, and yet he had already polluted it with the moſt capital crime. When he came to the Empire, he decreed at once all thoſe honours to his grandmother Antonia, which the Senate had decreed for Livia (b); but this was only through a ſudden ſtart of humour, for he afterwards neglected Antonia, and refuſed her a private audience. Theſe affronts threw her into ſuch a fit of grief that ſhe died; it is ſaid that he uſed poiſon, in order to haſten the effects of her grief [G]. He paid no honour to the deceaſed, and was not even preſent

(d) Joſeph. *Ant.* lib. 18. cap. 8. p. 632. C.

(e) Plin. lib. 7. cap. 19.

(f) *In eadem villâ* (apud Baulos in parte Baianâ) *Antonia Druſi murænæ, quam diligebat, inaures addidit; cujus propter famam nonnulli Baulos videre concupiverunt.* Plin. lib. 9. cap. 55.

(g) *Exhibit* (Sororibus) *Druſillam vitiâſſe virginem prætextatus adhuc creditur: atque etiam in concubitu ejus quondam deprehenſus ab aviâ Antoniâ, apud quam ſimul educabantur.* Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 24.

(b) Idem, ibid. cap. 15. *See likewiſe* Dion, lib. 59.

(8) Joſeph. *Ant.* lib. 18. cap. 8. p. 632. C.

" Tiberius, either upon account of her affinity to him, " as ſhe had been wife to his brother Druſus, or be- " cauſe of her continence, ſince tho' ſhe was then a wi- " dow in the flower of her age, ſhe refuſed a ſecond mar- " riage even at the deſire of Auguſtus, and in that " ſtate of widowhood ſhe preſerved her character free " from any imputation."

[C] *It was this Antonia, who diſcovered to Tiberius the deſigns of Sejanus.*] There is a great deal of probability, that Tacitus had given a particular account of this fact; but unfortunately that part of his *Annals* is loſt. Joſephus, if I am not miſtaken, is the only Hiſtorian, who acquaints us with the ſhare, which Antonia had in the diſcovery of this conſpiracy. We may credit him in this point, becauſe the intimacy, which Berenice and her ſon Agrippa had with this lady, and the ſervices, which ſhe did to Agrippa, made her well-known in Judea, and conſequently obliged the Jewiſh Hiſtorian to inform himſelf exactly with what related to her. We may therefore aſſure ourſelves upon his authority, that as ſoon as Antonia had intelligence of Sejanus's plot, ſhe wrote the circumſtances of it exactly to Tiberius, who was then in the Iſland of Capreæ, whither ſhe diſpatched one of her ſervants, whom ſhe could moſt confide in, with a letter. The regard, which that Emperor always had for this lady was very much encreaſed by this important ſervice, which ſhe did him. Ὁ δὲ μαθὼν τότε Σηϊανὸν κτείνει καὶ τοὺς συνεστῶτας τότε Ἀντωνίαν καὶ πρὸ ἀξιολόγως ἄγαν τιμωτέραν τε ὑπελάμβανε καὶ τοῖς πᾶσι πιθανήν (8). That is, " He (Ti- " berius) being acquainted with theſe things, gave " orders to put Sejanus and his aſſociates to death, and " whereas he had before greatly eſteemed Antonia, " his regard for her in every reſpect was encreaſed " by this means." I ſhall take notice in another place, that Xiphilin has occaſionally obſerved that Antonia wrote ſeveral things to Tiberius with relation to Sejanus.

[D] *She was not in a condition to walk as a mourner at the funeral of Germanicus.*] Let us ſee how Tacitus tells the ſtory, with his reflections upon it. *Tiberius atque Auguſta publico abſtinuere, inferius Majeſtate ſuâ rati ſi palam lamentarentur, an ne omnium oculis vultum eorum ſcrutantibus falſi intelligerentur. Matrem Antoniam non apud auctores rerum, non diurna actorum ſcriptura reperio ullo inſigni officio functam, cum ſuper Agrippinam, & Druſum, & Claudium, ceteri quoque conſanguinei nominatim perſcripti ſint, ſeu valitudine præpediebatur, ſeu victus luctu animus magnitudinem mali perferre viſu non toleravit. Facilius credierim Tiberio & Auguſta, qui domo non excedebant, cohibitam, ut par maror & matris exemplo avia quoque & patruus attineri viderentur* (10). i. e. " Ti- " berius and Auguſta avoided appearing in publick, " thinking it beneath their Majeſty to be ſeen as " mourners, or elſe that their hypocriſy might not " be obſerved by every perſon, who would undoubted- " ly examine their countenances. I do not find a- " mong any of the writers or the diaries of thoſe " times, that Antonia his mother appeared in any " publick manner, tho' all the reſt of his relations " beſides Agrippina, and Druſus, and Claudius are " particularly named: whether ſhe was prevented by " ſickneſs, or her mind being oppreſſed with grief " could not bear to ſee her great misfortune. I ra- " ther incline to think, that ſhe was reſtrained by Ti- " berius and Auguſta, who kept themſelves in private, " that their ſorrow might ſeem equal, and his " grandmother and uncle might appear to have been " detained by his mother's example."

(10) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 3. cap. 3. *ad ann.* 773. It was the year 20 of the Chriſtian Æra.

[E] *She treated her ſecond ſon as a monſter.*] It is Suetonius, who relates this. *Mater Antoniæ portentum eum hominis dictitabat, nec abſolutum à naturâ, ſed tantum inchoatum; ac ſi quem ſocordiæ argueret, ſtultiorem ajebat filio ſuo Claudio* (11). This ſhews that ſhe was a Lady of ſenſe and wit; for a woman of the common ſtamp never is ſenſible, that her children are fools; or if ſhe be ſenſible of it, ſhe never is overforward to own it, in order to acquit herſelf, and to treat them as changelings and productions, which were neglected before they were half finiſhed.

(11) Sueton. *in Claudio*, cap. 3.

[F] *She ſhut up her daughter in a room, where ſhe let her die with hunger.*] This ſhews again, that ſhe was a Lady of ſuperior qualifications, who lov'd her children no further than as they were an honour to her, and who preferred her regards to the grandeur of Rome to the inſtincts of nature. There were two traditions concerning the death of Livilla, one that Tiberius put her to death; the other, that he pardoned her crime, out of reſpect to Antonia, but that the latter ſtarved her to death (12).

(12) Dio, lib. 58.

[G] *Caligula occaſioned her to die of grief; and it is ſaid that ſhe uſed poiſon to haſten the effects of her grief.*] Suetonius and Dion agree in the firſt point: *per iſtiuſmodi indignitates & tædia cauſa extitit mortis; dato tamen, ut quidam putant, & veneno* (13). Dion does not ſpeak of the poiſoning her: He only ſays, that this cruel Emperor, not able to bear any longer the reproofs of his grandmother, obliged her to

(13) Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 23.

sent at her funeral (*i*). The temple of Antonia, which is mentioned only by Pliny, owed its name very probably to this Princeſs [*H*]. She did not ſee the misfortunes of her grand-daughter Antonia, whom Moreri has ſaid nothing of without falling into great errors [*I*].

(*i*) Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 23.

(14) Dio, lib. 59. *See likewiſe* Suetonius *in Caligulâ* cap. 29.

to put an end to her days (14). I cannot find in what year this illuſtrious Lady died; but ſince it was under the reign of Caligula, I think we may place her death in the year 792 of Rome. That of her husband happened in the year 744. We may know pretty exactly at what age ſhe was left a widow, and how long ſhe lived; for ſhe was born in the year 714 of Rome, ſince her mother Octavia, who married Marcus Antonius in the year 713 (15), was brought to bed of a daughter, when he returned from Greece the year following (16). The Poem intitled *Conſolatio ad Liviam Auguſtam de Morte Druſi Neronis* (17), repreſents Antonia as extremely diſconſolate, and gives her prodigious commendations. We find there, as likewiſe in Valerius Maximus, that Druſius never indulged himſelf in any purſuits of Gallantry. We are alſo told there, that his laſt words were for his dear wife.

(15) Calviſ. *ad annum mundi* 3910.

(16) Plut. *in Antonio*, p. 930. *See likewiſe*, pag. 931, D.

(17) *Conſol. ad Liviam*, ver. 299, *ſeqq.* It is printed with the works of Ovid, and ſeveral think it to be Ovid's writing.

Quid referam de te, digniſſima conjuge Druſo,
Atque eadem Druſi digna parente nurus?
Par bene compoſitum, juvenum fortiſſimus alter,
Altera tam forti mutua cura viro.
Fœmina tu princeps, tu filia Cæſaris: illi
Nec minor es magni conjuge viſa Jovis.
Tu conceſſus amor, tu ſolus & ultimus illi;
Tu requies ſeſſo grata laboris eras.
Te moriens per verba noviſſima queſtus abeſſe,
Et mota in nomen frigida lingua tuum.

[*H*] *The Temple of Antonia, which is mentioned only by Pliny, owed its name very probably to this Princeſs.*] He mentions it in his catalogue of the paintings of Apelles; *Ejuſdem arbitrantur*, ſays he, *manu eſſe & in Antoniæ templo Herculem averſum: ut quod eſt difficillimum, faciem ejus oſtendat verius pictura, quàm promittat* (18): That is, "It is imagined that from "the ſame hand we have an Hercules with his "back to us, in the temple of Antonia; which is "drawn in ſuch a manner, tho' that is extremely "difficult, that it ſhews his face much better than "ſuch a poſition would ſeem to promiſe." A very learned commentator (19) obſerves upon this paſſage, that he cannot tell whether this belonged to the elder or to the younger Antonia, nor in what part of the city it was built: *Cujus illud Antoniæ fuerit, majoris, minoriſve, quove urbis ſitu conditum fuerit, incompertum. Utraque Antonii Triumviri filia, major Germanici & Claudii Cæſaris parens; Neronis Avia.* Thus he prefers the opinion of Tacitus, to that of Suetonius (20); and gives the eldeſt of them to Druſus. However, theſe words *Neronis Avia*, i. e. *the Grandmother of Nero*, ſeem very difficult to me: I imagine that the Printer omitted *minor*, i. e. *the younger*, at leaſt; for by ſubſtituting this word, we ſhall perceive that Father Hardouin mentioned ſomething of both the Antonia's; of the eldeſt, that ſhe was mother to Germanicus and the Emperor Claudius; and of the younger, that ſhe was grandmother to Nero. If we do not inſert ſomething of this kind, we ſhall find a miſtake in the paſſage ſince the mother of Germanicus was not grandmother to Nero. To have recourſe to the adoption of Nero by Claudius, would be a weak ſubterfuge. In another paſſage (21), this commentator prefers the opinion of Suetonius, to that of Tacitus.

(18) Plin. lib. 35. cap. 10. pag. 213.

(19) Father Hardouin.

(20) See above the remark [*A*].

(21) In Plin. lib. 7. cap. 19. tom. 2. p. 38.

[*I*] *Moreri has ſaid nothing of Antonia her grand-daughter without falling into great errors.*] She was daughter to the Emperor Claudius and Ælia Petina; but born before he was Emperor. She was married at firſt to Cneius Pompeius Magnus (22), and afterwards to Fauſtus Sylla. She loſt both her husbands by violent deaths. The firſt was put to death by the order of the Emperor Claudius (23): The ſecond was killed at Marſeilles by thoſe, who were ſent by Nero for that purpoſe (24). She refuſed the addreſſes of that Prince, who would have married her after the death of Pompey (25). Nero put her to death under pretence that ſhe was engaged in a conſpiracy. I preſume it was that of Piſo. An hiſtorian tells us, that Piſo was to have brought with him Antonia into the camp of the Pretorian guards (26). Tacitus relates this, without ſeeing any great probability in it (27). He cannot incline to think, that Antonia would have expoſed herſelf to ſo great a danger, without ſome hopes of being the wife of Piſo. Now ſuch an expectation was groundleſs; for Piſo was known thro' the whole city to be extremely fond of his wife. Tacitus did not ſtop at this; he joins a reſtriction to it after his uſual manner; *if*, ſays he, *the paſſion of governing is not the moſt violent of all others.* By this reflection he gives again to Pliny's account the probability, which he had taken from it. *Antonia* might imagine that Piſo would divorce his favourite wife, in order to clear his way to the Throne, by marrying the daughter of the Emperor Claudius. *Interim Piſo apud ædem Cereris opperiretur, unde eum præfectus Fenius & cæteri accitum ferrent in caſtra, comitante Antonia Claudii Cæſaris filiâ ad eliciendum vulgi favorem, quod C. Plinius memorat. Nobis quoquo modo traditum non occultare in animo fuit, quamvis abſurdum videretur, aut inani ſpei Antoniam nomen & periculum commodaviſſe, aut Piſonem notum amore uxoris alii matrimonio ſe obſtrinxiſſe; niſi ſi cupido dominandi cunctis affectibus flagrantior eſt* (28). The errors of Moreri are theſe; 1. That Tacitus calls Antonia's ſecond husband Cornelius Salvus, whereas he calls him *Cornelius Sulla* (29). 2. That Antonia continued a long time a widow. Her husband Sylla was killed in the year 815; and Piſo's conſpiracy broke out in 818: Poppea died the ſame year. It is very probable that Antonia was courted ſoon after, and that her refuſal obliged Nero to renew the proſecution againſt her in particular. However, her widowhood could not be very long, ſince Nero, who put her to death, died in the year 821. 3. The authors quoted by Moreri do not mention, that Nero forc'd Antonia to kill herſelf.

(22) He reſtored to him this ſirname, which Caligula had taken from him. *Dio*, lib. 60.

(23) Sueton. *in Claud.* cap. 27.

(24) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 14. cap. 57.

(25) Sueton. *in Nerone*, cap. 35.

(26) Plinius *apud Tacitum, Annal.* lib. 15. cap. 53.

(27) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 20. cap. 53.

(28) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 15. cap. 53.

(29) Ib. l. 13. cap. 23, (and not in cap. 5, as it is in Moreri) and 47. Moreri has miſquoted lib. 14. cap. 16; it ſhould have been lib. 14. cap. 57. He has not quoted all the paſſages which he ſhould have done.

ANTONIA, the younger ſiſter of the preceding, both on the father's and mother's ſide, can furniſh us with but a ſhort article. I find nothing relating to her, but that ſhe was wife to Lucius Domitius Ænobarbus, and that by this marriage ſhe had a ſon and two daughters; the ſon named Cneus Domitius was father to the Emperor Nero. We ſhall ſpeak of the daughters under the word DOMITIA, and ſhew that Moreri was miſtaken in ſaying that one of them was married to Galba.

☞ ANTONIUS PRIMUS (MARCUS) was born at Toulouſe (*a*) in Gallia Narbonenſis ſome years after Chriſt. Under the reign of Nero he was convicted of a great fraud, having been concerned in the forging of a will, for which he was condemned to the penalty of the Cornelian Law (*b*), which was baniſhment. He was a man of a daring ſpirit, prompt and enterpriſing, ſo that he ſoon recovered his rank as a Senator. Being by Galba preferred to the command of a legion, he was believed to have made frequent application to Otho by letters, offering to ſerve him in the capacity of a General; but being neglected by Otho, he remained without any part in that war. When the fortune of Vitellius appeared to decline, he betook himſelf to that of Veſpaſian, and to his cauſe proved an addition mighty and momentous, brave as he was in perſon, a prompt ſpeaker,

(*a*) Martial. lib. 9. ep. 101. That city is in Languedoc, a Province of France.

(*b*) Tacit. *Annal.* 14. p. 377 of Mr. Gordon's tranſlation, vol. 1.

Speaker, a rare Artiſt in bringing under hate and diſguſt, a powerful man in popular tumults and uproar, rapacious, profuſe, one during peace altogether wicked and corrupt, in war too conſiderable to be ſlighted (*c*). He ſoon gave Veſpaſian unqueſtionable proofs of his prudence and courage. He adviſed him to march out of Pannonia into Italy [*A*], in order to attack Vitellius's party, and with great diſpatch he conducted a body of Vexillaries taken from the Cohorts, and part of the horſe, to invade Italy, accompanied by Arrius Varus, an Officer ſignal for bravery in war. They ſoon took poſſeſſion of Aquileia, after which they were admitted into all the neighbouring towns. Having alſo taken Padua and Ateſte (*d*), they there learnt, that three Cohorts of Vitellius, with the Squadron of horſe, called *Seriboniana*, had erected a bridge at Forum Allienum (*e*), and were poſted there. They were glad of the opportunity, which offered, to aſſault them, whilſt they were void of circumſpection. Accordingly at the dawn of the day they ſuddenly encounter'd and ſubdued them, moſt of them unarmed. Previous orders had been given to the aſſailants to content themſelves with the ſlaughter of a few, and by terror to conſtrain the reſt to exchange their allegiance. There were indeed ſome, who inſtantly ſurrendred; and the greateſt part by flying and breaking the bridge eſcaped the violence of the foe. Antonius accompliſhed a thing, which having been long wiſh'd, was by popular conſtruction heightened into an act of high glory. He cauſed the ſtatues of Galba, which by the violence and viciſſitude of the times had been thrown down, to be reſtored to their wonted place and reverence in all the municipal cities: For he judged that by appearing to approve the reign of Galba, and to countenance the revival of his party, he ſhould derive credit upon his own (*f*). He ſhewed ſome time after a very great courage and preſence of mind by appeaſing a ſedition which was raiſed by the ſoldiers againſt T. Ampius Flavianus [*B*]. By this ſedition and another which happened about the ſame time, the Leaders of conſular name having been obliged

(*c*) Gordon's *Tacitus*, vol. 2. book 2. p. 141.

(*d*) Now called *Eſte*, in the *Paduana* belonging to the Venetians.

(*e*) *Ferrara*, ſituated on an arm of the Po, in the ſtate of the church.

(*f*) Idem, book 3. p. 153—161.

[*A*] *He adviſed him to march out of Pannonia into Italy.*] Veſpaſian's Generals met at Petovio (1), and thoſe deliberated, whether to content themſelves with only guarding the paſſes of the Pannonian Alps, till their forces from all quarters behind them had advanced in a body to join them; or by a reſolution more daring, march forward and venture a ſtruggle for Italy. They, who held it adviſable to await the arrival of ſuccours and to protract the war, magnified the might and renown of the German legions. Beſides, there had ſince arrived with Vitellius the chief ſtrength of the army in Britain; with themſelves they had a ſmaller number of legions; theſe legions were lately routed, and tho' in words they were undaunted and terrible, yet ſtill in men vanquiſhed leſs bravery was found. But by ſecuring the Alps, they would have leiſure to expect Mucianus advancing with the bands of the Eaſt. To Veſpaſian there would ſtill remain the command of the ſea, of fleets, and of the Provinces, all affectionate to his cauſe; a ſource whence he might raiſe materials ample enough as it were for another and freſh war. Thus by a prudent and ſalutary delay new forces would certainly accrue, and of the former none would be loſt. In anſwer to theſe reaſonings, Antonius, who in truth from the beginning, with infinite ardour incited the war, argued, "That to themſelves diſpatch was "altogether advantagious, and to Vitellius only pernicious. A greater ſhare of ſloth and indolence had "poſſeſſed the conquerors, than of valour and ferocity; as men no longer inured to the regularity of a "camp, and prepared for feats of war, but ſeparated "over all the great towns of Italy, reſigned to idleneſs "and eaſe, and dreadful to none but their hoſts. Nay "the more furious and ſtern they formerly had been, "with the more greedineſs they ſwallowed pleaſures ſo "raviſhing and new. Moreover by haunting the "Theatres and the Circus, and by following the delightful paſtimes at Rome, they were utterly ſoftened and "debauched or by diſeaſes utterly waſted. But, were "time allowed them, their antient vigour would ſtill "return, by their application to the cares and purſuits "of war. Not far from them lay Germany, from "whence a ſure recruit of forces; beyond the channel, "Britain, juſt by France; as alſo both Spains; from "all a ready ſupply of men, and horſes, and contributions; Italy too itſelf in their poſſeſſion, with the "immenſe treaſures of Rome. And ſhould they reſolve, for prevention, to recur to offenſive arms, "they were furniſhed with two fleets, and the Illyrian Sea was open. What would then avail the "Streights and defence of the mountains? What the "protracting of the war till another Summer? Where, "in the interval, the money to be had? Where the "proviſions? Doubtleſs, much better it were to improve the occaſion preſented by the ſoldiery; for "that the Pannonian legions, who had been deceived "rather than vanquiſhed, were impatient to ſignalize "their vengeance; and the armies of Mœſia had "brought forces with them, by no rout diminiſhed. "If upon the number of men ſtreſs were to be laid, "rather than upon the number of legions, in this "hoſt was to be found ſuperiour ſtrength, nothing diſſolute, and, from a ſenſe of diſgrace, diſcipline "amended. The horſe, in truth, were not then defeated, but tho' the iſſue proved unfortunate, had "routed the cavalry of Vitellius. Yes, two ſquadrons from Pannonia and Mœſia, in that fight pierced quite through the ranks of the enemy. At preſent were united the banners of ſixteen ſquadrons; "a body who with the ſhock and thunder of the onſet, "nay, with the very cloud raiſed by them, will not "fail to overwhelm and cover yonder troops of horſemen and their horſes, both become unacquainted "with feats of war. The ſame meaſures, which I "adviſe, if I am not reſtrained, I will purſue; you, "who are yet free to follow fortune on either ſide, ſtay "and with you detain the legions, to me a few cohorts, "lightly equipped, will be ſufficient. Anon you "will hear that I have opened my way into Italy, "and ſhaken the power of Vitellius. You will then "be glad to follow, and travel in the tract of one who "had conquered for you." Theſe and the like ſtrains he uttered with eyes darting fire, with a voice fierce and vehement, and with ſuch effect, that he moved and influenced even ſuch as were moſt cautious and provident. They all loaded him with praiſes, and ſcorning the reſolutions of the other Generals as cold and fruitleſs, extolled him as the only brave man, the only vigorous Leader. This renown he firſt acquired in a late military aſſembly, where letters from Veſpaſian were publickly recited. For there he reaſoned not, like moſt others, in a ſtile equivocal and obſcure, with intent to wreſt the interpretation hither and thither, as intereſt ſhould require: he appeared to have fallen into the ſubject of debate with openneſs of expreſſion, free from all diſguiſe, and hence became more acceptable to the ſoldiers, ſince he thus offered himſelf as a ſharer in their lots, whether of guilt or of glory (2).

(1) Now called *Pettaw* in lower Stiria, in the Archbiſhoprick of Saltſburgh.

(2) Gordon's *Tacit.* vol. 1. p. 153--156.

[*B*] *He ſhewed a very great courage and preſence of mind by appeaſing a ſedition which was raiſed againſt T. Ampius Flavianus*] This man both by nature and old age ſlow and irreſolute, provoked the ſuſpicion of the ſoldiers, as if he too well remembred his affinity with Vitellius; as likewiſe for that having upon the firſt uproar of the legions betaken himſelf to flight, and then of his own mere motion returned, he was believed to watch an occaſion for executing ſome traiterous purpoſe (3). The ſoldiers having ſeen ſome

(3) Idem, ibid. p. 156.

obliged to withdraw, Antonius alone remained in poſſeſſion of the power and ſway over the army, by the conceſſion of his equals, the other Commanders of Legions, and by the bent and partiality of the ſoldiers. Neither were there wanting thoſe, who believed both theſe ſeditions to have been moved by the intrigues and contrivance of Antonius himſelf, that upon him alone might devolve the glory and emoluments of the war (*g*). By his conduct he ſhewed, that he was not unworthy to command the Roman Legions. Hearing that there were great diviſions in the army of Vitellius, he reſolved forthwith to attack them thus involved in animoſities, and divided in their forces and affections, e'er the Leaders had recovered authority, the ſoldiers their diſcipline and obedience, or the Legions ſpirit and boldneſs by uniting. With his whole army therefore he marched from Verona, and the next evening encamped at Bedriacum (*b*). A few days after he engaged in battle againſt Vitellius's army, and routed it, tho' with much difficulty; for which reaſon he did not urge his victory; for he was mindful of the condition of his men and horſes, waſted with heavy fatigue, and afflicted with many wounds, in a battle, which, however ſucceſsful in the iſſue, had proved doubtful and perillous. In the cloſe of the evening arrived the whole power of Veſpaſian's army, who having marched over hills of ſlain, and thro' the monuments and traces of a recent carnage, concluded the war to be compleatly finiſhed, and inſiſted to be led directly to Cremona, either to bring the vanquiſhed forces to ſurrender, or to force the place [*C*]. This the ſoldiers demanded with ſuch an audaciouſneſs, that they now utterly ſlighted the authority of their Tribunes and Centurions; and to drown the voice of any one, who offered to reaſon with them, they thundered with their arms, ready to renounce all command, unleſs they were forthwith led on. Antonius having conveyed himſelf into the crowd, after he had by his preſence and authority procured ſilence, repreſented to them in an elegant ſpeech, the danger of the enterprize [*D*]. But all his eloquence could not aſſwage the fury of the raving multitude, and an inſurrection was juſt beginning, when ſome horſemen, who had advanced cloſe to the walls of Cremona, there ſeized certain ſtragglers, by whom a diſcovery was made, that ſix Legions of Vitellius, and the whole hoſt, which had quartered at Hoſtilia (*i*), having learnt the defeat of their fellows, had that ſame day marched thirty miles, and were juſt approaching arrayed for battle. The minds of the men, otherwiſe ſtubborn and ungovernable, upon this terrible alarm, became pliant and open to the counſel of their Commander. Antonius immediately gave all the neceſſary

(*g*) Idem, ibid. p. 161, 162.

(*b*) A ſmall city on the river Oglio, between Mantua and Cremona; it is now called *Canito*.

(*i*) Now called *Oſtiglia*, a ſmall but ancient town, ſituated in the Dutchy of Mantua.

ſome horſes of their own, miſtook them at a diſtance for the enemy; and filled with panic fear, they at an inſtant graſped their arms againſt Flavianus, now charged as a traitor, tho' from no proof or indication of guilt; but as they had long ſince born him mortal rancour, his bloody doom was demanded with uproar, like that of a tempeſt. In vehement and repeated clamours they accuſed him, as the kinſman of Vitellius, a traitor to Otho, and guilty of appropriating to himſelf the donative intended for them. Liberty of defence there was none, tho' in the poſture of a ſupplicant he implored it, with his hands humbly extended, his body for the moſt part proſtrate upon the earth, his garments rent, his face and boſom convulſed with the emotion of anguiſh. To men enflam'd with bitterneſs and rage, even this his diſtreſs proved a freſh incentive, as if by dread ſo exceſſive he bewrayed his guilt. Aponius, as he attempted to ſpeak, was ſilenced by the cries of the ſoldiers; in clamours too and fierce noiſe they refuſed to hear the reſt. To Antonius only their ears were found open; for, beſides the talent of eloquence, and his art in ſoothing a multitude, he was withal of great weight and eſtimation. He when the ſedition was growing extreme and tragical, and from bitter words and revilings they proceeded to deeds of violence and the ſword, ordered Flavianus to be caſt into irons. The ſoldiers perceived the evaſion, and forcing away ſuch as guarded the tribunal, were about to perpetrate the murther. Antonius oppoſed them with his ſword drawn, with proteſtations, that he himſelf would firſt periſh by their hands or his own; and wherever he eſpied any particular known to him, or diſtinguiſhed by the ornament of their ſtation in the army, he called all ſuch by name to aſſiſt him. Then turning towards the Enſigns and Deities military, he beſought them, "That upon the armies of their "enemies they would rather pour that blind fury, and "that ſpirit of diſſention." By this means the ſedition came to ſubſide, and the day now cloſing, they all dropt off to their ſeveral tents. That very night Flavianus departed, and on his way to Veſpaſian met letters from him, ſuch as left him no longer any cauſe of fear (4).

(4) Ibid. p. 160, 161.

[*C*] *Either to bring the vanquiſhed forces to ſurrender or to force the place.*] This was the plauſible language, which openly they uſed, but privately every particular perſon reaſoned with himſelf in the terms following; "That the city, as it was ſituated in a plain, "might be taken by ſtorm; in forcing an entrance in "the dark, they ſhould be prompted with the ſame re"ſolution, and have greater latitude for ſpoiling. "Now if they awaited the return of day, preſently "ſupplications would be offered, preſently peace would "be accepted; and for their toils and wounds they "ſhould only reap renown and the praiſe of cle"mency, gratifications barren and vain. But to the "commanders of legions and principal officers would "accrue the wealth of Cremona; ſince to the ſoldiers "belonged the plunder of a town taken by the ſword, "as to the leaders, when gained by ſurrender (5)."

(5) Ibid. p. 167, 168.

[*D*] *He repreſented to them the danger of the enterprize.*] He declared to them, "That of no part of "their glory, of no part of their recompence, "ſought he to deprive men ſo well deſerving; "but between an army and its leaders, the duties "were ſhared and diſtinct. To the ſoldiers it ap"pertained to dare danger, to long for the combat; "the Generals ſhewed their excellence in providing "againſt exigencies, in concerting judicious meaſures; "nay, oftener by patience and procraſtination, than "by haſte and hazard, their ſucceſs was obtained. "As he had, at the peril of his life, and by the "dint of his ſword, promoted the late victory with "all his might, he was ready to contribute the aſſi"ſtance of his counſels and opinion; parts eſſential "to a General. In truth, the difficulties to be en"counter'd, admitted no queſtion or doubt; namely, "the night, the unknown ſituation of the city, the "enemy maſters of it, on all hands opportunities "for circumvention and ambuſh. Enter they ought "not, even tho' the gates were thrown open, even "though it were full day, till after ſure ſearch and "intelligence. Would they indeed begin the aſſault, "while yet bereft of light to diſcover where lay "the moſt eaſy and acceſſible places or what was "the height of the walls? Or before it was deter"mined whether the city were to be attacked by "miſſive engines and flights of darts, or by works "and machines for battery." Then turning round to particulars, he enquired of each, "If with him "he had brought a hatchet, a pick-axe, and other

neceſſary orders, and diſpoſed his army in ſuch a manner, that if the enemy reſolved to attack him, he might be in a condition to repel them with advantage. He was not deceived in his expectation; for the army of Vitellius, who in all diſcretion ought to have reſted at Cremona, and, having by meat and ſleep recovered their vigour, fiercely beſet the enemy next day, and puſhed them to an overthrow, while ſpent and diſabled with cold and faſting; yet, wanting a Ruler, and deſtitute of counſel, about the third hour of the night, ruſhed precipitately upon the forces of Veſpaſian already prepared and even embattled. Then enſued a moſt bloody battle; the ſoldiers fighting in the dark could not diſtinguiſh the friend from the foe. Antonius performed the part of a moſt ſkilful General, as much as it was poſſible in ſuch a confuſion. But fortune was yet leaning to neither ſide, when the night being very nigh ſpent, the Moon riſing preſented the contending armies to ſight, but deceived the eye. More favourable however ſhe proved to that of Veſpaſian, as ſhe ſhone upon their backs; for againſt the ſhadows of the men and horſes, thus magnified, as againſt their real bodies, the darts and arrows of the enemy were deceitfully directed, and fell e'er they reached their aim. But the bands of Vitellius, who from the reflection in front ſtood in clear view, were expoſed, quite defenceleſs and ſurprized, to be galled by men, who thus annoyed them as it were from a hiding place. Antonius, therefore, now that he could diſtinguiſh his own men, and be by them diſtinguiſhed, ſet himſelf to animate them ſeverally by different inſtigations, ſome by ſhame and reproof, many by applauſe and exhortation, all by hopes and promiſes. His endeavours proved ſucceſsful; the ſoldiers fought with the utmoſt courage and intrepidity, and won the victory. But this did not yet make them maſters of Cremona; that city was ſo ſtrong, that Antonius heſitated, and was unreſolved what directions to give [*E*]; however finding his ſoldiers were full of courage, and determined to aſſault the city, he yielded to their humour, and began the ſiege, and ordered fire to be immediately ſet to all the moſt ſumptuous and beautiful buildings in the neighbourhood of the city, in hopes that the people of Cremona, by ſeeing their poſſeſſions deſtroyed, might be induced to acknowledge Veſpaſian for Emperor. The ſiege was carried on with uncommon briſkneſs; and the city at laſt was taken. The inhabitants were in the utmoſt fear, being threatened with a preſent maſſacre, till by the entreaties of the Leaders, the raging ſoldiers became a little aſſuaged, but this did not entirely baniſh the apprehenſions of the vanquiſhed [*F*], for in a ſpeech, which Antonius made, tho' full of gentleneſs towards them, yet his expreſſions were ſuch, that they boded neither mercy nor wrath to Cremona; and beſides a word, which dropped from him, whilſt he was bathing himſelf, was quickly remark'd and divulged. As he complained the water was not very warm, he added, that it would ſuddenly prove abundantly hot; a ſaying which tho' uttered only to his ſlaves, turned the whole odium and indignation of the publick upon him, as if by this he had given the watch-word, for ſetting fire to Cremona. And indeed the city was barbarouſly plundered, pillaged, and burnt during four days, and was entirely deſtroyed. Antonius, ſtruck with ſhame for the barbarity committed, which was continually drawing freſh abhorrence upon him, iſſued a publick order, that no one ſhould preſume to hold captive any Citizen of Cremona. Such a prey had already been rendered vain and unprofitable to the ſoldiers, by the unanimous combination of Italy, to refuſe the purchaſe of ſuch for their ſlaves; which together with Antonius's orders, obliged the ſoldiers to murther thoſe whom they had in their power. When this inhumanity became known, the kindred and relations of thoſe, who had been taken, made haſte

" utenſils for beſiging towns." As they owned that they had not, he cried, " With ſwords and ſpears " alone can any hands poſſibly break thro' and over- " throw city walls? Should we be conſtrained to " throw up a rampart; ſhould it prove neceſſary to " ſhelter ourſelves under pent-houſes of boards, and " ſheds of hurdles; muſt we not in ſuch diſtreſs, " remain like the vulgar herd, ever thoughtleſs and " improvident, impotently ſtaring at the lofty towers " and ſtrong bulwarks of our enemies? Better it is " to delay for one night, and when our warlike " engines and machines are brought, carry with us " power and victory (6)."

(6) Ibid. p. 168.

[*E*] *Cremona—was ſo ſtrong, that Antonius—was unreſolved what directions to give.*] In the war againſt Otho, the ſoldiers from Germany had pitched their camp quite round the walls, and quite round their camp had drawn a great trench, and to this too had ſince added freſh bulwarks. At the ſight of all theſe the conquerors were checked. To proceed to the aſſault with an army already waſted and weary with the continued toils of a day and a night, were an enterpriſe full of difficulty; and, as no ſuccour or refuge was nigh, it were full of danger. If to Bedriacum they ſhould return, intolerable were the fatigue from a journey ſo long, and vain and abortive would then prove their victory gained. Should they here ſtay and encamp, this too was a courſe to be dreaded ſo near the enemy; for that by a ſudden ſally he might attack and diſtreſs the men, when diſperſed and employed in their works. Above all their apprehenſions was that, adminiſtred by their own ſoldiers, men apter to tempt perils, than to bear delays. To them all meaſures that were ſafe were diſtateful; in feats of temerity they placed their hopes; ſo that for all the ſlaughter which they ſuffered, for all their gorings, and the blood ſpilt, they found full compenſation in the luſt and fruition of ſpoil (7).

(7) Ibid. p. 173.

[*F*] *This did not entirely baniſh the apprehenſions of the vanquiſhed.*] For the army, beſides their inherent luſt of plunder, were ſtimulated by an old rancour, to ſeek the overthrow of that colony. The inhabitants were believed, even in the war againſt Otho to have ſupported the cauſe of Vitellius. Soon after, when the thirteenth legion had been left to rear an amphitheatre there, as the lower citizens every where have ſpirits pert and ſcornful, they of Cremona had, with biting and petulant jeſts conſtantly provoked and derided the ſoldiers. To heighten this ill humour and deſpight there concurred, that the ſame place had been now twice the ſeat of war, that it had furniſhed the army of Vitellius with proviſions, that even ſome of the women were ſlain in the fight, being carried thither by their paſſionate zeal for the cauſe. Moreover, by means of the fair, the city, though in itſelf very rich, was filled with a diſplay of wealth, ſtill more abundant (8).

(8) Ibid. p. 177.

haſte to redeem them (*k*). Antonius till this time appeared adorned with all the virtues of a great General, without diſcovering any of thoſe vices in which men in that ſtation too often indulge themſelves; but after his ſucceſs at Cremona he did by no means proceed in the ſame meaſure of innocence. As he judged that what war could do, he had amply done, and whatever was to follow would be eaſily accompliſhed; or whether it were, that, in a ſpirit like his, a flow of felicity only laid open the avarice, pride, and other vices, hitherto ſmothered and lurking in it, he oppreſſed Italy as a country by conqueſt doomed to ſpoil; he ſoothed and courted the Legions as his own; in all his ſayings, and in all his doings, he ſought to fortify himſelf, and to lay a mighty foundation of power; and that he might inure the ſoldiers to wantonneſs and wild freedom, he frankly committed to the diſcretion of the Legions, the choice of Centurions in the room of ſuch as were ſlain. By theſe popular ſuffrages, every the moſt factious and turbulent ſpirit came to be choſen; nor were the ſoldiers any longer under the controulment of their Leaders, but the Leaders forced headlong by the fury of the ſoldiers. Proceedings theſe apparently ſeditious, and contrived to debauch the army. He did alſo abandon himſelf entirely to plunder and rapine (*l*); and became ſo haughty and aſſuming, that he ſoon loſt the love and eſteem of the other Officers and of the whole army. Mucianus particularly, a great General, ſtung with envy at Antonius's victories, endeavoured to obſcure his glory, inſomuch that Antonius was obliged to write himſelf to Veſpaſian in his own defence [*G*], not without malicious inſinuations againſt Mucianus; hence aroſe deadly enmities between them, in which Antonius acted with an openneſs unguarded, Mucianus with cloſeneſs and craft, and conſequently with a more implacable rancour (*m*). All this time Vitellius was not yet vanquiſhed; his party ſtill ſubſiſted at Rome. Antonius at the head of Veſpaſian's army marched towards that city. But on the road, he that had appeared ſo briſk and forward in puſhing on the war, appeared now ſlow and remiſs, for which he was ſuſpected to have been bribed by Vitellius [*H*]; but by his conduct he ſoon ſhewed how ill-grounded this ſuſpicion was; for hearing that the capitol was beſieged (*u*), he advanced with all ſpeed towards Rome, in order to affiſt Sabinus

(*k*) Gordon's *Tacitus*, ibid. p. 165—179.

(*l*) Ibid. p. 189.

(*m*) Ibid. p. 192, 193.

(*n*) See the remark [*G*].

[*G*] *He was obliged to write to Veſpaſian in his own defence.*] The occaſion of it was as follows. Antonius and the other leaders of his party had agreed, to ſend forwards the horſe, in order to make a ſpecial ſearch through all Umbria for a tolerable paſſage over the ridges of the Apennine, to bring up the banners and eagles, and all the ſoldiers left at Verona, and to have abundant proviſions brought by ſea and by the Po. There were ſome amongſt the leaders, who ſtudied to frame obſtacles and delays; for beginning now to hate Antonius, becauſe of his haughty behaviour, they hoped to receive a treatment more equal and friendly from Mucianus. The truth is, Mucianus fretted at ſo quick a victory, and judged, that if he were not preſent at the entry into Rome, he ſhould be deprived of all ſhare in the war, and in the glory of it. For this reaſon he ſent frequent letters to Antonius and to Varus full of doublings and uncertainty, now urging them to purſue their deſigns with vigour, anon recommending the advantages of procraſtination and coolneſs, in a ſtile ſo contrived, that conformably to the iſſue, whatever it were, he might eaſily diſown all miſcarriages, or eaſily challenge all ſucceſs. He alſo wrote to ſeveral other officers, but in a manner more open and free, diſcovering his aim and intention to them. They returned anſwers ſuch as cenſured the overhaſty motions of Antonius and Varus, and complimented Mucianus, who by conveying their letters to Veſpaſian, had effectually cauſed all the proceedings and counſels of Antonius to be prized far beneath his hopes. This Antonius could not bear with patience; he caſt all the blame upon Mucianus, as one by whoſe calumnies all his actions and perils were rendered of no eſtimation. Nor ſpared he bitter words in his ſpeech ever violent, and a ſtranger to ſubmiſſion. To Veſpaſian he wrote letters in a ſtrain more pompous and aſſuming, than was allowable towards an Emperor, and not without ſevere reproaches tacitly aimed at Mucianus. He ſaid, "It "was he himſelf who had urged the Pannonian le- "gions to action and arms; by his inſtigation and "addreſs, the leaders in Mœſia had been influenced "and roused; by his vigour and perſeverance the "mighty Alps had been attempted and paſſed, Italy "poſſeſſed, all ſuccours from Retia and Germany "precluded. That the legions of Vitellius, when "found to be at variance, and even disjoined, had "been broken by a furious onſet from the horſe, "then utterly diſcomfited by the infantry continuing "the conflict and ſlaughter for a whole day and "night (9), was an action of conſummate luſtre, "and an action by himſelf accompliſhed. To the "fortune of war only muſt be aſcribed the ruin of "Cremona; but indeed, our civil diſſentions have of "old been carried on with much greater publick da- "mage, nay, to the deſtruction of many noble cities. "He was not one, who fought for his Emperor with "letters and meſſengers (10), but for him expoſed "his perſon and weiled his arms. Yet he meant "not to leſſen the glory of ſuch, as had attended "the while to the eſtabliſhment of Aſia; the tran- "quillity of Mœſia had been their ſtudy; it had "been his, to preſerve and ſecure Italy. The Pro- "vinces of Gaul and Spain, the moſt powerful quar- "ters of the Roman world, had by his perſuaſions "been brought to eſpouſe the cauſe of Veſpaſian. "But all his efforts and fatigues had been vainly "beſtowed, if the recompences of ſo many perils "were to be reaped by ſuch only as had risked "none (11)."

(9) This relates to the victory which preceded the taking of Cremona.

(10) This is levelled againſt Mucianus.

(11) Ibid. pag. 191, 192.

[*H*] *He was ſuſpected of having been bribed by Vitellius.*] Some charged him, as if through treachery he thus lingered, in conſequence of the letters ſecretly ſent him from Vitellius, with offers of the Conſulſhip, and of his daughter then marriageable, and with her a mighty fortune as the reward of his revolting from Veſpaſian. Others alledged, that all this charge was no more than a fiction, framed only to court Mucianus. Several argued, that it was a reſolution concerted amongſt all the leaders, rather to preſent the city with a terrible diſplay of war, than really to carry the war thither; ſince the chief ſtrength of the Prætorian bands had already deſerted Vitellius, who was likewiſe precluded from any reinforcement on every hand: ſo that it was preſumed he would quietly yield up the Empire; but that all was marred and diſconcerted, firſt by the raſhneſs, then by the puſillanimity of Sabinus, who having inconſiderately taken up arms, had not been able to maintain the invincible fort of the Capitol againſt three Cohorts, a place ſtrong enough to defy the aſſaults of mighty armies. The truth is, one cannot eaſily upbraid any particular commander with a fault committed by all: For beſides that, Mucianus, by his dark and equivocal letters, retarded the motion of the conquering army. Antonius too incurred great guilt by his overlate and pernicious complaiſance, tho' perhaps he thence ſtudied to transfer upon the other all publick reſentment and hate. For the reſt of the chiefs; by judging the war to be compleated, they rendei'd the end of it more ſignal and glaring (12).

(12) Ibid. p. 213, 214.

Sabinus, who defended the capitol; but the aid which he intended came too late; he met, on his arrival, in the neighbourhood of Rome, with many tidings, all very mournful; Sabinus murthered, the capitol reduced to aſhes, the city under a dreadful conſternation, nay, the populace and ſlaves all under arms for Vitellius. The Senate however ſent Embaſſadors to the armies to exhort them to peace and union [I], but to no purpoſe. Antonius's army attacked that of Vitellius without the gates of Rome, purſued them into the city, where the battle was renewed, and continued for ſome time in three different parts of the city (o) with the utmoſt fury and cruelty, till at laſt Vitellius's army was vanquiſhed, and Antonius remained maſter of Rome. Then he gave glaring inſtances of his avarice, being continually plundering from the Prince's houſe, treaſures, moveables, and domeſtick ſlaves, as though he were ſtill ſeizing the ſpoil of Cremona (p). Thus he put an end to the civil war, and fixed the Imperial crown on Veſpaſian's head. For this ſervice the conſular ornaments were preſented to him (q), though it does not appear that he ever really was a Conſul (r), except perhaps ſubrogated. Antonius's power and credit at Rome did not laſt long; for upon Mucianus's arrival, which was not long after Vitellius had been vanquiſhed, it in a moment dwindled away, and was quite ſunk. Mucianus acted with great prudence and policy to keep to himſelf the power which Antonius once enjoyed; making him fair promiſes, when at the ſame time he ſent into different and diſtant quarters thoſe legions which were the moſt affected to Antonius; ſuch was the jealouſy Mucianus felt from the love which the ſoldiers bore to his competitor, as well as from the haughtineſs of the man, who was ſo far from bearing an equal, that even a ſuperior he could not bear. Antonius bereft of all his authority retired from Rome, and went to Veſpaſian, where he was received, if not ſuitably to his own hopes, yet without any ill countenance or ſourneſs from the Emperor (s) [K]. From that time we do not hear what became of Antonius, at leaſt Tacitus does not mention him any more. But we may conclude from an Epigram in Martial (t), that Antonius retired to Toulouſe where he was born, there to lead a peaceable and quiet life. He applied himſelf to the ſtudy of polite learning, and exerciſed himſelf in compoſing verſes (u). He lived at leaſt ſixty or ſeventy five years, for Martial addreſſes to him an Epigram (w), in which he ſays, that Antonius had paſſed the fifteenth Olympiad. Now if with Chronologers we reckon four years for an Olympiad, Antonius was then ſixty years old; but if with the Poets we take an Olympiad for a Luſtre, that is for five years, he was ſeventy five years old. He was a great friend and patron of Martial, who gives him a very noble character [L], in which he is not very conſiſtent with Tacitus.

(o) Joſeph. *De Bell. Jud.* lib. 4. cap. 41.

(p) Gordon's *Tacit.* B. 3. pag. 215--220. B. 4. p. 223.

(q) Ibid. p. 225.

(r) *See* Faſtor. *Continuat. poſt Sigonium*; in Sigonius's works publiſhed by Mr. Argelati at Milan, 1732. vol. 1.

(s) Tacit. *ubi ſupra*, p. 230, 294.

(t) Lib. 9. ep. 101.

(u) Mart. lib. 1. ep. 6.

(w) Idem, lib. 10. ep. 13. *Ibique Notas Farnabii.*

ANTONIO

[I] *The Senate ſent Embaſſadors to the Armies.*] The different fate of theſe Embaſſadors ſhews, that moſt of the diſorders committed by the ſoldiers, are owing to the General's incapacity. The Embaſſadors, who went to Petilius Cerialis, who commanded one part of Veſpaſian's army, encounter'd perils almoſt fatal, as the ſoldiers ſternly rejected all terms of peace. Nay, the Prætor Arulenus Ruſticus was wounded; a barbarity, which beſides the violation of a character altogether ſacred, that of an Embaſſador, and of a Prætor, derived freſh abhorrence from the dignity and eſtimation of the man. His followers diſperſed and fled; his principal Lictor was ſlain, for daring to open a paſſage through the crowd; and had it not been for the protection of a guard, appointed by the chief officer; ſuch was the brutal rage, inſpired by the civil diſſentions, that the law and privilege of Embaſſadors, eſteemed inviolable even amongſt foreign and barbarous nations, had been profaned, nay, to the maſſacring of their perſons, in the midſt of their native country, and under the very walls of Rome. With more temper were the Embaſſadors received, who had gone to Antonius; *not that the ſoldiers had greater moderation, but the General greater authority* (13).

(13) Ibid. pag. 215.

[K] *He was received, if not ſuitably to his own hopes, yet, &c.*] The mind of Veſpaſian was under a Conflict; on one ſide ſwayed by the great ſervices of Antonius, by whoſe military conduct the Weſt was unqueſtionably gained, on the other, by letters from Mucianus (14). For it had alſo been reported, that Antonius had perſuaded Scribonianus Craſſus, who was deſcended from anceſtors very glorious in the State, to aſſume the Sovereignty (15). This was no doubt a ſtrong reaſon to Veſpaſian not to treat Antonius very kindly. To which muſt be added that all the officers combined to diſgrace him, they charged him with a peſtilent ſpirit, ſwoln with pride, and overbearing, and to heighten the charge, added the the enormities of his former life: neither failed he to raiſe enemies by his contumelious carriage; for he was wont to recount his own exploits and deſerts with an exceſſive oſtentation. The other commanders he treated with the utmoſt deſpight; hence by degrees he ſunk in his character and eſtimation, yet from the Emperor ſtill retained the face and appearance of friendſhip (16).

(14) Ibid. p. 294.

(15) Ibid. p. 255.

(16) Ibid. pag. 294, 295.

[L] *Martial gives him a very noble character.*] He tells us, that Antonius might call to his memory all the days and years he had paſſed, and yet not be afraid of death. That he had ſpent every day of his life in ſuch a manner, that there was not one day, which he might not remember with pleaſure. The reader will perhaps be pleaſed to find the Poet's own words here, without being obliged to recur to another volume.

Jam numerat placido felix Antonius ævo
Quindecies actas Primus Olympiadas:
Præteritos dies, & totos reſpicit annos,
Nec metuit Lethes jam propioris aquas.
Nulla recordanti lux eſt ingrata, graviſque,
Nulla fuit, cujus non meminiſſe velit.
Ampliat ætatis ſpatium ſibi vir bonus: hoc eſt,
Vivere vis, vita poſſe priore frui (17).

(17) Lib. 10. Ep. 23.

It is certainly a very great encomium, to ſay of a perſon that he lived in ſuch a manner, as to be pleaſed with the remembrance of every day of his life; but, in Martial's opinion, this was not ſufficient; he ſets his friend above all mankind. He does this in an epigram written upon Antonius's picture; there he tells us, that if his friend's mind could be deſcribed, it would be the fineſt picture in the world.

Hæc mihi, quæ colitur violis pictura roſiſque,
Quos referat Vultus, Cæciliane, rogas?
Talis erat Marcus mediis Antonius annis,
Primus in hoc juvenem ſe videt ore ſenex.
Ars utinam mores, animumque effingere poſſet!
Pulchrior in terris nulla tabella foret (18).

(18) Ibid. Ep. 32.

Every one knows how little ſtreſs muſt be laid upon praiſes beſtowed by a Poet on a Friend, to whom he has the ſtrongeſt obligation. P.

ANTONIO (NICHOLAS) Knight of the Order of St. James, and Canon of Seville, did a great honour to the Spaniſh nation by his *Bibliotheca of Spaniſh Writers*, which he printed at Rome in two volumes in folio in the year 1672. It is an excellent book of the kind [*A*], and no perſon has perhaps ſucceeded better than Don Nicholas Antonio in ſuch collections as theſe. He was born at Seville in the year 1617, and was ſon to a Gentleman, whom King Philip IV made Preſident of the Admiralty eſtabliſhed in that city in 1626. Having followed his Humanity Studies with Philoſophy and Divinity in his own country, he went to ſtudy Law at Salamanca, and applied himſelf chiefly to the Lectures of Franciſco Ramos del Manzano, who was afterwards Counſellor to the King, and Preceptor to Charles II. We have no better method to judge of the progreſs which he made, than from the deſigns which he conceived with regard to books, and from the manner in which he executed part of his ſchemes, notwithſtanding the variety of affairs which were unavoidable in the poſt he filled at Rome. He was there under the character of Agent-General of the King his maſter, and he had beſides particular commiſſions both from the Inquiſition in Spain, and the Viceroys of Naples and Sicily, and the Governor of Milan, to negotiate their affairs at the court of Rome. The deſign of the *Bibliotheca of Spaniſh Writers* contains two parts. The former relates to all the authors of this nation who lived before the end of the fifteenth Century; the other regards thoſe who lived ſince the end of that Century. This latter part, which was much more forward than the former, was publiſhed before the other. It was printed at Rome, as I obſerved above, in two volumes in folio in the year 1672. I cannot tell whether the author had all the leiſure that was neceſſary to finiſh the other part, and likewiſe another deſign, which was not leſs laborious than this. He was engaged in a work intitled, *Trophæum Hiſtarico-Eccleſiaſticum Deo Veritati erectum ex manubiis Pſeudo-Hiſtoricorum, qui Flavii Lucii Dextri, M. Maximi, Helecæ, Braulionis, Luitprandi, & Juliani nomine circumferuntur; hoc eſt, Vindiciæ veræ atque dudum notæ Hiſpanarum rerum Hiſtoriæ, Germanarum noſtræ gentis laudum non ex Germano-Fuldenſibus Chronicis emendicatarum in libertatem & puritatem plena aſſertio.* He had reaſon to ſay, that this is a work, not only of vaſt labour and criticiſm, but even of dangerous conſequence (*a*); for where are the people who can bear to be ſet right in thoſe fabulous ſtories which have long flattered the vanity of a nation? What riſque do they run who venture to oppoſe the torrent of a tradition which is for their honour, though at the ſame time chimerical and imaginary (*b*)? Every body knows the noiſe which the Provincial raiſed againſt Mr. de Launoi, who attempted to rectify their errors with regard to Magdalen and Lazarus. Perhaps Don Nicholas Antonio had no intention to touch upon certain pious fables [*B*], knowing too well the obſtinacy of his country in that reſpect, and the untractable diſpoſition of the Inquiſition. He intimates, that he had ſeveral other works in his thoughts. But we muſt not omit that which he publiſhed at Antwerp in 1659, *De exilio, ſive de pœna exilii exulumque conditione & juribus*, in folio (*c*).

(*a*) *Immenſæ molis, ac forſan invidiæ Opus.*

(*b*) See remark [*D*] at the end.

(*c*) *Biblioth. Hiſpanica*, tom. 2. p. 118, 119.

This is what I publiſhed concerning Don Nicholas Antonio in my firſt edition. Since that I have been informed, that upon his return to Seville, after he had ſtudied the Law at Salamanca, *he ſhut himſelf up in the Royal Monaſtery of Benedictins, and laboured there for ſeveral years at his* Bibliotheca Hiſpanica, *and made uſe for that purpoſe of the books of Bennet de la Serna, who was then Abbot of that Monaſtery, and Dean of the Faculty of Divinity at Salamanca. That in the year* 1659 *he was ſent to Rome by King Philip IV, to manage the affairs of that Kingdom under the character of Agent-General.... (d). That the Cardinal of Arragon, Ambaſſador at Rome, procured him from Pope Alexander VII a Canonſhip in the Church of Seville, the revenues of which he employed in charity and purchaſing*

(*d*) *Journal des Savans* of the 10th of June 1697, p. 420 of the Holland edition.

[*A*] *His Bibliotheca of the Spaniſh Writers is an excellent book of the kind* (1).] I have quoted Mr. Baillet, who ſhews the value of it particularly. He had good reaſon for recommending even the Indexes, for they are very well formed and uſeful. The Author has added a ſhort Preface to them, which ſhews his excellent taſte and judgment; he has quoted there the thought of a Spaniſh Writer, *Indicem Libri ab Autore, Librum ipſum à quovis alio conficiendum eſſe*; that is, "An Author ought to make the Index to his book, "whereas the book itſelf may be written by any "perſon elſe." The contrary method is generally taken; Authors refer to others the pains of making alphabetical Indexes; and it muſt be owned, that thoſe Gentlemen, who are not patient of labour, and whoſe talent conſiſts only in the fire and vivacity of imagination, had much better let others make the Index to their works; but a man of judgment and application will ſucceed incomparably better in compoſing the Tables to his own writings, than a ſtranger can. There might be a variety of good directions given for the compoſition of theſe Tables; which may be juſtly called the Soul of books.

(1) See the noble character which Mr. Baillet gives of it tome 2 of the *Jugemens des Savans*, num. 128. The *Journal des Savans* of the ſixth of July 1676 gives a wretched article upon this excellent work.

A THOUGHT upon the indexes of books.

[*B*] *He had no intention to touch.... upon certain fables.*] I may perhaps may be deceived; for Mr. Bailllet ſpeaks thus: *His critical talent is very judicious and ſolid in many places, eſpecially where he treats of the fabulous traditions of the firſt Catechiſts, who planted the Faith in Spain, and of thoſe falſe Hiſtorians, which have been forged to deceive the Spaniards, and upon whom our learned Author promiſed a particular diſquiſition* (2). This would have abſolutely determined me, if I had not found at the end of theſe expreſſions of Mr. Baillet this other remark: *Yet notwithſtanding he may be ſuſpected to have been too favourable to ſeveral common and vulgar opinions, which have been rejected by Criticks of a more exact judgment.* However that be, we cannot call in queſtion his deſign to explode the authority of all thoſe ſuppoſititious writers mentioned in his title (3). He would not have been the firſt, who wrote in that manner; for I have read what follows in ſome ſheets of the Abbot de la Roque: *Within a Century they have ventured to forge here* (he ſpeaks of Spain) *and publiſh ſpurious Chronicles, to impoſe upon the credulity of the learned or ignorant. This was ſo far from leſſening, that it raiſed the reputation of the Marquiſs of Agropoli, who intirely exploded Dexter, which is one of the moſt ancient of thoſe falſe Chronicles, in his* Diſſertationes Eccleſiaſticas, por el honor de los antiquos tutelares, contra las fictiones modernas, *printed at Saragoſſa in* 1671 (4).

(2) Baillet, *Jugemens des Savans*, tom. 2. p. 154.

(3) See the remark [*D*] at the end.

(4) *Journal des Savans* of the 13th of January 1687. p. 11. See remark [*D*] at the end.

chaſing of books; that he had above thirty thouſand volumes in his Library, ſo that it was inferior to none but that of the Vatican; that with the aſſiſtance of this, joined to a continual labour and indefatigable application, he finiſhed his Bibliotheca Hiſpanica *in four volumes in folio* .... (e). *That after he had publiſhed the two firſt volumes he was recalled to Madrid by King Charles II, to take upon him the office of Counſellor to the Cruſade, which he executed with the greateſt integrity till his death, which happened in* 1684 .... *That he left nothing at his death but his vaſt Library, which he had brought from Rome to Madrid; on the contrary his executorſhip was charged with ſo many debts, that his two brothers, who are Canons of Salamanca, and his nephews, were not able to publiſh his* Bibliotheca Hiſpanica, *and ſent it to the Cardinal d'Aguirre, who was ſo generous as to pay the charge of the impreſſion* [C], *and committed the care of it to Monſieur Marti his Library-keeper, who added notes to it under the name of his Eminence.* I have juſt ſeen a little piece, which tells us that the Jeſuits complain of this work of Don Nicholas Antonio [D].

(e) Ibid. p. 421, 422.

[C] *The Cardinal of Aguirra .... was ſo generous as to pay the charges of the impreſſion of the two volumes of his Bibliotheca of Spaniſh Writers.*] He was an old friend of the Author's, and Fellow-ſtudent with him in the Univerſity of Salamanca. The Commonwealth of Learning is extremely obliged to him for the charge he was at in printing ſuch a book, which contains two volumes in folio. They were printed at Rome, and publiſhed in 1696. You will find accurate extracts from it in the *Journal des Savans* (5), and that of Leipſic (6). The title of it is as follows: *Bibliotheca Hiſpana vetus, ſive Hiſpanorum, qui uſquam unquamve ſcripto aliquid conſignaverunt, Notitia, complectens ſcriptores omnes, qui ab Octaviani Auguſti imperio uſque ad annum MD floruerunt: Auctore Nicolao Antonio Hiſpalenſi, Juriſconſulto, Ordinis S. Jacobi Equite, Patriæ Eccleſiæ Canonico, Regiorum negotiorum in urbe & Romanâ curiâ Procuratore generali, demum Matritii Conſiliario Regio, opus poſthumum. Nunc primum prodit juſſu & expenſis Eminentiſſimi & Reverendiſſimi Domini D. Joſephi Saenz Cardinalis de Aguirre.*

(5) For the months of June and July 1697.
(6) *Acta Eruditor. Lipſienſ.* for June and July 1697.

[D] *The Jeſuits complain of the* Bibliotheca Hiſpana *of Don Nicholas Antonio.*] A Pamphlet (7), intitled, *Calumnia convicta, ſeu Epiſtola familiaris Cleandri ad clariſſimum & eruditiſſimum virum Evariſtum, per Memoriali nuper porrecto, Hiſpano idiomate ad Regem Catholicum à Patre Joanne de Palazol Societatis Jeſu, nomine & juſſu Thyrſi Gonzales ejuſdem So. Generalis præpoſiti,* and dated from Dilingen the 25th of June 1698 informs me, that the Jeſuits have repreſented to the King of Spain, that one of the five propoſitions of Janſenius has been commended as a Catholick doctrine in the work of Don Nich. Antonio. They pretend to have no deſign to attack the Cardinal of Aguirre, who paid the charge of the impreſſion of that book; but it is eaſy to perceive, that they fall upon him indirectly. They ſuppoſe that a Janſeniſt has perverted the text of Antonio in that paſſage. The real ſtate of this affair is thus: This Author acknowledges for Catholick this propoſition of Prudentius, Biſhop of Troyes, that the Blood of Jeſus Chriſt was ſhed for all believers, but not for thoſe who never have believed, nor do believe, nor ever will believe: *Quod ſanguis Chriſti effuſus ſit pro omnibus credentibus, ſed non pro iis, qui nunquam crediderunt, nec credunt, nec credituri ſint.* The Author of the Pamphlet ſhews, that this propoſition might be conſidered as Catholick; and conſequently there was no reaſon to caſt any ſuſpicion upon the faith of Don Nicholas Antonio, or the Cardinal of Aguirre. Obſerve that his Eminence had declared very ſtrongly againſt the looſe Caſuiſts (8), and it is ſuppoſed this was the cauſe of the ill will, which the Jeſuits ſhewed him.

(7) Of 27 pages in 12mo.

It is probable theſe will not be the only complaints, which will be made to the tribunals againſt theſe two Volumes of the *Bibliotheca Hiſpanica*. I have not ſeen them yet, and I doubt whether there is any copy of them in the United-Provinces (9); but I know however, that the author has declared with his utmoſt force againſt the pretended *Luitprand*, and *Higuera* who publiſhed him; and that he has exploded Aubert de Seville, the *Chronicles* of Dexter, Maximus, Julian, &c. A Spaniſh Jeſuit (11) obſerves this in a work, which he publiſhed in favour of his brethren of Antwerp, the compilers of the *Acta Sanctorum*. It is there that I have ſeen ſome paſſages of Don Nicholas Antonio upon this ſubject. But as the Marquiſs Agropoli, a Grandee of Spain by a double title, could not attack theſe fabulous Hiſtorians without expoſing himſelf to the trouble of being brought before the Inquiſition as a traitor to his country (11), I cannot ſee how the Monks of that country could ſuffer the memory of our author to be at reſt.

(8) See upon this point ſeveral extracts from his books in the *Memorial* of a Janſeniſt, which I ſhall quote in the article of BELLARMIN, remark [H].
(9) I write this the 8th of February 1699.
(10) Antonius Xaramilius *in Apologiâ pro Veritate*, p. 160, 161. This work being tranſlated from the Spaniſh into Latin by the Jeſuit Peter Cant, was printed at Antwerp in 1698.
(11) See the article VESPASIAN, remark [D].

ANVARI or ANVERI, one of the greateſt Poets among the Perſians, was born at a village belonging to the city of Abiûrd in Khoraſân. This village was called Bedeneh, and ſituated in a country called Deſhr Khaverân, which is ſaid to have given birth to four great men, among whom Anvâri was the moſt eminent. He had the title of *Sôltan al Khoraſân*, or *King of Khoraſân*, given him on account of the excellence of his Poetry. He performed his ſtudies in the city of Thoûs in the college called Manſuriâh, where he lived as a poor ſcholar. It is ſaid, that his original name was *Naveri*, which ſignifies *one that has no property of his own*, or *one that brings nothing*; and that his maſter prevailed upon him to change it into that of Anveri, which is the anagram of it, and ſignifies *illuſtrious* and *ſhining*. It happened very fortunately for him, that Sôltan Sangiâr, Monarch of the Selgiucides, in his journey to Radekân, ordered his equipage to paſs by the College, where Anvâri ſtudied; who ſitting at the gate, and ſeeing a man elegantly dreſs'd and well mounted riding by, enquired who he was; and being informed that he was one of the Poets belonging to the Sôltan, he reflected with himſelf, that the art of Poetry muſt certainly be highly eſteemed at the Court of that Prince, ſince one of his Poets travelled with ſo noble an equipage. He concluded therefore, that it would be of great advantage to him to apply himſelf to that art; and this thought made ſo deep an impreſſion upon his mind, that he wrote the ſame night a Poem in honour of Sangiâr, which he preſented to him the day following. The Sôltan, who was an excellent judge of Poetry, was ſo highly pleaſed with it, and found ſo noble a genius in the Author, that he asked him, whether he choſe to attend his Court, or only receive a reward for his performance. Anvâri immediately returned him a compliment in verſe, in which he told him, that he had no greater ambition than to engage in the ſervice of ſo great a Prince. The Sôltan upon this removed him from the College to his Court, and honoured him with

with a conſiderable ſhare in his favour. Anvâri was very well ſkilled in Aſtronomy, and wrote ſeveral treatiſes upon that ſcience. But it was this ſtudy, that occaſioned him to loſe almoſt all the advantages, which he had gained by Poetry, having failed in a prediction, which he had publiſhed upon a grand conjunction of the Planets [*A*]. This expoſed him to the reproaches of the Sôltan, and to the ridicule of thoſe, who envied him; upon which he quitted the city of Merû, the royal ſeat of the Selgiucides, and retired to that of Balkhe, another royal city of the Province of Khoraſân. But he met with no better fortune at Merû; for though he had not offended the inhabitants in any manner, yet they reproached him perpetually on account of the falſity of his prediction, and upbraided him with ignorance. They would likewiſe have expelled him that city, if Hamide'ddin, who was the principal Judge there, had not taken him under his protection. It was then that he wrote a Poem, in which he inſerted a publick and ſolemn proteſtation, that he would never more trouble himſelf with Aſtrology or Predictions. He died at laſt in peace in that city in the year of the Hegira 597, and of the Chriſtian Æra 1201. He is conſidered as the firſt writer who corrected the Perſian Poetry, by retrenching in his works whatever ſeemed too looſe and free. Raſhidi has highly commended him upon that account, though in other reſpects he ſhewed himſelf a great enemy to him; for theſe two Poets were engaged for ſome time in different parties; and Anvâri was in the camp of Sôltan Sangiâr, when he beſieged Atſiz, who was then Governor and afterwards Sôltan of the Khuarezmians, with whom Raſhidi had ſhut himſelf up in the ſtrong caſtle of Hezâr-Eſb. Theſe two rival Poets carried on the war with each other in their own particular way, by conveying to each other verſes tied to the ends of their arrows, while the two Sôltans were employed in aſſaulting and defending the caſtle. Toguſhe or Tagaſhe, Sôltan of the Khuarezmians, a Prince of diſtinguiſhed genius and learning, gave the preference to Anvâri and Zehîr over all the other Perſian Poets (*a*).

(*a*) D'Herbelot, *Biblioth. Orient.* in the article ANVARI.

[*A*] *Having failed in a prediction, which he had publiſhed upon a grand conjunction of the Planets.*] It happened in the year 581 of the Hegira, and 1185 of the Chriſtian Æra, which was the tenth of the reign of Togrûl Ebn Arſlân, Soltan of the family of the Selgiucides, that the ſeven Planets were found together in the third degree of the conſtellation Libra, which the Aſtronomers call the Grand Conjunction. Our aſtronomical Tables, which we ſtile the *Alphonſine Tables*, place this conjunction in the year 582 of the Hegira, which anſwers to the Jewiſh year 4946, and to that of Chriſt 1186. The Aſtronomers of that time, among whom was our Anvâri, foretold, that there would be that year a prodigious ſtorm of wind, which would tear up the trees by their roots, overthrow the ſtrongeſt buildings, and even ſhake the mountains themſelves. This prediction, which was to have happened upon the day of this grand Conjunction in the month of September, occaſioned many perſons to prepare themſelves ſubterraneous vaults in order to retire to, that they might eſcape the fury of the tempeſt. But this apprehenſion of theirs was as vain as the prediction of the Aſtrologers; for even the lamps, which were lighted upon the tops of the Moſques, were not extinguiſhed; and a great quantity of corn continued in the ſheaf in the Granaries till the year following, becauſe it could not be threſhed for want of wind. The enemies of our Poet did not fail to take this opportunity of expoſing him to ridicule, and weakening his intereſt at court. The Sôltan likewiſe reproved him in very ſevere terms for having fallen into ſo groſs an error. Anvâri could not give him any other anſwer, but that theſe grand Conjunctions of the Planets never happened without producing ſome extraordinary event; and that the peculiar effect, which this laſt had occaſioned, was that there had been a perfect calm without any motion of wind all that year. Ferid Khâteb, who was one of thoſe that bore the greateſt enmity to our Poet, wrote verſes in Perſian upon this occaſion; the ſenſe of which was, that Anvâri had threatned the world with ſuch a dreadful ſtorm of wind, as would make a horrid devaſtation in it; and yet there was not a breath of wind followed his prediction. *This is a ſufficient proof to us*, ſays he afterwards, addreſſing himſelf to God, *that it is you that command the winds, and not Anvâri.* But if the Aſtrologers were found to have been miſtaken with regard to the winds, it is certain, as Mr. D'Herbelot obſerves (1), that there happened the ſame year one of the greateſt ſtorms that ever fell upon the Eaſt; which was the irruption of Jenghiskhan into thoſe Provinces of Aſia, which lie on this ſide the river Oxus; for he made ſuch a terrible devaſtation in them, as will for ever be remember'd there in that part of the world.

T.

(1) *Biblioth. Oriental.* in the article ANVARI.

APAFI (MICHAEL) Prince of Tranſilvania, was promoted to this principality in the year 1661, without his knowing beforehand any thing of the affair. Ali Baſſa, who had forced Kimin Janos to abandon Tranſilvania, was apprehenſive that he could not prevent him from returning, and making his party ſuperior by the acceſſion of the Imperial troops. He reſolved therefore to ſet up againſt him a Prince elected by the States of the Country, under the protection of the Port. For that purpoſe he demanded of the Deputies of the Cities of Tranſilvania, whether there was not in the Countries, which had ſubmitted to his arms, ſome great Tranſilvanian Lord, who was worthy of the principality (*a*). They told him of Michael Apafi, who kept himſelf retired in his caſtle of Ebeſtfalve, and was ſtill ſenſible of the long diſtreſſes, which he had ſuffered amongſt the Tartars, which at laſt he was delivered from by means of a very conſiderable ranſom. Ali ſent for him without mentioning his deſign to him. Apafi imagined he was to be put to death. [*A*], and yet durſt not refuſe to follow the guard, which was ſent to

(*a*) Joannes Betlenius, *Rerum Tranſylvaniæ*, lib. 3. p. 246.

(1) See his titles before his *Hiſtory of Tranſilvania*, printed at Amſterdam in 1664 in 12°, are as follows: *Joannes Betlenius, Comes Comitatus Albenſis, Regni Tranſylvaniæ Conſiliarius, ac ſedis Siculicalis Udvarhely Capitaneus ſupremus, &c.*

[*A*] *Apafi being ſent for by Ali Baſſa, imagined he was to be put to death.*] I give more credit to this, than to thoſe, who ſay he was an ambitious man. I have quoted an author, who was well informed of this; he lived at that time, and had ſeveral poſts in Tranſilvania, which gave him all the opportunities of knowing the bottom of affairs (1). Now he tells us in a manner, which ſeems very frank and ingenuous, that Apafi was made Prince of Tranſilvania, without having contributed the leaſt to it himſelf; and he aſſures us, that he was a man of no ambition. However it is a very excuſable miſtake to ſay, that *Apafi . . . had certainly the qualifications, which rendered him worthy a principality; and that with theſe*

to him. His wife, then ready to lie in, was in a dreadful apprehenſion, ſuppoſing him abſolutely loſt. He underſtood, before he left his own Territories, that ſhe was ſafely brought to bed of a ſon; but he did not know whether he ought to rejoice or be ſorry at the news of it: however the Turks, who convoyed him, and without doubt were much better acquainted with the intention of Ali Baſſa than he, told him, that this was a preſage of a noble principality to him. Ali received him with great reſpect, and a few days after had him elected Prince of Tranſilvania. And that his election might appear lawful, he ſent for into his army all the Gentlemen of Tranſilvania, whom he could procure, and aſſured them, that he wiſhed, that in conjunction with the Deputies of the Cities they would chooſe one of them to be their Prince, and promiſed to confer in the Sultan's name the Enſigns of Principality upon him, whom they ſhould chooſe (*b*). In this manner Michael Apafi became Prince of Tranſilvania, without any ſollicitation or expectation of it [*B*]. He was a man of noble birth [*C*] indeed; but of an eaſy diſpoſition, and much depreſſed by his long impriſonment in *Crim-Tartary*. Kimin Janos, who expected prodigious things from his conjunction with the Imperial Troops commanded by Count Montecuculi, was extremely deceived; for as ſoon as the ſtate of the Ottoman Forces was known, Montecuculi thought it more proper to return to Hungary, than to hazard a battle. This retreat gave an opportunity to the Turks to commit a thouſand depredations; and they won a battle in Tranſilvania, in which Kimin Janos was killed in the month of January 1662 [*D*]. His ſon attempted to ſupport his pretenſions; but without ſucceſs. Apafi was obliged to join his Forces to thoſe of the Turks in order to recover thoſe places, which the Emperor had taken in Tranſilvania. The Imperial Garriſon of Clauſembourg defended itſelf a long time, ſo that the Turks and Michael Apafi raiſed the ſiege with great diſhonour (*c*). Negotiations were carried on to no purpoſe for the evacuation of theſe places; ſo that they were obliged to come to open

(*b*) Ibid. p. 248, 249.

(*c*) The Governor's name was David Rettani. He was a Venetian, an excellent Engineer. Vianoli, *Hiſt. Venet.* tom. 2. p. 669.

he had an AMBITION *proportionable to his* GREAT *ſpirit* (2); for commonly thoſe, who are raiſed to elective principalities in the midſt of all the tumults, which are excited by the ſeveral pretenders, have a very ambitious mind. A French Author, who has publiſhed an Hiſtory of the troubles of Hungary, does not repreſent Michael Apafi as a Prince, who ſought to aggrandize himſelf; for when he ſpeaks of the reſolution, which was taken by the Hungarian Proteſtants to enter into a league with thoſe of Tranſilvania, to defend liberty of conſcience ſword in hand, he adds this; *The Princeſs, a woman of a turbulent ſpirit, and extremely devoted to the errors of Calvin, ſollicited this union very powerfully, while her husband who was of a more calm diſpoſition, was engaged in nothing but hunting and converſing with men of learning* (3).

(2) Ricaut, *Hiſt. de Mahomet IV*, p. 292.

(3) *Hiſtoire des Troubles de Hongrie*, liv. 2. a l'an. 1668. pag. 75. edit. Amſterd. in 1686.

[*B*] *He became Prince of Tranſilvania without any ſollicitation or expectation of it.*] This is what I ſpoke of in the preceding remark. I have only now to mention ſome Authors, who ſeem not to have been well informed of the manner, in which he was elected. *In the beginning of the year* 1663, ſays one of them (4), *Kimin Janos was defeated and loſt his life. . . . . The Turks meeting with nothing to oppoſe them, made themſelves maſters of all Tranſilvania, except thoſe places, of which the Imperialiſts had taken poſſeſſion. Michael Apafi, who had been elected in the room of Kimid Janos, deſired peace of the Turks; and for that purpoſe Hali Baſſa entered into a negotiation with the Baron de Grez.* This account plainly intimates, I, that Apafi was at war with the Turks, while he was Prince of Tranſilvania; II, that he was not elected till after the death of Kimin Janos, and conſequently till the year 1663. All this is falſe. He was elected during the life of Kimin Janos in 1661, upon the recommendation of Ali Baſſa. Beſides Kimin Janos was killed in January 1662. The Author of the Life of Count Tekeli (5) tells us upon an hear-ſay, that Michael Apafi was raiſed by the Turks to *the principality of Tranſilvania, on account of his promiſe to pay them a larger tribute.* We may place this promiſe in the ſame claſs with the account of thoſe *other competitors, which he had, and who addreſſed themſelves to the Grand Seignor*, as Moreri tells us without any grounds.

(4) Ibid. liv. 1. p. 41.

(5) Page 18 of the edition printed in 1694.

[*C*] *He was a man of noble birth.*] Let us hear the Author, whom I have already quoted more than once. *Hic* (Michael Apafi) *erat*, ſays he (6), *ex antiquiſſimâ Magnatum familiâ ortus, pius, ſed tam naturâ, quam propter diuturnas carceris Crimenſis moleſtias, plus juſto demiſſus ac lenis, ut adepto etiam principatu nimiæ à pleriſque lenitatis inſimularetur.* Theſe words, *ex antiquiſſimâ Magnatum familiâ*, that is, "of an "ancient and noble family," fully confute Moreri, who tells us, that Michael Apafi *was ſon to a Magiſtrate of the city of Harmanſtad, the Capital of Tranſilvania.* It is without doubt upon the credit of this Dictionary, that the Author of the *Mercure Hiſtorique* aſſures us of the ſame fact (7).

(6) Bethlenius, *Rer. Tranſylvaniæ*, p. 247.

(7) *Mercure Hiſt.* of March 1690, p. 490.

[*D*] *Kimin Janos was killed in January* 1662.] I have already confuted the Author, who ſays it was in the beginning of the year 1663. Here is another reply to his aſſertion. Mr. Ricaut tells us, that *Kimin Janos having been defeated near Clauſembourg, reſolved ſome time after to try his fortune a ſecond time*; that *he fought the Turks at ſome diſtance from Presbourg*; that *the ſucceſs was a long while doubtful*; *but that he was obliged to give way to numbers*; and that *Kimin Janos in his flight was thrown from his horſe by his own men, who trod him under foot.* This Hiſtorian obſerves, that the Turks killed or took priſoners fifty thouſand Chriſtians at the battle of Clauſembourg; and that a little before they avoided the combat, becauſe the troops of the Emperor, and thoſe of Kimin Janos were ſuperior to theirs (8). I find nothing of this in the Tranſilvanian Author abovementioned. He tells us, on the contrary, that Montecuculi and Kimon Janos having advanced beyond Clauſembourg, were informed, that the army of Ali Baſſa was four times ſtronger than theirs; ſo that Montecuculi declared to Kimin Janos, that conſidering the bad condition which the Foot was in, for want of proviſion, he was reſolved not to riſque the troops of his Imperial Majeſty (9). Kimin Janos thrown into deſpair, and ſcarce refraining from tears upon this declaration (10), was obliged to return to Hungary with Montecuculi. He fought no other battles than that, in which he was ſlain; and this was not in Hungary, near Presbourg, but in Tranſilvania, near a village called Hetur, the 23d of January 1662 (11). The Hiſtorian obſerves, that hunger and ſickneſs had deſtroyed about five thouſand ſoldiers of Montecuculi's army (12). This circumſtance joined to what is mentioned above, weakens the credit of what Mr. Ricaut tells us, "that "the forces of the Emperor, and thoſe of Prince Kemini "united formed ſo fine and numerous an army, that it "is ſaid they marched with a deſign not only to defend "the frontiers of Chriſtendom, but even to contend with "the Turks for the Empire of the whole world (13)." How could this be, ſince the Ottoman army was four times ſtronger than they? But how is it poſſible to ſuppoſe ſuch a victory of the Turks near Clauſembourg, which coſt the Chriſtians fifty thouſand men, when we have not a word mentioned of it in the Tranſilvanian Hiſtorian? Have the Turks at Conſtantinople a ſett of Gazetteers, who, in imitation of the Chriſtians, write ſtories of imaginary victories?

(8) Ricaut, *Hiſt. de Mahomet IV*, p. 292, 293, under the year 1661.

(9) Bethlenius, p. 251.

(10) Idem, pag. 252.

(11) Idem, pag. 284, 285.

(12) Idem, pag. 254.

(13) Ricaut, *Hiſtoire de Mahomet IV*, pag. 291.

open war (*d*). This proved fortunate to the Turks in 1663; but the year following they loſt the famous battle of St. Gothard; upon which the Grand Viſir conſented to a truce for twenty years. Apafi treated in 1664 with the Imperial Garriſons of Clauſembourg and Zatmar, who delivered up thoſe two cities to him (*e*). He lived under the protection of the Ottoman Port entirely independent of the Court of Vienna, during the truce between the two Empires. He favoured at firſt the male-contents of Hungary, without breaking with the Emperor; but at laſt he undertook an open war in defence of them, and publiſhed his reaſons in a Latin Manifeſto, which he addreſſed to all Chriſtian Princes [*E*]. The Turks broke with the Emperor in 1683, and entered Hungary with ſo formidable an army, that they penetrated as far as Vienna with the utmoſt facility. Theſe ſucceſsful beginnings were followed by a dreadful reverſe of fortune. The Grand Viſir raiſed the ſiege of Vienna; and from that time there was nothing but loſſes upon loſſes, and misfortunes upon misfortunes on the Ottoman ſide. Tranſilvania fell a prey to the Imperial Troops, and ſtill continues ſo; and ſo far was Apafi from endeavouring to defend the liberty of Hungary, that on the contrary he was the cauſe of that Kingdom's loſing even the ſhadow of it, which it enjoyed till then [*F*]; for it has loſt its right of being elective now; it was conſidered as a conquered country, and upon that foot was erected into an hereditary Kingdom. Apafi died at Weiſſembourg about the end of April 1690 [*G*]. The Turks endeavoured to fix Count Tekeli in his place; but he had not the good fortune to ſucceed in the irruption, which was made into the country (*f*). The preſence of Prince Lewis of Baden diſſipated this, as the Sun diſſolves a cloud; and from that time to this, in which I am writing (*g*), he has never diſturbed the new titular Prince of Tranſilvania; who is the ſon of Michael Apafi.

d) Betlen. *Hiſt. Rerum Tranſylvan.*

(*e*) Bunonis *notæ in* Phil. Cluverii *Introduct. Geograph.* p. 281.

(*f*) During the campaign in 1690.

(*g*) In February 1699.

[*E*] *He publiſhed his reaſons in a Latin Manifeſto, which he addreſſed to all Chriſtian Princes.*] I have a copy of it printed in 1682 from that publiſhed in Tranſilvania. But as there is no date to the Manifeſto of Michael Apafi, and my edition does not mention when that of Tranſilvania was publiſhed, I cannot certainly affirm, that this Prince proclaimed the war in 1682; for I find in the Life of Count Tekeli (14), that in 1681, Abaffi came to join him *with an army of Tranſilvanians, and that in conjunction with him he undertook the ſiege of Zathmar*. The Author of *the Hiſtory of the Troubles of Hungary* mentions this ſiege under the ſame year (15), and tells us, that Michael Apafi made himſelf maſter of the city (16); but not being able to reduce the citadel, he retired, and loſt all his baggage in the retreat (17); that no perſon could penetrate into the true cauſe of this misfortune (18), which ſome aſcribed to the miſunderſtanding, which happened between Count Tekeli, and Tekeli who commanded the troops of Tranſilvania at this ſiege; that the latter was accuſed of having uſed bad gun-powder, which did no execution; that others were of opinion, *Prince Apaffi refuſed to take the city, upon the advice, which he received, that the Grand Seignior pretended, that he ſhould put that place into his hands; that it is certain however, that the Baſſa, who commanded the Turks at this ſiege, ſent to Conſtantinople a large Memorial againſt this Prince, which obliged him to return to his own country, leſt ſome change ſhould happen during his abſence*. Thus the Hiſtorian relates the ſpeculations of people upon this ſubject. The *Mercure hiſtorique & politique* has copied them very exactly (19).

(14) Pag. 104.

(15) In the Amſterdam edition 1686 at the top of the pages is marked the year 1680. This error might deceive thoſe who do not obſerve it near.

(16) Liv. 8. pag. 30.

(17) Pag. 39.

(18) Pag. 32.

(19) For May 1690, p. 492; but that author places the ſiege of Zathmar in 1680.

[*F*] *He was the cauſe of the Kingdom of Hungary's loſing even the ſhadow of liberty, which it enjoyed till then.*] It would be unjuſt upon this to accuſe him of imprudence; for there never were more reaſons to promiſe ſucceſs. The forces of the malecontents alone had till then kept the Imperial troops in awe. What might not then be reaſonably expected from the extraordinary preparations of the Grand Seignior, who had promiſed great things to Tekeli? By one of thoſe fatal conjunctures, which the Providence of God is pleaſed to produce from time to time, to confound the beſt-grounded hopes of mortals, it happened that Apafi not only was able to do nothing for Hungary, but likewiſe brought ſlavery upon his own country. *Sic erat in Fatis:* i. e. "Such was the determination "of Fate." It happened, that inſtead of weakening the Houſe of Auſtria, it was recovered from a very low condition, and gained the ſuperiority; it gained the whole Kingdom of Hungary; and the Dominions of the Turks proved an inexhauſtible ſource of good news to the league, which was formed againſt France, during the courſe of the war. But is Apafi upon this to be repreſented as an imprudent and raſh Prince (20)? By no means, at leaſt unleſs all thoſe are to be called ſo, who cannot foreſee events, which are contrary to all probability. Would not the beſt Politicians have maintained, that France would puſh at the wheel on one ſide, while the Turks would preſs them on the other? Who would have believed, that this Nation would have continued unactive for ſix years together, as it did, amongſt a thouſand opportunities the moſt favourable that ever any people had to aggrandize themſelves? Apafi, Tekeli, and their party, are very excuſable for not being able to foreſee, that they would chooſe rather to make war upon the Edict of Nantes, than the Houſe of Auſtria.

(20) See the remark [*G*] of the article KOTTERUS.

What I have ſaid of the good news, which are brought us from Turky (21), is well known to every body. Our Gazetteers and other News-writers ſcarce ever tell us of any thing from that country, but what is agreeable. The murmurs of the people, their miſery, their wiſhes for peace, the diſagreement in the Divan, a Prime-Viſir ſtrangled, formidable factions, plagues, and fires at Conſtantinople, inſurrections in Egypt, Arabia, Syria, and an hundred other things of this Kind, which are brought by the Couriers of Germany, ſometimes the one, ſometimes the other, are not theſe good news? How many real victories, how many cities taken, how many bodies of men defeated, how many ſucceſsful incurſions into the enemy's country, have we not had reaſon to publiſh in the ſummer, and what hopes of peace have not been given us during the winter? Even the raiſing of the ſiege of Belgrade in 1693 has been repreſented as a lucky event; ſince conſidering all the circumſtances together, the Imperial Troops executed their principal deſign, which was to prevent the Ottomans from making an irruption upon Tranſilvania. Some body ſaid after the reduction of Ireland, that it would have been right to have protracted the war for a long time, that we might have a ſure fund of good news both in the Eaſt and in the Weſt.

(21) I wrote this in 1694; I have made no alteration in the ſecond edition.

[*G*] *Apafi died at Weiſſembourg about the end of April* 1690.] The News-writers have contradicted each other upon the circumſtances of his death. Some have publiſhed, that he died ſuddenly in the Aſſembly of the States of Tranſilvania (22); others, that he died after a long ſickneſs (23). All of them agree, that he died at Weiſſembourg (24).

(22) *Gazette de Paris*, of the 20th of May 1690.

(23) *Mercure Hiſtorique*, for May 1690, pag. 490. *Vie de Comte Tekeli*, p. 263.

(24) The *Vie du Comte Tekeli* ſays it was at Alba Julia, which is the ſame city as Wiſſembourg.

APELLES, one of the moſt illuſtrious Painters of antiquity, was born in the Iſle of Cos [*A*], and

[*A*] *He was born in the iſle of Cos.*] I have found but two authors, who aſſert this; beſides we muſt ſuppoſe that one of them did not write what we have in moſt of the editions, but inſtead of theſe words, *Apelles*

and flouriſhed in the time of Alexander the Great [B]. He was ſo highly eſteemed by that Prince, that he was the only perſon who obtained his permiſſion to draw his picture (a). He received likewiſe another mark of his particular regard for him, which was that Alexander having employed him to draw the picture of one of his miſtreſſes, and finding him in love with her, reſigned her to him [C]. It is very improbable, that Apelles ſhould make ſo free with the good-nature of that great Monarch, as he is ſaid to have done [D]; he was certainly too good a Courtier not to know that a ſpeech ſo diſreſpectful as that, which is aſcribed to him, muſt prove very diſpleaſing to the King. The anſwer which

(a) See the remarks of the article LYSIPPUS.

Apelles eo uſque Olympiade 112 *provectus, ut plura ſolus prope quam cæteri omnes contulerit*, he wrote as follows, *Apelles Cous Olympiade* 112 *picturæ plura ſolus prope quam cæteri omnes contulit* (1). Turnebus conjectured that we ought to read *Apelles Cous* and not *Apelles eo uſque*. His conjecture was confirmed by the Vatican manuſcript (2), and thoſe in the King's and Mr. Colbert's Library (3). The other authority is *Ovid*, who writes thus;

Ut Venus artificis labor eſt & gloria Coi,
Æquoreo madidas quæ præmit imbre comas (4).
That is,

" As Venus riſing from the Ocean's wave,
" Is the chief work of the great Coan artiſt.

(1) Plinius, lib. 35. cap. 10.

(2) *See* Carlo Dati, *Poſtille ſopra la Vita d' Apelle*, p. 104.

(3) *See* Father Hardouin upon Pliny, tom. 5. p. 264.

(4) Ovid, *de Ponto*, lib. 4. eleg. 1. ver. 29.

I ſhall ſpeak in the remark (I) of another paſſage in this Poet, where ſome read *Cois*, and others *Cous*. The great number of authors, who give another country to Apelles, obliged Mazzoni to defend the cauſe of Ovid, but inſtead of *Co*, he aſſerted that the Poet wrote *Chio* (5). Three conſiderable authors repreſent Apelles as born at Epheſus (6). Suidas makes him a native of Colophon, and adds that he was adopted by the city of Epheſus.

(5) *Difeſa di Dante*, lib. 3. cap. 16, *in* Carlo Dati, *Poſtille ſopra la Vita d' Apelle*, p. 103.

(6) Strabo, lib. 14. Lucian. *de Calumn.* Ælian. *Hiſtor. Animal.* lib. 4. cap. 50. *See likewiſe* Tzetzes, *Chil.* 8. *Hiſt.* 197. ver. 193.

[B] *He flouriſhed in the time of Alexander the Great.*] It is undeniable, that he was at the height of his reputation, when that Prince began his conqueſt of Aſia, that is, in the 111th Olympiad. The adventure of Apelles at the court of Egypt ſhews that he ſurvived Alexander. It is an error therefore to ſay as Majoragius does, that he was a ſcholar of Zeuxis; the diſtance of above 120 years, between the 84 Olympiad, when Zeuxis flouriſhed (7), and the reign of Ptolomy the firſt, ſhews the impoſſibility of it. It is *Carlo Dati*, who corrects this miſtake of Majoragius: *Non ſo*, ſays he (8), *con qual fondamento Marcantonio Majoraggio nel comento ſopra l'Orat. di Cior. a* 11 *diceſſe, che Apelle foſſe ſcolare di Zeuſi, quando tra l'uno e l'altre corſe l'eta d'un uomo.* The ſtory of his adventure at the court of Egypt is as follows. Apelles had not the good fortune to be in favour with Ptolomy at the court of Alexander. A ſtorm forced him to take ſhelter at Alexandria during the reign of Ptolomy. A knaviſh fellow, in order to do him a diskindneſs, went to him, and invited him in the King's name to dinner. Apelles came, and ſeeing the King in a prodigious paſſion, to excuſe himſelf ſaid that he ſhould not have come but at his orders. He was commanded to ſhew the man, who had invited him; this was impoſſible; for the impoſtor was not then in the room. Apelles upon this drew a sketch of his picture upon the wall, with a coal; the firſt lines of which diſcovered him immediately to Ptolomy. *Non fuerat ei gratia in comitatu Alexandri cum Ptolomæo, quo regnante Alexandriam vi tempeſtatis expulſus, ſubornato fraude æmulorum plano regio invitatus, ad Regis cænam venit, indignantique Ptolomæo, & vocatores ſuos oſtendenti ut diceret a quo eorum invitatus eſſet, arrepto carbone exſtincto è foculo imaginem in pariete delineavit, agnoſcente vultum plani rege ex inchoato protinus* (9).

(7) See the remark [A] of the article ZEUXIS.

(8) Carlo Dati, *Poſtille ſopra la Vita d' Apelle*, p. 105.

(9) Plin. lib. 35. cap. 10.

[C] *Alexander .... finding him in love with one of his miſtreſſes, ... he reſigned her to him.*] Pliny tells the ſtory in this manner. *Alexander ei honorem clariſſimo præbuit exemplo, namque cum dilectam ſibi è pallacis ſuis præcipuè, nomine Campaſpen, nudam pingi ob admirationem formæ ab Apelle juſſiſſet, eumque tum pari captum amore ſenſiſſet, dono eam dedit. Magnus animo, major imperio ſui: nec minor hoc facto, quam victoriâ aliquâ; quippe ſe vicit, nec torum tantum ſuum, ſed etiam affectum donavit artifici; ne dilectæ quidem reſpectu motus, ut quæ modo Regis fuiſſet, nunc pictoris eſſet. Sunt qui Venerem Anadyomenen illo pictam exemplari putant* (10). That is, " Alexander gave an eminent inſtance of his regard for " Apelles; for when he had employed him to draw " the picture of Campaſpe, one of his miſtreſſes, whom " he was moſt fond of, naked, on account of her " admirable beauty, and found him ſeized with an " equal affection for her, he gave her to him. In " this inſtance he ſhewed himſelf great in mind, " greater in the command of himſelf, and no leſs " glorious in ſuch an action, than in any conqueſt; for he " conquer'd himſelf, and not only reſigned his miſtreſs, " but even his love to a Painter; and was not in the " leaſt moved with any reſpect for her, who was before " miſtreſs to a King, and now muſt be ſo to a Painter. " Some writers are of opinion, that the Venus Anady- " omene was painted from her." Ælian mentions this ſtory; but he gives the name of Pancaſte to the Lady (11). The article of that Prince will contain a remark upon this ſubject (12): I ſhall ſhew, that a man, who ſuffers the moſt beautiful of his miſtreſſes to be drawn naked, does not deſerve the character of being continent and chaſte; which has been given him.

(10) Plinius, lib. 35. cap. 10.

(11) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 12. cap. 34.

(12) See the remarks [H] and [I] of the article MACEDON.

[D] *It is very improbable, that he ſhould make ſo free with the good nature of Alexander, as he is ſaid to have done.*] Let Pliny ſay what he pleaſes, that Apelles had made himſelf agreeable to that Prince by his polite behaviour and complaiſance; he will ſcarce perſuade any one, who knows Alexander's character, that a Painter could ſay to him with impunity, *Hold your tongue; for the boys, who mix the colours, laugh at you. Fuit & comitas illi, propter quam gratior Alexandro magno erat frequenter in officinam ventitanti... Sed & in officinâ imperitè multa differenti ſilentium comiter ſuadebat, rideri eum dicens à pueris, qui colores tererent. Tantum erat auctoritati juris in regem alioqui iracundum* (13). It is incredible, that Apelles ſhould imagine ſuch an expreſſion as that, however uſed, would be taken in good part; and it is equally improbable, that Alexander, who had ſo good an education, and ſo fine a genius, would talk ſo impertinently upon painting, as to expoſe himſelf to the laughter of the youngeſt apprentices of the profeſſion. This is the opinion of the learned Freinſhemius. *Non crediderim in officinâ imperite multa differentem ab Apelle mordaci dicterio repreſſum fuiſſe. Nam id neque majeſtati tanti Regis, neque modeſtiæ pictoris, hominis non ſtupidi nec indocti conveniſſet, & Alexander liberalibus ſtudiis ab extremâ ætate imbutus, etiam de artibus, quas non calleret, haud ineptè judicare didicerat* (14). As for Megabyzus, Prieſt of Diana (15), it would not be ſo ſurprizing that Apelles gave him ſuch advice. It was he, if we believe Plutarch, who was rallied in this manner by Apelles: *Do not you perceive*, ſays he, *that the boys, who beat the Oker, and who, as long as you kept ſilence, had the utmoſt reverence for you on account of your gold and purple garments, had no ſooner heard you diſcourſe upon a paint, which you knew nothing of, but they began to laugh at you* (16)? Another tells us, that it was Zeuxis, who ſaid this to Megabyzus (17). I can be perſuaded more eaſily of the liberty, which it is ſaid Apelles took with Alexander upon another occaſion. Alexander having viewed his own picture drawn by Apelles, did not commend it ſo much as it deſerv'd. A little after an horſe was brought, which neighed at ſight of the horſe, which was painted in the ſame picture, as if it had been a real horſe. Upon this ſays Apelles to Alexander, *Sir, it is plain, this horſe underſtands painting better than your Majeſty* (18). But to ſpeak freely my ſentiments, I think all this is too rude, and unmannerly, and brutal to be aſcribed to a Painter, who is repreſented in other places to be a man of an eaſy, complaiſant and polite behaviour. He muſt either have been a kind of Court-Buffoon, or a perſon of ſuch an odd capricious humour, as we often meet with in the moſt eminent artiſts; I ſay, we muſt have recourſe to one or other of theſe two ſuppoſitions, to give credit to what is related of Apelles, not only with regard to Alexander, but alſo to Megabyzus, who

(13) Plin. l. 35. cap. 10.

(14) Frienſhem. *Supplem. in Curtium*, lib. 2. c. 6.

(15) Several learned men are of opinion, that Megabyzus was a name that properly belonged to the Prieſt of Diana. Others underſtand here by *Megabyzus*, a Nobleman of Perſia.

(16) Plutarch. *de Diſcrim. Adulat. & Amici*, p. 58. & *de Tranquill. Animi*, p. 471, 472.

(17) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 2. c. 2. Freinſh. *Suppl. in Curt.* lib. 2. cap. 6. quotes him as aſcribing this to Apelles.

(18) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 2. c. 3.

which he made concerning *Lais*, is no compliment to his morals [*E*]. His picture of calumny has been ſpoken of; but ſcarce any perſon has perceived the miſtakes which are in the account of the fact, which gave occaſion to that picture [*F*]. The diſcourſe in which Lucian ſpeaks of it is an excellent piece (*b*). The maſter piece of Apelles was the picture

was venerable on account of his gold and purple ornaments.

The diſcourſe of Apelles to Alexander on occaſion of the neighing of the horſe, is much more genteel and polite in the tranſlations of ſome learned men, than it is in the original; but this polite turn, which they have added to it, is no compliment to them, ſince it is founded upon a great miſtake and ignorance. The Greek is thus: Ἀλέξανδρος θεασάμενος τὴν ἐν Ἐφέσῳ ἰδίαν ἐκτυπωθεῖσαν ὑπὸ Ἀπελλοῦ γραφεῖσαν οὐκ ἐπῄνεσε κατὰ τὸν ἀξίαν ἐργάσατο· ἐπιχειρήσαντος δὲ ἵππου ἐπὶ τῇ πόᾳ πρὸς τὸν ἵππον τὸν ἐν τῇ πόᾳ ὡς πρὸς ἀληθινὸν ἐκτείναντος, ὦ Βασιλεῦ (φησὶν ὁ Ἀπελλῆς) ἀλλ' ὅγε ἵππος ἐστὶ σου γραφικώτερος εἶναι καὶ πολύ (19). Eraſmus relates the fact in this manner. *Apud Epheſum, quum Alexander conſpectam effigiem ſui corporis ad vivum magna arte expreſſam admiraretur, atque interim forte equus inductus picto in eadem tabula equo adhinniret, deceptus imitatione, Apelles, equus, inquit, ô Rex, multo melius expreſſus eſt quam tu* (20). That is, "While "Alexander was viewing with admiration at Epheſus "a picture of himſelf drawn with prodigious skill, "an horſe being brought in by accident neighed at "the horſe which was painted in the ſame picture, "being deceived by the exact imitation of nature; "upon which Apelles ſaid to Alexander, the horſe, "O King, is painted much better than your Majeſty." I ſhall omit the circumſtances, which Eraſmus relates, and which are not in Ælian; and confine my ſelf to the reflection, which he tells us the Painter made upon it; *Sir, I have ſucceeded much better in painting your horſe than in painting your Majeſty.* This is not the ſenſe of the Greek; a learned Critic has ſhewn, that γραφικὸς ſignifies a perſon, who underſtands painting; and has proved by this that Cælius, Rhodiginus, and Eraſmus have extremely miſrepreſented this ſtory (21). I am ſurprized that Pliny was ignorant of this, who has ſaid ſomething relating to the neighing of a horſe. See below the Remark [*K*].

(19) Idem, ibid.

(20) Eraſm. *in Apophthegmat.*

(21) Paulus Leopardus *Emendationum*, lib. 12. cap. 4.

[*E*] *The anſwer, which he made concerning Lais, is no compliment to his morals.*] She was but a young girl, when Apelles ſeeing her return from the well, and ſtruck with admiration of her beauty, courted her to go along with him in ſo engaging a manner, that ſhe ſubmitted to it immediately. He carried her to a feaſt, where he expected to find ſeveral of his friends; who rallied him for bringing a raw girl, inſtead of a courtezan to them. *Do not you trouble your ſelves with this*, replied he; *do not be ſurprized at it; I ſhall inſtruct her in ſuch a manner, that before three years are paſt, ſhe ſhall know her buſineſs to perfection.* Χλευασάντων δ' αὐτὸν τῶν ἑταίρων ὅτι ἀπ' ἰτυίας παρθένον εἰς τὸ συμπόσιον ἀγάγοι. μὴ θαυμάσητε, εἶπεν, ἐγὼ γὰρ αὐτὴν εἰς μιᾶλλόσαι ἀπόλαυσιν μετ' οὐ πολὺν χρόνον καλὴν δείξω (22). Would not one imagine, that he was ſpeaking here of a young horſe who was not broken yet; but under the care of a skilful querry, would ſoon learn all ſorts of airs and paces? It it dreadful to conſider the corruption of thoſe times. Apelles's friends even ſhew'd a more irregular and vicious diſpoſition than he (23). Lais became one of the moſt celebrated courtezans of that age. The Painters frequented her houſe, in order to take a copy of her fine breaſt (24). Apelles, as a Painter, without doubt made uſe of the ſame original. *Nemini dubium eſſe poteſt, quin hanc ipſam quoque Laidem ſibi veluti in contubernium aſciverit Apelles, quo vivam emendatiſſimæ formæ imaginem ab animali exemplo in tabulas ſuas transfunderet* (25).

(22) Athen. lib. 13. p. 588.

(23) Richelet in his Dictionary under the word *Pucelage*, tells us, that a *Maidenhead* is called the *Rageo of Fools*.

(24) Athen. lib. 13. p. 588.

(25) Junius, *in Catalogo Artificum in Apelle*, p. 19.

[*F*] *No perſon has perceived the miſtakes, which are in the account of the fact, which gave occaſion to that picture.*] Lucian tells the ſtory thus. Antiphilus, the Painter, being piqued at the favour which Apelles was in at the Court of King Ptolomy, accuſed him of being an accomplice in the conſpiracy of Theodotus, Governor of Phœnicia. He affirmed, that he had ſeen Apelles at dinner with Theodotus, and whiſpering to him all the time of the entertainment. After this he was informed, that by the advice of Apelles the city of Tyre had revolted, and that of Peluſium was taken. However it was certain, that Apelles had never been at Tyre, and knew nothing of Theodotus, but that he was Governor of Phœnicia. Ptolomy was ſo enraged at this, that without examining into the affair, he was juſt reſolved to put Apelles to death. He conſidered neither the circumſtances of the accuſer, nor thoſe of the perſon accuſed. The former, out of envy with regard to his profeſſion, might attempt the ruin of an innocent man; and the latter was too inconſiderable a man to be capable of forming ſuch a plot, tho' his gratitude for ſo many favours, which he had received from Ptolomy, had not reſtrained him from ſuch malicious deſigns. The King regarded none of theſe conſiderations; he never enquired whether Apelles had ever made a voyage to Tyre; he did nothing but rave and ſwear; and if one of the conſpirators had not ſhewed him, that it was a mere calumny of Antiphilus, he muſt infallibly have been put to death upon the accuſation. But as ſoon as Ptolomy knew the crime of his accuſer, he condemned him to be a ſlave to Apelles, and gave the latter an hundred talents. This is the affair, which gave occaſion to Apelles's excellent picture of calumny, which Lucian has given us a deſcription of. It is a misfortune, that this Author in his Deſcription did not obſerve the monſtrous anachroniſm, which he has fallen into; for the conſpiracy of Theodotus was in the reign of Ptolomy Philopator, which did not begin till an hundred years after the death of Alexander the Great (26). Judge now whether Apelles could be living then. We muſt ſuppoſe one or other of theſe two things, either that Lucian ſpeaks of an Apelles, different from him who was in ſuch great reputation at Alexandria; or that he has confounded ſome plot, which was contrived under Ptolomy Philadelphus, with the conſpiracy of Theodotus. As we have no Author, who can give us any light with regard to any plot, in which our Painter might be falſely accuſed of being engaged, it would be to no purpoſe to examine into the foundation of Lucian's error. Let us ſee then whether he had in his view another Apelles, than him, we are ſpeaking of in this article. I cannot imagine to myſelf ſuch a perſon; for every writer of judgment takes particular care, when he mentions a Painter, who has nothing in common with the great and incomparable Apelles but his name, not to call him ſimply *Apelles* without ſome other character to diſtinguiſh him. He tells us, that he does not ſpeak of the great Apelles. Now Lucian tells us nothing of this; and whatever he ſays relates directly to the great Apelles: it is of him therefore, that he pretends to ſpeak. I know indeed that a learned man fixes upon the epithet of Epheſian, Ἀπελλῆς ὁ Ἐφέσιος, *ad diſtinctionem illius Apellis, qui ſub Alexandro & Ptolomæo Lagi vixit maximi nominis & artis, Coi patria. Hic autem patriâ Colophonius, verum θέσει, id eſt adoptione fuit Epheſius, teſte Suidâ, Pamphili Amphipolitæ diſcipulus* (27); i. e. "A- "pelles the Epheſian, to diſtinguiſh him from that Apel- "les, who lived under Alexander the Great and Pto- "lomy Lagus, and was famous for his prodigious "excellence in painting. But this Apelles was of "Colophon, tho' by adoption an Epheſian, as Suidas "tells us, and was ſcholar to Pamphilus of Amphi- "polis." But I know likewiſe, that others have given this epithet to the great Apelles (28). And I can confirm this by a reaſon, which is contained in the paſſage, which I have quoted; for if Lucian could give this epithet to his Apelles, becauſe he was ſpeaking of a Painter born at Colophon, and adopted by the Epheſians, I may argue from thence, that he has applied it to the great Apelles, who was born in the iſle of Cos, but was without doubt a Citizen of Epheſus. Would a man of his eminence have ſettled in that city, (for it was there, that Alexander ſaw and viſited him,) unleſs he had received all the rights of a Citizen? Here is another proof: Mr. Tollius owns, that Lucian ſpeaks of the ſame Apelles, that Suidas mentions. Now Suidas ſpeaks of the great Apelles only. I ſhall prove this, 1, becauſe he ſpeaks but of one Apelles: it is probable, that he would

(26) *See* Polybius, lib. 4 and 5. He gives a long account of it.

(27) Jacobus Tollius *Notis in Lucian. de Calumniâ*, cap. 2. n. 1.

(28) Strabo, Ælian, Tzetzes.

picture of Venus rising out of the sea [G]. Some writers tell us, that the mistress which Alexander gave him, served him for the original when he drew that piece; others say that Phryne the Courtezan was employed for that purpose. It is said, that he began another picture of Venus, which would have excelled the former, if he had not been prevented by death from finishing it [H]. Moreri has taken one of these pieces for the other [I], and have passed by the great and celebrated Painter of that name, and mentioned only another who was obscure and unknown? II, Because he tells us, that his Apelles was a scholar to Pamphilus of Amphipolis, which Pliny expressly mentions of the great Apelles (29). Thus Lucian's error is very evident; and I am surprized, that neither John Baptista Adriani (30), nor Carlo Dati (31), nor Francis Junius (32), nor a great many other famous Authors, who have spoken of this treatise of Lucian, have perceived it, but taken the whole story as a real adventure of the great Apelles. Mr. Tollius knew very well, that the crime, of which Apelles was accused, had relation to the reign of Ptolomy Philopator; but he did not imagine that Lucian was deceived; he chose rather to suppose, that Lucian had in view another Apelles, who was contemporary with Antiphilus, and a scholar to Pamphilus. I cannot tell when Antiphilus or Ctesidemus, whose scholar he was (33), lived; but it is plain from Pliny, that Pamphilus flourished in the time of Philip, father to Alexander the Great (34).

(9) Plin. lib. 35. cap. 10. & *init.* cap. 11. Carlo Dati, *Postille sopra la Vita d'Apelle*, and Father Hardouin upon Pliny, tom. 5. p. 205, tells us, that Plutarch in his *Life of Aratus* says, *that Apelles was scholar to Pamphilus*; but it is a very obscure testimony. Plutarch, p. 1032, seems rather to say, *that Apelles was a scholar to Melanthus.*

(30) In a letter, which is at the beginning of the 3d volume of Vasari.

(31) In his *Postille sopra la Vita d'Apelle.*

(32) *In Catalogo Artificum, in Apelle.*

(33) Plin. lib. 35. cap. 10. pag. 222.

(34) Idem, ibid. p. 206.

[G] *His master-piece was the picture of Venus rising out of the sea.*] Augustus dedicated it in the temple of Julius Cæsar. The lower parts were injured, and no person could be found capable of restoring them. Length of time destroyed the rest; and then Nero had another Venus drawn by Dorotheus, which he placed in the room of that of Apelles. *Venerem exeuntem è mari Divus Augustus dicavit in delubro patris Cæsaris, quæ Anadyomene vocatur, versibus Græcis tali opere tum laudatur victo, sed illustrato: hujus inferiorem partem corruptam qui reficeret non potuit reperiri. Verum ipsa injuria cessit in gloriam artificis. Consenuit hæc tabula carie, aliamque pro eâ Nero principatu substituit suo.* These are the words of Pliny, in the 10th chapter of his 35th book. I have quoted in remark [C] the passage, where he says, that Alexander's mistress was the original of this Venus. The article of PHRYNE will shew us a tradition different from this.

[H] *He would have finished a finer picture of Venus, if he had not been prevented by death.*] If Calcagnini had chosen rather to give us the testimonies of ancient Authors, than have spoken things of his own head, he would never have assured us, that Apelles left his *Venus Anadyomene* imperfect with design. *The reason of that conduct*, says he, *was, that Apelles despaired of finishing it to the same perfection as he had begun. Sed ô me multo Apelle incautiorem! ille enim tanta felicitate Veneris emergentis partes superiores expressit, ut diffisus penicillo reliquas posse absolvere desperaverit, atque in admirationem posteritatis tabulam inchoatam reliquerit* (35). Carlo Dati, who accuses this Author of advancing a great many things, without mentioning whence he took them, gives us two other instances of it. It is certain, that the words of Pliny prove Calcagnini guilty of an error; and are as follows: *Apelles inchoaverat aliam Venerem Cois superaturus etiam suam illam priorem. Invidit* Mors *peracta parte, nec qui succederet operi ad præscripta lineamenta inventus est* (36). That is, "Apelles had "begun another Venus for the Coans, which would "have excelled his former; but death cut him off, "when but part was finished, and no person could "be found to compleat the rest according to his "draught." Cicero in two places of his work, tells us only, that Apelles left his Venus imperfect (37).

(35) Calcagnini, lib. 13. p. 177, *apud* Carl. Dati, p. 145.

(36) Plinius, lib. 35. cap. 10. pag. 212.

(37) Cicero *Epist.* 9. *ad Famil.* lib. 1. & *de Officiis*, lib. 3. c. 2.

[I] *Moreri has taken one of these pictures for the other.*] He expresses himself in this manner. *The finest of all Apelles's pieces were his two Venus's, one of which rising out of the Sea was called Anadyomene, and the other is that, which he drew for the inhabitants of the island of Cos, and which is mentioned by Ovid in these terms,*

Si nunquam Venerem Cois pinxisset Apelles,
Mersa sub æquoreis illa lateret aquis.

That is,

"——— If great Apelles
"Ne'er for the Coan Isle had painted Venus,
"She still beneath the Sea had lain conceal'd."

He quotes *Ovid in Sent.* He should have quoted his third book *De Arte Amandi.* It is certain that Apelles never finished the last of these two pictures; Pliny expressly assures us of it (38). What probability is there then, that Ovid, who had two pictures of Venus to mention, the one compleat, the other but half finished, should leave the former to speak of the latter? To act in that manner shews an ignorance of the common methods of reasoning. Besides the second verse is a plain allusion to the *Venus Anadyomene*, that is, *rising out of the waves of the Sea.* So that he must necessarily mean the first picture. We know, that Venus had that attitude in the first piece, but we cannot tell whether she had it in the latter. I add, that if these two verses of Ovid were written by him as they are represented above, he must have reasoned very absurdly; so that we must correct them in this manner; and then they form a good proof of what is gone before.

(38) See the preceding remark.

Si Venerem Cois nusquam posuisset Apelles,
Mersa sub æquoreis illa jaceret aquis.

The best Criticks are for reading it *Coüs* and not *Coïs.* I think this is right, tho' it is plain, that Apelles drew his *Venus Anadyomene* for the inhabitants of the Isle of Cos; for it was of them that Augustus procured it, and remitted them in consideration of this picture the payment of an hundred talents of the tribute, which they owed to his treasury. They had this *Venus* in the temple of Æsculapius, with the *Antigonus* of the same Painter. *Lacter promontorium est Coæ insulæ, in cujus suburbio est ædes Æsculapii nobilitata Antigono Apellis . . . . conspiciebatur ibidem quoque ejusdem artificis Venus Anadyomene* (39). Ἡ νῦν ἀνάκει-ται τῷ Θεῷ Καίσαρι ἐν Ῥώμῃ, τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ ἀναθέντος τῷ πατρὶ τὴν ἀρχηγέτιν τοῦ γένους αὐτοῦ. φασὶ δ' τοῖς Κώοις ἀντὶ τῆς γραφῆς ἑκατὸν ταλάντων ἄφεσιν γενέσθαι τοῦ προσαχθέντος φόρου (40). That is, "This picture "is now dedicated to the divine Cæsar, Augustus "having consecrated to his father the Patroness of his "family. It is said, that the Coans had an hun-"dred talents of the tribute laid upon them, remit-"ted to them on account of this picture." Pliny might not know that the *Venus Anadyomene* was drawn for the Isle of Cos; and therefore we are not to wonder, that he speaks only of the second Venus of Apelles.

(39) Junius *in Catalogo Artif. in Apelle*, p. 22.

(40) Strabo, lib. 14. p. 452.

I have a doubt upon my mind, which I am going to propose; I cannot tell whether Pliny has not multiplied beings without necessity, when he mentions a *Venus Anadyomene*, and another *Venus* begun for the inhabitants of the Isle of Cos. The ground of my doubt is, that the former *Venus* was not perfect but with respect to the upper part of the picture. It is Pliny himself, who tells us this, and adds, that no Painter ever attempted to repair what had been injured (41). Now the other *Venus* was not finished but only with respect to the upper parts, and no Painter had the courage to undertake what was wanting. It is Pliny again, who tells us this (42). I believe he is the only Author, who made this remark with regard to the two *Venus's* of Apelles, which were defective in the same places. The other Writers observe this only of the *Venus* of Apelles in general; and when they mention this *Venus*, they place it in the Isle of Cos (43); and we have seen above that it was from this Isle that Augustus had the *Venus Anadyomene* (44). It is probable therefore, that Pliny was not exact in his account. I refer this to those Gentlemen, who will take the pains to examine this little doubt, which I have suggested.

AN enquiry, whether there are two Venus's of Apelles.

(41) Plinius, lib. 35. p. 212.

(42) Ibid.

(43) *See* Cicero *de Offic.* lib. 3. cap. 2. *de Natura Deor.* lib. 1. cap. 27; *in Verrem Orat.* 4. cap. 60.

(44) *Ex* Strabonis lib. 14. pag. 452.

and misrepresented the story of painting of the horse [K]. There was no business so important, that could oblige Apelles to be one day without using his pencil, which gave occasion to the famous proverb [L]. The books, which this great Painter wrote upon painting, are all lost (c). We cannot tell where or when he died. One of his chief excellencies was to make his pictures so exactly resemble the persons painted, that the Physiognomists could form a judgment as readily from his portraits, as if they had seen the originals [M]. We may refer to this what he did at the court of Egypt (d).

(c) *Voluminibus etiam editis, quæ doctrinam eam continent.* Plin. l. 35. c. 10.

(d) See remark [B].

[K] *Moreri has misrepresented the story of painting of the horse.*] The ancient Authors have spoken with great esteem, says Moreri *of an horse drawn so naturally by Apelles, that the mares neighed at the sight of it.* I believe that no ancient Writer has said this; but let us see what Pliny tells us: *Est & equus ejus, sive fuit, pictus in certamine; quod judicium ad mutas quadrupedes provocavit ab hominibus. Namque ambitu æmulos prævalere sentiens singulorum picturas inductis equis ostendit: Apellis tantum equo adhinnivere, idque & postea semper illius experimentum artis ostentatur* (45). This passage acquaints us, that Apelles, in a contest with several other Painters, who could paint an horse best, mistrusting the integrity of the judges, chose to commit this cause to the decision of the brutes; he ordered horses to be brought in, which neighed at the sight of Apelles's picture only. Some Authors (46) are of opinion, that Ælian's story (47) is nothing but an alteration of this; that is, they imagine, that what passed between Apelles and the judges of the prize, when that Painter preferred the judgment of a horse to theirs, gave occasion to the report, that he said to Alexander, *Your horse understands painting better than you.* Others think that these are two entire different stories (48). With regard to my own opinion, I have already given it, that this story of Ælian is to be considered as a mere fable. The silence of Pliny upon so fine an opportunity of introducing it, confirms me in this sentiment. Would Pliny have omitted the mention of the horse's neighing in Apelles's shop before Alexander the Great, and the consequence which Apelles drew from it; when he has given us another story, which tells us, that Apelles appealed from the judges to the decision of the horses? Carlo Dati has observed, that in either of these cases Apelles did not speak as a skilful Painter, since he supposed that the better judge a man was of painting, the more readily he would take the picture for the object itself. But we must take notice, that this censure cannot fall upon the story, which Pliny relates; for Apelles preferred the judgment of the horses to that of men upon no other account, but because he saw his rivals had bribed the judges (49). The remark of Carlo Dati is very just at the bottom; it is more easy to deceive those, who do not understand painting, than those, who do. He quotes John Paul Lemazzo (50): we may quote hereafter Mr. Perrault, who has fully confuted the consequences which are drawn in favour of the ancient Painters, from their having deceived both men and beasts (51).

(45) Plinius, lib. 35. p. 213.

(46) Schefferus *in* Æliani *Var. Hist.* lib. 2. c. 3.

(47) See remark [D].

(48) Carlo Dati, *Postille sopra la Vita d'Apelle*, p. 128.

(49) Ibid. pag. 129.

(50) Lib. 3. cap. 1. *della Pittura.*

(51) *Parallèle des anciens & des modernes*, Dialog. 2. p. 136.

[L] *He never passed one day without using his pencil, which gave occasion to the famous proverb.*] It is Pliny, who tells us this: *Apelli fuit alioqui perpetua consuetudo nunquam tam occupatam diem agendi, ut non lineam ducendo exerceret artem, quod ab eo in proverbium venit* (52). Carlo Dati remarks upon this, that Salmasius in confirmation of this proverb quotes these words as a verse of Horace, *Nulla dies abeat, quin linea ducta supersit*, which belongs not to Horace, nor any other ancient Poet. He adds, that this Author appears very often to have trusted too much to his memory: *Non lascerò d'avvertire in questo luogo, che Claudio Salmasio, grandissima critico dell' eta nostra, nelle Dissertaz. Pliniane sopra Solino a 5, in confermazione di questo proverbio, fidandosi troppo della memoria, come bene spesso egli fece, cita un verso d'Orazio. . . . il quale non è (ch'io sappia) ne d'Orazio, ne d'altro Poeta Latino antico, ma forse uno di quei versi proverbiali, che vanno per le bocche di gli uomini senza saperne l'autore* (53).

(52) Plin. lib. 35. cap. 10. pag. 208.

(53) Carlo Dati, *Postille sopra la Vita d'Apelle*, p. 107. Father Hardouin makes the same remark. *See* tom. 5. of his *Pliny*, p. 208.

[M] *The Physiognomists could form their judgments as readily upon his portraits, as from the originals themselves.*] Apion the Grammarian tells a story upon this so improbable, that it would almost be treated as fabulous, tho' an Author of much better credit, than that great romancer was, had assured us of it. Let us content ourselves with knowing historically what Pliny says: *Imaginem adeò similitudinis indiscretæ pinxit, ut (incredibile dictu) Apion Grammaticus scriptum reliquerit quendam ex facie hominum addivinantem (quos metoposcopos vocant,) ex iis dixisse aut futuræ mortis annos, aut præteritæ* (54). Pliny could never possibly persuade himself, that at the sight of a picture, which extremely resembled the person painted, a man could tell immediately at what age he died, or would die. We must suppose, that this Diviner informed himself whether the person was living or not.

(54) Plinius, lib. 35. cap. 10. pag. 210.

APELLES, an excellent Tragedian under Caligula, raised himself by a very infamous manner of life; but when the flower of his youth was gone, he turned Comedian (a), and maintained himself so highly in the good graces of Caligula, that this Emperor, who would always have him in his company even in publick (b), made him one of his Counsellors (c). But one day, having asked him as they stood by the statue of Jupiter, *Which of the two seems the greatest person to you, Jupiter, or I?* he fell into such a prodigious passion with Apelles for not answering quick enough, that he ordered him to be whipp'd very cruelly: and said upon this occasion by way of raillery, that Apelles had an agreeable voice, even when he cried [A]. Some authors assure us that he put him into irons, and gave orders from time to time to turn him upon a wheel (d).

(a) Philo *Legat. ad Caium*, pag. 1021.

(b) Dio, lib. 69. p. 643.

(c) Phil. *Legat. ad Caium*, pag. 1021.

(d) Idem, ibid.

[A] *Caligula . . . . said . . . . that he had an agreeable voice, even when he cried.*] Suetonius's words upon this subject are as follows: *Inter varios jocos cum assistens simulacro Jovis Apellem tragœdum consuluisset, uter illi major videretur, cunctantem flagellis discidit, collaudans subinde vocem deprecantis, quasi etiam in gemitu prædulcem* (1).

(1) Sueton. *in Caligul.* cap. 33.

APELICON, who bought the Library of Aristotle. See the remarks upon the article TYRANNION.

APICIUS. There were at Rome three Apicius's famous for their gluttony. The first lived before the change of the Commonwealth, the second under Augustus and Tiberius, and the last under Trajan. It is the first Apicius that Athenæus means, where after he has told us upon the authority of Posidonius, that they had preserved at Rome the memory of one Apicius, who exceeded every body in gluttony, he adds, that it was the same Apicius, who was the cause of Rutilius's banishment (a). We know that Posidonius flourished in the time of Pompey, and that Rutilius was banished about the year of Rome 660. The second Apicius is the most celebrated of the three. Athenæus places

(a) Athen. l. 4. pag. 168.

places him under Tiberius, and tells us, that he ſpent immenſe ſums of money upon his belly, and invented divers ſorts of cakes, which bore his name (*b*). It is of him that Seneca ſpeaks in the 95th Letter, and in the 11th chapter of his book *de Vitâ beatâ*, and in his treatiſe of *Conſolation*, which he wrote to his mother Helvia under the Emperor Claudius. We find in this laſt work, that this Apicius lived in the time of Seneca, and kept as it were a ſchool of gluttony at Rome; that he ſpent two millions and an half in entertainments; that finding himſelf very much in debt, he at laſt thought proper to examine into the ſtate of his affairs, and ſeeing that he had but two hundred and fifty thouſand livres remaining, he poiſoned himſelf out of apprehenſion of being ſtarved with ſuch a ſum. Dion, who calls him M. Gabius Apicius, relates the ſame thing (*c*), and adds one particular, which we meet with likewiſe in the firſt chapter of the fourth book of Tacitus's *Annals*, that Sejanus, when he was very young, had proſtituted himſelf to him. Pliny calls him M. Apicius, and mentions very frequently the ragoo's which he invented (*d*): *Nepotum omnium altiſſimus gurges:* i. e. "He was the compleateſt glutton "that ever appeared in the world." There was a book written upon his gluttony, which is quoted by Athenæus (*e*). There is no doubt but the Apicius of Juvenal, Martial, Lampridius, &c. is the ſame with this [*A*]. The third APICIUS lived under Trajan. He had an admirable ſecret to preſerve oyſters; he ſhewed this by ſending ſome to Trajan as far as Parthia, which were extremely freſh when he received them (*f*). The name of Apicius continued a long time applied to ſeveral kinds of meats, and made a ſort of ſect amongſt the cooks. We have a treatiſe *de Re Culinaria* under the name of Cælius Apicius, which is judged by ſome Critics to be very antient, though they do not ſuppoſe it was written by either of theſe three Apicius's (*g*). Some are of opinion the author's name was Apicius Cælius. A learned Dane is of this ſentiment, and aſcribes this work to him, who ſent the oyſters to the Emperor Trajan. This book was found in the Iſle of Megulonne near Montpellier, by Albanus Torinus, who publiſhed it at Baſil twelve years after [*B*]. It had been diſcovered near an hundred years before under Pope Nicholas V, by Enoch d'Aſcoli (*b*). It had in the title M. Cæcilius Apicius. Voſſius is of opinion, that the Author called himſelf M. Cælius, or M. Cæcilius, and that he intitled his work *Apicius*, becauſe it treated of cookery (*i*). We find in Caſaubon's remarks

(*b*) Idem, lib. 1. pag. 7.

(*c*) Dio, lib. 57.

(*d*) Plin. lib. 8. cap. 51; lib. 9. cap. 18; lib. 10. cap. 48; lib. 19. cap. 8.

(*e*) Apion was the author of it. *Ath.* l. 7. p. 294.

(*f*) Athen. lib. 1. p. 7.

(*g*) Borrichius, *Cogit. de variis Linguæ Lat. ætatibus*, p. 18.

(*b*) Platin. *in Vit. Nicolai V.*

(*i*) Voſſ. *de Analog.* lib. 1. cap. 14. p. 55.

[*A*] *The Apicius of Juvenal, Martial, Lampridius, &c. is the ſame with this.*] I refer to theſe words of Juvenal:

Multa videmus,
Quæ miſer, & frugi non fecit Apicius . . . (1).

"Many things we ſee
"Which ev'n Apicius, ſordid as he was,
"Would never do."

(1) Juvenal. Sat. 4. ver. 23.

And to theſe two verſes of *Martial*:

Ipſe quoque ad cænam gaudebat Apicius ire;
Cum cænaret, erat triſtior ille, domi (2).

"Apicius went with joy to ſup abroad:
"To ſup at home, would vex him to the ſoul."

(2) Mart. Epigram. 69. lib. 2. *See likewiſe* Epig. 73. lib. 10.

And to that paſſage of Lampridius, where we read, that the Emperor Heliogabalus eat very often the tongues of peacocks and nightingales, in imitation of Apicius. *Comedit ſæpius ad imitationem Apicii calcanea camelorum, & criſtas vivis gallinaceis demptas, linguas pavonum, & luſciniarum* (3). There is in *Juvenal* another paſſage, where *Apicius* ſignifies in general a man, who ſpends a great deal in eating;

Quid enim majore cachinno
Excipitur vulgi quam pauper Apicius (4)?

"What greater object of the publick laughter
"Than indigent Apicius?

(3) Lamprid. *in Heliogab.* cap. 19. p. 835. *See likewiſe* cap. 18. pag. 827, *and* cap. 24. p. 857.

(4) Juven. Sat. 11. ver. 2.

Some Commentators very abſurdly ſuppoſe, that the Poet intends here either the Apicius of the firſt book of *Athenæus* (5), or him in the fourth Satyr of *Juvenal* (6).

(5) Bernardus Autumnus upon this paſſage of Juvenal.

(6) Farnabius upon the ſame paſſage.

[*B*] *His book was found by Albanus Torinus, who publiſhed it at Baſil twelve years after.*] He publiſhed it in 4to in 1541. He added it to the treatiſe of Paulus Ægineta *de Facultatibus Alimentorum*, which he had tranſlated, and the ten books of Platina *de tuendâ Valetudine, de Naturâ Rerum, & Popinæ Scientiâ*. He ſays in his Preface, that going to the Iſland of Magulonne twelve years before with William Peliſſier (7), he ſaw a manuſcript, in which he diſcovered by tracing the characters the title of CÆLII APITII DE RE CULINARIA LIBRI X. He was prodigiouſly pleaſed with the diſcovery. He got the work exactly copied; and found it was the production of an ancient Author; but as the manuſcript was in great diſorder, he thought proper before he put it to the preſs to collate it with a copy at Venice, which he expected for a long time. This was ſent him at laſt, but he found it more corrupt than that of Maguelonne. He would have reſolved never to have printed it, if ſeveral Students had not induced him by their complaints and importunity to publiſh it. He publiſhed a ſecond edition of it the ſame year in 8vo at Lions, by Sebaſtian Gryphius. It was publiſhed at Zurich in 1542 in 4to, with the notes and corrections of Gabriel Humelbergius. I am of opinion, that Geſner and Simler deſerve no cenſure for ſaying, that this work was printed at Venice, before Albanus Torinus publiſhed it. It is pretended that they miſunderſtood the expreſſions of this Torinus: *In Bibliotheca Simlero-Geſneriana dicuntur Apicii libri primum excuſi Venetiis, quod acceptum ex male intellectis Torini verbis in dedicatione* (8). Torinus's expreſſions are as follow: *Premendum plane cenſebam donec melioris alicujus exemplaris fieret copia, quod acceperam eſſe annis abhinc plus minus quinquaginta Venetiis impreſſum* (9). Tho' this does not very clearly acquaint us, that he ſpeaks here of an impreſſion of this book, yet it is excuſable to underſtand him ſo, and in reality we find a certain Bibliographer, who aſſures us, that *Apicius* was printed at Venice in 1503 in 4to *apud Joban. de Cereto de Tridino* (10). The heirs of Andrew Wechel had ſome deſign to reprint this work. Pignorius offered them by Velſerus a good manuſcript (11). This was not executed. There was in the Library of the Dukes of Urbin an Apicius, the characters of which are like thoſe of the Pandects of Florence. It is now in the Vatican Library. Gudius compared it with the edition of Lyons (12). Beſides, Albanus Torinus has been ſeverely cenſured for pretending to have diſcovered the air and taſte of antiquity in this Author. *Olfaciebam ſtatim autorem eſſe vetuſtiſſimum & obſcœnum, qui de re popinali linguâ coquinariâ egregiè præter cæteros ſcripſiſſet, & qui obſonia delicatius quam pro eâ ætate, quâ glandibus veſcerentur homines, confeciſſet* (13). Latinus Latinius aſſures us, that a man muſt have a very indifferent taſte, who can form ſuch a judgment; and that this pretended Apicius is a mere ſtupid and barbarous Writer, whoſe methods of cookery are very often more proper to bring the ſkin off the mouth and to ſet one a vomiting. *In Latini Latinii Bibliothecâ profanâ, ubi quædam illius viri docti in*

(7) He was Biſhop of Maguelonne, that is, of Montpellier.

(8) Joh. Albertus Fabricius *in Biblioth. Latinâ*, pag. 130. edit. Hamburgenſ. an. 1697.

(9) Alban. Torinus, *in Epiſt. Dedicat.*

(10) Merckli-nus, *in Lindenio renovato*, p. 85.

(11) *See the Letters of* Reineſius *to* Daumius, pag. 109.

(12) Joh. Albert. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Latin.* p. 130.

(13) Alban. Torin. *in Epiſt. Dedicat.*

marks upon Athenæus ſomething relating to our Apicius (k). I have diſcovered ſeveral errors in different authors upon this article [C]. I ſhall collect them all into a ſingle remark below.

(k) Caſaub. *in Athen.* lib. 1. cap. 6; and lib. 4. cap. 19.

In Apicium obſervationes leguntur, ad verba editoris, ubi in præfat. ait ſe ſtatim olfeciſſe autorem eſſe vetuſtiſſimum, *hæc nota occurrit*: "Quam vereor ne tuæ "nares obeſiores fuerint: Quid enim vetuſtatis redo- "lere poſſunt verba ſemibarbara, & ab eo florenti "ſeculo prorſus aliena? Ego vero, ut quod ſentio "paucis expediam, commentum puto eſſe hominis "otioſiſſimi, qui cum illudere poſteris ejuſdem naris "facilè ſibi eſſe perſuaſiſſet, mentito nomine Apicium "credidit venditare poſſe. Sed paſſim occurrunt, "quibus pene manifeſto prodit ſeipſum autor inep- "tus, barbarus, & nullius in eâ arte ingenii, aut gu- "ſtûs, qui ea interdum conjungat ad ſaporis gratiam, "quæ uſu docente omnes interdum ſcimus ſummam "palato moleſtiam, nauſeamque ſtomacho creare ſo- "lere (14)." The judgment of Latinius is not amiſs; Iſaac Grangæus would have done much better to agree to it, than have pretended, that the ten books *de Re coquinariâ*, which paſs under the name of Apicius, were written by our ſecond Apicius (15). I confeſs the Scholiaſt upon *Juvenal* obſerves, that this Apicius wrote a treatiſe upon Cookery (16); and I own likewiſe, that Iſidorus Hiſpalenſis aſcribes ſuch a piece to the ſame Apicius: *Coquinæ apparatum Apicius quidam primus compoſuit, qui in eo abſumptis bonis morte voluntariâ periit* (17). But theſe are not two Writers, whoſe teſtimony can be a ballance to the ſilence of ſo many other Authors of greater credit, who had unavoidable occaſions to quote this book of Apicius. However, a juſt criticiſm will oblige us to judge, that if there ever was ſuch a book, it is not that publiſhed by Albanus Torinus.

(14) Joh. Albert. Fabric. *Biblioth. Lat. Append.* p. 179.

(15) Iſaac. Grangæus, *in Juvenal.* Sat. 3. ver. 23.

(16) *Auctor præcipiendarum cænarum, qui ſcripſit de juſcellis; fuit enim exemplum gulæ. Vetus Scholiaſt. in Juvenal.* Sat. 4. ver. 23.

(17) Iſidor. Hiſpalenſ. *Origin.* lib. 20. cap. 4. *apud* Joh. Albert. Fabricium, *Bibliothecæ Latinæ*, p. 132.

[C] *I have diſcovered ſeveral errors in different Authors upon the article.*] I ſhall begin with Moreri. He was miſtaken in ſaying, that the Apicius, whom Seneca ſpeaks of, *wrote a book of the Delicacies of eating*, and that *he hanged himſelf out of deſpair, finding that he ſpent all his ſubſtance.* Moreri quotes *Seneca lib. de conſol.* This is too general and uncertain, ſince we have three treatiſes of that Philoſopher intitled *de Conſolatione*. He ſhould have quoted that, which he addreſſed to his mother. We find there that Apicius poiſoned himſelf, upon finding on a calculation of his eſtate, that he had but two hundred and fifty thouſand livres remaining, when all his debts were paid (18). *Ære alieno oppreſſus, rationes ſuas tunc primum coactus inſpexit. Superfuturum ſibi ſeſtertium centies computavit, & velut in ultimâ fame victurus ſi ſeſtertio centies vixiſſet, veneno vitam finivit. Quanta luxuria erat, cui ſeſtertium centies egeſtas fuit* (19)! Martial has the following Epigram upon this ſubject:

Dederas, Apici, bis trecenties ventri,
Sed adhuc ſupererat centies tibi luxum.
Hoc tu gravatus, ni famem & ſitim ferres,
Summa venenum potione duxiſti.
Nil eſt, Apici tibi guloſius factum (20).

(18) I make uſe of the valuation of Lipſius in his *Commentaries upon Tacitus*, lib. 4. cap. 1.

(19) Seneca, *Conſol. ad Helviam.* cap. 10.

(20) Martial, Epigram 22. lib. 3.

It is a ſmall fault in Moreri not to have followed the Author, whom he quotes, with regard to the manner of Apicius's death; but he has taken away all that is ſurprizing in this ſtory, by ſuppreſſing the ſum, which this luxurious perſon had remaining, when he killed himſelf. The quotation from *Athenæus li.* ii. is to no purpoſe. In ſhort Moreri ought to have known, that there were three Apicius's, and have confined himſelf to one. Charles Stephens pretends, that the Apicius, whom Seneca ſpeaks of (21), hanged himſelf, and that he publiſhed a book *de Gulæ Irritamentis*, which is ſtill in the hands of every body. There is no good critic, who thinks, that the work, which we have *de Re culinariâ*, is that Apicius's whom Seneca mentions (22): However, this is the original, from which Moreri took ſeveral of his errors. It is from hence that he learned, that Apicius hanged himſelf, and that he wrote a book *of the Delicacies of Eating*. He ſhould likewiſe have learned from the ſame place, that Apicius had ſtill two hundred and fifty thouſand livres; for this is a fact, which Charles Stephens has not omitted. Lloyd has followed Charles Stephens in every point, except that he has not ſaid, that the book *de Gulæ Irritamentis* is now in the hands of every body. He has conſiderably enlarged the article by copying what Lipſius had remarked upon the three Apicius's; but he knew not, that the paſſage of Suidas, relating to the oyſters ſent to Trajan into Parthia, was to be found in *Athenæus*. The memory of the greateſt men fails them in a thouſand inſtances. Thus Lipſius, who quotes *Athenæus* twice with regard to Apicius, yet has omitted a third paſſage of that Author, which is in every reſpect as remarkable as the two others (23). If he had conſulted it, he would never have conjectured, that the word *Trajan* was corrupted in *Suidas*. Hofman has only copied Lloyd, except that he has quoted more paſſages. His quotations are not always very juſt; for inſtance, he quotes *Seneca de Conſolatione ad Albin. & de Conſolatione ad Elbiam*, as if they were two different pieces. Caſaubon (24) tells us, that Athenæus ſays, that ſeveral cakes bore the name of the firſt Apicius; but it is certain, that Athenæus ſays this of the ſecond Apicius, who lived under Tiberius the Emperor: Ἐγένετο κατὰ τοὺς Τιβερίου χρόνους ἀνήρ τις Ἀπίκιος, πλουσιώτατος, τρυφητὴς, ἀφ' οὗ πλακοῦντας νῦν πολλοὶ Ἀπίκια ὀνομάζουσι (25). Dalechamp has committed in his tranſlation of Athenæus an error, which is very obvious. It is in the fourth book, p. 168. Athenæus having told us, what Poſidonius ſaid concerning the firſt Apicius, a man infamous for his gluttony, adds, Περὶ δὲ Ἀπικίου τοῦ καὶ αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ ἀσωτίᾳ διαβοήτου ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις εἰρήκαμεν; the meaning of which is, that at the beginning he had ſpoken of Apicius, who was alſo himſelf well known for his gluttony. So that the Latin verſion is falſe; *Antea nos quoque iſtius Apicii ob immodicum luxum famoſi meminimus*; that is, "We have likewiſe before men- "tioned that Apicius, who was infamous on account "of his extravagant luxury." This, I ſay, is doubly falſe; for it does not anſwer the force of the Greek, and imputes a falſity to Athenæus. It is not true, that Athenæus had already ſpoken of that Apicius, whom Poſidonius mentioned. Dalechamp obſerves, that Athenæus in his third book had ſpoken of the ſame Apicius, who was mentioned at the beginning of page 7 (26). I am of opinion, that this is falſe. I ſhall ſay nothing upon his quoting *Cælius lib.* v. *cap.* 30 (27). He means Cælius Rhodiginus, whoſe fifth book has but fourteen chapters. He ſhould have quoted the eleventh chapter of the ninth book (28). This Author ſays there are ſeveral things relating to Apicius; but if he falſifies in every other place what he quotes, as he has done in this place a paſſage of Athenæus, it is a misfortune for thoſe, who depend upon his authority. Athenæus, according to him, relates, that Apicius being very diligently enquiring for a certain kind of cray-fiſh at Alexandria, was told, that there were very large ones upon the coaſts of Libya; upon this he ſailed thither immediately; but finding that he had been impoſed upon, he curſed the Country, and left it with a reſolution never to return thither as long as he lived. This is far from the account, which Athenæus gives: he tells us, that Apicius having eat at Minturnæ in Campania a kind of water-locuſts, which exceeded the lobſters of Alexandria in bigneſs, and being told, that ſome of them were found in Africa, which were prodigiouſly large, he paſſed over thither immediately, in ſpite of a great many inconveniencies. The fiſhermen, being told of his arrival, went to him with the largeſt that they had taken. But as ſoon as he found by them, that they had none which exceeded them in ſize, he gave orders to carry him back to Minturnæ without ever going aſhore (29).

(21) Charles Stephens quotes him *in Libro de Conſolatione ad Albinam.* Caſaubon, *in Athenæum*, pag. 23. quotes him in the ſame manner.

(22) See remark [B] towards the end.

(23) It is that in the firſt book, p. 7.

(24) In *Athen.* pag. 23.

(25) *Athen.* pag. 7.

(26) Dalechamp, *Not. in Athen.* p. 706.

(27) Idem, ibid.

(28) I do not pretend to deny, that the firſt edition of Rhodiginus was differently divided into books and chapters, from that which is now common.

A modern Author, whom I have quoted, is miſtaken in ſaying that the manuſcript of Apicius was found in the Iſle of Maguelonne by Enoch d'Aſcoli, in the time of Pope Nicholas V. He founds this aſſertion upon the authority of Leander Albertus, and that of Philip of Bergomum. *Ut tradit*, ſays he (30), *Leander Albertus Bononienſis in Deſcriptione Italiæ, p.* 267, *& Philippus Bergomas in Chronici continuatione, qui M. Cæcilium*

(29) *Athen.* lib. 1. p. 7.

(30) Joh. Albert. Fabricius, *Biblioth. Latinæ*, p. 129.

APIEN (PETER), in French, in Latin APIANUS, a Mathematician of Germany in the ſixteenth Century. I ſhall add but one thing to what Moreri has ſaid, and this is, that he has been accuſed of being a plagiary of Regiomontanus [*A*].

Cæcilium appellat. But theſe two Writers never mention the Iſle of Maguelonne, and it is certain, that the manuſcript was not found there by Albanus Torinus till the year 1529. Philip of Bergamum, without mentioning any place, ſays only, that Enoch Aſculanus found, in the time of Pope Nicholas V, theſe two books, *Porphyrio upon Horace*, and M. Cæcilius Apicus. He mentions this under the year 1454. Herman Buſchius agrees with him in reſpect to the time. The words of Leander Albertus are as follow: *Cujus* (Enochi Asculani) *induſtriâ M. Cælius Apitius & Pomponius Porphyrio in Horatium circa Nicolaum V Pontificum inventi ac è tenebris in lucem vindicati ſunt* (31). That is, "By his (Enoch "d'Aſcoli's) induſtry M. Cælius Apitius and Pompo- "nius Porphyrio upon Horace were diſcovered and "brought to light in the time of Pope Nicholas V." Volaterranus aſſures us, that Suidas ſays, that Marcus Apicius wrote a book *de Gula*. Robert Stephens, a great copier of Volaterranus, aſſures us of the ſame thing in his *Elucidarium Poeticum*. They have been cenſured for this; *Vellem locum indicaſſent*, ſays our modern Author (32), *hoc enim apud Suidam non reperio*: That is, "I wiſh they had quoted the place; for I can "find nothing of this in Suidas."

(31) Leander Albertus *in Deſcriptione Italiæ*, p. 404.

(32) Joh. Albert. Fabricius, *Bibliath. Latin.* pag. 132.

[*A*] *He has been accuſed of being a Plagiary of Regiomontanus.*] Thoſe, who deſign to enlarge the Catalogues of Plagiaries already publiſhed, may, if they pleaſe, make uſe of this paſſage of *G. B. Benedetti*: *Hæc omnia*, ſays he (1), *tradita fuerunt, & ſcriptis mandata ab antiquis & à recentioribus uſurpata, ut facilè deprehendi poteſt in Eraſmo Oſualdo, qui omnem ferè ſui primi mobilis rationem à Petro Apiano deſumpſit; Petrus verò Apianus hæc eadem cum multis aliis propoſitionibus à Monte Regio accipiens ſibi ipſi aſcripſit.* That is, "All theſe things were delivered to writ- "ing by the Ancients, and uſed by the moderns; as "appears from Erasmus Osualdus, who took al- "moſt the whole demonſtration of his Primum Mo- "bile from Peter Apianus, and Peter Apianus bor- "rowed the ſame with a great many other propoſi- "tions from Regiomontanus, and claimed the ho- "nour of them to himſelf."

(1) Joh. Baptiſta Benedictus *de Gnomorum Umbrarumque ſolarium uſu*, cap. 2. fol. 2.

APION, a famous Grammarian, born at Oaſis in Egypt [*A*], was a Profeſſor at Rome in the reign of Tiberius (*a*). It is undeniable that he was a man of learning [*B*], and that he had made the moſt diligent enquiries into the moſt abſtruſe ſubjects of antiquity, and was maſter of thoſe points, which give to learning the character of accuracy and variety. But he had all the arrogance of a mere pedant [*C*], and amuſed himſelf too much with difficult and inſignificant enquiries [*D*]. The Emperor Tiberius knew very

(*a*) Suidas *in Apion.*

[*A*] *Apion . . . . was born at Oaſis in Egypt.*] I cannot imagine why Moreri's Dictionary has made two articles of this Grammarian, one under the name of *Apian*, and the other under that of *Appion*, without acquainting us, that they were but one and the ſame perſon. I believe that no good Scholars have ever called him *Apian*; but I am certain that thoſe, who value themſelves upon exactneſs, never call him *Appion*. Their reaſon is, becauſe his name was derived from *Apis*, the Deity of the Egyptians, and not from *Appia*, a Roman family (1). His country has been horribly diſfigured in Moreri: it was changed into *Oſias*. The Supplement has corrected it as it ought to be. Suidas obſerves, that Heliconius had ſaid, that Apion was of the Iſle of Crete; but there is no queſtion but he was born at Oaſis, ſince Joſephus aſſures us of it, and repreſents it as a crime in him, that he abjured his country, and called himſelf an Alexandrian (2). This accuſation of Joſephus would have ſignified nothing, tho' it had not been exaggerated and heightened with great pomp of words; for Apion, in ſtyling himſelf an Alexandrian, after he was made a Citizen of Alexandria, did nothing but what ſeveral famous Profeſſors practiſed before. The ſirname of Pliſtonices, which was given him (3), carried it in a very honourable meaning (4); but we know nothing of the reaſon why he was called ſo. Suidas makes him the ſon of a man, who was named *Pliſtonices*, Ἀπίων ὁ Πλειστονίκου. Upon that foot his ſirname would have been no manner of honour to him. Others ſay, that his father was named *Poſidonius*, Ἀπίων ὁ Ποσειδωνίου (5). It is poſſible, that the copiers might have changed Πλειστονίκου into Ποσειδωνίου.

(1) Voſſius *de Hiſt. Græcis.* pag. 531.

(2) Joſeph. *contra Apion.* lib. 2.

(3) Plinius, lib. 37. cap. 5. Aul. Gellius, lib. 5. cap. 14; and lib. 6. cap. 7.

(4) Ἀπίων ὁ γραμματικὸς, ὁ Πλειστονίκης ἐπικαλούμενος: that is, "Apion the "Grammarian, "who was ſir- "named Pliſto- "nices, which "ſignifies that he "was very often "conqueror.

(5) Jul. African. *apud* Euſeb. *Præparat. Evangel.* lib. 10. cap. 10. p. 490. Juſtin. *Admonit. ad Græcos*, p. 9.

[*B*] *It is undeniable that he was a man of learning.*] Tatian treats him as a man of great reputation, ἀνὴρ δοκιμώτατος (6). Aulus Gellius ſpeaks of him in this manner: *Literis homo multis præditus; rerumque Græcarum plurima atque varia ſcientia fuit: ejus libri non incelebres feruntur, quibus omnium fermè quæ mirifica in Egypto viſuntur audiunturque hiſtoria comprehenditur* (7). That is, "He was a man of great "learning, and extenſive and various knowledge in "the Greek affairs. His books are of conſiderable "reputation, in which we have an Hiſtory of all "the wonderful things, which are to be ſeen or "heard of in Egypt." This is what relates to his learning, and we may judge of his talkative and bold humour by the following words of the ſame Author, *facili atque alacri facundiâ fuit* (8). But let us not anticipate the following remark.

(6) Tatian. *apud* Euſeb. *Præpar.* lib. 10. cap. 11. p. 493, D.

(7) Aul. Gellius, lib. 5. cap. 14.

(8) Idem, lib. 6. cap. 7.

[*C*] *He had all the arrogance of a mere Pedant.*] Aulus Gellius ſays enough to give us an idea of him as a man of extreme vanity and oſtentation. *In his quæ audiviſſe vel legiſſe ſeſe dicit, fortaſſe à vitio ſtudioque oſtentationis ſit loquacior. Eſt enim ſanè quam in prædicandis doctrinis ſuis venditator* (9). Apion uſed to boaſt, with the greateſt aſſurance, that he gave immortality to thoſe, to whom he dedicated his works. There never was any prediction or promiſe more falſe than this. None of his books were able to reſiſt the injury of time; and if other Authors had not told us, that there was ſuch a writer, we ſhould have known nothing now of his name or his perſon. So that he has done no ſervice to thoſe, whom he placed at the head of his writings. I ſhall give the paſſage of Pliny at length. *Apion quidam Grammaticus, hic, quem Tiberius Cæſar cymbalum mundi vocabat, quum publicæ famæ tympanum potius videri poſſet, immortalitate donari à ſe ſcripſit, ad quos aliqua componebat* (10). Mr. de Tillemont confeſſes, that he does not underſtand what Pliny ſays of our Apion in this paſſage (11). I ſhould chooſe rather to confeſs as much, than to adopt the interpretation, which I have read in the Supplement to Moreri. *He boaſted*, ſays the Supplement, *that he ſhould immortalize thoſe, to whom he dedicated any of his works. It is for this reaſon, that the Emperor Tiberius called him the Cymbal of the world; upon which occaſion Pliny ſays, that he ſhould rather be called the Drum of the world, becauſe he gave but a very diſagreeable ſound.* But in the firſt place it is falſe that Pliny tells us, that becauſe Apion valued his Dedications at ſo high a rate, this Emperor called him *cymbalum mundi*. In the ſecond place, Pliny does not ſay, that he ought rather to be called the *Drum of the World*; he uſes the expreſſion *Publicæ Famæ Tympanum*, which has a particular force to repreſent him as a kind of publick Cryer, who, at the ſound of a drum or of his horn, proclaims to the whole City what is neceſſary to be known publickly. In the third place, Pliny does not ſay, that becauſe Apion gave but a very diſagreeable ſound, it was more proper to call him *Tympanum* than *Cymbalum*. Who told the Author of the Supplement to Moreri, that the cymbal was a more agreeable inſtrument than a drum?

(9) Idem, lib. 5. cap. 14.

(10) Plinius *in Præfat. Nat. Hiſt.*

(11) Tillemont, *Hiſtoire des Empereurs*, tom. 1. p. 776. Errors in the Supplement to Moreri. See likewiſe the remark [*E*].

[*D*] *He amuſed himſelf too much with difficult and inſignificant enquiries.*] Julius Africanus calls him the moſt formal of all the Grammarians, or ſuch an one, as

very well the defect of this man's genius; for though we do not perhaps understand all that this Emperor meant (*b*), yet we see plainly that he considered Apion as a romancer, who made too great a noise and ostentation of his learning. He was the head of an embassy, which the inhabitants of Alexandria sent to Caligula, to complain of the Jews who lived in their city, with whom they had great contests. He went to Rome with two other Deputies. The Jews sent likewise three persons (*c*) to Caligula to justify their conduct. Philo was the head of their Embassy. Apion, animated with all the hatred which the Egyptians had maintained for time immemorial against the Jewish nation, accused the Jews of several crimes, and insisted principally upon a point, which was most likely to provoke the resentment of Caligula; and this was, that the Jews would not dedicate images to him [*E*], nor swear by his name, while all the nations of the Empire dedicated temples and altars to him (*d*). One of the chief works of Apion was his *Antiquities of Egypt*. It is without doubt in this book, that he speaks of the Pyramids so amply, as to merit a place amongst the twelve authors, which Pliny tells us wrote upon that subject (*e*). He speaks in the same work very severely of the Jews, but he was not content with abusing them upon the occasion which was given him in his *Antiquities of Egypt*, for he wrote an express work against them (*f*). Josephus thought himself obliged to confute the malicious calumnies which this author had thrown upon them [*F*]. Apion was not living when this confutation was written; for we have an observation in it concerning the manner of his death. We are assured, that after he had so much ridiculed the Jewish ceremonies, without considering that in some respects by his reproaches upon the Jews he trampled upon the antient Laws of the Egyptians (*g*), he found himself seiz'd with

(*b*) See the remark [*C*].

(*c*) This is according to Josephus, *Antiq. Judaic.* lib. 18. cap. 10. for Philo p. 1043 tells us, that there were five deputies of the Jews.

(*d*) Joseph. *Antiq.* lib. 18. cap. 10.

(*e*) Plin. lib. 36. cap. 12. *See likewise* lib. 37. cap. 5.

(*f*) Justin. *Parænet. ad Græcos*, p. 9. Clemens Alexand. *Strom.* l. 1. p. 320.

(*g*) Amongst the rest that of circumcision.

as examined things with the greatest exactness imaginable, περιεργότατος γραμματικῶν (12). According to Suidas he had the surname of μοχθος given him. This word signifies *labour*, and is stronger and more expressive in this place than that of μοχθηρος, *laboriosus*, or *importunate*, which according to the conjecture of a very ingenious person (13), was perhaps inserted in *Suidas* instead of μόχθος. Dydymus, who was surnamed χαλκέντερος (14), that is, *a man with entrails of brass*, had in the person of Apion a perfect imitator of himself. Apion, as laborious as his master, had like him a surname, which shewed this disposition. I am of opinion, that the Scholar was of the same taste with his Master in the choice of his subjects. Didymus wrote Dissertations upon Homer's country, upon the true mother of Æneas, upon the manners of Anacreon and Sappho (15). His Scholar was so zealous in his enquiries into the country and family of Homer, that he made use even of magick spells for that purpose. He imagined himself to have made a wonderful discovery, when he found that the two first letters of the *Iliad* taken numerically made up 48. Upon this foundation he assures us, that Homer waited to add the first verse of his *Iliad*, till his two Poems were finished; and that he chose to begin his *Iliad* with a word, the two first letters of which would shew, that his two Poems would contain 48 books. This savours very much of the mysteries of the *Cabala*. This man, who was so great an enemy to the Jews, gave very readily into their reveries, with regard to the mysterious positions of letters. However that be, let us hear what the Author says, who relates these facts: *Quærat aliquis quæ sint mentiti veteres magi, cum adolescentibus nobis visus Apion Grammaticæ artis, prodiderit cynocephaliam herbam, quæ in Ægypto vocaretur Osyrites, divinam & contra omnia veneficia: sed si tota erueretur, statim eum, qui eruisset, mori; seque evocasse umbras ad percontandum Homerum quanam patriâ, quibusque parentibus genitus esset, non tamen ausus profiteri, quid sibi respondisse diceret* (16). It appears from this passage, that Apion boasted in his writings, that he had made use of magic to gain a conversation with Homer, and that he made a mystery of the answers, which he received to his questions. This savours very much of the mountebank. Pliny gives us his opinion of this man plainly enough. Seneca had no regard for him. *Apion Grammaticus*, says he (17), *qui sub C. Cæsare tota circumlatus est* (18) *Græcia, & in nomen Homeri ab omnibus civitatibus adoptatus, aiebat, Homerum utramque materiâ consummatâ, & Odysseâ & Iliade, principium adjecisse operi suo, quo bellum Trojanum complexus est. Hujus rei argumentum afferebat, quod duas literas* (19) *in primo versu posuisset ex industriâ librorum suorum numerum continentes* (20). We find by these words, that this Grammarian imposed very much upon Greece, since he was received in every city as a second Homer, as Homer revived. A man, who has a share of learning, and besides that impudence and vanity, may easily deceive many people by his talk.

(12) Jul. Afric. *apud* Euseb. *Præpar. Evang.* lib. 10. cap. 10.

(13) Tillemont, *Hist. des Empereurs*, tom. 1. p. 776.

(14) Ammian. Marcellin. l. 22. *cap. ultimo*, pag. 344.

(15) Seneca, Ep. 88. p. 361.

(16) Plinius, lib. 30. cap. 2. *sub finem.*

(17) Seneca, Ep. 88. p. 361.

(18) Lipsius's manuscript in these words of Seneca, approves this reading, and pretends that Apion was a Quack and Mountebank, *Agyrta fuit & circulator.*

(19) The first word of the *Iliad* is μῆνιν. The letter μ is 40, and the ν is 8.

(20) Compare what Plutarch says *Sympos.* lib. 9 cap. 3. pag. 739.

[*E*] *He accused the Jews to Caligula for not dedicating images to him.*] This was the chief accusation. Josephus, in a passage quoted in the Supplement to Moreri, tells us this very plainly; and as they were the Jews of Alexandria, whom Apion had orders to accuse, it appears that the question was not concerning what the Jews of Jerusalem did or did not. However, if we believe the Author of the Supplement, he had only this to speak of; and it was not the City of Alexandria, which complained of the Jews; it was Caligula himself, *who complained that they would not receive his image into the temple of God.* It must be confessed, that this Emperor endeavoured extremely to get his statue placed in the Temple of Jerusalem (21); but we must confess likewise, that neither the embassy of Philo, nor that of Apion, had any relation to that fact. Philo, when he gives so exact an account of the complaints and questions of Caligula to himself, mentions nothing relating to this statue in the temple (22). Caligula complained in general, that the Jews were the only people, who refused to honour him as a God. Apion had already irritated him upon that point, in order to prevent him from doing justice in the main dispute. The question was properly concerning the privileges, which the Jews ought to enjoy at Alexandria; their cause was good; they would certainly gain it before disinterested Judges. What then does Apion do? He changes the question; he makes the Jews odious to Caligula, he accuses them of impiety, and amuses the Court with captious incidents. It is this method, which is daily taken by zealots to support themselves in the unreasonable power, which they have usurped as well upon the consciences of mankind, as in all other affairs. This remark cannot be too often repeated.

(21) Philo *de Legat.*

(22) Ibid. pag. 1041, *& seq.*

[*F*] *Josephus thought himself obliged to confute the malicious calumnies, which this Author had thrown upon the Jews.*] The Author of the Supplement to Moreri has been mistaken again in this passage. *This*, says he, *occasioned Josephus afterwards to write the Life and Errors of Apion.* It is false, that Josephus wrote the Life of this Grammarian; and it is a very improper way of speaking to say *he wrote his Errors.* These words naturally suggest to us this thought, that Josephus wrote a book of controversy against the heresies of Apion. The truth is, that having understood, that several Criticks had attacked his Jewish Antiquities, not with exceptions against the manner or style, but accusing him of having invented a thousand fabulous stories for the honour of his nation; he wrote an Apology, in which he replies to their objections, and the calumny, which had been cast upon the Jews. Half of the Apology has no relation to Apion, tho' it is generally quoted, as if the whole was levelled against Apion. It is mentioned by Origen under the title *de Antiquitate Gentis Judaicæ* (23).

(23) Origen, *contra Celsum.*

with a diſeaſe, which requires inciſions in the natural parts; but this remedy could not prevent him from dying of this diſeaſe amidſt the greateſt pains imaginable (*b*). He boaſted of having raiſed the ſoul of Homer from the dead, to enquire concerning the country and family of that Poet (*i*). We have an account of the titles of four or five of his books [*G*].

(*b*) Joſeph. lib. 2. *contra* Apionem, *ſub finem.*

(*i*) See remark [*D*].

It is falſe, that Apion related, that Euphranor intending to paint Jupiter, *went to Athens to conſult a Profeſſor, who read Homer to his ſcholars*, and that this Painter drew an admirable picture of that God *from the deſcription, which that Poet in the firſt book of his Iliad has given us of Jupiter, &c.* (*k*). This error, which was committed by Father Rapin in the firſt edition of his *Reflections upon Poetry*, was very ſeverely taken notice of by the Jeſuit Vavaſſeur [*H*].

(*k*) Rapin, *Reflex. ſur la Poetique*, num. 28. p. 73. edition of 1674.

[*G*] *We have an account of the titles of four or five of his books.*] I have ſpoken of his *Antiquities of Egypt*, divided into five books (24), and his *Treatiſe againſt the Jews*. Beſides theſe he wrote a treatiſe *de Luxu Apicii* (25), another *de Linguâ Romanâ* (26), and another *de Diſciplinâ Metallicâ* (27). Suidas aſcribes to him an Hiſtory, in which he treated of all nations, ἱγραψε ἱσοριαν καθ' ἑθνος. The famous Hiſtory of the Lion of Androcles is known only from the account of Apion. He ſpeaks of it as an eye-witneſs. Aulus Gellius relates it after him (28). He owes another remark to him; which is the reaſon why the ancients wore the ring on the fourth finger of the left hand. Apion gives a reaſon for it taken from the diſcoveries, which were made in Egypt by Anatomy (29).

(24) Tatian, *apud* Euſeb. *Præpar. Evangel.* p. 493.
(25) Athen. lib. 7. p. 294.
(26) Idem, lib. 15. p. 680.
(27) Plinius *in Indice Libri* 35.
(28) Aul. Gellius, lib. 5. cap. 14.
(29) Idem, lib. 10. cap. 10.

[*H*] *An error which was committed by Father Rapin with relation to Apion was ſeverely taken notice of by the Jeſuit Vavaſſeur.*] He mentions the fact firſt, and then adds: "Gueſs, reader, the pleaſant blunder "of our Reflector, occaſioned by his miſunderſtanding two words of this Commentator (30). In the "place, where I have given it, when he went from "the ſchool of the Profeſſor, he painted the picture of "Jupiter, our Reflector in tranſlating theſe words of "Euſtathius, καὶ αἰτιὼν ἱγραψιν, i. e. *he went out and* "*painted*, has thought proper to render it, *as Apion* "*the Grammarian has written.* The good man ſure "was very careleſs in this, he never perceived either "that this participle αἰτιὼν is not *Apion*, as the "Grammarian is called; or that the verb ἱγραψιν ſig-"nifies in this place, *he painted*, as it was ſaid be-"fore in the ſame ſenſe γράφων and γράψει; or in "ſhort that αἰτιὼν, *when he went out*, anſwers to the "verb that goes before, παρῆν, *he ſtood by.* After-"all this, if the Reflector ſaw this paſſage of Eu-"ſtathius himſelf, I am ſurprized that he miſtook "it ſo; and if he took this tranſlation from ſome "other perſon, I am ſtill more ſurprized that he "ſhould pretend to have conſulted Euſtathius, having "marked very carefully the paſſage which he ne-"ver ſaw (31).

(30) Euſtathius.

(31) *Remarques ſur les nouvelles Reflexions touchant la Poetiques*, p. 56, 57.

APOLLINARIS (CAIUS SULPITIUS) a very learned Grammarian, born at Carthage [*A*], lived in the ſecond Century, under the Antonines. He had for his ſucceſſor in the Profeſſion of Grammar Helvius Pertinax, who had been his ſcholar, and was at laſt Emperor (*a*). He is ſuppoſed to be the author of the verſes which are prefixed to the Comedies of Terence [*B*], and contain the argument of them. We have an Epigram, which he wrote upon the orders which Virgil gave to burn his Æneid [*C*]. Aulus Gellius, who had ſtudied under him, ſpeaks very often of him with great commendation [*D*]. I would adviſe the reader particularly to ſee what he ſays in the fourth chapter of

(*a*) Julius Capitolinus *in Pertinace*, cap. 1.

[*A*] *Born at Carthage.*] I have found no antient author who aſſures me of this; I only relate it upon the credit of the moderns, who have publiſhed the Collections of Epigrams, or *Catalecta* of antient Poets.

[*B*] *He is ſuppoſed to be the author of the verſes prefixed to the Comedies of Terence.*] I have read in a letter of Petrus Crinitus (1) that Politian had remarked, that theſe verſes were not to be aſcribed to Terence, as ſeveral were of opinion, but to Sulpicius Apollinaris. He adds, that there was to be read in a very ancient manuſcript of Terence this inſcription in large characters prefixed to the arguments, G. SULPICII APOLLINARIS PERIOCHA. People have much governed themſelves by this inſcription in the editions of *Terence*. Mr. de Tillemont refers us to Seth Calviſius with regard to theſe arguments (2). It is true, that Calviſius ſpeaks of them under the year 163; but he quotes *Suidas*; and I am very much in doubt, whether he ought to do it. It would ſeem from Mr. de Tillemont's manner of expreſſing himſelf, that we have ſtill two works of Apollinaris remaining. *He* * *left ſeveral letters*, ſays he, *and a* † *writing, in which he cenſures another Grammarian named Caſſellius Vindex.*

(1) It is amongſt thoſe of Politian the 22d of the 12th book; Paris edition in 1526 in 4to.

(2) Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Empereurs*, tom. 2. p. 589.

* Gellius, lib. 15. cap. 5.
† Idem, lib. 2. cap. 16.

[*C*] *We have an Epigram, which he wrote upon the orders, which Virgil gave, to burn his Æneid.*] It is but a diſtich, and is as follows:

Infelix alio cecidit prope Pergamon igne,
Et pene eſt alio Troja eremata rogo.

Theſe verſes make us regret the loſs of the others. *Verſus habemus ejus aliquos de Æneide Maronis, qui deperditorum accendunt ſitim* (3). Theſe are the Jeſuit Brietius's words. I am ſurprized, that he ſays nothing of the arguments of Terence, and that Voſſius ſays nothing of our Poet. I confeſs he ſpeaks of one Apollinaris, who is placed by Giraldus among the Latin Poets; but as this Apollinaris lived in the time of Martial (4), it is plain that it is not he whom we are ſpeaking of. Beſides every perſon, who amuſes himſelf in writing verſes, is not a Poet: ſo that there is ſome reaſon to diſpute with Giraldus the character of a Poet, which he gives to Martial's Apollinaris, and which he grounds upon the regard, which this Apollinaris had for Martial's Poetry. *Eum in Poëtis memorat Lilius, ſed non ſat firmo argumento; nec enim ſi dilectaretur Epigrammatis, eo & ipſe fuerit Poeta* (5).

(3) Brietius, *de Poet. Lat.* pag. 42.

(4) He addreſſes to him his 25th Epigram of the 7th book.

(5) Voſſius, *de Poet. Lat.* pag. 50.

[*D*] *Aulus Gellius . . . ſpeaks very often of him with great commendation* (6).] He calls him *virum præſtanti literarum ſcientiâ* (7); i. e. "a man of excellent "learning:" *hominum memoriæ noſtræ doctiſſimum* (8); i. e. "the moſt learned man of our age:" *virum eleganti ſcientiâ ornatum* (9); i. e. "a man of great ſkill "in polite learning:" *virum in memoria noſtra præter alios doctum* (10); i. e. "a man ſuperior to all others "of our age in learning." See the 13th chapter of his 12th book. He gives him another qualification, which is no leſs valuable than that of learning; which is, that Apollinaris had nothing of that pedantic arrogance, which prompts a man to cenſure thoſe with a magiſterial air, who take the liberty to talk upon ſubjects, which they do not perfectly underſtand. As for him, he always ſhewed them their miſtake in an eaſy gentile manner. Aulus Gellius gives a noble inſtance of this: for as little as Apollinaris was a Pedant, he might juſtly have expreſſed his cenſure in the ſevereſt terms upon an occaſion, wherein Aulus Gellius repreſents him as acting with the utmoſt politeneſs. There was a queſtion asked in his preſence, who one Cato Nepos was, that appeared in the title of a book? A young Scholar began firſt, and attempted to anſwer the queſtion, but was abſolutely wrong in it. The dignity of the Profeſſor

(6) Aul. Gell. *Noct. Attic.* lib. 6. cap. 6; and lib. 13. cap. 16; and lib. 20. cap. 6.
(7) Idem, lib. 4. cap. 17.
(8) Idem, l. 13. cap. 16.
(9) Idem, lib. 16. cap. 5.
(10) Idem, lib. 18. cap. 4.

of the eighteenth book. He will find there the true picture of a pretender to learning, and ſee the genteel manner in which Apollinaris rallied him [*E*].

was injured by this; to ſee a young man give his opinion upon a queſtion before a Profeſſor of Grammar, without waiting for the judgment of the Grammarian. This forwardneſs was inſupportable; however Apollinaris did not correct his miſtake, without commending him in a very civil manner. *Tum Apollinaris, ut mos ejus in reprehendendo fuit, placide admodum leniterque,* "*Laudo,* inquit, *te, mi fili, quod in* "*tantulâ ætate etiamſi hunc M. Catonem, de quo nunc* "*quæritur, quis fuerit ignoras, auditiunculâ tamen* "*quadam de Catonis familiâ aſperſus es* (11): That is, "Upon this Apollinaris ſaid to him in a mild "and gentle way, as was his manner of reproving a "perſon; "I commend you, my ſon; that tho' you "are ſo young, and know nothing of this Cato, "whom we are inquiring about, yet you have heard "ſomething concerning the family of Cato."

(11) Aul. Gell. *Noct. Attic.* lib. 13. cap. 18.

[*E*] *He rallied a pretender to learning in a very genteel manner.*] This pretender boaſted in a Bookſeller's ſhop, that he was the only perſon, who underſtood Salluſt thoroughly: "*I do not ſtand,* ſays he, "*upon the ſhell or ſurface of a thought; I penetrate* "*to the blood and marrow of it.*" *Neque primam tantum cutem ac ſpeciem ſententiarum, ſed ſanguinem quoque ipſum ac medullam verborum ejus eruere atque introſpicere penitus prædicaret.* Apollinaris aſſuming the ironical humour of Socrates (12), addreſſed himſelf to this man with an air of great reſpect, and congratulated himſelf upon his having ſo opportunely met with an Oracle, to conſult upon a paſſage of Salluſt, the meaning of which he had been asked the day before, without being able to give any anſwer to it. He asked him what difference Salluſt intended between *ſtolidior* and *vanior*, when he tells us, that *Cn. Lentulus . . . . per incertum ſtolidior an vanior* (13). The pretender to learning replied with an air of contempt, that ſuch trifles were to be propoſed to others; and that he never gave himſelf the trouble of explaining what all the world underſtood. However he did not refrain from ſhewing very plainly his ignorance upon the queſtion propounded; but when he ſaw that he was preſſed more cloſely, and expoſed to ridicule, he hurried away under pretence of having buſineſs ſomewhere elſe. Apollinaris afterwards explained this paſſage of Salluſt, and obſerved that *vanus* ſignifies a knave, and *ſtolidus* a rude ſtupid perſon. The words of Aulus Gellius are ſo very expreſſive, and deſcribe the fact ſo well, that they deſerve to be quoted. *Tum ille rictu oris labiorumque ductu contemni à ſe oſtendens, & rem de qua quæreretur, & hominem ipſum, qui quæreret;* "*Priſcorum,* inquit, *& remote-*"*rum ego verborum medullas & ſanguinem, ſicuti dixi,* "*perſpicere & elicere ſoleo, non illorum, quæ proculca-*"*ta vulgo & protrita ſunt. Ipſo illo quippe Cn. Len-*"*tulo ſtolidior & vanior, qui ignorat ejuſdem eſſe va-*"*nitatem & ſtoliditatem.*

(12) *Jactatorem quempiam & venditatorem Salluſſianæ lectionis irriſit illuſitque genere illo facetiſſimæ diſſimilationis, quâ Socrates ad Sophiſtas utebatur.* Aul. Gellius, lib. 18. cap. 4.

(13) Salluſtius, *Hiſtor.* lib. 12.

☞APOLLINARIS SIDONIUS (CAIUS SOLLIUS), an eminent Chriſtian writer [*A*], and Biſhop in the fifth Century, was born of a noble family in France. His father and grandfather were Prefects of the Pretorium there (*a*). There are different accounts of his country, but it appears from ſeveral paſſages in his works that he was born at Lyons, and very probably about the year 430 (*b*). He was educated under the beſt maſters, among whom he mentions Hoenius in Poetry, and Euſebius in Philoſophy (*c*). He made a prodigious progreſs in the ſeveral Arts and Sciences, but particularly in Poetry and polite Literature. After he had left the ſchools he applied himſelf to the profeſſion of war (*d*). He married Papianilla, the daughter of Avitus, who was Conſul, and afterwards Emperor,

(*a*) *Vide* Vitam Sidonii Apollin. *præfixam editioni Operum ejus, Pariſ.* 1614, in 8o.

(*b*) Du Pin, *Biblioth.* Part 2. tom. 3. p. 250. *edit. de Mons* 1691.

(*c*) *Vita* Sidonii Apollin. *ubi ſupra.*

(*d*) Cave, *Hiſt. Litt.* p. 292. edit. Colon. Allobrog. 1720.

[*A*] *An eminent Chriſtian writer.*] He wrote a great many little pieces in proſe and verſe; but he preſerved none but thoſe, which he thought were worthy of being continued down to poſterity. He collected himſelf the nine books, which we have remaining of his letters. His chief pieces in Poetry are the three Panegyrics upon the Emperors Avitus, Majorianus, and Anthemius. The reſt of them are a collection of Poems addreſſed to his friends upon particular ſubjects. His letters contain a variety of particulars relating to polite Literature and profane Hiſtory. There are but few in which he ſpeaks of matters of religion; however theſe will furniſh us with ſome extracts, to ſhew the ſtate of the church at that time. In the twenty fourth letter of the fourth book he gives us the portrait of a Biſhop of Toulouſe in France, whoſe name was Maximus, and whom he viſited in order to requeſt him to allow one of his friends time to pay a ſum of money, which his father had borrowed of Maximus before he was raiſed to the Biſhoprick. He tells us, that having known him formerly, he found him entirely changed; that his dreſs, his countenance, and his diſcourſe breathed nothing but modeſty and piety; his hair was ſhort, and his beard long; his furniture was plain; he had nothing but wooden ſtools, curtains of coarſe ſtuff, a bed without feathers, a table without any covering of tapeſtry, and that pulſe was the chief diet at his houſe. *Habitus viro, gradus, pudor, color, ſermo religioſus: tum coma brevis, barba prolixa, tripodes ſellæ, cilicum vela foribus appenſa, lectus nil habens plumæ, menſa nil purpuræ, humanitas ipſa ſic benigna, quod frugi, nec ita carnibus abundans, ut leguminibus. Certe ſi quid in cibis unctius, non ſibi ſed hoſpitibus indulgens.* Sidonius being ſurpriſed to ſee him ſo prodigiouſly altered, asked thoſe who ſtood by him, what his profeſſion was, whether he was a Monk, a Clerk, or a Penitent. He was anſwered, that he had been lately made a Biſhop contrary to his own deſire. *Cum ſurgeremus, clam percontor adſtantes, quod genus vitæ de tribus arripuiſſet ordinibus; monachumne ageret, an clericum, pœnitentemne? dixerunt, nuper impacto ſacerdotio fungi, quo recuſantem factioſè ligaſſet civicus amor.* Mr. Du Pin obſerves upon this paſſage (1), that it is evident from hence, that the manner of life, dreſs, and furniture of a Biſhop ought to be like thoſe of a monk and a penitent. He ought to do that out of modeſty, which the others are obliged to do by their profeſſion or circumſtances. Maximus forgave his creditor the intereſt due to him, which amounted to double the principal, and allowed him time to diſcharge his debt: . . . . *quod & annum ſolutioni ſpatium prorogabo, & ſuperpoſitam medietatem, quæ per uſuræ nomen accrevit, indulgeam, ſola ſimpli reſtitutione contentus.* He informs us in the fourteenth Letter of the 5th Book, and in the firſt Letter of the 6th Book, that the cuſtom of Rogations was inſtituted by St. Mamertus Biſhop of Vienne. It is ſaid by ſome Writers, that they were antecedent to his time, and that he only reſtored them; but this, as Du Pin obſerves (2), muſt be a miſtake, ſince our Author poſitively affirms, that it was St. Mamertus, *qui primus invenit, inſtituit, invexit* (3). Proceſſions were in uſe before; but there was no fixed time for them, and they were performed without devotion, and very ſeldom, and in a negligent manner. They were interrupted with feaſts, and deſigned only to procure rain or fair weather. *Vagæ, tepentes, infrequenteſque, utque ſic dixerim, oſcitabundæ ſupplicationes, quæ ſæpe interpellantum prandiorum obicibus hebetabantur maximè aut imbres aut ſerenitatem deprecaturæ* (4). But St. Mamertus fixed the time and manner of celebrating them, and appointed that they ſhould be attended with faſting, prayer, ſinging of Pſalms, and tears. The Church of Clermont and ſeveral others followed this example of St. Mamertus, and in a ſhort time the cuſtom ſpread itſelf over all the Churches in Europe (5). In the 17th Letter of the 5th Book he obſerves, that the annual feſtivals of the Saints were celebrated with great ſolemnity; that the people reſorted to the church before day; that a great number

(1) *Biblioth.* Part 2. tom. 3. p. 251, 252.

(2) Pag. 252.

(3) Sidonii lib. 5. Epiſt. 14.

(4) Ibid.

(5) Du Pin, *ubi ſupra.*

Emperor, by whom he had three children (*e*). But Majorianus in the year 457 having deprived Avitus of the Empire, and taken the city of Lyons, in which our author reſided, Apollinaris fell into the hands of the enemy. However the reputation of his learning ſoftened Majorianus's reſentments, ſo that he treated him with the utmoſt civility, in return for which Apollinaris compoſed a Panegyric in his honour; which was ſo highly applauded, that he had a ſtatue erected to him at Rome (*f*), and was honoured with the title of Count (*g*). In the year 467 the Emperor Anthemius rewarded him for the Panegyric, which he had written in honour of him, by raiſing him to the poſt of Governor of Rome, and afterwards to the dignity of a Patrician and Senator, and erecting a ſtatue to him (*b*). But he ſoon quitted theſe ſecular employments for the ſervice of the

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

(*f*) Du Pin, *ubi ſupra.*

(*g*) Cave, *ubi ſupra.*

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

number of candles were lighted up; and that the Monks and Clerks ſung the Vigils in two choirs. The ſpeech, which he made upon the choice of a Biſhop of Bourges, and which we find in the 9th Letter of the 7th Book, ſhews us how great a taſk it is to chooſe a Biſhop, and how difficult to ſatisfy every perſon. "If I "name a Monk, ſays he, it will be ſaid, that ſuch "an one is proper for an Abbot, and not for a Biſhop. "If I chooſe a perſon of remarkable humility, it will "be apprehended, that he may become contemptible. "If I chooſe a man of reſolution, he will be thought "proud. If I chooſe a man of little learning, his "ignorance will expoſe him to ridicule. If he be "learned, his knowledge will be ſuppoſed to render "him haughty and opinionated. If I chooſe a perſon "of great ſtrictneſs and ſeverity, he will be thought "cruel; if a man of gentle diſpoſition, his eaſineſs "will be objected againſt. If I chooſe a man of "ſimplicity, he will be deſpiſed as ignorant and "uncultivated; if a man of ſagacity, he will be "avoided as a man of cunning and deſign. If "I chooſe a man of diligence and application, he "will be repreſented as ſuperſtitious; if a man of "leſs attention, he will be thought negligent. If I "chooſe a man of an abſtemious temper, he will "be called covetous ..... If I chooſe one "one of the Clergy, thoſe, who are above him, will "deſpiſe him, and thoſe who are below him, will en-"vy him. Age and ſeniority in the Clergy are al-"moſt the only thing regarded at preſent; as if a per-"ſon's having been ſeveral years in Orders gave "him the merit, which he wanted in all other re-"ſpects; and as if it were ſufficient to deſerve a Bi-"ſhoprick to have lived a long time without having "lived well. We find among the Clergy ſome, who "have been their whole life negligent in the diſcharge "of their function, and indulged themſelves in all "the intemperance of the tongue, ready to engage "in parties and factions, averſe to charity, always "full of envy and ambition; and yet notwithſtand-"ing towards the end of their life they endeavour to "gain a Biſhoprick, and want to govern others at "a time when they have occaſion to be governed "themſelves." *Hic qui nominatur, inquiunt, non epiſcopi, ſed potius abbatis complet officium; & intercedere magis pro animabus apud cæleſtem, quam pro corporibus apud terrenum judicem poteſt. Sed quis non exacerbaſcat, cum videat ſordidari virtutum ſinceritatem criminatione vitiorum? Si eligimus humilem, vocatur abjectus; ſi proferimus erectum, ſuperbire cenſetur. Si minus inſtitutum, propter imperitiam creditur irridendus: ſi aliquatenus doctum, propter ſcientiam clamatur inflatus. Si ſeverum, tanquam crudelis horretur; ſi indulgentem, facile culpatur. Si ſimplicem, deſpicitur ut brutus; ſi acrem, vitatur ut callidus. Si diligentem, ſuperſtitioſus decernitur; ſi remiſſum, negligens judicatur. Si ſolertem, cupidus; ſi quietum, pronuntiatur ignarus. Si abſtemium producimus, avarus accipitur; ..... Si elericum dixero, ſequentes æmulantur, derogant antecedentes. Nam ita ex iis pauci, quod reliquorum pace ſit dictum, ſolam clericatus diuturnitatem pro meritis autumant calculandam; ut nos in antiſtite conſecrando, non utilitatem velint eligere, ſed ætatem; tanquam diu potius, quam benè vivere, debeat accipi ad ſummum ſacerdotium adipiſcendum, pro omnium gratiarum privilegio, decoramento, lenocinamento. Et ita quidam in miniſtrando ſegnes, in obloquendo celeres, in tractatibus otioſi, in ſeditionibus occupati, in caritate infirmi, in factione robuſti, in æmulationum conſervatione ſtabiles, in ſententiarum aſſertione mutantes, nituntur regere eccleſiam, quos jam regi neceſſe erit per ſenectam.* As ſuch a diſcourſe as this might offend the Clergy of the Church, in which he ſpoke, he ſoftened the rigour of it in a very artful manner, by obſerving, that his deſign was not to reflect upon a great many perſons on account of the ambition of a few; that by not mentioning any perſon in particular, thoſe, who ſhould ſhew themſelves offended by what he had ſaid, would by that means declare their diſpoſition; that there were many in that church, who deſerved to be raiſed to the Biſhoprick: but it was impoſſible that all, who merited it, could obtain it. Having thus diſpoſed them to approve of the choice, which he was about to make, he proteſted ſolemnly in the name of the Holy Ghoſt, that he was not influenced by any ſecular conſideration, by money, or intereſt; and declared at laſt, that he determined upon Simplicius, who was a Clergyman of that Church, and whoſe character he extolled. And becauſe they had all ſworn to follow his advice in the election, he declared in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt, that it was Simplicius, who muſt be Biſhop of Bourges, and Metropolitan of that Province. Theſe are the moſt remarkable circumſtances with regard to the diſcipline of the Church, which are to be found in Sidonius's Letters. They inform us likewiſe of ſeveral things relating to the Biſhops of that time, to whom Sidonius wrote, and who are called *Papæ* or *Popes*, according to the cuſtom of that age. His works were publiſhed with the Commentaries of John Baptiſta Pius at Baſil 1542 in 8°; and at Lyons 1552 in 8°, by Elias Vinetus (6). The learned John Savaro in 1599 publiſhed an edition of them at Paris in 4to, in which an infinite number of errors are corrected, with excellent notes, which fully explain the text, and contain a great many very uſeful and curious remarks. It might have been imagined, that this editor had left nothing to be attempted in any future edition; but this did not deter Father Sirmond, who had laboured upon this Author before Savaro's edition appeared, from publiſhing Sidonius's works at Paris in 8vo, 1614, with notes, which ſhewed his great ſagacity, and the extent of his learning. For tho' it ſeemed that nothing had eſcaped the exactneſs of Savaro, yet Father Sirmond found a great many things, that deſerved an explication and remarks, which had been omitted by Savaro: and his notes are ſo judicious, and learned, and curious, that they are far ſuperior to Savaro's in the opinion of the beſt judges. However, as Mr. Du Pin obſerves (7), it is proper to have both editions; and it were to be wiſhed, that we had another edition, in which the notes of both thoſe commentators were included. Since Father Sirmond's death, his edition has been reprinted with ſeveral additions in 4to (8) at Paris 1652. Dr. Cave mentions an edition of Sidonius, Hanov. 1617 in 8vo. Our Author's works are publiſhed in the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, Tom. VI. p. 1075 (9). Dr. Cave gives us a Catalogue of ſeveral works of his, which are loſt; particularly *the Hiſtory of King Attila and the Siege of Orleans*, mentioned in the 15th Letter of the 8th Book, which he began at the deſire of Proſper Biſhop of Orleans, but broke it off before he had finiſhed it. *Exegeras mihi, ut promitterem tibi Attilæ bellum ſtylo me poſteris intimaturum; quo videlicet Aurelianenſis verbis obſidio, oppugnatio, irruptio, nec direptio, & illa vulgata exauditi cælitus ſacerdotis vaticinatio continebatur. Cæperam ſcribere, ſed operis arrepti faſce perſpecto tæduit inchoaſſe.* Dr. Cave tells us, that he begun this work at the requeſt of Leo, Counſellor of King Evariges; but he does not mention any authority for this aſſertion; and it is evident that this muſt be applied to the Life of Apollonius Tyanæus, which Apollinaris ſent to Leo, as appears from the 3d Letter of the 8th Book, which is addreſſed to this Leo, who, as Father Sirmond

(6) Cave, *Hiſt. Liter.* p. 292.

(7) Pag. 253.

(8) Dr. Cave ſays that it was in 8vo.

(9) Cave, *ubi ſupra.*

the church. The Biſhoprick of Clermont being vacant in 472 by the death of Eparchius, Apollinaris, who was then only a Layman, was choſen to ſucceed him without any intereſt or ſollicitation on his part (*i*), in which See he acted with the greateſt integrity [*B*]. Clermont being beſieged by the Goths, he animated the people to the defence of that city, and would never conſent to the ſurrender of it; ſo that when it was taken about the year 480 he was obliged to retire, but he was ſoon reſtored by Evariges King of the Goths, and continued to govern the church as he had done before (*k*). Not long before his death, as we are informed by Gregory Turonenſis (*l*), he was deprived of the adminiſtration of his church by two ſeditious Prieſts, but one of them dying in a very miſerable manner, he was reſtored about a year after with great honour. He did not long ſurvive this; and having appointed Aprunculus, who had been Biſhop of Langres, for his ſucceſſor, he died in peace the 21ſt of Auguſt 487, as Du Pin tells us (*m*), or in 482, according to Dr. Cave and Olearius (*n*). Du Pin informs us, that he had been fifteen years Biſhop, and had lived ſixty ſix years. His feſtival is ſtill obſerved in the church of Clermont, where his memory is held in great veneration. He left three children, whom he had by Papianilla before he was raiſed to the Biſhoprick, Apollinaris a ſon, and two daughters Roſcia and Severiana (*o*). He is eſteemed the moſt elegant writer of his age both in proſe and verſe, ſo that Claudius Mamertus ſtiled him the Prince of Orators in his time, the moſt eminent among the Learned, and the Reſtorer of the antient Eloquence. His writings confirmed this character of him; they are full of genius and fire; we find in them many excellent, agreeable, and lively thoughts; there is a copiouſneſs and variety, which ſurpriſes and charms the reader. His expreſſions are proper, ſignificant and extraordinary, but he uſes ſome phraſes which are not pure Latin, though there is a great deal of wit and poignancy in them. His manner of writing is truly Epiſtolary, that is, conciſe, agreeable, and full of points and diverting thoughts; he excels in deſcriptions and portraits of perſons and things, which are the chief ornament of his writings. However his too great ſubtilty joined to his profound learning renders him ſometimes very obſcure; and his expreſſions, metaphors, and compariſons are frequently too bold and affected. He had a ready talent at Poetry, but he did not take ſufficient time to poliſh his compoſitions of that kind (*p*).

(*i*) Du Pin, *ubi ſupra.*

(*k*) Cave, *ubi ſupra.*

(*l*) *Hiſt. Franc.* lib. 2. cap. 23. *apud* Cave, *ubi ſupra.*

(*m*) Pag. 251.

(*n*) *Bibliœth. Script. Eccleſ.* tom. 2. pag. 161. edit. Jenæ 1710.

(*o*) *Vita* Sidonii, *ubi ſupra.*

(*p*) Du Pin, *ubi ſupra.*

☞ APOLLI-

mond obſerves in his Notes, was Counſellor to King Euricus or Evariges. *Apollonii Pythagorici vitam, non ut Nicomachus ſenior è Philoſtrati, ſed ut Taſcius Victorianus è Nicomachi ſchedio exſcripſit, quia juſſeras, miſi; quam dum parere feſtino, celeriter ejecit in tumultuarium exemplar turbida & præceps & opica tranſlatio.* Dr. Cave ſuppoſes, that Sidonius tranſlated this Life of Apollonius from the Greek into Latin; but it is evident from Father Sirmond's Notes upon this paſſage, that Leo had deſired him to ſend him a copy of Philoſtratus's Life of Apollonius, which Sidonius accordingly did, and at the ſame time acquainted him, that it had been tranſcribed from the manuſcript, which Victorianus had reviſed. He tells him likewiſe, that Victorianus had tranſcribed his copy from that, which had been written and corrected by Nicomachus, and Nicomachus had tranſcribed his copy from the original of Philoſtratus. So that Nicomachus and Victorianus are not the names of Authors, who wrote the Life of Apollonius, nor of ancient copiers of books, but of men who were dignified with the title of *Viri clariſſimi*, and who corrected at their leiſure and for their own ſatisfaction the faulty copies, which had been written by the tranſcribers. *Nicomachus ergo & Victorianus nomina ſunt, non auctorum, qui Apollonii vitam ſcripſerint, neque ſcribarum antiquariorum, ſed clariſſimorum virorum, qui ab antiquariis mendosè ſcripta per otium & animi gratia caſtigabant.* Father Sirmond obſerves, that there are ſeveral manuſcripts of Livy, in which it appears, that Nicomachus and Victorianus took the ſame pains with the copies of that Hiſtorian. We find the following words in thoſe manuſcripts. *Nicomachus Dexter V. C. emendavi ad exemplum parentis mei Clementiani, ab urbe condita. Victorianus V. C. emendabam domnis Symmachis.* And in another place: *Emendavi Nicomachus Flavianus V. C. Præfectus urbi apud Hennam, ab urbe condita. Victorianus V. C. emendabam domnis Symmachis.* As there were therefore two Nicomachus's, Sidonius to diſtinguiſh them, added the epithet of *Senior*. With regard to the word *Tranſlatio* in the paſſage abovementioned from Sidonius, Father Sirmond obſerves, that it generally ſignifies in him only a tranſcript or copy; as appears from the 16th Letter of the 9th Book, where he ſpeaks of the copies of his Letters; *raptim, coactimque* TRANSLATOR *feſtinus exſcripſi*; and again in the 11th Letter of the ſame Book, *copiæ* TRANSFERENDI. Ruricius likewiſe in the 8th Letter to Sidonius ſays; *Codicem namque quem de fratre meo Leontio me recipere juſſeratis,* TRANSTULISSE *me fateor*; which he explains afterwards by the word *exemplaſſe*. It is plain therefore, that Dr. Cave was miſtaken in ſuppoſing, that Sidonius tranſlated the Life of Apollonius Tyanæus into Latin; and that Mr. Bayle has committed ſeveral errors in note [*I*] of his article of APOLLONIUS, where he aſſerts that Nicomachus, and Victorianus, and our Author, wrote each of them a lye of that Impoſtor.

[*B*] *In which he acted with the greateſt integrity.*] As ſoon as he was raiſed to the Biſhoprick, he applied himſelf to thoſe ſtudies, which were ſuitable to his function. His reputation for knowledge and wiſdom was ſo well eſtabliſhed, that being ſent for to the city of Bourges, the See of which was vacant, all the Biſhops unanimouſly gave him the power of chooſing the Biſhop. He appointed Simplicius, as we obſerved in the preceding note; and his choice was univerſally applauded. He was actuated by a truly Epiſcopal ſpirit of charity towards the poor of his Dioceſe; he diſtributed among them whatever he was poſſeſſed of, and even ſold his plate to ſupport them, without the knowledge of his wife, who was obliged to buy them back again. He maintained at his own expence and with the aſſiſtance of Ecdicius his brother-in-law above four thouſand Burgundians, who had been compelled to leave their country. He viſited his Dioceſe very frequently, and was one of the firſt Biſhops in France, who introduced into his church the cuſtom of Rogations, which had been juſt before inſtituted by Mamertus Biſhop of Vienne (10). In ſhort, as he undertook the charge of his See with the greateſt modeſty and diffidence, ſo he executed it with equal integrity and care, in times of the utmoſt perplexity and diſtreſs. *Quod munus ſumma cum modeſtia ſuſceptum pari cum ſanctitate ac vigilantiâ turbidiſſimis temporibus, maximaſque inter difficultates tum privatas tum publicas adminiſtravit* (11). Gennadius Maſſilienſis in his book *de Viris illuſtribus* (12), having extolled him on account of his excellent genius and learning, and recommended his performances both in proſe and verſe, tells us, that he was animated with a true Chriſtian reſolution amidſt all the ravages of the Barbarians, which at that time oppreſſed France, and diſtinguiſhed himſelf like a Catholick Father and Doctor. *Scripſit varia & grata volumina, & ſanæ doctrinæ. Homo ſiquidem tam divinis quam humanis ad integrum imbutus, acerque ingenio, ſcripſit ad diverſos diverſo metro vel proſâ compoſitum inſigne volumen, in quo quid in literis poſſit oſtendit. Verùm in Chriſtiano vigore pollens etiam inter barbaræ ferocitatis duritiem, quæ eo tempore Gallos oppreſſerat, catholicus Pater & Doctor habetur inſignis.*

(10) Du Pin, p. 250.

(11) *Vita* Sidon. Apollin. *ubi ſupra.*

(12) Cap. 92.

APOLLINARIUS the younger [A], ſon of a famous man of the ſame name, was at firſt *Lector* or Reader at Laodicea, and afterwards Biſhop of that city [B]. He was univerſally eſteemed the greateſt man of his age, both for learning and piety, and a moſt accurate and nervous defender of the faith againſt all its enemies, whether Heathens or Hereticks (a). He was highly valued by the moſt eminent perſons of that age [C]. Vincentius Lirinenſis repreſents him as a very extraordinary man, *that he had a moſt acute wit and ſublime learning; that in many volumes he had overthrown hereſies, and confuted errors oppoſite to the faith; that in thirty large and noble books, he had moſt convincingly baffled the calumnies of Porphyry; that it would be too long to recite all his works by which indeed he might have been equalled with the chiefeſt pillars of the church, had he not fallen into hereſy* (b). Philoſtorgius tells us (c), that the books which Apollinarius wrote againſt Porphyry were much ſuperior to thoſe of Euſebius and Methodius on the ſame ſubject; and he prefers Apollinarius to Baſil and St. Gregory Nazianzen, with regard to Theological Learning (d). His words, as we find them in Suidas (e) are to this purpoſe; Apollinarius, Baſil, and Gregory Nazianzen defended the Divinity of Chriſt better than any either before or after them, in compariſon of whom the great Athanaſius was eſteemed but a child. They had not only an extraordinary faculty both in ſpeaking and writing, but their lives were ſo attracting, that whoever either ſaw or heard them, was drawn and perſuaded by them; but the moſt eſteemed and conſidered of theſe three was Apollinarius (f). Philoſtorgius adds (g), that the reaſon why Apollinarius excelled our Baſil and Gregory was, that he was ſkilled in the Hebrew tongue, which is abſolutely neceſſary to underſtand and explain the holy Scripture. If we may believe the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians, and thoſe Fathers who wrote againſt Apollinarius, this great and good man entertained the moſt groſs and monſtrous hereſies that were ever invented; for he ſaid, "that the only begotten God, who is the Judge of all Men, the Author of Life, "and the Deſtroyer of Death, was mortal, ſuffered in the very Godhead, and even "died with the body, and was reſtored to life by the Father (h)." He is alſo charged with having maintained, that "there were different degrees of dignity in the Deity, and "that

(a) King, *on the Creed*, p. 243.

(b) Vincent. Lirin. *Commonit.* cap. 16. pag. 46. *apud* King, *ubi ſupra.*

(c) *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 8. n. 14. *In Hiſt. Eccleſ. Script.* edit. G. Reading, tom. 3. p. 525.

(d) Idem, ibid.

(e) *In Voce* Ἀπολλιναρίστ.

(f) I follow my Lord King's tranſlation, pag. 244.

(g) *Hiſt. ubi ſupra, in Notis Valeſii*, n. 1.

(h) Gregor. Nazianz. *apud* Sozom. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 6. cap. 27. pag. 255.

[A] *Apollinarius the Younger.*] He is called ſo to diſtinguiſh him from his father, who bore alſo the name of Apollinarius, and is ſtyled the Elder. His family was of Alexandria; but he himſelf firſt taught Grammar at Berytus (1), and afterwards at Laodicea. He was very well verſed in the Greek learning, and in polite Literature. Being at Laodicea he there married, and (perhaps after his wife's death) entered into Prieſt's Orders (2). After the death of Conſtantius (3), Julian his ſucceſſor gave our Apollinarius a fair opportunity of acquiring much glory. For that Emperor having made a law, by which the Chriſtians were prohibited to inſtruct their children in the Greek learning, and to read any of the Greek Authors, Apollinarius and his ſon undertook to ſupply this defect. The Father being a ſkilful Grammarian, wrote a Grammar adapted to the genius of the Chriſtian Religion (4), which ſignifies, I ſuppoſe, that inſtead of explaining his rules by paſſages of Heathen Writers, he imitated thoſe paſſages in ſuch a manner, that inſtead of the profane ſenſe they had originally, he made them ſignify ſomething agreeable to the Goſpel. He alſo tranſlated the books of Moſes in heroic verſe, and expreſſed the other hiſtorical books of the Old Teſtament, partly in dactyl verſe, partly in the form of Tragedy; and employed all his ſkill and induſtry, that the Chriſtians might not be unacquainted with any phraſe or expreſſion of the ancient Greek Writers (5). Zozomen ſays (6), that Apollinarius wrote the Hiſtory of the Old Teſtament in heroic verſe from the beginning to the reign of King Saul, and divided it into twenty four books, each of which bore the name of a letter of the alphabet, which was prefixed to it. That he wrote Comedies in imitation of Menander, and alſo imitated Euripides and Pindar. He adds, that if men were not accuſtomed to admire antiquity, and to be delighted with ſuch writings only, as they are uſed to, they would highly extol Apollinarius's works, and admire his genius and wit, who excelled in all kinds of writing and learning; whereas the ancients applied themſelves to one ſort of ſtudy only. But Zozomen does not diſtinguiſh the father from the ſon, and aſcribes to the latter ſome books, which Socrates gives to the former. Voſſius (7) alſo aſcribes to Apollinarius the Elder, *a Paraphraſe on the Pſalms* ſtill extant, which has been ſometimes printed ſingly, and is alſo to be found in the Appendix to the *Bibliotheca Patrum* printed at Paris in 1624. Dr. Cave (8) is of opinion, that this Apollinarius is the author of a Tragedy intitled *Chriſtus Patiens*, i. e. "Chriſt's Paſſion," which is uſually printed with the works of Gregory Nazianzen, under the name of that Father. Moreri without quoting any authority, and even againſt the poſitive evidence of Socrates and Zozomen ſays, that Apollinarius the Elder was not very learned; whence he concludes that the works of the ſon have been erroneouſly aſcribed to the father.

(1) A city in Phœnicia.

(2) Socrates, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 2. cap. 46. p. 163. edit. Reading. Cambridge 1720, fol.

(3) In the year 361.

(4) Idem, lib. 3. cap. 16. p. 191.

(5) Idem, ibid.

(6) Zozom. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 5. cap. 18. p. 207. edit. Reading.

(7) *De Hiſtor. Græc.* lib. 2. cap. 18. p. 252.

(8) *Hiſt. Liter.* Vol. 1. p. 176.

[B] *At firſt Reader and afterwards Biſhop of Laodicea.*] Philoſtorgius expreſly calls him Biſhop, on which occaſion Photius ſays, he does not know whence that Author has took particular (9). But Philoſtorgius's aſſertion is ſupported by the authority of Athanaſius (10), of Jerom (11), who had been Apollinarius's diſciple, and of Rufinus (12). With regard to the City, of which he was Biſhop, the learned are not agreed, whether it was Laodicea in Syria, or that in Phœnicia of Libanus: Theſe are the words of a celebrated Author (13). But Mr. Baſnage (14) affirms on the authority of Suidas, that Apollinarius was Biſhop of Laodicea in Syria, the great Laodicea, built by Seleucus, and the ſiſter and rival of the See of Antioch, which being near the former was ſoon infected with the arch-heretick's poiſon. *Suidas*, ſays he, *Laodiceam Siriæ appellavit* (15), *& fuit procul dubio Laodicea magna, à Seleuco condita, Antiochinæ ſedis ſoror & æmula, quam brevi veneno ſuo, ut viciniorem, infecit Hereſiarcha.*

(9) Philoſtorgius, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* l. 8. n. 15. edit. Reading, tom. 3. p. 525.

(10) *In Ep. Synod. ad* Euſebium & Luciferum, p. 580.

(11) *De Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.*

(12) H. lib. 20.

(13) King's, *Hiſt. of the Apoſtles Creed*, pag. 243.

(14) *In Diſſertatione de Apollinaris Hæreſi*, p. 41. *annexa Epiſtolæ D. Chryſoſtomi ad Cæſarium*, edit. a Jac. Baſnage, 1687. 8vo.

(15) *In voce* Ἀπολλινάριος.

[C] *Highly valued by the moſt eminent perſons of the age.*] He had a very intimate friendſhip with St. Athanaſius, who viſited him after his return from baniſhment, as appears from St. Epiphanius (16). Leontius in his third book againſt Neſtorius tells us that Apollinarius boaſted, that he had received letters from St. Athanaſius, Serapion, and the moſt eminent perſons of his time. He cites likewiſe a fragment of a Letter of our Author, in which he ſpeaks of the letters which he received from St. Athanaſius. His Deputies were preſent at the Council of Alexandria, and ſigned as Deputies of an orthodox Biſhop. It does not appear, that St. Athanaſius ever broke off the friendſhip between them. St. Baſil in his 82d Letter tells us, that he had a great regard for him; and that he was ſo much his friend, that he would readily take his errors upon himſelf. St. Epiphanius ſtiles him a venerable old man, and obſerves, that he was careſſed by St. Athanaſius and all the orthodox Biſhops. St. Jerom in his 64th Letter tells us, that he had often ſeen him at Antioch, and had a prodigious eſteem for him, and had learned a great many things of him. We find likewiſe many teſtimonies to the advantage of his character in many other ancient Writers (17).

(16) *Hæreſ.* 77. *apud* Du Pin, p. 128 *in Notis.*

(17) Du Pin, *ubi ſupra.*

"that the myſtery of our redemption was imperfect, ſince the human ſoul was excluded "from ſalvation (*i*)." But if we rightly conſider theſe heavy charges, it will appear that they were only conſequences, which Apollinarius's adverſaries drew from his real opinion [*D*], and which he does not appear to have ever maintained himſelf. It appears from Socrates (*k*) that his real ſentiment was, that "the *Logos*, or Son of God only aſ- "ſumed an human body, without a ſoul, or at leaſt with only a ſenſitive ſoul, but deſtitute "of an intelligent mind, the want of which was ſupplied by the Divinity." In this only, adds the ſame Hiſtorian (*l*), did Apollinarius differ from the Orthodox, for he and his followers admitted the Conſubſtantiality of the bleſſed Trinity. The ſame will appear by the following authorities, quoted by my Lord King (*m*). "The hereſy of Apollinarius "was, according to St. Auſtin's expreſſion, that Chriſt (*n*) *aſſumed fleſh without a ſoul*, "or, as Caſſian words it (*o*), that *he had not an human ſoul*, or *a rational ſoul*; for he "allowed him a ſenſitive ſoul as in brutes, but denied him to have a reaſonable one, as "Vincentius Lirinenſis writes (*p*), that Apollinarius affirmed, *That there was not in our "Saviour's body an human ſoul, at leaſt not ſuch a one wherein was mind and reaſon*; but "that (*q*) *inſtead thereof his Divinity ſupplied its room and place.* So that in ſhort, the "error of Apollinarius was this; that though Chriſt in his becoming man was ἐνσαρκος, "that is, was incarnate, had real fleſh and a ſubſtantial body, yet he was not ἐμψυχος "νους, that is, he had no reaſonable human ſoul, but his Divinity performed all the "actions and offices thereof." Gregory Nazianzen adds (*r*), that Apollinarius maintained that the human nature was not aſſumed by Chriſt, but that he brought it with him from heaven. To ſupport this opinion, he quoted ſome paſſages from the Scripture, as for inſtance theſe words (*s*), *No man has aſcended up to heaven, but he that came down from heaven, even the Son of Man*; whence he concluded, that Chriſt was the Son of Man, even before he deſcended from heaven, and that he brought his own fleſh from thence, that ſame fleſh which he had already in heaven, and which was eternal and blended with his own ſubſtance [*E*] (συνκαιμένην). He alſo alledged theſe words of St. Paul (*t*), *the ſecond man from heaven.* How far St. Gregory is to be credited in this, we leave our

(*i*) Theodoritus, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* l. 5. cap. 3. p. 194.

(*k*) *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 2. cap. 46. p. 164.

(*l*) Ibid.

(*m*) *On the Creed*, p. 247.

(*n*) *De Hæreſ.* cap. 55. p. 182.

(*o*) *De Incarn. Chriſt.* lib. 1. p. 1241.

(*p*) *Comment.* cap. 17. pag. 50.

(*q*) *Epit. Hær. Fab.* lib. 4. *in Hær. Apol.* pag. 167.

(*r*) *Ap.* Sozom. lib. 7. cap. 27. p. 255.

(*s*) John iii. 13.

(*t*) 1 Cor. xv. 47.

[*D*] *Theſe charges are only conſequences, which Apollinarius's adverſaries drew from his real opinion.*] It is the common practice in all diſputes about theological ſubjects, to charge an adverſary with all the conſequences, that may really or ſeemingly be drawn from his opinion. This was the caſe of Apollinarius, as appears expreſly by the words of Theodoret, who charges him with denying the redemption and ſalvation of the ſoul. "Since the Word, ſays he (18), did not "take upon him an human ſoul, according to Apol- "linarius's opinion, he could not give any aſſiſt- "ance or honour to it. But the body, which is ter- "reſtrial, is worſhiped by the inviſible powers, whilſt "the ſoul, tho' created in the image of God, re- "mains here below, ſtill involved in the ſhame and "infamy of ſin." Now it appears plainly that this is only an inference drawn from Apollinarius's opinion, which he might eaſily deny, by ſaying, that it was enough for us, if God would be pleaſed to accept of Chriſt's ſacrifice both for the redemption of our ſoul and body. Or if this anſwer was not ſatisfactory, Apollinarius ſhould have been charged with inconſiſtency; but it is unfair to accuſe a man of ſuch conſequences, which he does not expreſly admit. The ſame may be ſaid of thoſe other charges, that the Divinity was mortal, ſuffered with the body, and even died with it. Theſe are only conſequences, which Apollinarius was not bound to admit of in his ſyſtem. He could anſwer, that a body with a ſenſitive tho' without a rational ſoul, may ſuffer and die; which he could illuſtrate by the example of brutes, which have no rational ſoul, and yet ſuffer and die (19). He might have added, that as in men death conſiſts in the ſeparation of the ſoul from the body, the ſoul ſtill remaining immortal, notwithſtanding this ſeparation; ſo Chriſt died, when the Divinity united with the body came to be ſeparated from it on the Croſs; which does not ſuppoſe that the Deity itſelf died. But that the reader may be convinced, that moſt of the hereſies charged upon Apollinarius, were only dangerous conſequences, which, according to his adverſaries, followed from his opinion, we ſhall tranſcribe here a paſſage from the *Critical Hiſtory of the Apoſtles Creed.* "This hereſy, ſays that noble and learned Author (20), "the Fathers apprehended to be attended with moſt "dreadful conſequences; for if Chriſt had been deſti- "tute of an human ſoul, and the place thereof ſup- "plied by his Deity, then ſeveral actions, as deſiring, "grieving, and the like, would have been moſt im- "piouſly attributed by the holy Scripture unto his Di- "vine Nature; which argument is urged to very "good purpoſe by Epiphanius (21) againſt theſe here- "ticks; and Athanaſius moſt pertinently aſks them, "how Chriſt could be ſorrowful, and troubled (as it "is ſaid of him in John xiii. 21.) if he had not (22) "*had an human ſoul? For to aſcribe that to inſenſible "matter was ridiculous, or to the immutable Godhead "was blaſphemous.*" But (23) to this the Apollinarians rejoined, that Chriſt's *being ſorrowful and exceeding heavy &c. might well be underſtood of the body, that was perceptive and ſenſible of ſuffering* (24); an example whereof is found in brutes, who tho' they have no rational ſoul, yet appear to be capable of ſenſation and paſſion. "Beſides if Chriſt had been void "of a reaſonable ſoul, he would not have had the "whole eſſence of man, his humanity would have "been defective and imperfect. On which account "Vincentius Lirinenſis anathematiſes Apollinarius for "(25) *taking away the property of the perfect humanity*; "and Epiphanius accuſes his followers (26) *of mak- "ing the incarnation of Chriſt imperfect, by holding "that he did not aſſume a ſoul.* Clemens Romanus "writes (27), that *Chriſt gave his fleſh for our fleſh, "and his ſoul for our ſoul:* But thoſe hereticks by "denying our Lord an human ſoul, by CONSEQUENCE "rendred his ſalvation defective and incomplete, and "confined it ſolely to the ſenſitive and bodily part "of man. For, as Athanaſius proves againſt them, "one thing could not be redeemed by another diffe- "rent therefrom; but (28) *the body muſt be given for "the body, and the ſoul for the ſoul.* And therefore "Damaſus Biſhop of Rome, in the ſynodical Epiſtle, "which he wrote on purpoſe to condemn that hereſy, "aſſerts in oppoſition thereunto, that Chriſt the Son "of God our Lord, by his Paſſion (29) *brought ſuch "full ſalvation to mankind, that he freed the whole "man, which was intangled by ſin, from all iniquity.* "And in another ſynodical Epiſtle penned before this "at Alexandria, Anno 362, in contradiction to that "neceſſary conſequence of this hereſy, Chriſt is de- "clared to be the Saviour of the whole man (30), "*not of the body only, but alſo of the ſoul.*" Thus it appears, not that Apollinarius held all theſe opinions, but only that they were ſo many conſequences drawn from his ſentiment, and thought ſufficient to ſhew the abſurdity of it.

(18) *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 5. cap. 3. p. 194.

(19) *See* King *on the Creed*, p. 254.

(20) Pag. 248—251.

(21) *Adv. Hæreſ. Hær.* 77.

(22) Tom. 1. *de Incarn. Chriſti adverſ. Apollin.* p. 628.

(23) King, *ubi ſupra*, p. 252.

(24) *Int. Opera* Athanaſ. tom. 2. *De S. Trinit. Dial.* 4. p. 246.

(25) *Commonit.* cap. 22. p. 69.

(26) *Serm. Ancorat.* p. 502.

(27) Epiſt. 1. p. 64.

(28) Tom. 1. *De Incarn. Chriſti adverſ. Apoll.* p. 630.

(29) *Apud* Theodorit. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 5. cap. 10. p. m. 208.

(30) Athanaſ. tom. 1. *Epiſt. ad Antiochen.* pag. 578.

[*E*] *Blended with his own ſubſtance.*] Apollinarius is by ſome writers accuſed of maintaining, that the body of Chriſt was *conſubſtantial* with his Deity: But Mr. Baſnage ſhews that this is falſe (31). For he obſerves

(31) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 44.

our readers to judge; only we ſhall obſerve with Mr. Baſnage (*u*), that it is not ſafe to ſearch for a man's opinion, in the works of thoſe who wrote againſt him. As for the time when Apollinarius began his hereſy it is not exactly known. He was not anathematized as an heretick by name till the ſecond general Council at Conſtantinople, anno 381. But nineteen years before that, viz. anno 362, his hereſy was condemned by a Synod at Alexandria, in which were preſent Athanaſius, Euſebius Biſhop of Verceil in Piedmont, with ſeveral others, without mentioning his name. The reaſon of this might be, either becauſe ſome Monks were ſent by him thither to purge him of the ſuſpicion of hereſy, as there is ground in the relation of the Synod (*x*) for ſuch a conjecture; or becauſe they were unwilling to believe that ſo great a Doctor of the church could fall into ſo foul an hereſy. Epiphanius writes, that when he firſt heard of this error, by ſome who came from him, he could not believe that a man of his character had eſpouſed ſuch heretical notions, and that they were only *ſome people's miſtaken apprehenſions, who could not fathom the depth and profundity of ſo great a ſcholar* (*y*). Or elſe they were unwilling to caſt ſo eminent a man out of the communion of the church, and therefore would firſt condemn his hereſy without mentioning his name, hoping that this might be a means to regain him to the Catholick faith, of which he had been ſo noted and ſtrenuous a Defender. How long before this Synod he vented his hereſy is not certainly known; only it could not be a very conſiderable time, and not above three or four years at fartheſt (*z*). The ancient and modern Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians and other writers of controverſy aſcribe Apollinarius's hereſy to very bad motives, but he has been very well defended on that account by the learned Mr. Baſnage, as we ſhall ſhew in the note [*F*]. We may obſerve, that Jerom, who ſtudied under Apollinarius, aſſerts, that he was of Tertullian's opinion concerning the origin of the ſoul, which he ſaid was *ex traduce*, that is, that as the body was propagated by the body, ſo was the ſoul by the ſoul. To which Nemeſius adds (*aa*), that Apollinarius ſupported his opinion

(*u*) *In Diſſert. de Apollinaris Hæreſi.*

(*x*) Athanaſ. *Epiſt. ad* Antiochen. tom. 1. p. 580.

(*y*) Epiph. *adv. Hær. Dimærit.* p. 421.

(*z*) King, *On the Creed*, pag. 245, 246.

(*aa*) *In Bibl. Patr.* tom. 12. p. 730.

obſerves that Apollinarius in a letter of his to Serapion has theſe words: *Eorum autem, qui dicunt carnem Deo conſubſtantialem, magnam inſaniam damnavimus* (32); that is, "We condemn the great folly of thoſe who "ſay, that the fleſh is of the ſame ſubſtance with the "Deity." Neither did Apollinarius believe, the two ſubſtances were confounded and blended together in the perſon of Chriſt; for theſe are his own words: "If "a man, ſays he (33), have a ſoul and body, which "tho' united remain ſtill diſtinct, how much more "muſt the Divinity of Chriſt remain unconfounded "with his body." Notwithſtanding theſe poſitive declarations of Apollinarius, moſt of the Fathers have bitterly inveighed againſt him as the author of the greateſt blaſphemies. But this, adds Mr. Baſnage (34), happened, 1. becauſe if Apollinarius drop'd any expreſſion, which could be taken in an heretical ſenſe, even the moſt candid men were apt to object that ſenſe to him as his own. 2. They charged him with the conſequences, which they drew from his opinion, tho' he did not admit them. 3. They aſcribed to him ſeveral opinions, which were only thoſe of his followers. 4. The Fathers too eaſily gave credit to all that was falſly ſaid of Apollinarius. See Epiph. Hær. 77.

(32) Leont. *in Bibl. Patr.* tom. 4. Part 2. pag. 1031.

(33) *Ap.* Theodoret. *Dial.* 2. tom. 4. p. 112.

(34) Ibid.

[*F*] *He has been very well defended by the learned Mr. Baſnage.*] The famous Petavius, following Socrates's account (35), ſays, that both the Apollinarius's father and ſon, were very intimate at Laodicea with one Epiphanius a Heathen and a Sophiſt; and that Theodotus Biſhop of that City, fearing that they might by him be drawn over to Paganiſm, adviſed them to have no converſation with Epiphanius. But they both ſlighted his advice; and George the ſucceſſor of Theodotus, having in vain exhorted them again, excommunicated both the father and the ſon; whereupon Apollinarius the Younger, not being able to bear this treatment, and confiding in his eloquence, and in order to revenge himſelf, invented his new hereſy (36). But Mr. Baſnage obſerves upon this, that Petavius (as well as Socrates, whom he copies) muſt be miſtaken. For Apollinarius was very young, when he was excommunicated by Biſhop George; and when he began to publiſh his hereſy he was already advanced in years, if we may believe Nilus (37), and had already publiſhed a great number of books. Beſides, he had been perſecuted by the Arians ſoon after his excommunication, and ſuffered very courageouſly for the orthodox faith; and was afterwards made Biſhop of Laodicea by the orthodox before he began to propagate his heretical opinions. How then can this agree with the learned Petavius's aſſertion (38)? Sozomen's account is not more probable. He tells us (39), that when Theodotus, George's predeceſſor, was Biſhop of Laodicea, Epiphanius an eminent Sophiſt ſung an hymn to the honour of Bacchus, and that Apollinarius, then a young man, and a ſcholar of Epiphanius, was preſent at it. That when Epiphanius, according to cuſtom, ordered all the prophane, who were not initiated in the myſteries of Bacchus, to depart, Apollinarius the father and ſon ſtayed with all the other Chriſtians that were preſent. This coming to the knowledge of the Biſhop, he was extremely offended at it, and having gently reprimanded the laity, he pardoned them; but caſt both the Apollinarius's, who were in Orders, out of the Church. But in a little time, upon their repenting, he admitted them again. However when George was made Biſhop of Laodicea, Apollinarius the Younger having kindly entertained Athanaſius, the Biſhop excommunicated him; and would never admit him again, tho' he often entreated him very earneſtly for it. Apollinarius finding he could not prevail over him, out of ſpite and revenge reſolved to diſturb the Church, and invented his hereſy for that purpoſe. Here follow Mr. Baſnage's obſervations on this paſſage: "I "confeſs, ſays he (40), that all thoſe who communicated "with Athanaſius abhorred George for being an Ari- "an: nor do I deny that both the Apollinarius's "were Athanaſius's intimate friends; for Apollinarius "the Elder has ſaid in writing, that Alexander Biſhop "of Alexandria had been informed from heaven, "that Athanaſius would ſucceed him, and confound "the Arians. Athanaſius himſelf on his return from "his baniſhment went to Laodicea, where he entered "into a great friendſhip with Apollinarius the younger. "But tho' this be true, I cannot believe that George "gave occaſion to Apollinarius's hereſy. What ſort "of a vengeance would this be? Beſides, as the Em- "peror Julian gave liberty of conſcience to every "ſect, the Jews themſelves not excepted, ſo the Ari- "ans favoured all thoſe who did not communicate "with the orthodox. How then is it poſſible, that if "Apollinarius had broke off all communion with "Athanaſius, and often earneſtly deſired George to "admit him, he would have been denied to commu- "nicate with the Arians? Epiphanius, who was co- "temporary with Apollinarius, is not only ſilent a- "bout this application to the Arian Biſhop, but on "the contrary ſays expreſly (41), that Apollinarius "refuſed to agree with the Arians, and underwent his "baniſhment with a truly Chriſtian courage." Theodoret pretends that Apollinarius publiſhed his hereſy out of ambition, and becauſe he had been deprived of the government of the Church (42): "But, ſays Mr. Baſ- "nage (43), where Theodoret differs from other Hi- "ſtorians, he does not deſerve much credit. Beſides, "we may obſerve that the Synod of Antioch, which "Theodoret

(35) *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 2. cap. 46. p. 161.

(36) Petav. *Dogm. Theol.* tom. 4. lib. 1. cap. 6. p. 24, 25.

(37) In Ep. 234.

(38) Baſnage, *ubi ſupra*, p. 37.

(39) *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 6. cap. 25. p. 251.

(40) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 37, 38.

(41) *Hær.* 77. p. 1018.

(42) Theodoret. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 5. cap. 4. p. 197.

(43) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 38, 39.

opinion by the following arguments, 1. That if God created a ſoul for every body that was conceived in the womb, he would be aſſiſting to the fornicators in their lewd actions. 2. That Moſes would then be guilty of a falſity, ſince he affirms that God reſts from all his works (*bb*). It is not known when he died, though he was certainly living in the time of Theodoſius the Great (*cc*). Beſides his large work againſt Porphyry, and his other pieces againſt the Hereticks, Socrates ſays (*dd*), that he wrote an Expoſition of the Goſpels and of the writings of the Apoſtles by way of dialogue after the manner of Plato. And Sozomen mentions a book intitled *Of Truth*, againſt the Emperor Julian, and the heathen Philoſophers, in which Apollinarius confuted the falſe notions which the Heathens entertained concerning God, and reaſoned only upon the principles of common ſenſe, without quoting any part of the Scriptures (*ee*). But in that ſame place Sozomen aſcribes to our Apollinarius ſome books which belong to his father, as we have already obſerved (*ff*). There is alſo an Epiſtle of our Apollinarius, which we have quoted in the remark [*E*]. The errors objected to him were probably the occaſion of the loſs of his works. For the Orthodox had ſo great a dread of the books of the Hereticks, that they did not even preſerve thoſe which had no manner of relation to their hereſies, though they might have been of great uſe to the church. It was upon this account, as Mr. Du Pin (*gg*) obſerves, that we have ſcarce any of the works of the ancient Hereticks now remaining; and that the Eutychians were obliged to give the ſanction of the names of ſome Catholick writers, as St. Athanaſius, St. Gregory, and St. Cyril, to thoſe of Apollinarius, in order to preſerve them.

(*bb*) *Apud* Baſnage, *ubi ſupra*, p. 42.

(*cc*) Labbe, *De Script. Eccleſ.* tom. 1. p. 99.

(*dd*) *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 3. cap. 17. p. 191.

(*ee*) Sozom. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 5. cap. 18. pag. 207, 208.

(*ff*) In the remark [*A*].

(*gg*) *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* tom. 2. pag. 64 and 127. edit. de Paris 1693.

" Theodoret mentions, was held under the Emperor " Gratian, at the time, when the church of that city " was ſo miſerably rent on account of Paulinus and " Meletius, that their diviſion was like to occaſion " a ſchiſm not only in the Eaſt but even in the Weſt. " But Apollinarius's hereſy had already been condemn- " ed by the Synod of Alexandria in 362, and himſelf " anathematized by Pope Damaſus, as appears from " Theodoret himſelf (44). How then is it poſſible, that " an hereſy condemned ſome years before, ſhould now " begin to be publiſhed? It was not therefore out of " ambition that Apollinarius invented his hereſy. But " it is the general fault of Hiſtorians both ancient and " modern, that they chooſe rather to render the au- " thors of hereſies odious, than to anſwer them with " ſolid arguments. They make revenge, ambition, " or avarice the parents of all hereſies, as if men were " ſo fooliſh as wilfully to renounce heaven; and as if " the mind of man, naturally ſubject to error, could " never go aſtray, without ſome particular and ex- " ternal motive and inducement (45)." Mr. Baſnage's Latin words are ſo ſtrong, that we think we ſhall oblige the readers by tranſcribing them here. *Hæc obſervo*, ſays he, *adverſus veteres & recentiores biſtoricos, qui plerumque Hæreſes Auctorum vitiis potius, quam pondere rationum vileſcere volentes, Vindictæ ſtudium, Ambitionem, Auri ſacram famem omnium Hæreſeon genetrices faciunt; quaſi cœlum ipſum non peteremus ſtultitiâ; errorique ſubjecta mens ſine motivis externis in devia tranſgredi nequaquam poſſet.* P.

(44) *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 5. cap. 3. pag. 195.

(45) Baſnage, *ubi ſupra*, p. 40.

APOLLO, a Heathen Deity. See PHŒBUS.

APOLLODORUS. A great many perſons of different profeſſions and diſtinguiſhed merit have had this name. Scipio Tetti (*a*), a Neapolitan, has written a Treatiſe of the Apollodorus's, printed at Rome in 1555, with the *Bibliotheca* of Apollodorus tranſlated into Latin by Benedictus Ægius (*b*). Dr. Thomas Gale has treated of this ſubject again above an hundred years after (*c*). Moreri has given us under this name a great many articles, which have great need of being reviſed. He has omitted a famous Apollodorus, who is the only one that I intend to ſpeak of.

(*a*) Moreri calls him *Tattius*, inſtead of *Tattius*.

(*b*) *See* Nicodemo, *Additione alla Biblioth. Napolit.*

(*c*) See his *Apollodorus* printed at Paris with other Tracts, in 1675.

APOLLODORUS, a famous Architect, under Trajan and Hadrian, was born at Damaſcus. He had the direction of the Bridge of Stone, which Trajan ordered to be built over the Danube in the year 104, and which was eſteemed the moſt magnificent of all the noble works of that Emperor. Procopius ſpeaks of it (*a*); and it is ſomewhat probable, that Apollodorus left a deſcription in writing. Hadrian, who valued himſelf ſo highly upon his underſtanding all Arts and Sciences to perfection, that he grew jealous of and hated every one, who had raiſed himſelf a great reputation in his profeſſion, had ſome very particular reaſons to have no affection for Apollodorus; for one day as Trajan was diſcourſing with the great Architect upon the buildings which he raiſed at Rome, Hadrian gave his judgment, but ſhewed that he knew nothing of the matter (*b*). Apollodorus turned upon him very bluntly, and ſaid, *Go, paint Citruls, for you are very ignorant of the ſubject which we are talking upon.* Hadrian at that time was engaged in painting of Citruls, and even boaſted of it. This inſult of Apollodorus coſt him very dear. Hadrian remembered it his whole life, and when he came to be Emperor he did not forget to take his revenge. He never employed Apollodorus, but baniſhed, and at laſt had him accuſed of ſeveral crimes, under the pretence of which he put him to death. He would have been aſhamed to have declared the true cauſe of his puniſhment. Apollodorus had added to his former offence a new injury, which touched this Emperor to the quick: he had found fault with, and what is ſtill worſe, very juſtly found fault with a coſtly building which Hadrian had made. The Emperor, to ſhew Apollodorus that he had no abſolute occaſion for him, ſent him the plan of a temple of Venus; and though he aſked him his advice, it was not to be directed by it, for the temple was already built. Apollodorus wrote very freely what he thought of it, and found ſuch eſſential faults in it [*A*], as the Emperor could neither deny, nor remedy. It was this which threw the Prince

(*a*) *De Ædific.* lib. 4. cap. 6. p. 81. *apud* Tillemont *Hiſtoire des Empereurs*, tom. 2. p. 302.

(*b*) Xiphilin *in Hadriano.*

[*A*] *He found very eſſential faults in the plan of the Temple of Venus.*] He ſhewed by convincing reaſons, that it was built neither large, nor high enough; and that the ſtatues in it were diſproportioned to the

Prince into the greateſt paſſion imaginable, and prompted him to get rid of Apollodorus (c). This latter freedom of his was infinitely more excuſable than the former. We do not know whom we offend, when we treat with contempt thoſe ignorants, who pretend to ſhew their knowledge before the greateſt maſters. We ſometimes offend a perſon, whom we may come to be ſubject to [B], or whom we may have great occaſion for. This confirms me in my conjecture with regard to the converſations between Apelles and Alexander [C].

(c) *Ex* Xiphilin. *in Hadriano.*

the bulk of the Temple; *for*, ſaid he, *if the Goddeſſes ſhould have a mind to riſe and go out, they could not do it* (1). One of our Authors has paraphraſed this thought in the following manner. *The Architect Apollodorus ſeeing ſeveral images of the Gods in the Temple of Venus, ſaid immediately,* " *Theſe Gods would do well to continue* " *fixed where they are. If they ſhould have a mind to* " *riſe, unleſs they ſtoop extremely, they muſt beat thro'* " *the top of the Temple; and it would be ſtill worſe, if* " *they ſhould attempt to go out; for the door being too* " *low for them, they muſt ſtoop in a very inconvenient* " *and indecent manner* (2)." I have read ſome where or other, that the ſame objection was made againſt the Olympian Jupiter of Phidias; but others have given a pious turn to it. Let us hear Bardin: *It is ſaid, that Phidias having orders to make a ſtatue of Jupiter Olympius, choſe to make it in a poſture of ſitting, and of a height ſo diſproportionate to that of the Temple, that if it had been ſtanding, the top of the temple would have been too low for it. We may obſerve from hence, that God deſcends into our ſouls, which are his temples; but his Eſſence can never be contained in them to its whole extent* (3).

(1) Idem.

(2) Coſtar, *Apologie*, p. 90.

(3) Bardin, *Lycée*, chap. 2.

[B] *We ſometimes offend a perſon, whom we may come to be ſubject to* (4).] The relation between Trajan and Hadrian might have put Apollodorus in mind of this; but here we ſee the defect of thoſe, who think themſelves neceſſary, and whom their ſuperior abilities introduce into favour. They imagine, that they have no need to uſe any addreſs towards young Princes, and that their grand patron is ſufficient for them. The times afterwards change, and they find by experience that their magiſterial and haughty behaviour, and their contempt towards every one, who ventures to ſpeak impertinently of their profeſſion before them, is a great inſtance of folly in their conduct.

(4) See the text of the article ANTONIANO towards the end.

[C] *This confirms me in a conjecture with regard to the converſations between Apelles and Alexander.*] I have declared above (5), that I cannot perſuade myſelf, that this great Painter would venture to take ſo great a liberty of cenſuring that young conqueror, as ſome Authors mention. I know well enough, that thoſe, who excel in certain arts, are ſometimes of ſo capricious an humour, that they are incapable of containing themſelves within the bounds of reſpect, when the whim ſeizes them; but I know alſo, that Apelles is ſaid to have been a man of great civility and politeneſs. This is not my principal reaſon; for my ſtrongeſt is as follows. Alexander, who was a man the leaſt able of all others to bear an affront, would never have ſuffered ſo contemptuous a reproach to eſcape with impunity. Now we do not find, that Apelles ever loſt his favour. The argument from the greater to the leſs is in force here. Hadrian was leſs paſſionate than Alexander. He was not an Emperor, when the affront was offered him; and yet the cenſure of our Architect proved fatal to the latter.

(5) In the remark [D] of the article APELLES.

☞ APOLLONIUS the author of the *Argonautics*, was born at Alexandria in Egypt (a). He was called *Rhodius* or the *Rhodian*, becauſe he taught Rhetoric a long while in the city of Rhodes, as we are informed by the anonymous writer of his life in Greek. Suidas ſtiles him an Alexandrian. Meurſius in his notes upon Apollonius Dyſcolus diſtinguiſhes Apollonius of Rhodes from Apollonius of Alexandria; for which he is juſtly cenſured by Voſſius in his book *de Hiſtoricis Græcis* (b). He was ſon to Illeus or Silleus, and ſcholar to Callimachus, whom he is accuſed of having treated with ingratitude; by which means he expoſed himſelf to the indignation of that Poet, who gave him the name of *Ibis*, a bird of Egypt, which uſes to purge itſelf with its bill. He flouriſhed about the 133d Olympiad, under the reign of Ptolomy Euergetes, and ſucceeded Eratoſthenes the Grammarian in the place of Keeper of the Alexandrian Library, as Suidas tells us. We have a Poem of his upon the Expedition of the Argonauts into Colchis or Mingrelia, as it is called at preſent (c). Quintilian in his *Inſtitutiones Oratoriæ* (d) tells us, that this Poem is of a middle nature between the ſublime and low manner of writing, and that the Author has preſerved a juſt and uniform tenour in his performance. This appears likewiſe to have been the opinion of Longinus in his Treatiſe *Of the Sublime* (e), who acknowledges that Apollonius never ſinks in his Poem, but has kept it up in an uniform and equal manner. However he declares, that notwithſtanding this advantage he is infinitely inferior to Homer, even with all the faults of the latter, becauſe the ſublime, though ſubject to irregularities, is always preferable to all other kinds of writing. The moderns have proceeded further in their judgments upon our Poet, but their opinions are a little different concerning him [A]. He is ſaid to have written likewiſe a book concerning *Archilochus*, a Treatiſe *of the Origin of Alexandria*, *Cnidos*, and other works. We have the antient *Scholia* upon his *Argonautics* ſtill extant; they are very ſhort, but extremely

(a) Baillet, *Jugemens des Savans ſur les Poetes Grecs*, tom. 3. Part 1. num. 1127. p. 430. edit. Amſterdam 1725.

(b) Lib. 1. c. 16.

(c) Baillet, *ubi ſupra.*

(d) Lib. 10. c. 1.

(e) Cap. 27.

[A] *Their opinions are a little different concerning him.*] Lilius Giraldus in his *Hiſtory of the Poets* (1) obſerves, that his Poem is a work of great variety, which coſt the Author an infinite deal of pains; however the ſtyle and manner of it are harſh, and the Poem itſelf is far from being agreeable, except in that part, where the paſſion of Medea is deſcribed. This paſſage, according to the Author above quoted, pleaſed Virgil ſo highly, that he made no ſcruple to copy it almoſt entirely, in order to compoſe the fineſt part of the fourth book of his Æneid. Tanaquil Faber in his *Abregé des Vies des Poetes Grecs* (2) was of the ſame opinion with Giraldus with regard to Virgil's borrowing from our Poet; but he cannot agree with Longinus, who affirms, that there never was any thing found, which could be objected to in the œconomy of his Poem. He cenſures likewiſe thoſe criticks, who thought that his compoſition was equal, eaſy, and agreeable. However he owns, that he underſtood Greek tolerably well, and had ſome notion of the difference of characters. Claude du Verdier in his *Cenſ. omnium Auctorum* (3) tells us, that according to the judgment of a great many perſons, the ſtyle of Apollonius was always conſidered as low, rough and inelegant, and that all his contemporaries ridiculed him upon that account. Olaus Borrichius takes notice of this objection in his *Diſſertation. de Poetis Græcis* (4), and allows, that he was at firſt deſpiſed for the roughneſs of the verſes, which he wrote when he was very young; but he aſſerts, that he afterwards corrected and poliſhed them in ſuch a manner, that they were univerſally applauded. This Critic

(1) *Dialog.* 3. pag. 338, 380, 341. *apud* Baillet, tom. 3. Part 1. p. 431.

(2) Pag. 159. *apud* Baillet, *ubi ſupra.*

(3) Pag. 46. *apud eundem.*

(4) Num. 46.

tremely uſeful and full of learning, and are ſuppoſed to have been written by Tarrhæus, Theon, and others (*f*). Henry Stephens publiſhed an edition of this Poem in Greek in 4to, in 1574, with the *Scholia* and his own Annotations. There is likewiſe another edition in 8vo publiſhed in Greek and Latin at Leyden in 1641, by Jeremiah Hoelzlin, which is highly eſteemed by ſome perſons, though others have no better opinion of it than of many other editions of the *Variorum* (*g*). Monſieur de la Monnoye in his notes upon Baillet's *Jugemens des Savans* (*b*), obſerves, that though Hoelzlin's ſtyle is very harſh, yet he is very learned; and that at the end of his Commentary upon Apollonius there are three pages of ſmall notes by Lucas Holſtenius, which Mr. Menage reproaches Baillet for omitting to take notice of, though the latter never undertook to give a compleat Catalogue of all the works, which have been written in order to explain the Authors whom he treats of.

(*f*) Baillet, pag. 432.

(*g*) Idem, p. 432, 433.

(*b*) *In loco ſupra citato.*

Critic is likewiſe of the ſame opinion with thoſe, who eſteem Apollonius's diction to be pure, correct, uniform, eaſy, and agreeable; and he affirms that our Poet has obſerved the proper order and proportion in his work, and interſperſed in it a great many excellent maxims of policy. But Father Rapin in his *Reflections upon Poetry* (5) declares that his ſtyle has no manner of elevation or ſublimity, and that the ſtructure of the fable of his Poem is very injudicious; that the Catalogue of the Argonauts has nothing of that variety, which the ſubject was capable of; and that the Poem grows extremely languid from the firſt book. Add to this, that Apollonius has made this expedition to continue but four months; which is an egregious error in him. T.

(5) Part 2. Reflec. 15.

APOLLONIUS of Perga, a city of Pamphylia, was a great Geometrician (*a*), under the reign of Ptolomy Euergetes, which reaches from the ſecond year of the 133d Olympiad, to the third year of the 139th. He ſtudied a long time at Alexandria under the diſciples of Euclid (*b*), and compoſed ſeveral works, of which only that of the Conicks remains [*A*]. This is very much valued, and many Authors both ancient and modern have laboured in commenting upon it, or tranſlating it [*B*]. M. Des Cartes did not judge

(*a*) Eutocius Aſcalonita, *initio Commentar. in Conica Apollonii, ex* Heraclii *Vitâ Archimedis.*

(*b*) Pappus, *in Proœmio ad l. 7. Mathemat. Collection.*

[*A*] *He compoſed ſeveral works, of which we have only that of Conicks remaining.*] Two books περὶ λόγου ἀποτομῆς, *of the ſection of proportion*; two περὶ χωρίου ἀποτομῆς, *of the ſection of ſpace*; two διωρισμένης τομῆς, *of determinate ſection*; two ἐπαφῶν, *of tactions*; two νεύσεων, *of inclinations*; two τοπων ἐπιπέδων, *of plain places* (1); eight of Conicks. We cannot doubt of there being eight books in that laſt work. The Author's preliminary Epiſtle, addreſſed to a Geometrician of Pergamus, named Eudemus, ſhews it plainly. The Publick has not yet ſeen the laſt of theſe eight books: the four firſt are the only ones that we have in Greek; the three following were only tranſlated into Latin from the Arabic verſion. See the following note. We find in quotations the books of Apollonius *de cochlea*, and *de perturbatis rationibus* (2). I do not know whether we muſt not aſcribe to the ſame Author the *Comment on the Phænomena of Aratus*, which is attributed by the ancients to Apollonius the Geometrician (3).

(1) Voſſius, *de Scient. Mathemat.* cap. 16. p. 55. *ex* Pappi, lib. 7. *Mathematicæ Collectionis.*

(2) *Apud* Proclum *in Euclidem.* See the Epitome of Geſner's *Bibliotheca*, pag. 71.

(3) *See* Voſſius, *de Scient. Mathemat.* cap. 32. pag. 156, and *de Hiſtor. Græcis*, p. 505.

[Dr. Halley * informs us, that there is another work of Apollonius mentioned by Eutocius, in his Commentary on Archimedes's *Dimenſio Circuli*, commonly called Ὠκυτόκιον †, in which he ſeems to have treated of the rendring of Arithmetical Calculations more expeditious, which were very intricate before the invention of figures. He adds that there is a ſpecimen of it in a Fragment of the ſecond book of Pappus, according to Dr. Wallis, who publiſhed that Fragment in 1688. ADD. REM.]

* *Præf. ad Apol.* edit. Oxon. in folio, 1710.

† Dr. Halley conjectures with his uſual ſagacity, that for Ὠκυτόκιον we ought to read Ὠκυτόκιον.

[*B*] *Several Authors ancient and modern have laboured in commenting on his Conicks, or tranſlating them.*] It is ſaid, that Hypatia, the daughter of Theon, made a Comment on Apollonius's Conicks (4). We have ſtill that which Eutocius of Aſcalon compoſed on the four firſt books of this work, with ſome lemma's and corollaries of his own. He promiſed to comment on the four others. See his Epiſtle dedicatory to Anthemus. We have alſo (5) to the number of ſixty five lemma's, which Pappus diſpoſed and ſet in order on the Conicks of Apollonius. The Catalogue of the works of Francis Maurolycus, printed at Venice, informs us, that this able Mathematician compoſed a book intitled *Apollonii conica elementa, libris quatuor & demonſtrationibus & lineamentis opportunis inſtaurata* (6). Joannes Baptiſta Memmius (7), a noble Venetian, and Profeſſor of Mathematicks at Venice, made a Latin verſion of the four firſt books of Apollonius, which was printed in 1537 (8). It is good for nothing: he did not underſtand the ſubject, and that was the cauſe of his not perceiving the moſt viſible faults of the Greek manuſcript. *Eos primus tranſtulit*, ſays Voſſius (9), *Joannes Baptiſta Memmius*; *ſed infeliciter, eò quod argumentum operis non intelligerat: unde non vidit ſat manifeſtas Græci codicis mendas, ac ſæpe pueriliter allucinatur; ſicut monitum Franciſco Maurolyco præfatione in Coſmographiam ſuam.* Frederick Commandin (10) made a new verſion of it, a great deal better, which he printed at Bologna, in 1566. He joined to it the verſion of the Commentary of Eutocius, and ſeveral notes. But becauſe he made uſe of a Greek manuſcript, that was full of faults, he could not make his verſion ſo good as he deſired: wherefore Marinus Ghetaldus (11) thought himſelf obliged to go up quite to the ſource of the evil: he endeavoured to correct the manuſcript according to the ſenſe of the Author, and to ſolve the problems: and thought he had reſtored this ancient Geometrician to life (12). See the book which he intitled *Apollonius redivivus, ſeu reſtituta Apollonii Pergæi inclinationum Geometria*, and his *Supplementum Apollonii Galli, ſeu exſuſcitata Apollonii Pergæi tactionum Geometriæ pars reliqua*, printed at Venice, in 1607, in 4to. Claudius Richardus a Jeſuit of Franche Comté and Royal Profeſſor of Mathematicks in the Imperial College of his Order at Madrid, explained in his publick Lectures, in 1642, the four firſt books of Apollonius, and in 1643, four other books, of which he was the Author, wherein he ſupplied the other part of the work of this ancient Geometrician (13). What he has done on the four firſt books was printed at Antwerp, in 1655, in folio. He acknowledges, that after having finiſhed theſe two works, he read with a great deal of pleaſure and admiration the Conicks of Claudius Middorgius (14), and the Quadrature of the Circle by Gregory of St. Vincent, where there are a great many things that relate to the loſt books of Apollonius. *In quibus* (de Quadraturâ Circuli duobus tomis) *præter elementa conica peculiari ordine diſpoſita, innumera prodit ſicuti Middorgius, quo ſpectant ad poſtremos quatuor Apollonii libros injuria temporum ſuppreſſos, in lucem revocandos* (15). Ferdinand I, Grand Duke of Florence, deſigned to procure ſeveral Arabian Manuſcripts to be tranſlated, that were in his Library. John Baptiſt Raimond, who held the firſt rank amongſt thoſe to whom that Prince allowed penſions for this work, had promiſed to tranſlate Apollonius, of whom there was an Arabic copy in that Library; and there are ſome Authors, who have publiſhed that this verſion was finiſhed (16); but nothing has been found of it amongſt his papers (17). At laſt the Grand Duke Ferdinand II, and his brother Prince Leopold de Medicis caſt their eyes upon Abraham Ecchellenſis, Profeſſor of the Oriental languages at Rome, and impoſed this taſk upon him. He tranſlated into Latin the 5th, 6th,

(4) Claud. Richardus, *Præf. ad Apollon. Pergæum*, Sect. 10.

(5) *In Libro* 3. *Mathemat. Collect.* Pappi.

(6) Claud. Richard. *Præf. ad* Apollon. Pergæum, Sect. 4.

(7) Moreri calls him, *de Meſmes*; he took him no doubt for a Frenchman of the family of that name.

(8) Claud. Richardus *Præfat. in Apollon. Pergæum*, Sect. 15.

(9) Voſſius, *de Scient. Math.* p. 55.

(10) And not *Commandon* as Moreri calls him.

(11) He was a Patrician of Raguſa.

(12) *Ex* Voſſio, *de Scient. Mathemat.* p. 434.

(13) Claud. Richard. *Præf. in Apollon.* Sect. 11.

(14) *Tres Conicorum Libros Claudii Middorgii .... novâ methodo ex Apollonianis fontibus petitos & proprio ingenio appoſitè digeſtos.* Claud. Richard. *Præf. in Apollon.* Sect. 11.

(15) Idem, ibid.

(16) As Jerom Lunadorus, in his book *de Romanâ Curiâ. See* Borelli, in his Preface.

(17) Abrah. Ecchellenſis, *in Præfat. Verſionis Apollonii.*

judge favourably of it [C]. Some have thought that Apollonius appropriated to himſelf the writings and diſcoveries of Archimedes [D]. He had a ſon who called himſelf Apollonius,

6th and 7th book of Apollonius, with the aſſiſtance of Alfonſus Borelli, Profeſſor of Mathematicks in the Univerſity of Piſo. This tranſlation was printed at Florence in 1661, in folio, with the ſame Borellus's Comment, who maintains in his Preface, that theſe books are not ſuppoſititious, but belong really to our Apollonius. He anſwers the difficulties of Claudius Middorgius, who imagined that the three books, which Golius had brought out of the Levant (18), were written by an Arabian, who had concealed himſelf under the illuſtrious name of Apollonius. Father Merſenna informs us of this opinion of Claudius Middorgius; but he does not approve of it: he is of opinion that the eighth book of the Conicks of Apollonius, and all the other works of the ſame Author, even thoſe which Pappus has not quoted, really exiſt in Arabic tranſlations (19). He depends in this point on Aben Nedin, who wrote a book *de Philoſophis Arabibus* (20). Obſerve I, that at the end of Golius's manuſcript, it was noted that the eighth book of Apollonius had not been tranſlated into Arabic, becauſe it was wanting in the Greek books, from which the tranſlation of the others had been made. II, That the manuſcript, from which Ecchellenſis made his tranſlation, came out of the Oriental Library, which Ignatius Neama, Patriarch of Antioch, had left to the Grand Duke Ferdinand the firſt (22). III, That Abalphat Aſphahanenſis is the Author of the Arabic tranſlation, which ſerved Ecchellenſis for his original; and which he made for King Abicaligiar, who aſcended the throne in the 372d year of the Hegira. Whence it follows, that this verſion is not the firſt that was made in this language; for Gregory Barhebræus obſerves, that ſeven books of the Conicks of Apollonius were tranſlated into Arabic in the time of Almamun. Now Almamun was inaugurated in the 203d year of the Hegira (23). IV, That Abalphat pretends nevertheleſs that his verſion is the firſt, and that before they had only ſome fragments of the moſt eaſy places of Apollonius. Hence we may conclude, either that he had never ſeen the tranſlation made under Almamun, or that this tranſlation contained only ſome fragments of the Conicks of Apollonius (24).

(18) The 5th, 6th and 7th of the *Conicks* of Apollonius.

(19) Merſennus, *Præfat. in Apollonii Conica, quæ ſunt in ejus Συνόψει Mathematicâ.*

(20) *See* Voſſius *de Scientiis Mathemat.* p. 55.

(21) Idem, ibid.

(22) Borellus, *in Præf.*

(23) Abrah. Ecchellenſ. *in Præfat.*

(24) Idem, ibid.

This is what I could ſay by way of comment on the text of this note. I do not ſpeak of the Apollonius Batavus of Willibrord Snellius, *ſeu exſuſcitata Geometria Apollonii Pergæi περὶ διωρισμένης τομῆς*, a work printed at Leyden in 1608, in 4to; and I omit Vincentio Viviani, Author of the treatiſe *de Maximis & Minimis, geometrica Divinatio in quintum librum Conicorum Apollonii Pergæi*, printed at Florence, in 1659, in folio.

[It would be a piece of injuſtice not to take notice in this place of that excellent edition of Apollonius, publiſhed by Dr. Halley in the year 1710, and printed at the Theatre at Oxford, in folio, with the Lemma's of Pappus, and the Comments of Eutocius *. This work was begun by Dr. Gregory, who had undertaken to prepare the four firſt books of Conicks for the preſs, with the Comment of Eutocius, in Greek and Latin, while Dr. Halley was to tranſlate the three laſt out of Arabic into Latin, and to endeavour to reſtore the eighth, which was loſt thro' the injury of time. But the death of Dr. Gregory hindred him from proceeding any farther than the 44th page; ſo that the whole remainder of the work fell upon Dr. Halley. This learned Editor chiefly made uſe of an Arabic verſion in the Bodleian Library, made by Thebit ben Corah, but reviſed about four hundred and fifty † years ago by Naſir-Eddin two of the moſt famous Mathematicians of the Eaſt. He ſometimes alſo conſulted another Arabic manuſcript in the ſame Library, made by Abdolmelec Schirazita a Perſian five hundred years ago, and brought out of the Eaſt by Chriſtianus Ravius, who had given a barbarous tranſlation of it. But what was principally of uſe to him was the famous manuſcript of Golius, which Dr. Marſh, Archbiſhop of Armagh, had purchaſed of Golius's heirs, and readily communicated to him for the publick benefit. From this he in many places not only corrected his own verſion, but alſo ſupplied the deficiencies in the Greek text. This valuable manuſcript contains the firſt ſeven books of the Conicks of Apollonius, and in the margin of the laſt page is written to this effect ‡: "At the end of the copy from which this was tranſcribed it is written, that the eighth part of this book was not tranſlated into Arabic, becauſe it was wanting in the Greek copies." It was tranſlated by Thebit ben Corah, and corrected by Beni Moſes. It was afterwards reviſed by Mohammed Ebn Mohammed Ebn Al Haſan Tuſæus, who began his corrections Auguſt 16, 1247, and finiſhed them March 9, 1248. The *Scholia* were written by Achmed Ebn Aly Abul'farai Mohammed, ſurnamed Ebno' Ibawwâb of Bagdad, who finiſhed that in October 1263. The whole was compleated on the 30th of March in 1303, at Marága, a city on the confines of Media and Aſſyria. Theſe were the helps our Editor had to compleat his work. However the 8th book was ſtill wanting, a difficulty with which no man elſe would have thought of encountering. But it was no diſcouragement to Dr. Halley. That great genius diſcovering the neceſſary connection there muſt be between the ſeventh and eighth books, ventured to ſupply the eighth, and in ſuch a manner, that one cannot fail of thinking, that, if the real book ſhould ever be recovered, it cannot poſſibly differ much from the conjecture of this ſagacious editor. ADD. REM.]

‡ See the Preface to the fifth book.

* See the Preface.

† This was writ in 1710.

[C] *Mr. Des Cartes did not think favourably of his Conicks.*] "It did not ſeem ſtrange to him, that there "were people who could demonſtrate Conicks more "eaſily than Apollonius, becauſe this ancient writer is "exceſſively tedious and perplexed, and all that he has "demonſtrated is eaſy enough of it ſelf (25)." He compared what he had done in Metaphyſicks *to Apollonius's demonſtrations; in which there is really nothing but what is very plain and certain, when one conſiders each point ſeparately. But becauſe they are ſomething long, and one cannot ſee in them the neceſſity of the concluſion, if one does not exactly remember all that went before, there is hardly a man to be found in a whole city, or in a whole province, that is capable of underſtanding them.*] However, on the teſtimony of thoſe few that comprehend them, and affirm that they are true, there is no body who does not believe them (26).

(25) Baillet, *Vie de des Cartes*, tom. 2. p. 39.

(26) Ibid. p. 161.

[D] *It has been thought that he appropriated to himſelf the writings and diſcoveries of Archimedes.*] Heraclius affirms, that Archimedes was the firſt who laboured on conick theorems, and that his compoſitions thereupon fell, before they were publiſhed, into the hands of Apollonius, who publiſhed them as his own work (27). Eutocius refutes this by two arguments: one that Archimedes ſpeaks in ſeveral places of his books *of the Knowledge of Conicks*, as of no new thing; the other is that Apollonius does not boaſt of being the inventor of what he has writ: he contents himſelf with ſaying, that he has handled this ſubject more amply than had been done before him (28). This methinks is but a ſorry juſtification with regard to the crime of plagiariſm; for one may eaſily appropriate to one's ſelf the works of another, provided they be not works, wherein the Author pretends to ſay nothing but what is new. The glory of explaining a difficult ſubject, better than had been done before, is enough to tempt a man to ſeize upon a work, that may gain him this honour. Apollonius muſt be in this caſe, as appears by the very terms of his own Apologiſt. This is not all; he boaſts ſometimes in the general ſummary of his eight books to advance ſome new things (29). Judge if it was not a powerful motive to aſcribe a like work to himſelf. Eutocius then ſeems to me to defend him very ill, and I ſhould chooſe to juſtify him by the ſilence of Pappus his cenſurer, and a very ſevere one too. And obſerve, that Pappus not only does not accuſe him of being a plagiary, but alſo acknowledges him expreſly for the true Author of the eight books of Conicks; tho' he pretends that Euclid had already compoſed four books on this ſubject (30). He takes Euclid's part againſt Apollonius, who has obſerved, that this famous Geometrician had ſucceeded very ill in a certain point. He excuſes Euclid by what Apollonius himſelf had acknowledged; that before the diſcoveries of Apollonius it was impoſſible to handle that ſubject well. The

(27) Heraclius, *in Vitâ Archimedis, apud* Eutocium, *init. Comment. in Apollonii Conica.*

(28) Eutocius, ibid. *See* Claudius Richardus in his Preface to *Apollonius*, Sect. 7.

(29) See the *Letter* of *Apollonius* to *Eudemus*, at the beginning of his firſt book. See alſo his *Letter* to *Attalus*, at the beginning of the 4th book.

(30) Pappus, *in Proœmio*, lib. 7. *Mathem. Collect.*

lonius, and who carried the second book of Conicks to him, to whom the Author had dedicated it. The Arabians have been very ignorant with regard to his chronology [*E*]. Moreri has committed many faults here [*F*].

☞ We may add here from the learned Dr. Halley *, that "He was very famous under "Philopator, who died in the seventeenth year of his reign, and the two hundred and "fifth before Christ; whence we may gather that he was forty years younger than Ar- "chimedes, and that he was not much antienter than Geminus Rhodius, who was cer- "tainly before Hipparchus. This Geminus tells us that our Apollonius obtained on ac- "count of this excellent book of Conicks, the name of *the Great Geometrician* among "the Mathematicians of his own time." *Sub Philopatore (qui imperii sui anno xvii ante Christum ccv. diem obiit supremum) maxima erat in celebritate, teste Ptolemæo Hephæstione apud Photium Cod. cxc. adeo ut hinc liceat conjicere, quod annis circiter xl. minor fuerit Archimede, quodque non longo intervallo præcesserit Geminum Rhodium, certe Hipparcho majorem. Testatur autem Geminus hunc nostrum Apollonium, propter eximium hoc Conicorum opus, inter sui ævi Mathematicos* Magni Geometræ *nomen adeptum esse.*

* *Præf. in Apollon.* edit. Oxon. in fol. 1710.

The principles, which were made use of before, were not sufficient to lead to it. He pretends that Euclid, full of mildness, honesty, and modesty, kept to the discoveries of Aristæus with relation to Conicks, without desiring either to oppose them, or go beyond them, and that he stopp'd where they could carry him no further; but he was careful not to say, that the point of perfection was there: he would have been blameable in that case (31). Observe by the way, that this shews the falseness of what Heraclius pretends, that Archimedes was the first that wrote concerning Conicks. Vossius has not taken notice of the proofs that overturn this pretence. He observes as something in justification of Heraclius, that Archimedes has sometimes referred to a work on Conicks; and that after his peculiar manner of referring to his own writings (32). He adds, that Guido Ubaldus has proved against Eutocius, that Archimedes was not ignorant that Cones could be cut by planes, that have an inclination different from the side of the Cone (33). But how does this prove the point in dispute? Let us grant that Archimedes had composed a work on Conicks, that was good, fine, and excellent: is this saying that no body had treated of this subject before him, or that this work was stolen by the plagiary Apollonius?

(31) You will find Pappus's words in the note on the article ARISTÆUS the Geometrician.

(32) Vossius, *de Scient. Mathem. in Addendis*, pag. 434.

(33) Guido Ubaldus, *initio Commentarii in secundum ἰατροσυνικὸν Archimedis.*

[*E*] *The Arabians have been very ignorant in Chronology, with regard to Apollonius.*] They have said, that he lived in the time of Ahaz King of Judah, and that his writings on Conicks were the cause of Euclid's writing some books a long time after (34). This is so strange a blunder, that one may well be surprized, that Ecchellensis has treated it with so much precaution. He has abstained from saying that the Arabian Author, who has made it, is mistaken: he says only that this Chronology seems very different from the common. *In his longè videtur discrepare Gregorius à communi Chronologorum sententia & opinione, qui Apollonium floruisse scribunt anno periodi Julianæ* 4474 . . . . . *discrepat præterea ab iisdem Chronologis in ætate Euclidis, quem Apollonio juniorem agnoscit, ubi illi eum collocant in anno periodi Julianæ* 4430 (35). That is, "In these things Gregory seems to differ "widely from the common opinion of Chronologers, "who write that Apollonius flourished in the 4474th "year of the Julian Period. . . . . He differs besides "from the same Chronologers in the age of Euclid, "whom he acknowledges to be younger than Apol- "lonius; whereas they place him in the 4430th year "of the Julian Period." Ecchellensis leaves us the liberty of choosing between these two opinions: he had better have decided, that the Arabian Author was mistaken; for that is very certain. And observe, that his mistake is not a difference of a few years: Ahaz began to reign in the 3970th year of the Julian Period. Ptolomy Euergetes, under whom Apollonius flourished, succeeded the King his father, in the 4468th year of the same Period. Thus the mistake is very considerable, it contains a difference of about five hundred years.

(34) Gregorius Barhebræus, l. 3. *Chronicorum in Achaz, apud* Abrah. Ecchell. *Præf. in Apollon.*

(35) Ecchellens. ibid.

[*F*] *Moreri has made a pretty many faults in this place.*] I. He has given the surname of *Great Geometrician* simply and absolutely to our Apollonius. He should have used some restriction, and contented himself with saying, that his contemporaries gave him that surname, on account of his capacity in Conicks. This is to a tittle what Eutocius of Ascalon relates (36). II. Moreri pretends, that this surname is the same with that of ὁ Κίτιος: it is a great blunder, be it treated ever so favourably; for in fine, the Apollonius, who had the surname of Κίτιος, was not the Geometrician; he was a native of Cyrene (37), and never had any reputation (38). III. Eutocius does not relate the work of Heraclius concerning the life of Archimedes: he only quotes it. IV. To say that *we have* the treatise *of Cones*, Conicorum, *translated by John Baptist de Mesmes*, is committing a barbarism, and endeavouring to persuade the readers, that this John Baptist has translated all this work; whereas he has translated only the four first books. V. It is not true, *that the learned know that these* (39) *four first books of Apollonius are Euclid's of Megara.* VI. No body has said, that Apollonius was *the disciple of Eubulides the disciple of Euclid*, and there is no probability that he was so, for Eubulides cultivated only the quirks of Dialecticks, and did not teach in Alexandria, where our Apollonius studied under the disciples of Euclid (40). VII. After having advanced, that Euclid is the real Author of the four first books of Apollonius, ought he to have said, that this last *wrote Comments on the four first books of Cones of this Philosopher?* what confusions, or rather what contradictions! VIII. It is not true, that Golius has translated the fifth, sixth, and seventh Books of Apollonius out of *Arabic into Latin.* Moreri, who affirms it, is inexcusable, because he had read in Vossius, only that Golius had brought these three books in Arabic out of the Levant, and that the Mathematicians would soon be under great obligations to him, and especially when these three books should be printed (41). IX. The Apollonius, who was Diodorus's master, is not the person treated of in this article. See above (42) two other faults in Moreri.

(36) Eutoc. Ascalon. *initio Comment. in Conica Apollonii.* He builds upon the testimony of Gemini, lib. 6. *Mathemat. Præceptionum.*

(37) Strabo, lib. 17. pag. 576.

(38) Idem, lib. 14. pag. 453.

(39) Observe that Moreri had said nothing to which the word *these* might refer; which makes insufferable nonsense.

(40) *See* Diogenes Laertius, lib. 2. num. 3.

(41) Vossius, *de Scient. Mathem.* cap. 16. p. 55.

(42) In the note [*B*] in the marginal quotations (9) and (m).

APOLLONIUS of Tyana, was one of those men of whom the most extraordinary things have been said. I had resolved to make a very long article of him; but having seen that which Mr. Tillemont has given us of him, I thought it was better to employ my time in searching for other things, than to take a great deal of pains only to repeat what he has said, or only to take the trouble of barely copying him. His book will go thro' more hands than this; every body will be readier to consult that than my Dictionary. It will be sufficient to say, that you may find in the second volume of his work (*a*) a full and exact collection of all that there is most remarkable to be said concerning Apollonius of Tyana. I shall observe however, though it be only for form, that he was born at Tyana in Cappadocia, about the beginning of the first Century; that when he was but sixteen years old, he set up for a strict observer of Pythagoras's rule, renouncing wine, women, and all sorts of flesh, not wearing shoes, letting his hair grow, wearing nothing but linen (*b*); that

(*a*) Pag. 200, &c. of the Brussels edition.

(*b*) Philost. *in Vitâ Apollonii*, lib. 1.

that a little after he ſet up for a reformer; that he choſe a habitation in a temple of Æſculapius, where many ſick perſons went to him to aſk for their cure; that when he was of age he gave one part of his wealth to his eldeſt brother; that he diſtributed another part to ſome poor relations; and that he kept very little for himſelf; that he went five years without ſpeaking; that this ſilence did not hinder him from ſtopping many ſeditions [A] in Cilicia and in Pamphylia (c); that he went to travel, and that he ſet up for a Legiſlator; that he boaſted he knew all Languages without having ever learnt them, perceived the thoughts of men (d), and underſtood the oracles which birds gave by their ſinging (e); that he condemned dancing and other diverſions of this nature; that he recommended works of charity (f); that he travelled to almoſt every part of the world (g); that at Cadiz he ſtirred up the Super-intendant of the Province againſt Nero (b) [B]; and that he died very old, without its being ever certainly known where, or in what manner (i). His life has been amply deſcribed by Philoſtratus [C]; it is not to be doubted but that it contains a thouſand fabulous things, or if the facts were true, that they ought to be attributed to the Magic Art. The Heathens were very glad to put the pretended miracles of this man in oppoſition to thoſe of our Saviour [D], and to make them parallel with one another. It is remarkable that St. Auguſtin has acknowledged that Apollonius at the worſt

(c) Idem, ibid.

(d) Idem, ibid.

(e) Idem, ibid. cap. 14.

(f) Idem, ibid. lib. 4. cap. 1 and 2.

(g) See the 16th Letter of St. Jerom.

(b) Philoſt. lib. 5. cap. 3 and 12.

(i) Under the Empire of Nerva, in the year of Chriſt 96 or 97.

[A] *During his ſilence he put a ſtop to ſeveral ſeditions.*] That which he put a ſtop to in Aſpendus (1) was one of the moſt difficult to appeaſe, becauſe it conſiſted in making thoſe hearken to reaſon whom hunger had driven to revolt, *fames magiſtra peccandi, duriſſima neceſſitatum* (2). i. e. "hunger the miſtreſs "of offending, and the hardeſt of neceſſities." They were ready to burn the Governor, becauſe ſome rich perſons, by concealing corn, had brought an extreme ſcarcity on the city. Apollonius, without ſaying a ſingle word, ſtopped this popular emotion. Was ever ſilence ſeen more eloquent, more active, more perſuaſive? He was quite another ſort of man than he of whom Virgil ſpeaks:

Tum pietate gravem ac meritis ſi forte virum quem
Conſpexere ſilent, arrectiſque auribus aſtant:
Ille regit DICTIS *animos ac pectora mulcet* (3).

"As when in tumults riſe th' ignoble crowd,
"Mad are their motions, and their tongues are loud;
"And ſtones and brands in rattling vollies fly,
"And all the ruſtick arms that fury can ſupply:
"If then ſome grave and pious man appear,
"They huſh their noiſe, and lend a liſt'ning ear;
"He ſooths with ſober WORDS their angry mood,
"And quenches their innate deſire of blood."
Dryden.

He muſt ſpeak, if he would put a ſtop to the fury of a mutinous people. Apollonius had no need of that: his Pythagorean ſilence brings about all that the fineſt figures of the art of Oratory could have effected.

(1) It was the third city of Pamphylia.

(2) Quintil. *Declamat.* 12. The French have a Proverb, *Ventre affamé n'a point d'oreilles*, i. e. "A hungry "belly has no "ears." The Antients had one like it. See in the *Chiliads* of Eraſmus, *Venter non habet aures*; i. e. "The belly has "no ears." Cato began a harangue with theſe words, *Arduum eſt ad ventrem verba facere, qui careat auribus.* i. e. "It is difficult "to argue with "the belly, "which has no "ears." The deſign of it was to appeaſe the people that were crying out for corn.

(3) Virgil. Æn. lib. 1. ver. 148.

[B] *He ſtirred up at Cadiz . . . . him that had the government of the country.*] "Philoſtratus extolls him "for having ſtirred up at Cadiz the Governor of the "country againſt Nero, and the other Philoſophers "made no more ſcruple of it than he, [not having "the Chriſtian Religion, which teaches us to conſider "men according to what they are, not in themſelves, "but in the order of God, and never to violate one's "promiſe (4)."] Mr. de Tillemont might have ſpared this moral reflection, and his whole parentheſis. Chriſtianity has many real and ſublime advantages above all Philoſophy; but upon the point here in queſtion, I do not ſee that for theſe thouſand years it has any right to inſult the Philoſophers. The Chriſtians and they have not been in debt to one another on this account for a long time. One may ſay of this engagement *never to violate one's promiſe*, what the Poets ſaid of chaſtity;

Credo pudicitiam Saturno rege moratam
In terris, viſamque diu . . . .
Quippe aliter tunc orbe novo cœloque recenti
Vivebunt homines (5).

"I grant that chaſtity when Saturn reign'd
"Was ſeen on earth . . . .
"For in the earth's nonage, under heav'n's new frame
"No vice they knew. Sir Robert Stapylton.

(4) Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 2. p. 208.

(5) Juven. Sat. 6. *init.*

It did not get beyond the three firſt Centuries. Mr. de Tillemont obſerves, that Apollonius *ſtrove to ſtir up every body againſt the Emperor Domitian* (6). The Author of this Philoſopher's Life reckons it an heroic action (7). This impoſtor had mimicked the Son of God in ſeveral things; but with regard to ſubmiſſion and patience, he dropp'd the maſk, and miſſed his aim. There is no parallel here.

(6) Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 2. p. 210.

(7) Philoſt. lib. 7. cap. 2.

[C] *His life has been amply deſcribed by Philoſtratus.*] That which Damis, a native of Niniveh, *the moſt attached to him of all his diſciples*, had compoſed, *was in reality nothing but Memoirs indifferently written* (8). They fell into the hands of the Empreſs Julia the wife of Severus. *She gave them to Philoſtratus, who, from them, and from what he could gather from Apollonius's own works, and ſome other memoirs, compoſed the Hiſtory which we have of him. He ſpeaks of one Maximus of Eges, who had compoſed a book on Apollonius, and of one Mæragenes, who had written four books, but he would not have us depend much upon this laſt* (9). See in the note [I] ſome other authors of the Life of Apollonius. As to what Philoſtratus has compoſed, it was firſt printed in Greek, at Venice, by Aldus Manutius, with Euſebius's treatiſe againſt Hierocles. This treatiſe was turned into Latin by Zenobius Acciaioli: the Life of Apollonius was tranſlated into the ſame language, by Alemannus Rhinuccinus, of Florence. Theſe two works were printed in Latin, at Cologn, in 1532, in 8vo, with ſeveral corrections and little marginal notes, by Giſbert Longolius. The Paris edition of all the works of the Philoſtrati, by the care of Frederick Morel, is better than thoſe which were before it; but it were to be wiſhed that ſome good Grecian would correct the Latin verſion. He would find there a good many things that require the hand of a ſkilful Phyſician. See the note [I], and the marginal quotation (n), on the ſubject of Vigenere's tranſlation.

(8) Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* p. 201. *Ex* Philoſt. lib. 1. cap. 3.

(9) Tillemont, ibid. *ex* Philoſt. lib. 1. cap. 2 and 3.

[D] *The Pagans were very ready to oppoſe this man's pretended miracles to thoſe of our Saviour.* We need only conſult Euſebius's work (10) againſt one Hierocles, a great enemy of the Goſpel under the Emperor Diocletian. The drift of Hierocles, in the treatiſe which Euſebius refutes, ſeems to have been to draw a parallel between Jeſus Chriſt and Apollonius of Tyana, where he gave the preference to the latter. Theſe words of Lactantius confirm what I have juſt ſaid: *Item cum facta* Jeſu Chriſti *mirabilia deſtrueret nec tamen negaret, voluit oſtendere Apollonium vel paria vel etiam majora feciſſe* (11). i. e. "Alſo when "he would have diſcredited the wonderful works of "Jeſus Chriſt, and yet did not deny them, he would "have ſhewn that Apollonius did as great, if not "greater." Mr. Tillemont has ſaid ſomething remarkable: *Apollonius*, ſays he (12), *was one* * *of the moſt dangerous enemies that the* Church *has had in its beginning, by the apparent innocence of his life, and by his pretended miracles. The* † *Devil ſeems to have ſent him into the world, according to his own panegyriſts,* [*about the ſame time that Jeſus Chriſt was pleaſed to appear in it, either to* § *ballance his authority in the mind of thoſe who ſhould take the illuſions of this magician for true miracles,*] *or that thoſe who ſhould acknowledge him for a real cheat and a magician, ſhould be carried ſo far as to doubt alſo of the miracles of Jeſus Chriſt and his Diſciples.*

(10) In his book *de Demonſt. Evangel.* p. 511.

(11) Lact. *Divin. Inſtit.* lib. 5. cap. 3.

(12) Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 2. p. 200.
* Godeau, *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe*, pag. 245.
† Apollon. *Vita*, lib. 1. cap. 3.
§ Godeau, *Hiſt. de l'Egliſe*, pag. 246.

worſt was preferable to the Jupiter of the Gentiles (*k*). It cannot be denied but that this Philoſopher received very great honours, both during his life, and after his death [*E*]; and that his reputation laſted as long as Paganiſm [*F*]. He left ſome works, which are

(*k*) See the note [*F*] quotation (28)

[*E*] *He received very great honours, both during his life and after his death.*] Mr. de Tillemont reproaches him juſtly, for † *not having been offended at being treated as a God* §, *and for having ſuffered himſelf* ‡ *on one occaſion from having divine honours publickly paid him, it was, ſays his Hiſtorian, for fear of envy* (13). The inhabitants of Tyana built a temple to their Apollonius after his death (14): his image is alſo in a great many other temples (15). The Emperor Adrian collected the letters of Apollonius, as much as poſſibly he could, and laid them up in his fine palace of Antium, with a little book of this Philoſopher's concerning the anſwers he had received from the Oracle of Trophonius. This little book was ſtill to be ſeen at Antium, in the time of Philoſtratus; and there was nothing that rendred this city ſo particularly famous as that little book (16). Antoninus Caracalla had a very great veneration for Apollonius: he built alſo a temple to him as to a Hero (17). The Emperor Alexander had the image of his Philoſopher, *in a particular place of the palace, amongſt thoſe of Jeſus Chriſt, Abraham, and the beſt Princes* (18). Aurelian, after having taken a reſolution to ſack Tyana, did not do it, becauſe Apollonius appeared to him, and forbad him. Not contented with obeying this order of Apollonius, he vowed to him an image, a temple, and ſtatues. Vopiſcus, when he informs us of that, declares himſelf an admirer and devotee of Apollonius, and promiſes to write his Life. The paſſage is worth relating notwithſtanding its length; almoſt the whole of it is a proof of the text of this remark. *Taceri non debet res quæ ad famam venerabilis viri pertinet. Fertur enim Aurelianum de Thyanæ civitatis everſione vera dixiſſe, vera cogitaſſe: verum Apollonium Thyanæum celeberrimæ famæ autoritatiſque ſapientem, veterem philoſophum, amicum verum Deorum, ipſum etiam pro numine frequentandum, recipienti ſe in tentorium ea forma qua videtur, ſubito aſtitiſſe, atque hæc Latine, ut homo Pannonius intelligeret, verba dixiſſe:* Aureliane, ſi vis vincere, nihil eſt quod de civium meorum nece cogites. Aureliane, ſi vis imperare, à cruore innocentium abſtine. Aureliane, clementer te age, ſi vis vincere. *Norat vultum Philoſophi venerabilis Aurelianus, atque in multis ejus imaginem viderat templis. Denique ſtatim attonitus, & imaginem & ſtatuas & templum eidem promiſit, atque in meliorem rediit mentem. Hæc ego à gravibus viris comperi, & in Ulpiæ bibliothecæ libris relegi, & pro majeſtate Apollonii magis credidi. Quid enim illo viro ſanctius, venerabilius, antiquius, diviniuſque inter homines fuit? Ille mortuis reddidit vitam? Ille multa ultra hominem & fecit & dixit: quæ qui velit noſſe, Græcos legat libros, qui de ejus vita conſcripti ſunt. Ipſe autem, ſi vita ſuppetat, atque ipſius viri favori uſquequaque placuerit, breviter ſaltem tanti viri facta in literas mittam: non quo illius viri geſta munere mei ſermonis indigeant, ſed ut ea quæ miranda ſunt omnium voce prædicentur* (19). i. e. "I muſt not conceal a thing "that conduces to the honour of the venerable man. "For it is reported, that Aurelianus ſpoke truly and "thought truly of the ſubverſion of the city Thyana: "but that Apollonius of Thyana, a man of great "fame and authority, an old Philoſopher, and true "friend of the Gods, and himſelf alſo to be reſorted "to as a Deity, appeared to him on a ſudden, in ſuch "a ſhape as he is ſeen, juſt as he was retiring into "his tent, and ſpoke to him thus in Latin, ſo as Aurelian a native of Pannonia might underſtand: *If you would conquer, O Aurelianus, you muſt not think of the deſtruction of my Citizens. If you would reign, O Aurelianus, abſtain from the blood of the innocent. If you would conquer, O Aurelianus, behave your ſelf with clemency.* Aurelianus knew the face of the venerable "Philoſopher, and had ſeen his image in many temples. And being immediately aſtoniſhed, he promiſed him an image, and ſtatues, and a temple, "and altered his former reſolution for the better. This I "have had from men of gravity, and have read it in "books in the Ulpian Library, and believed it the "more on account of the majeſty of Apollonius. "For what was more holy, more venerable, more "noble, and more divine amongſt men? He reſtored "the dead to life. He did and ſaid many things "above the reach of man: which he that deſires to "know muſt read the Greek books that are written "concerning his Life. And I myſelf, if my life "be but ſpared, and he himſelf ſhall be pleaſed with "it, will commit to writing briefly at leaſt the actions of ſo great a man: not that the deeds of ſuch "a man ſtand in need of my praiſe, but that ſuch "things as are to be admired, may by celebrated by "the voice of all men." Thoſe words of Lampridius, concerning the adoration of the Emperor Alexander are no leſs worthy to be related. We learn from thence, that he began the day with acts of devotion, when he was in a fit ſtate, that is, when he had not lain with his wife. He went in the morning into his oratory, to perform there the religious ceremonies in honour of the Patrons he had choſen; of whom Apollonius was one. *Uſus vivendi fuit. Primum ut, ſi facultas eſſet, id eſt, ſi non cum uxore cubuiſſet, matutinis horis in lararia ſuo (in quo & divos principes, ſed optimos electos & animas ſanctiores, in queis & Apollonium, & quantum ſcriptor ſuorum temporum dicit, Chriſtum, Abraham, & Orpheum, & hujuſcemodi Deos habebat, ac majorum effigies) rem divinam faciebat* (20). Euſebius teſtifies, "that in "his time there were ſome that pretended to make "enchantments, uſing with them the name of Apol- "lonius (21)."

(19) Vopiſcus, *in Aureliano*, cap. 24.

(20) Lamprid. *in Alexand. Severo*, cap. 29.

(21) Euſeb. *in Hierocl.* p. 476, 477. quoted by Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emp.* p. 220.

[*F*] *His reputation laſted as long as Paganiſm.*] Mr. de Tillemont, who denies this, makes uſe of the teſtimonies of Lactantius and Euſebius. *About the beginning of the fourth Century*, ſays he (22), *Apollonius was no longer honoured as a God, tho' it is pretended that the Epheſians ſtill reverenced his ſtatue, tho' not under his own name but that of Hercules, becauſe it was manifeſt that he was nothing but a mere man and an impoſtor. Euſebius affirms alſo, that* [*ſcarce*] *any body knew Apollonius any longer at that time, not only as a God, or an extraordinary and wonderful man, but even as a mere Philoſopher.* Mr. de Tillemont quotes the third chapter of the fifth book of *Lactantius*, and *Euſebius againſt Hierocles*, pag. 468. I acknowledge Lactantius ſuppoſes, that no one honoured Apollonius as a God: *Cur igitur*, aſks he, *ô delirum caput, nemo Apollonium pro Deo colit? niſi forte tu ſolus illo ſcilicet Deo dignus, cum quo te in ſempiternum verus Deus puniet*; i. e. "Why then, O madman, does no one "worſhip Apollonius for a God? unleſs perhaps you "alone who are worthy of ſuch a God, with whom "the true God will puniſh you eternally." But he does not deny what the Author whom he refutes had advanced; that they ſtill honoured at Epheſus the image conſecrated to Apollonius under the name of Hercules: *Simulacrum ejus ſub Herculis Alexicaci nomine conſtitutum ab Epheſiis etiam nunc honorari* (23). He contents himſelf with making uſe of Apollonius's not being honoured under his true name, but a borrowed one. *Ideo alieni nominis titulo affectavit divinitatem, quia ſuo nec poterat nec audebat*; that is, "Therefore he affected Divinity under a borrowed "name, becauſe he neither could nor durſt do it under "his own." That is more ſubtil than ſolid; for when the Epheſians conſecrated this image, they had no deſign to honour any but Apollonius, and they made uſe of the title of *Hercules* ἀποτροπαῖος, or *Alexicacus*, only to ſhew that Apollonius delivered them from the plague. There does not ſeem to be any artifice in all this: Apollonius did not ſeek to cover himſelf under another name thro' any fear, that his own might give men's minds any ſcruple. Here then is a good teſtimony produced by Lactantius, concerning the worſhip that was ſtill given to our Apollonius at the beginning of the fourth Century. With all the reſpect due to this Father, I know not how to perſuade myſelf that thoſe of Tyana had diſcontinued their veneration, or that the images of Apollonius were taken out of all their temples (24). I find in Euſebius, that in his time, there was a rumour that abundance of things were done by the invocation of the name of Apollonius.

(22) Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 2. p. 220.

(23) Lactant. *Divin. Inſtit.* lib. 5. cap. 3. pag. 310.

(24) See the paſſage of Vopiſcus in the preceding note, quotation (19).

† Philoſt. *in Apollon. Vitâ*, lib. 8. cap. 2. pag. 376.

§ Ibid. lib. 7. cap. 10. p. 346. *See alſo* lib. 1. cap. 13. pag. 25.

‡ Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 19. p. 189.

(13) Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 2. p. 216.

(14) Philoſtrat. lib. 1. cap. 4. p. 6. *See alſo* lib. 8. cap. *ult.*

(15) Vopiſcus, *in Aureliano*, c. 24.

(16) Philoſt. *in Vita Apollonii*, lib. 8. cap. 8.

(17) Herodian. Dio, lib. 77. pag. 878. c. *apud* Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emp.* pag. 219.

(18) Lamprid. pag. 123, *apud eundem.*

are not now extant [G]. They mention another Philoſopher named Apollonius of Tyana [H]; he lived under the reign of Hadrian. I do not know of what ſect he was; but no body is ignorant that our Apollonius was a ſtrict Pythagorean. He made ſo open a profeſſion of the belief of Tranſmigration, that he cauſed a Lion to be worſhiped, under pretence that the ſoul of Amaſis (*l*) was united with the body of this beaſt (*m*). We have his life tranſlated into French by Blaiſe de Vigenere, from the Greek of Philoſtratus (*n*), with a very ample commentary by Artus Thomas Sieur d'Embry a Pariſian. It is not long ſince an Engliſh tranſlation of this life, with notes, furiouſly offended the pious (*I*]. It was condemned, proſcribed, anathematiz'd, and not without reaſon. I ſhall

(*l*) He had been King of Egypt.

(*m*) Philoſt. lib. 5. cap. 15.

(*n*) The title informs us that Fed. Morel, Reader and Interpreter to the King, has reviſed and corrected this verſion exactly according to the Greek original. It was printed at Paris in 1611, in 2 vol. in 4°.

Apollonius. *Αὐτίκα τῶν νῦν εἰσιν, οἱ περίεργοις μηχαναῖς τῇ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀνακλήσεως προσηγορίᾳ κατειληφέναι λέγουσι* (25); i. e. "And there are ſome now, who ſay "they have found magical powers in the invocation "of his name, whereby ſome ſuperſtitions are per-"formed." He calls them magical or ſuperſtitious; but we muſt not queſtion that ſeveral Pagans took them for good miracles. I find in St. Auguſtin, that in his time, the Chriſtians were ſo teazed with the chimerical parallel between the miracles of Apollonius, and thoſe of Jeſus Chriſt, and with the ridiculous pretence that the firſt equalled or exceeded the laſt, that they had recourſe to this great light of the Church, for a refutation of this difficulty. *Sed tamen etiam ego in hac parte, qui* PLURIMIS *quicquid reſcripſeris,* PROFUTURUM *eſſe confido, precator acceſſerim, ut ad ea* VIGILANTIUS *reſpondere digneris, in quibus nihil amplius Dominum quam alii homines facere potuerunt, feciſſe vel geſſiſſe mentiuntur.* APOLLONIUM *ſiquidem ſuum nobis & Apuleium alioſque magicæ artis homines in medium proferunt, quorum majora contendunt extitiſſe miracula* (26); that is, "But yet I alſo, who "truſt that whatſoever you ſhall write on this occaſion "will be of USE to VERY MANY, beſeech you to an-"ſwer thoſe VERY CAREFULLY, who feign that our "Lord has done no more than other men could "have done. And they produce their Apollonius "and Apuleius, and other magicians, whoſe miracles "they affirm to be greater." It was then that St. Auguſtin declared what has been read in this article (27; that Apollonius of Tyana was preferable to Jupiter, which by the way ought to make ſome modern Divines aſhamed, who cannot bear that one ſhould look upon the privation of the knowledge of God as a leſs ſin than the Gentiles worſhipping abominable Deities, and worſe, in St. Auguſtin's opinion, than magicians. *Quis autem vel riſu dignum non putet,* quod Apollonium & Apuleium exteroſque magicarum artium peritiſſimos *conferre Chriſto, vel etiam præferre conantur, quamquam* TOLERABILIUS *ferendum ſit, quando illos ei potius comparent quam Deos ſuos: multo enim melior, quod fatendum eſt, Apollonius fuit, quam tot ſtuprorum auctor & perpetrator, quem Jovem nominant* (28); that is, "But who does not think it "ridiculous, that they endeavour to compare *Apollo-"nius and Apuleius and other Magicians* with Chriſt, "or even prefer them, tho' this is more TOLERA-"BLE than the comparing of their own Deities with "him: for it muſt be confeſſed, that Apollonius was "much preferable to that author and perpetrator of "ſo many adulteries, whom they call Jupiter." The ſame Father obſerves that the Pagans, who made a jeſt of the Hiſtory of Jonas, would have given a great deal of credit to a like adventure, if it had been related of Apuleius or Apollonius of Tyana. *Si hoc quod de Jona ſcriptum eſt, Apuleius Madaurenſis, vel Apollonius Tyaneus, feciſſe diceretur, quorum multa mira, nullo fideli auctore, jactitant . . . . ſi de iſtis ut dixi quos Magos vel Philoſophos laudabiliter nominant tale aliquid narraretur, non jam in buccis creparet riſus, ſed typhus* (29). Laſtly I find, that *Eunapius wrote at the beginning of the fifth Century,* that *Apollonius was not ſo much a Philoſopher, as ſomething between a God and a man,* and that *Philoſtratus ought to have intitled his Hiſtory of him, the deſcent of a God upon the earth* (30). Am I then in the wrong to affirm, that Apollonius's glory laſted as long as Paganiſm?

There is nothing more for me to do now than to anſwer to the authority of Euſebius, which Mr. de Tillemont has laid great ſtreſs upon. This is no difficult matter; for it is plain from the facts juſt now alledged, that Euſebius repreſents hyperbolically what ſeems to have no ſhadow of truth. How could it be true, that no body, in the time of Euſebius, did Apollonius the honour of treating him as a Philoſopher, when Ammianus Marcellinus, in the ſame Century, having ſpoken occaſionally of a fountain near Tyana, mentions Apollonius with this elogy, *Ubi ampliſſimus ille Philoſophus, Apollonius traditur natus* (31)? I ſhould chooſe rather to ſay, for the honour of Euſebius, that he ſpeaks of Philoſtratus, in ſuch a manner that his ſenſe is, that there is no occaſion to refute at large the whimſies related by Philoſtratus, ſeeing he is an author not at all regarded, and not ſo much as ranked in the number of Philoſophers. This explication is (I confeſs) ſubject to ſome difficulties; but it is certain, that Euſebius pretends to attack the Phantom of Philoſtratus, and not the real Apollonius. Does not he declare, that he has always looked upon Apollonius as a learned man, and conſents that he ſhould be placed in the number of the Philoſophers with all ſorts of honour? that he rejects only the fables and ſupernatural virtues, of which Philoſtratus and ſome other Panegyriſts have ſpoken: and that in the reaſoning upon what Philoſtratus aſſerts, he will ſhew that Apollonius is unworthy to be reckoned, not only in the number of the Philoſophers, but alſo in the number of perſons of a moderate degree of virtue: ſo far was he from deſerving any competition with Jeſus Chriſt: *Μόνην ἐπισκεψώμεθα τὴν δ' Φιλοστράτου γραφὴν δι' ἧς εὐθυνοῦμεν ὡς οὐχ ὅτι γε ἐν φιλοσόφοις ἀλλ' οὐδ' ἐν ἐπιεικέσι καὶ μετρίοις ἀνδράσιν ἄξιον ἐγκρίνειν, οὐχ' ὅπως τῷ σωτῆρι ἡμῶν Χριστῷ παρατιθέναι τὸν Ἀπολλώνιον* (32).

(31) *Amm. Marcellin.* lib. 23. cap. 6. p. 370.

(32) Euſeb. *in Hierocl.* pag. 514.

[G] *He left ſome works, which are now loſt.*] He had writ four books of *Judicial Aſtrology* (33), and a *Treatiſe upon the ſacrifices* (34), to ſhew what is to be offered to each Deity. This laſt work grew very famous: Euſebius quotes it (35). Suidas alſo takes notice of it, and adds to it a *Teſtament*, a *Collection of Oracles and Letters*, and the *Life of Pythagoras* (36). The *Theology*, of which Euſebius quotes a paſſage (37), is perhaps the ſame with that on ſacrifices. Apollonius wrote an infinite number of *Letters:* Philoſtratus has inſerted ſome of them in his Hiſtory, all very ſhort. The *Hymn on Memory* is not a work of Apollonius, as Mr. de Tillemont pretends. He quotes the eleventh chapter of the firſt book of Philoſtratus, page 18. I have not found it there, but only that Apollonius at the age of a hundred years had a better memory than Simonides ever had, and that he often ſung the Hymn which Simonides had compoſed in praiſe of memory. Suidas relates this ſo confuſedly, that he ſeems to ſay it was Apollonius that compoſed this piece. Konig was entrapped by it. See his *Bibliotheca*, page 49. The *Teſtament*, which Suidas mentions, *διαθήκη*, is no doubt the ſame book that Philoſtratus has quoted in theſe words: *Καὶ διαθήκαι ὃ τῷ Ἀπολλωνίῳ γεγράφθαι παρ' ὧν ὑπάρχει μαθεῖν ὡς ὑπολιάζων τὴν φιλοσοφίαν ἐγένετο* (38); that is, "And there were Teſtaments "(or Memoirs) written by Apollonius, by which one "might learn how tranſported he was with Philo-"ſophy."

(33) Περὶ μαντικῆς ἀστέρων. *De Divinatione Aſtrorum. Philoſtrat. in vitâ Apollonii,* lib. 3. cap. 13.

(34) Idem, ibid. *Vide etiam* lib. 4. cap. 6.

(35) Euſeb. *Præparat. Evangel.* lib. 4. cap. 13. pag. 150.

(36) Suidas *in* Ἀπολλώνιος, pag. 376.

(37) Euſeb. *Demonſt. Evangel.* l. 3. c. 3. p. 105.

[H] *There is mention made of another Philoſopher called Apollonius of Tyana.*] It is Suidas that ſpeaks of him upon the credit of Agreſphon, who wrote a book concerning perſons of the ſame name, περὶ Ὁμωνύμων, *de Homonymis.* This brings to my mind that a learned man, whom I quoted before (39), queſtions whether the ancients wrote books like thoſe of Leo Allatius, *de Simeonibus, de Pſellis, &c.* But he need not queſtion it; for beſides Agreſphon, we have Demetrius Magnes. Some learned men would add Dionyſius of Sinape and Simariſtus; but they are miſtaken. See the note [B] of the article of this DEMETRIUS towards the end.

(38) Philoſtrat. *Vita Apollon.* lib. 1. cap. 3.

(39) Mr. de Sallo. See the note (F) of the article ALLATIUS, towards the middle.

[I] *An Engliſh tranſlation of this Life . . . . has furiouſly offended the pious.*] The Author of this verſion

(25) Euſeb. *in Hieroclem,* pag. 541.

(26) Marcellin. *ad Auguſtinum, Epiſt.* 3. *inter Auguſtini Epiſtolas,*

(27) Quotation (*k*).

(28) Auguſt. Epiſt. 4. p. 23.

(29) Idem, Epiſt. 49. pag. 208.

(30) Eunapius, *de Vitis Philoſoph.* Præf. p. 2. I make uſe of Mr. de Tillemont's words, *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 2. p. 220.

ſhall ſpeak of it in the notes. If we had what a contemporary Philoſopher, named Euphrates, had ſatyrically written againſt Apollonius, we ſhould have an ample collection of ſlanders, for when ſuch rivals once declare a war, they diſcloſe many ſecrets. Philoſtratus was in the right to make uſe of the ſilence of this Euphrates, to convict thoſe of calumny who had ſlandered Apollonius with regard to his chaſtity, and boldly to maintain that Apollonius, in the moſt vigorous part of his youth, had triumphed over nature, and had always lived in a ſtrict continence (*o*). Sidonius Apollinaris has drawn a character of Apollonius, in which you may ſee as great a philoſophical hero as can be imagined [*K*]. The author of the portrait does not forget to make a good many excuſes to the Catholick faith.

(*o*) Philoſt. lib. 1. cap. 8.

ſion had brought it down only to the third book excluſively. If he had only tranſlated it, there had been no room to complain; but he has added a great number of very large notes to his verſion, which he had taken for the moſt part out of the manuſcripts of the famous Lord Herbert. That is the name of a great Deiſt, if one may believe a good many people. Thoſe who have read theſe notes, have aſſured me that they are full of poiſon; that they tend only to the ruin of revealed Religion, and to render the holy Scriptures contemptible. The Author does not endeavour after this by reaſons propoſed gravely and ſeriouſly, but almoſt continually by prophane ralleries and little ſubtilties. It was therefore with a great deal of juſtice and wiſdom, that this book, which was printed at London, in 1680 (40), has been ſeverely prohibited. This new tranſlator of Philoſtratus was Mr. Charles Blount, an Engliſh Gentleman. He publiſhed, in 1693, a treatiſe intitled *the Oracles of Reaſon*, and accompanied it with other little pieces of the ſame ſtamp. He came to a tragical end, the ſame year. He was very fond of his brother's widow, and pretended he might marry her without inceſt: he had writ a treatiſe to prove it; but he ſaw no probability of obtaining the conſent of the Church. Upon that, he fell into deſpair and killed himſelf. See the Hiſtory of the works of the learned (41). To conclude, Mr. de Tillemont, ſpeaking of thoſe who have written the Life of Apollonius, ſtops at Philoſtratus. Let us go farther: Nicomachus, who lived under the Empire of Aurelian, wrote the Life of Apollonius after that which Philoſtratus had writ. Taſcius Victorianus made another upon that which Nicomachus had compoſed. Sidonius Apollinaris made another, and regulated himſelf much more by the model of Victorianus, than upon that of Nicomachus (42). We read in Suidas, that Soterichus, a native of Oaſis in Egypt, had compoſed the Life of Apollonius. This Author lived under the Empire of Aurelian. I cannot gueſs at Savaron's authority for putting Plutarch among thoſe who have writ the Life of our Apollonius (43).

(40) The title expreſſes the year 1680. The book muſt have remained concealed ſeveral years; for it was not condemned before 1695.

(41) Month of November 1693, pag. 135, 136.

(42) *Ex* Sidonii Apollinaris, Epiſt. 3. lib. 8.

(43) Savaro *in Sidon. Apollinar.* pag. 491.

[*K*] *Sidonius has repreſented him in a Deſcription, wherein we ſee a Hero of Philoſophy as great as poſſible.*] That every one may judge of it, let us give here the words of Sidonius Apollinaris. He had written the Life of Apollonius, and ſending it to a Counſellor of Evariges King of the Goths, this is what he ſays to him. *Lege virum (fidei Catholicæ pace præfatâ) in plurimis ſimilem tui, id eſt, à divitibus ambitum, nec divitias ambientem; cupidum ſcientiæ, continentem pecuniæ; inter epulas abſtemium, inter purpuratos linteatum, inter alabaſtra cenſorium: concretum, hiſpidum, hirſutum, in medio nationum delibutarum; atque inter ſatrapas regum tiaratorum myrrhatos, pumicatos, malobatratos, venerabili ſqualore pretioſum. Cumque proprio nihil eſui aut indutui de pecude conferret, regnis ab hoc, quæ pererravit, non tam ſuſpicioni, quam fuiſſe ſuſpectui; & fortuna regum ſibi in omnibus obſecundante, illa tantum beneficia poſcentem, quæ mage ſit ſuetus oblata præſtare, quam ſumere* (44); that is, "Read of a man (with reverence to the Catholick Faith be it ſpoken) in moſt things like your ſelf, ſought after by the rich, yet not ſeeking after riches; covetous of knowledge, not of money; abſtemious in the middle of feaſts; plainly cloathed amongſt the ſumptuous, ſevere amongſt the luxurious, rough and unadorned in the midſt of delicate nations; and ſhining with a venerable negligence amongſt the wanton Nobles of Perſian Kings. And when he made no uſe of the flocks either for food or apparel, he was rather ſlighted than envied in the Kingdoms thro' which he travelled: and when the good fortune of Kings favoured him in every thing, he only aſked thoſe favours, which he was more ready to give than take."

(44) Sidon. Apollinar Epiſt. 3. lib. 8. pag. 486.

APONO (*a*) PETER DE) one of the moſt famous Philoſophers and Phyſicians of his time, was born 1250 (*b*), in a village ſituated four miles from Padua. He ſtudied a long time at Paris, and was there promoted to the degree of Doctor in Philoſophy and Phyſick [*A*]. I do not know whether he died rich or not, but I have read that he would

(*a*) Some call him *Peter de Avano.*

(*b*) Jacobus Philippus Tomaſinus, *Elog. Illuſt. Vir.* pag. 22.

[*A*] *He ſtudied a long time at Paris, and was there advanced to the degree of Doctor in Philoſophy and Phyſick.*] Naudæus obſerves this in an Oration wherein he extols as much as he is able the ancient glory of the Univerſity of Paris. I ſhall relate his words at length, becauſe they inform us by the way, that Peter de Apono compoſed at Paris the great work, which obtained him the name of the Reconciler. *Prodeat tandem Petrus Aponenſis ab inſigni libro, quem dum veſtras ſcholas frequentaret edidit, Conciliatoris nomen adeptus: certè latebat in Italia, nulli prope cognita, nullis aliis diſciplinis, nullis artibus, nedum propriis exculta, nulla denique, vel linguarum cognitione, vel Philoſophiæ nitore decorata medicina; cum ecce tutelaris illius genius, ex Aponenſis balnei pago, Italiam ab ignorantiæ barbarie, velut alter Camillus Romam à Gallorum obſidione liberaturus; diligenter inquirit, ubinam gentium humaniores literæ felicius excolerentur, Philoſophia ſubtilius traderetur, medicina purius & ſolidius doceretur: cumque reſciviſſet uni Lutetiæ hanc laudem deberi, in eam ſtatim involat, illius gremio totum ſe tradit, Philoſophiæ Medicinæque myſteriis ſedulo incumbit, gradum, & lauream in utraque conſequitur, utramque poſtea celeberrimè docet, & poſt diuturnam annorum moram divitiis veſtris onuſtus, imò Philoſophus, Medicus, Aſtrologus, Mathematicus ſuæ tempeſtatis præſtantiſſimus in patriam ſuam revertitur, & primus omnium, Scardæoni viri gravi ſſimi judicio, ſynceram Philoſophiam, & Medicinam illi reſtituit. Unde gratitudinis ergo compellandus venit, & à vobis merita gratia proſequendus Michael Angelus Blondus Medicus Romanus, quod ſuperiori ſeculo Aponenſis veſtri Conciliationes phyſiognomicas elegantioribus typis demandare volens; cum vidiſſet eas à doctore veſtro, Pariſiis, & in facultate veſtra fuiſſe elaboratas, has idcirco veſtri Collegii nomine & auſpicio in lucem prodire voluerit, ut communis loci famæ beneficio frueretur* (1). That is, "At length let us ſpeak of Peter de Apono, who obtained the name of the Reconciler by a famous book, which he put out whilſt he frequented your ſchools. Phyſick then lay hid in Italy, hardly known by any body, cultivated with no other diſciplines, and no arts, not ſo much as thoſe which properly belong to it, not adorned with any knowledge of languages or ſplendor of Philoſophy; when behold its tutelar genius comes out of the village of Apono like another Camillus, to free Italy from the barbarity of ignorance, as the firſt did from the beſieging of the Gauls; he inquires diligently, where the liberal ſciences were moſt ſucceſsfully cultivated, where Philoſophy was moſt ſubtilly handled, where Phyſick was taught moſt purely and ſubtilely: and as ſoon as he knew that this glory was entirely due to Paris, he immediately flies thither, throws himſelf

(1) Gabriel Naudæus, *de Antiquitate Scholæ Medicæ Pariſienſis*, pag. 44, & ſeq.

would be paid very large ſums for his viſits to the ſick [*B*]. He was ſuſpected of Magick, and proſecuted by the Inquiſition upon that account [*C*]; and if he had lived to the end of the proceſs, it is very likely that he would have ſuffered in perſon what he only ſuffered in effigy after his death. We ſhall relate (*c*) what his Apologiſts obſerve. His corps

(*c*) In the note [*C*].

" himſelf wholly into her boſom, labours diligently " upon the myſteries of Philoſophy and Phyſick, ob- " tains a degree and the laurel in both; afterwards " teaches both of them with honour, and after a ſtay " of many years, returns into his own coun- " try, laden with your riches, and at the ſame " time the beſt Philoſopher, Phyſician, Aſtrolo- " ger and Mathematician of his time, and was the " firſt, in the opinion of Scardæonus a man of great " judgment, who reſtored true Philoſophy and Phyſick " to it. Whence gratitude leads you to celebrate " Michael Angelus Blondus a Roman Phyſician, who " in the laſt Century being about to print the *Conci-* " *liationes Phyſiognomicæ* of your Apono in a beautiful " manner, when he ſaw they were drawn up by a " Doctor of yours, at Paris, and in your Faculty, " was pleaſed to publiſh them in the name and under " the patronage of your College."

[*B*] *He took large ſums for viſiting the ſick.*] It is not ſet down what he demanded for the viſits he made in the place of his reſidence, but it is affirmed that he would not go to the ſick out of the city unleſs they gave him a hundred and fifty florins a day (2). It is added, that being ſent for by Pope Honorius IV, he demanded four hundred ducats a day (3). Thus much we learn from the abridgment of his Life inſerted in the new edition of Vander Linden *de Scriptoribus Medicis*; Camerarius relates the ſame thing (4); but does not name the Pope who had recourſe to this Phyſician. But he is not ſilent with regard to the place where Peter de Apono lived. He ſays it was Bologna. He makes mention alſo of Honorius IV; but pretends that the Phyſician, who exacted ſo enormous a ſum of the Pope, was not Peter de Apono. He ſays to this effect: *In the time of our fathers, a Florentine Phyſician, named Thaddæus, gained ſuch reputation, that going to practiſe out of the city, he got fifty crowns a day, and being ſent for by Pope Honorius the fourth, he had a hundred a day, ſo that at his return from Rome he brought with him ten thouſand crowns* (5). If he had looked into Chronology, he would not have ſaid *in the time of our fathers*; for this Pope was elected in 1285, and died in 1287. Don Lancelot de Perouſe quoting Ciaconius (6), ſays that this Thaddæus, a Florentine, and Profeſſor at Bologna, got a promiſe of a hundred crowns a day, when Pope Honorius IV ſent for him, and adds that this journey was worth ten thouſand crowns to him; but he obſerves that others write that Peter de Apono obtained of this Pope four hundred crowns a day (7). He had ſaid this Peter did not go out of the city to ſee the ſick, without having fifty florins given him. You will find in Paul Freher's *Theatrum*, that he was Profeſſor of Phyſick at Bologna, and that he was called to patients in all parts of Italy, tho' he exacted fifty florins a day (8). You will find there alſo that he ſtipulated with Honorius IV for the ſum of a hundred florins a day; and that when he had cured this Pope, he received a thouſand. Here are a good many variations.

(2) Mercklinus, *in Lindenio renovato*, pag. 878.
(3) Idem, ibid.
(4) Camerarius, *Meditations Hiſtor.* tom. 1. liv. 1. chap. 4.
(5) Ibid.
(6) *In Vitâ Honorii IV.*
(7) *Lancelloti da Perugia, l'Hoggidì*, Parte 2. *Diſinganno* 18. pag. 377.
(8) Freher. *in Theatro Viror. Illuſtr.* p. 1209. He quotes Bernardus Scardeonus, lib. 2. Claſſe 9. *Hiſtoriæ Patavinæ.*

[*C*] *He was ſuſpected of magick, and perſecuted by the Inquiſition on that account.*] This ſuſpicion is ſtill remaining among a good many people: we may ſee that they do more than ſuſpect, and are even perſuaded of it. *The common opinion of almoſt all Authors is, that he was the greateſt Magician of his age; that he had acquired the knowledge of the ſeven liberal Arts by means of the ſeven familiar Spirits, which he kept incloſed in a cryſtal; that he had the cunning, like another Paſetes, to make the money he had ſpent come back again into his purſe* (9). He that furniſhes me with theſe words, adds, that *it is manifeſt he was accuſed of magick in the eighteth year of his age* (10), *and that when he was dead in* 1305 (11), *the proceſs againſt him was not yet finiſhed, and that nevertheleſs, according to the relation of Caſtellan* *, *they condemned him to the fire, and burned a bundle of ſtraw or oſier to repreſent him in the publick place of the city of Padua, deſigning by ſo rigorous an example, and the fear of incurring a like puniſhment, to ſuppreſs the reading of three ſuperſtitious and abominable books which he had compoſed: the firſt is that* Heptameron, *which is now printed at the end of the firſt volume of Agrippa's works: the ſecond, that which is called by Trithemius,* Elucidarium Necromanticum Petri de Albano; *and the laſt, one that is called by the ſame Author,* Liber Experimentorum mirabilium de annulis ſecundum 28 manſiones Lunæ (12). Theſe proofs ſeem ſtrong: but Naudæus however does not much regard them. He refutes them at once by this remark; that Peter de Apono was a prodigy of wit and learning in an age of darkneſs: now this was enough to make him be taken for a Magician, eſpecially as he was alſo very much attached to the curious and divinatory ſciences. *He was a man,* ſays he (13), *that appeared as a prodigy and a miracle amidſt the ignorance of his age, and that, beſides the knowledge of Languages and of Phyſick, had ſo dived into the leaſt common ſciences, that after having left very ample teſtimonies by his writings of Phyſiognomy, Geomancy, and Chiromancy, of what he was able to do in each of them, he forſook them all, along with the curioſity of his youth, to give himſelf up entirely to Philoſophy, Phyſick, and Aſtrology, the ſtudy of which was ſo favourable to him, that to ſay nothing of the two firſt, which introduced him into the good graces of all the Popes and ſovereign Pontiffs that were in his time, and acquired him the authority which he has at preſent among the learned men, it certainly appears that he was exceedingly well verſed in the laſt, as well from the aſtronomical figures which he cauſed to be painted in the great hall of the Palace of Padua, and his tranſlations of the books of Rabbi Abraham Aben-Ezra, added to thoſe which he compoſed on the critical days, and the eclairciſſement of Aſtronomy: as from the teſtimony of the famous Mathematician Regio-Montanus, who has drawn up a fine Panegyrick on him, as an Aſtrologer, in the Oration which he recited publickly at Padua, when he explained the book of Alfraganus there.* Afterwards, Naudæus obſerves that Peter de Apono paid great deference to Aſtrology (14), and that from thence it came that many Authors maintain *an opinion directly contrary to thoſe which went before, namely, that he underwent ſuch a condemnation, not on account of his magick, but becauſe he would give a reaſon for the marvellous effects that happen moſt frequently in nature by the virtue of celeſtial bodies, without aſcribing them to Angels or Dæmons, which ſeems very probable by the collection which Symphorian Champier* * *has made of the paſſages of his differences, which ought not to be read without precaution and by the peremptory authority of Francis Picus, who ſays expreſly, ſpeaking of him* †, Ab omnibus ferme creditus eſt Magus; verùm conſtat quam oppoſitum dogma ei aliquando tributum ſit, quem etiam hæreſium inquiſitores vexaverunt, quaſi nullos eſſe Dæmones crediderit: *to which we muſt add, that Baptiſta Mantuanus* ‡ *calls him on this occaſion,* Virum magnæ, ſed nimium audacis temerariæque doctrinæ; *that Caſmannus* ‡ *places him in the number of thoſe who aſcribed all the miracles to nature; and that Le Loyer, in his* SPECTRES §, *affirms that he made a jeſt of the witches and their ſabbath: whence one might be aſtoniſhed, that the ſame Authors name him in a great many other places amongſt Enchanters and Magicians, if it was not uſual for thoſe, who write on this ſubject, ſo to ſwell the bulk of their books by copying all that they find in others, that it is hard for them to obſerve the precept of the Poet,*

(9) Naudé *Apologie des grans Hommes accuſez de Magie*, ch. 14. pag. 380.
(10) That is falſe. See the note [*F*].
(11) That is falſe. See the ſame note.
* *In Vitis Illuſt. Medicorum.*

(12) Naudé, *Apologie des grans Hommes accuſez de Magie*, pag. 380.
(13) Ibid. p. 382.
(14) This appears from all his works, and principally in the 156th Difference of his *Conciliator.* Naudé, *Apologie des grans Hommes*, pag. 384.
* Part 3. lib. *Cribrat.*
† Lib. 7. *de Prænot.* cap. 7.
‡ Lib. 1. *de Patientia*, cap. 3.
‡ *Angelogr.* Part 2. cap. 21. Quæſt. 2.
§ Book 4. ch. 3.

Primo ne medium, medio ne diſcrepet imum (15).
That is,
" Make all ſeem uniform, and of a piece."
Roſcommon.

(15) Naudé, *Apologie des grans Hommes*, pag. 384.

After that, his Apologiſt declares that he has *wherewithal to defend him,* both from the crime of Magick, and from that of Atheiſm, *as well by the teſtimony which the moſt illuſtrious and religious Frederick Duke of Urbino was pleaſed to give to his merits, making a ſtatue for him amongſt thoſe of the illuſtrious men, which are ſet up in his citadel, as alſo by the publick*

atteſtation

corps being ſecretly taken up by his friends, eſcaped the vigilance of the Inquiſitors, who would have burnt it [D]. It was tranſported to ſeveral places, and at laſt they placed it in the church of St. Auguſtin, without an epitaph, and without any mark of honour (d). The accuſers of Peter de Apono attributed to him ſome opinions that were very incompatible. They will have it that he was a Magician, and that he did not believe there were any Devils [E]. He had ſuch an antipathy againſt milk that he could not ſee any eaten, without being ſick (e). He died in 1316, being ſixty ſix years old [F]. One of his chief books is that which gave him the ſurname of *Conciliator*. There is a very ridiculous ſtory told of him, which is, that having no well in his houſe, he cauſed his neighbour's to be carried into the ſtreet by Devils, when he heard they had forbid his maid fetching water there (f). He had much better have employed the Devils in making a well in his own houſe, and have ſtopt up his neighbour's, or at leaſt tranſported it into his houſe, rather than into the ſtreet.

(d) Tomaſini, *Elog. Viror. Illuſt.* pag. 24.

(e) Mercklinus, *in Lindenio renovato*, pag. 879. Freherus *in Theatro*, p. 1209. He quotes Marcellus Donatus, *and* Matth. de Gradibus.

(f) Tomazo Garſoni, *Piazza univerſale di tutti le Profeſſioni, Diſcorſo* 135, folio 365 *verſo*.

APOSTO-

teſtation of the city of Padua, which ſet his ſtatue over the gate of their palace, amongſt thoſe of Titus Livius, Albertus and Julius Paulus, with this inſcription upon its baſe: Petrus Aponus, Patavinus, Philoſophiæ Medicinæque ſcientiſſimus, ob idque Conciliatoris nomen adeptus, Aſtrologiæ verò adeo peritus, ut in Magiæ ſuſpicionem inciderit, falſoque de hæreſi poſtulatus, abſolutus fuerit (16). . . . *But*, adds he (17), *to diſcover entirely the falſity of theſe objections, we may anſwer to what Ludwigius * has ſaid of the ſeven Spirits that taught him the ſeven liberal Arts, that this fabulous narration aroſe from what Peter de Apono † himſelf affirms, after Albumazar, that the prayers, which are made to God, when the Moon is in conjunction with Jupiter in the head of the Dragon, are infallibly heard; and that for his part, as he had asked, to uſe his own terms,* Sapientiam à primo viſus eſt ſibi in illa amplius proficere. *Whereupon nevertheleſs, a good many Authors juſtly rally him for having ſo indiſcreetly diſavowed all his watchings and labours, that he might be indebted for his learning only to the ſuperſtition of this prayer, which muſt be vain and inefficacious, take it in what ſenſe you will. For if you ſay it is addreſſed to the Stars, it is a mere ſtupidity to think they are able to hear it; if to God, I would willingly ask whether he was deaf before this conjunction, whether he will not receive our prayers without it, or whether it can conſtrain and oblige him to condeſcend to the vows that are made to him. And hence Joannes Picus ‡, ſpeaking of this new Solomon, had reaſon to ſay,* Conſulerem Petro iſti ut totum quod profecit ſuæ totius induſtriæ ingenioque acceptum referret, quam Joviæ illi ſuæ ſupplicationi. i. e. "I would adviſe him to aſcribe "all his proficiency rather to his own induſtry and "genius, than to that ſupplication to Jupiter." *One may ſay alſo, to give ſatisfaction to the proof of the three books publiſhed under his name, that they are no leſs falſly aſcribed to him, than a good many others to almoſt all the great genius's. And Trithemius * will not acknowledge them to be legitimate, on account of the great number of fables which people had taken a fancy to invent concerning this Author. He had ſaid alſo before in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtical Writers, that he did not give credit to what had been ſaid of the Magick of Peter de Apono, becauſe he had never found that he had written any book on that ſubject. To this teſtimony if we add the ſilence of all the writers of Bibliotheques, and the confirmation that Symphorian Champier † gives to this authority of Trithemius, when he affirms that he never ſaw any of his magical books, except one paſſage where he treats of it accidentally, I believe there will be nothing more to hinder us from acknowledging his innocence, and judging with the moſt ſenſible, that all the ſuſpicion of his Magick comes, as from its true ſource and origin, from the power he aſcribes to it in the hundred and fifty ſixth difference of his Conciliator, and from the predictions he was able to make by means of Aſtrology, whence in proceſs of time all theſe fables and chimæras have crept in, according to the very true ſaying of Propertius,*

*Omnia poſt obitum fingit majora vetuſtas *.*
That is,
"Time enlarges every thing after death.

Obſerve ſome faults of M. de Clavigni de Sainte Honorine. He pretends that *the ſtatue of Peter d'Apono, which was* made by the care of the Duke of Urbino, *is in the publick place of Padua with Livy, Albertus and Julius Paulus,* and that the inſcription contains *Aſtrologiæ adeo peritus, ut in magiæ ſuſpicionem venerit* (1). I. The ſtatue whereon are theſe words is not in the publick place of Padua, but over one of the doors of the Town-houſe. *In unâ portarum Prætorii Patavini* (19). II. The ſtatue which the Duke of Urbino cauſed to be made was not ſet up at Padua, but in the caſtle of that Duke. III. It does not contain the words related by M. de Clavigni. See Tomaſini (2),

(16) Naudé, *Apologie des grans Hommes*, pag. 386. This inſcription is in Tomaſini, *in Elog. illuſt. Vir.* pag. 23.
(17) Ibid. p. 388.
* *Dæmonomagiæ* Quæſt. 16.
† *Differentia* 156.
‡ Lib. 4. *adverſus Aſtrolog.* c. 8.
† *Antipali*, lib. 1. cap. 3.
† *Tractat.* 4. lib. *de Claris Medicinæ Scriptoribus.*
* *Eleg.* 1. ver. 20. lib. 3.

(18) Clavigni de Sainte Honorine, *Lecture des Livres ſuſpects*, pag. 101, 102.
(19) Tomaſini, *Elog. Viror. illuſt.* pag. 23.
(20) Ibid.

[D] *His corps eſcaped the vigilance of the inquiſitors who would have burnt it.*] Peter de Apono, being accuſed of Necromancy and Hereſy, died during the proceſs, and was interred in the church of St. Anthony. All the zealots were offended at it: the inquiſitors continued their proceſs, and having convicted him of impiety from his own writings, they condemned his corps to be burnt; and, as they did not find it, they burned publickly a figure that repreſented him. This is what we read in Spondanus (21): but how ſhall we make it agree with the inſcription which the Magiſtrates of Padua put under the ſtatue of this Phyſician, and wherein they declared that he was acquitted (22)? Pierre de St. Romuald relates, that the inquiſitors having read publickly the condemnation of Peter de Apono, *threw his effigies in the fire.* He obſerves alſo, that they could not find his body, becauſe *his concubine Mariette* had taken it up *ſecretly by night*, and hid it *in a ruined ſepulchre* (23).

(21) Spondanus. *Annal. Eccleſ. ad ann.* 1316. num. 8. He quotes Scardeon. *Hiſt. Patav.* lib. 2. Claſſ. 9.
(22) See this inſcription above, quotation (16).
(23) Saint Romuald, *Journal Chronol. & Hiſt.* Decemb. 31. He quotes *Bernard Scande*: he meant no doubt *Bernardin Scardeon.*

[E] *His accuſers attributed to him ſome opinions that were incompatible. They will have it that he was a Magician, and that he did not believe there were any Devils.*] We have ſeen (24) how his Apologiſt took advantage of this contradiction; but he ought to have been aware that Bodinus places Peter de Apono among the Sorcerers, who, to elude the purſuits of juſtice, maintain, that all that is ſaid of Devils and Magick is a chimera. Bodinus declares that he has written a book on the Dæmonomania of Sorcerers, among other reaſons, "to give an anſwer to thoſe "who endeavour in printed books to ſave the Sor-"cerers by all means, ſo that Satan ſeems to have "inſpired them, and drawn them to his party to pub-"liſh theſe fine books, as one Peter de Apono, a "Phyſician, who endeavoured to make it believed "that there are no ſpirits, and yet it was afterwards "proved that he was one of the greateſt Sorcerers of "Italy (25).

(24) In the note [C].
(25) Bodin, *Preface de la Demonomanie des Sorciers*, pag. 5. See alſo ch. 5. p. 71.

[F] *He died in* 1316, *being ſixty ſix years old.*] So we read in an inſcription related by Tomaſini (26); it muſt be ſaid therefore, that Naudé is miſtaken when he ſays that Peter de Apono, being accuſed at the age of eighty years, died in 1305. Freherus ſays the ſame thing, as taken from Bernardin Scardeon (27). We may ſay alſo that Geſner is miſtaken in making Peter de Apono flouriſh in 1320 (28). Mr. Konig has copied this fault (29). But Father Rapin is more ſtrangely miſtaken, for he places him in the ſixteenth Century. *Peter de Apono*, ſays he (30), *a Phyſician of Padua, who flouriſhed under Clement VII, ſo vitiated his imagination by reading the Arabian Philoſophers, and by too frequent ſpeculations upon the Aſtrology of Alfraganus, that he was put into the inquiſition on ſuſpicion of Magick.* Voſſius has followed Geſner, and has made an obſervation that deſerves to be conſidered. *Peter de Apono*, ſays he (31), *ſent his book* de Medicinâ omnimodâ *to Pope John XXII, who was elected in* 1316, *and ſate ſeventeen years.* We know then by this the time of our Phyſician. But if the year 1316 was that of his death, the concluſion is not exact, and does not ſave Voſſius from being miſtaken.

(26) Tomaſinus, *in Elog. Viror. illuſt.* p. 22.
(27) Paulus Freher. *in Theatro Viror. illuſt.* pag. 209.
(28) Geſnerus, *in Biblioth.* folio 544.
(29) Konig, *Bib. vet. & nova*, pag. 49.
(30) Rapin, *Reflex. ſur la Philoſ.* num. 28. pag. 360.
(31) Voſſius, *de Scient. Mathem.* pag. 181.

APOSTOLIUS (MICHAEL) a learned Greek of the fifteenth Century, flouriſhed in the year 1450 and 1460, about the ſame time that the Empire of the Greeks founded by Conſtantine the Great was extinguiſhed under Conſtantine Paleologus the laſt Chriſtian Emperor. He was a man of diſtinguiſhed learning among the modern Greeks, as appears from a conſiderable number of little Tracts written by him [*A*], the greateſt part of which ſtill continue in manuſcript in ſeveral Libraries. He had a great ſhare in the friendſhip of Cardinal Beſſarion, Archbiſhop of Nice, whom he frequently wrote to, and from whom he received many letters. He had the misfortune to ſee Conſtantinople, the Capital of the Greek Empire, after a long ſiege, fall into the hands of the Turks, to the great diſhonour of the Chriſtians, who were at that time involved in wars among themſelves, inſtead of uniting to ſecure a city of ſuch importance from the violence of the Infidels. This calamity gave our Author an occaſion of writing a funeral Oration upon the Emperor Conſtantine, who loſt his life among many others at the taking of the city. It is ſuppoſed, that the deſtruction of the Eaſtern Empire obliged him to leave Greece ſome time after the year 1453, and to paſs over to Italy; ſince it appears by his manuſcripts, that in 1462 he lived at Viterbo, where he wrote a ſevere Treatiſe againſt Theodorus Gaza of Theſſalonica, who valued himſelf upon his Greek Eloquence (*a*). Leo Allatius, formerly Keeper of the Vatican Library, in his book *De Eccleſiæ Occidentalis & Orientalis perpetua conſenſione* (*b*), i. e. "Concerning the perpetual Agreement of the "Eaſtern and Weſtern Churches," having mentioned thoſe who had written in defence of

(*a*) Caſimir, Oudin. *Comment. de Scriptor. & Scriptis Eccleſ.* tom. 3. Sæc. 15. Col. 2514. edit. Lipſiæ 1722.

(*b*) Lib. 3. c. 3. *apud* Oudin. Col. 2519.

[*A*] *A conſiderable number of Tracts written by him.*] There are ſeveral of them extant in Greek in the Library of the King of France at Paris, as Father Labbe aſſures us in his *Bibliotheca Manuſcriptorum Librorum Græcorum, Latinorum, & Gallicorum*; where he mentions particularly in *part* 1. *p.* 71, our Author's *Funeral Oration upon Cardinal Beſſarion*; in *part* 3. *p.* 99, *three Letters* of Cardinal Beſſarion, one of which was addreſſed to Apoſtolius in *part* 4. *p.* 109; Apoſtolius's *Funeral Monody* to Andreas Calerges; in *part* 4. *p.* 135, his Heroic, Elegiac, and Iambic Verſes upon the principal Feſtivals of our Lord and the Saints, with other Poems upon Beſſarion. Father Labbe mentions likewiſe a Collection of Proverbs written by our Author's own hand; and his Verſes in Praiſe of Homer's battle of the frogs and mice; and in his *Supplement IV*, *p.* 205. *cod.* 303. the Proverbs of Apoſtolius written very beautifully, and as large again as the edition, which was printed; and in *Supplement VII*, *p.* 287, *cod.* 1251, his Proverbs in the handwriting of the Author. Lambecius in the ſeventh book of his *Commentar. Biblioth. Cæſar. Vindob. p.* 113, tells us that in the Imperial Library at Vienna, there is extant a Greek Manuſcript in folio, containing I, *Apoſtolius's Book concerning the Ariſtotelian Subſtance in defence of George Gemiſtus Pletho againſt Theodorus Gaza.* II. His *Menexenus*, or *Dialogue concerning the holy Trinity, upon this queſtion, Whether the Jews and Turks are more right in believing but one God, or the Chriſtians in believing the Trinity of the Godhead in Unity.* Apoſtolius borrowed this title from Plato, who has a Dialogue ſtill extant, intitled *Menexenus*, or a *Funeral Oration*, in which that Philoſopher propoſes to exhort every perſon to the love of his country. This he does by two methods; firſt by extolling thoſe, who expoſe themſelves to danger and death for the good of their country; and then by recommending the antiquity and excellencies of his country. The whole deſign of his Dialogue is to ſhew, that one's country is to be preferred to every conſideration in the world, and that thoſe are happy, who died for it, ſince an immortal reward and honour attends them. This ſhews how great a difference there is between the *Menexenus* of Plato and that of Apoſtolius with regard to the argument. III. *An Oration of Apoſtolius addreſſed to his father-in-law, who was angry with him for marrying a ſecond time.* IV. His *Appeal to the laſt Emperor of Conſtantinople, Conſtantine Paleologus, in which is contained a confeſſion of his ſuſpected Religion.* We may obſerve, that he expreſly acknowledges the *Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt from the Father alone, and not from the Son likewiſe*, in theſe words: Τὸ δ' ἅγιον Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐκπορευόμενον ἐκ Πατρὸς, οὐ μὴν οὐκ ἐξ Υἱοῦ, κατὰ τὸν λόγον τῆς ἀληθείας, ὡς τοῖς σοφωτέροις θεολογικώτερος εἴδοξε ῥητέον τ' ἀνδρὶ, ἐπιὼν πρὸς ὃ ταῦτα λέγειν ἐκκαλούμενον μὴ ψυδεῖσθαι γαλεπώτατα. It appears from hence, that Apoſtolius wrote his book *concerning the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt againſt the Latins*, in order to declare publickly to the Greeks that he was orthodox, and not a ſchiſmatic, as Lambecius aſſerts, and to remove the ſuſpicion of his being of the Latin Faith, which the Greeks taught to be ſchiſmatical. *Hinc igitur patet, cur idem Apoſtolius librum* de Proceſſione Spiritûs Sancti contra Latinos *ſcribere atque docere conatus fuerit, nempe ut hoc ipſo publicè ſe* orthodoxum, *& non* ſchiſmaticum, *ut vult Lambecius, apud Græcos oſtenderet, & ſuſpicionem Latinæ ſive ſchiſmaticæ juxta Græcos fidei à ſe amoliretur* (1). V. His *Oration addreſſed to his maſter John Argyropulus, when he began to teach publickly at Conſtantinople, during the Life of Conſtantine Paleologus the laſt Emperor of Conſtantinople.* VI. *Forty five Epiſtles of Apoſtolius*; the firſt of which is addreſſed to Gemiſtus Pletho, and the reſt to Emanuel Chryſoloras, Laonicus Chalcocondylas, John Argyropulus, Marcus Muſurus, Michael Marullus, John Chryſoloras, Cardinal Beſſarion, Peter Callerges, and divers other eminent men of that age; which Letters deſerve to be publiſhed, ſince they might give us a conſiderable light into the hiſtory of thoſe times. In the Duke of Bavaria's Library at Munchen, *cod.* 100, we have Apoſtolius's *Congratulation to Cardinal Beſſarion*; his *Oration to his father-in-law, who was angry at his marrying a ſecond time, and concerning the three Affections of the mind*; his *Encomium upon Conſtantine Paleologus the Emperor, who was killed at the taking of Conſtantinople*; his *Confeſſion of Faith*, with his *Letter to Beſſarion*; and *Beſſarion's Letter to Apoſtolius.* In the Heidelberg Library, which was removed to that of the Vatican at Rome, *cod.* 272, we have his *Anſwer to thoſe, who aſſerted, that the learned men of the Weſt excel thoſe of the Eaſt in Philoſophy as well as in Divinity, and particularly againſt Scotus, in which likewiſe is an account of the manner of the Generation of the Son, and the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt.* Oudin (2) is of opinion, that he maintains the Greek notion of the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt in this treatiſe, tho' he does not doubt but he wrote it in Italy. This Tract is extant in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, *cod.* 76, and among the Baroccian Manuſcripts, *cod.* 76 (3). In the Heidelberg Library is likewiſe Apoſtolius's *Oration to the Emperor Frederic, written at the deſire of Ariſtonymus of Byzantium*, but imperfect. In the ſame Library, *cod.* 275, we have his *Apology for Pletho againſt the objections of Theodorus Gaza, in oppoſition to Ariſtotle concerning Subſtance*; and his *Menexenus* or *Dialogue upon the Trinity*; and his *ſix Orations and ſixty five Epiſtles, among which are ſeveral to Cardinal Beſſarion, and his Congratulation to him, with Beſſarion's Anſwer in defence of Theodorus Gaza.* This volume is in folio, and written with Apoſtolius's own hand. In the ſame Library, *cod.* 126, is *Cardinal Beſſarion's Epiſtle to our Author*; and *Michael Apoſtolius's book againſt Theodorus Gaza, written at Viterbo in* 1462. Among the Baroccian Manuſcripts in the Bodleian Library, *cod.* 165, is extant *the Diſpute concerning ſeveral Platonic Doctrines between Apoſtolius and Gemiſtus, Theodorus Gaza and Beſſarion*; and there are ſeveral other Manuſcripts of our Author's works in the Libraries belonging to Cathedrals and other famous Libraries in England, as we are informed by Oudin (4).

(1) Oudin. tom. 3. Col. 2517.

(2) Col. 2518.

(3) Oudin, ibid.

T.

(4) Col. 2519.

of the Greek Schiſmatics, as he ſtiles them, againſt the Latins and the Council of Florence, tells us, that our Apoſtolius, who ſaid of himſelf, that he was *King of the Poor there*, Βασιλεὺς τῶν τῆδε πενήτων, and was ſupported only by the generoſity of Cardinal Beſſarion, grew uneaſy, that he ſhould be leſs conſidered than the other learned men who flouriſhed at that time; upon which he wrote againſt ſeveral perſons of the greateſt character and diſtinction among them. This expoſed him to the reſentment of Beſſarion, ſo that he was obliged by poverty to retire to the Iſland of Crete, where he maintained himſelf in a very mean manner by tranſcribing books, and inſtructing children. His averſion to the Roman church induced him likewiſe to compoſe a Tract againſt it *concerning the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt*. But the judicious reader will conſider how far a regard is to be paid to Allatius, who was prodigiouſly devoted to the church of Rome, when he ſpeaks of a perſon of the contrary party. Though he wrote many things, yet Oudin tells us (*c*), that he never ſaw any book printed under his name, except his *Proverbs collected out of the beſt Greek Authors*, publiſhed in Greek and Latin at Leyden in 4to, 1653, with the tranſlation and notes of Peter Pantinus, and others. This is a large work, and of conſiderable importance. He was a Layman, but moſt of his writings relate to diſputes of religion. Mr. Wharton in his *Appendix* to Dr. Cave's *Hiſtoria Literaria*, has entirely omitted the mention of him. He is taken notice of by Lambecius in the ſeventh book of his *Commentarii Bibliothecæ Cæſareæ Vindobonenſis* (*d*); by Poſſevinus in the ſecond volume of his *Apparatus Sacer*, and at the end of his *Apparatus*; and by Frederic Spanheim in his Catalogue of the Library at Leyden (*e*).

(*c*) Col. 1514.

(*d*) Pag. 113, 114, 115, 116.

(*e*) Pag. 169. *apud* Oudin. Col. 2519.

☞APPIAN, an eminent writer of the Roman Hiſtory in the Greek Language, flouriſhed under the reigns of the Emperors Trajan and Hadrian, as we are informed by Photius in his *Bibliotheca* (*a*), and wrote about the nine hundredth year of the city of Rome, and about two hundred years from the beginning of the Monarchy under the Cæſars, as he tells us himſelf in his Preface. He ſpeaks of the deſtruction of Jeruſalem under Hadrian, as of an event which happened in his time (*b*). He was born of a good family in Alexandria in Egypt; from whence he went to Rome, where he diſtinguiſhed himſelf ſo highly as an Advocate, that he was choſen one of the Procurators of the Emperor (*c*), and the Government of a Province was committed to him (*d*). Sigonius and other writers call him the Alexandrian and Egyptian Sophiſt (*e*). He wrote the Roman Hiſtory in a very peculiar method [*A*]. But this performance of his is charged with a great many errors [*B*]; and the Author is particularly accuſed of plagi-

(*a*) Cod. 57.

(*b*) *De Bellis Syr.* pag. 119. edit. Hen. Stephani 1592.

(*c*) Idem *in Præfatione*, pag. 9.

(*d*) Photius, *ubi ſupra*.

(*e*) La Mothe le Vayer, *Jugement ſur les anciens & principaux Hiſtoriens Grecs & Latins*, p. 95. edit. Paris 1684.

[*A*] *He wrote the Roman Hiſtory in a very peculiar method.*] He did not compile it in a continued ſeries after the manner of Livy; but wrote diſtinct Hiſtories of all Nations, that had been conquered by the Romans, and in which he placed every thing which related to thoſe Nations, in the proper order of time. So that his deſign, which was highly approved of by Evagrius (1), was to write an exact Hiſtory of the Romans and of all the Provinces of their Empire to the reign of Auguſtus; nay he ſometimes deſcends as low as Trajan. La Mothe le Vayer (2) is of opinion, that this method of Appian's is not preferable to that of the other Hiſtorians; the moſt eminent of whom always follow the order of time, and give an account under every year of what was tranſacted in the moſt diſtant parts of the world. But tho' Appian ſeems to have obliged himſelf to a method, which is directly oppoſite to that of nature, and which none of the ancients have followed but himſelf, yet it muſt be owned, that this method is very proper for repreſenting every thing diſtinctly, and giving us a clear and full view of the Hiſtory of every particular country. Suidas informs us, that this Hiſtory was anciently diſtinguiſhed by the title of *Baſilica* or the *Royal Hiſtory*, which is a great compliment to it, if that Epithet does not particularly relate to the firſt of his works, which contained an account of the deſcendants of Æneas to the building of Rome, and the government of the ſeven Kings, as we may conjecture from the text of Photius. We may obſerve that Florus's EPITOME conſiſts likewiſe of diſtinct accounts of wars and events. But his method is different from that of our Author, who repreſents every thing in its full extent without any interruption, how long time ſoever it may contain; whereas Florus mixes them together; and places, for inſtance, between the firſt, ſecond, and third punic war, thoſe wars, which the Romans carried on againſt the Gauls, Ligurians, Macedonians, and divers other Nations, whom they attacked in the interval between their wars with the Carthaginians (3). Appian's Hiſtory was divided into three volumes, which contained twenty four books, according to Photius, who never ſaw thoſe, which Appian mentions in his *Preface*; or twenty two, according to Charles Stephens, Volaterranus, and Sigonius (4). Suidas mentions particularly what was contained in his Hiſtory of the Gauls. Photius tells us, that there were nine books concerning the civil wars, tho' there are but five now extant. Henry Valeſius publiſhed ſeveral Fragments of his works, which he extracted from the Collections of Conſtantine Porphyrogennetus, the ſon of Leo, and grandſon of Baſilius Macedo (5). David Hœſchelius was the firſt, who publiſhed his *Iberica* or *Spaniſh Hiſtory*, whereas there were only Fragments of it printed before (6). In the beginning of his *Syriaca* he mentions himſelf his Ἑλληνικὴν γραφὴν, or *Hiſtory of Greece*; and his *Egyptian Hiſtory* in his *Mithridatics*. Zonaras likewiſe in the ſecond tome of his *Annals* quotes our Author in his twenty ſecond book of the *Roman Hiſtory*; ἐν τῷ εἰκοστῷ δευτέρῳ λόγῳ τῆς ἱστορίας Ῥωμαϊκῆς.

(1) Lib. 6. cap. 24. *apud* Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Empereurs*, tom. 2. Part 2. pag. 548. edit. 2. Bruxelles. 1711.

(2) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 88.

(3) Idem, ibid.

(4) Idem, p. 95.

(5) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græc.* lib. 2. cap. 13.

(6) Idem, ibid.

[*B*] *This performance of his is charged with many errors.*] Bodin in his *Methodus Hiſtorica* (7) accuſes him of ſeveral falſities in point of Hiſtory, or rather of ſeveral defects of memory and judgment. For when that Critic aſſerts, that the Romans never lent their wives to one another after the manner of the Parthians and Lacedæmonians, it is in order to reproach our Hiſtorian with credulity; tho' Plutarch himſelf has related the ſame fact, and affirmed, that Cato voluntarily ſent his wife Martia to the Orator Hortenſius, that the latter might have iſſue by her. And we may obſerve, that the Law of Romulus, or that, which Aulus Gellius mentions againſt adultery, does not in the leaſt contradict this, as Bodin imagined (8). But when that Author charges Appian with having aſcribed to Cæſar in his ſecond book of *the Civil Wars* the words, which were ſpoken by M. Anthony alone, as Bodin tells us; or by Pompey, as la Mothe aſſerts, when he ſaid in the Senate in a threatening manner, and with his hand to his ſword, that if they would not grant him what he demanded, that ſword of his ſhould give it him; this may eaſily be excuſed as a mere ſlip of Memory, which every man is ſubject to. In the ſame manner we may conſider another error of his, in miſtaking Calphurnia for Pompeia the wife of Cæſar, who was debauched by Clodius in the temple of the Goddeſs, whom the Romans

(7) Cap. 4. pag. 58, 59. edit. Baſileæ, 1576.

(8) La Mothe le Vayer, p. 90.

plagiariſm [C]. However Photius is of opinion that he wrote with the utmoſt regard to truth, and has ſhewn the greateſt knowledge of military affairs of any of the Hiſtorians; ſo that we cannot but imagine, while we read him, that we ſee the battles which he deſcribes. But his chief talent, continues that Author, is diſplayed in his Orations, in which he moves the paſſions, as he thinks proper, either in reviving the reſolution of the ſoldiers, or repreſſing the impetuoſity of thoſe who are too precipitate. His ſtyle is plain and ſimple, without any thing turgid or ſuperfluous (*f*). He gives us in his Preface a general deſcription of the Roman Empire [D]. Of the great number of books which he wrote, we have but a ſmall part now extant, which are his Hiſtories of the Punic, Syrian.

(*f*) Photius, *ubi ſupra.*

mans called *Bona Dea. Idem P. Clodium cum Calſurniâ Cæſaris ſtupri commercium habuiſſe, & in ſacris bonæ Deæ deprehenſum tradit, quæ ad Pompeiam pertinent* (9). However tho' Bodin tells us, that Appian very often miſtakes in the Roman Hiſtory, *cum in eorum* [Romanorum] *antiquitate ſæpiſſime offendat*; yet he allows, that he is the only Hiſtorian, who gives a juſt and clear account of the Roman Provinces, riches, and armies, and a lively deſcription of the whole Empire: *Unus eſt tamen ex omnibus hiſtoricis, qui Romanorum provincias, opes, exercitus, totiuſque imperii deſcriptionem ad intuendum velut in ſubjectâ tabulâ proponit* (10). He obſerves likewiſe, that Strabo, Pliny, and Rufus have given ſome account of the Provinces, but omitted any mention of the riches of the Empire; whereas our Hiſtorian tells us in his Preface (11), that the Romans had forty thouſand Horſe, and two hundred thouſand Foot, with arms for above twice the number; two thouſand ſmaller ſhips, a thouſand ſhips of three banks of oars, and five hundred of five banks; a greater number of naval armaments, beſides eight hundred ſhips adorned with golden poops and prows; three hundred elephants, and two thouſand armed chariots; and ſeven hundred and forty thouſand talents in the Treaſuries of Egypt. Sigonius treats our Hiſtorian with much greater ſeverity than Bodin has done, and accuſes him of inaccuracy and omiſſions, without alledging any proof. Scaliger proceeds ſtill further in his *Animadverſions upon Euſebius* (12), where he does not ſcruple to call Appian a mere child with regard to hiſtory, unleſs, ſays he, it ſhould appear, that a great many things have been interpolated in his account of the wars of Syria. *Scaligeri tamen in Animadverſionibus Euſebianis judicium eſt, vel admodum in hiſtoria eſſe infantem, vel multa ejus Syriacis eſſe adſuta* (13). La Mothe le Vayer thinks (14), that the juſteſt ground of complaint againſt him, is what he has been reproached with by ſeveral perſons, that he ſhews too great a partiality to the Romans, by repreſenting always the right as well as the advantage to be on their ſide, to the prejudice of all other Nations, and even of his own Country among the reſt.

(5) Bodin. pag. 59.

(10) Idem, ibid.

(11) Pag. 6.

(12) Pag. 195. a. *apud* Voſſium, *ubi ſupra.*

(13) Voſſ. *ubi ſupra.*

(14) Pag. 90.

[C] *Is particularly accuſed of plagiariſm.*] La Mothe le Vayer thinks it is impoſſible to defend him from this imputation. For it is evident, that he has borrowed a great number of paſſages word for word from Polybius, Plutarch, and other Authors, which he has inſerted in his book without mentioning thoſe, to whom he is thus obliged. Scaliger in his *Animadverſions* abovementioned (15), and Voſſius accuſe him of this fault. *Sane multum Polybio debere, ac Plutarchum ad verbum exſcribere ſolitum viri docti jamdudum obſervârunt* (16). Other Writers aſſure us, that he tranſcribed in the ſame manner the greateſt part of thoſe Commentaries of Auguſtus, which contained, as we are informed by Suetonius (17), the chief actions of his life. It is undoubtedly, as La Mothe le Vayer obſerves (18), a diſhonourable manner of acting, to borrow from others without any acknowledgment. This juſtly intitles him to the character, which Scaliger gives him, of *alienorum laborum fucum*, a drone, who robs the induſtrious bees of their labour. The Rhodians only changed the heads of the ancient ſtatues, which belonged to their city, and placed new ones upon them, whenever they thought proper to honour the memory of any perſon by ordering an image to be erected in publick. Plagiaries, ſays La Mothe la Vayer, do almoſt the very ſame thing, though in a manner ſtill more ridiculous than the other. By prefixing their own name to the labours of others, they imagine that they have appropriated them to themſelves, but do not reflect, that inſtead of the glory and immortality which they propoſe, they generally gain nothing but contempt and ſhame by ſuch a manner of proceeding. This puts one in mind of the ſtory of Alcibiades with regard to Diomedes his friend, who had given him the charge of the horſes, which he ſent to the Olympic Games. Alcibiades made them paſs under his own name, and by that means aſſum'd the honour of the victory, which they gained, and which was of great conſequence at that time. Nay he carried his injuſtice ſo far as to refuſe to reſtore the horſes to Diomedes, who had intruſted them to his care. This is juſt the ſame kind of artifice, as we are guilty of when we aſcribe the works of others to our ſelves, and claim the honour of their inventions. The figurative word *plagiary*, which the Latins gave to thoſe, who were convicted of this crime, ſhews their deteſtation of it, by intimating, that the ſcourge is the proper puniſhment for ſuch an offender. Vitruvius in the Preface to his ſeventh book of Architecture having obſerved, that ſuch perſons ought to be puniſhed as impious, mentions the ſeverity, with which King Ptolomy treated ſome Poets, who had the aſſurance to recite before him at Alexandria verſes, which they had ſtolen from different Authors, as if they had been of their own compoſition. And yet theſe Poets would have carried the prize, which the King propoſed, by the conſent of the ſix Judges and the people in general, if the ſeventh Judge, whoſe name was Ariſtophanes, and who was a man of greater reading than the reſt, had not detected the fraud, and preferred to them a Poet, who had been heard with the leaſt applauſe, tho' he recited nothing but what was really his own. Theocritus very juſtly values himſelf in one of his Epigrams upon not being one of thoſe, who ſteal the verſes of others, and claim them as their own. In excuſe for this conduct it is ſaid by ſome writers, that Clemens Alexandrinus in his *Stromata*, *L.* 5 & 6, and Euſebius in his *Præparatio Evangelica*, *L.* 9. *c.* 2 & 3. have ſhewn how the Greeks have borrowed their moſt valuable knowledge from the Hebrews, and have even robbed each other of their works; of which many inſtances are given. To this we may add the judgment, which Strabo in his 17th book paſſes upon the writings of Eudorus and Ariſton the Peripatetics, who wrote Commentaries concerning the Nile ſo exactly alike, that nothing leſs than the Oracle of Jupiter Hammon could diſcover which of them was the Plagiary. Marcianus Heracleota tells us, that Eratoſthenes tranſcribed entirely an Epitome concerning the Iſlands which had been compoſed by Timoſthenes, and publiſhed it as his own performance. Athenæus at the end of the eleventh book of his Deipnoſophiſts accuſes Plato of having borrowed the greateſt part of his Dialogues from Byrſon, Ariſtippus, and Antiſthenes. And tho' we ſee evidently that Apuleius has ſtolen the ſtory of his *Golden Aſs*, yet we cannot be certain whether it was from Lucius Patrenſis or Lucian, becauſe the two laſt mentioned Authors have been ingenious enough to make their copy paſs for an original. But all theſe examples with an infinity of others can never gain the end, which is deſigned by thoſe, who urge them. It is impoſſible to excuſe a fault by ſhewing only, that it is very common. And therefore La Mothe le Vayer concludes theſe obſervations with affirming, that he ſhould chooſe rather to ſuffer Appian to continue under the imputation of plagiariſm, than to palliate that fault in order to juſtify him.

(15) Pag. 163.

(16) Voſſius, *ubi ſupra.*

(17) C. 85.

(18) Pag. 91.

Reflections upon Plagiariſm.

[D] *He gives us in his Preface a general deſcription of the Roman Empire.*] He tells us, that this Empire was bounded in the Eaſt by the river Euphrates, Mount Caucaſus, the greater Armenia, and Colchis; and in the North by the Danube, beyond which however he obſerves that the Romans poſſeſſed Dacia,

as

Syrian, Parthian, Mithridatic and Spaniſh wars, with thoſe againſt Hannibal, and the Civil Wars, and thoſe in Illyricum; for with regard to the Celtic or Gallic wars, we have nothing but a fragment remaining, which can only make us regret what is loſt, inſtead of ſatisfying our curioſity (g).

(g) La Mothe le Vayer, p. 96.

as well as ſeveral other Nations beyond the Rhine. They were maſters of above half of Britain, but neglected the reſt, as he informs us, becauſe it was no uſe to them, and they received but very little advantage from what they actually poſſeſſed. There were ſeveral other countries, which coſt them more than they gained by them; but they thought it diſhonourable to abandon them. This occaſioned them to neglect the opportunities of making themſelves maſters of many other Nations, and to ſatisfy themſelves with giving them Kings, as they did particularly to the greater Armenia. He aſſures us likewiſe, that he ſaw at Rome Embaſſadors from ſeveral countries of the Barbarians, who deſired to ſubmit to the Roman Empire, but were rejected by the Emperor becauſe they were poor, and conſequently he could not expect any profit from them: ὧν ἐγώ τινας εἶδον ἐν Ῥώμῃ προσδυομένους τε καὶ δεδόσθαι ἑαυτοὺς ὑπηκόους εἶναι, καὶ ἃ δεξάμενοι βασιλέα ἄνδρας ἐσθῆτι αὐτῷ χρησίμους ἀπομένους (19).

(19) Appian. *Præfat.* p. 4.

APPIUS CLAUSUS, or CLAUDIUS SABINUS, a Sabine by birth and one of the principal inhabitants of Regillum, was very conſpicuous for his ſtrength and riches, but ſtill more illuſtrious for his virtue and eloquence. His ſhining merit having drawn the envy of ſome of his fellow-Citizens upon him [A], he retired to Rome with all his family, attended, as Plutarch relates (a), with five thouſand families; they were very kindly received by the Romans, who made them all Citizens, and gave each of them two acres of ground beyond the river Teverone. To Appius they gave five and twenty acres, and admitted him into the Senate. In this poſt he ſoon diſtinguiſhed himſelf in a very honourable manner by his wiſe counſels, and eſpecially by his ſteadineſs and reſolution (b). He was made Conſul with Publius Servilius Priſcus (c) in the year 259 from the building of Rome, and 495 before the birth of Chriſt. That year the people of Rome raiſed a tumult, on account of the heavy debts which they had contracted [B], and which they would have aboliſhed. Their rage proceeded ſo far, that the Conſuls themſelves, endeavouring to pacify the multitude, were in danger of their lives. Appius, who was of a very ſevere temper, was of opinion that this tumult could not be appeaſed but by the death of one or two of the ringleaders. But Servilius, more gentle, compaſſionate, and popular, maintained that ſome regard was to be had to the miſerable circumſtances of the people; and as the Romans were then threatened with a dangerous war, it was proper to give ſome ſatisfaction to thoſe who had been oppreſſed, and who would not inliſt themſelves, unleſs they were relieved. Servilius's advice prevailed; he publiſhed an edict in favour of the poor debtors, whereupon the army was ſoon raiſed. But the Conſul's edict was not very faithfully executed [C], ſo that after the campaign the people began to murmur, and to raiſe ſeditions with more fury than ever, eſpecially at the

(a) *In* Publicola, *Oper.* tom. 1. p. 108. Livius, lib. 2. cap. 17. and not Velleius Paterc. as Mr. Vertot ſays by miſtake, *Revolut. Rom.* tom. 1. p. 63.

(b) Plutarch. ibid.

(c) Livius, lib. 2. cap. 21. p. m. 39. Col. 1.

[A] *His ſhining merit drew the envy of ſome of his Fellow-Citizens upon him.*] The Sabines being engaged in war againſt the Romans, Appius adviſed them to conclude a peace with them. His enemies accuſed him of giving ſuch advice, only that the Romans might have time to become more powerful, and then he could eaſily make himſelf Tyrant of his own country. Appius perceiving that the people readily hearkened to this report, and that he was hated by thoſe who were againſt the peace, and ſought only to embroil the State, durſt not ſubmit to the judgment of the people; but finding his faction ſupported by a great many of his friends and relations, he raiſed a ſedition, which hindred the Sabines from carrying on the war with vigour againſt the Romans. The Conſul Publicola deſiring to know the cauſe of this, as well as to kindle the fire that had broke out among the Sabines, ſent ſome perſons to Appius, to let him know that it was his opinion, that a good and honeſt man, however injured by his fellow-citizens, ought never to revenge himſelf. He alſo promiſed him, that if he would conſult his ſafety, he ſhould leave his enemies, and go to Rome, where he might be raiſed in a manner ſuitable to his own virtue, and to the dignity of the Romans. Appius, who was not exaſperated againſt the Sabines, and loved a quiet and eaſy life, having conſulted with his friends, accepted Publicola's invitation, and retired to Rome (1). This happened in the year 250 from the building of that city, under the Conſuls P. Valerius Publicola IV, and T. Lucretius Tricipitinus II, 504 years before the Chriſtian Æra.

(1) Plutarch. *in vit. Publicolæ*, *Oper.* tom. 1. p. 108.

[B] *On account of the heavy debts which they had contracted.*] It was an ancient cuſtom at Rome during the government of the Kings, that when the Romans had ſeized the lands of their enemies, half of them was ſold to pay the expences of the war; the other half belonged to the publick, and was given either gratis, or under a very moderate rent to the pooreſt of the Citizens. But when the Regal Government had been aboliſhed, the Nobles and Patricians, who tho' they were now the only Rulers of the Commonwealth, kept for themſelves, under divers pretences, moſt of the conquered lands; which was not only a loſs to the State, but alſo a great injury to the poor ſoldier, who having ſpilt his blood to enlarge the territories of his country, was by the great men's avarice deprived of that portion of land, which was to be both his pay and reward. But theſe were not the only uſurpations of the Patricians. When there was a ſcarcity of proviſions, they, by aſſiſting them, knew how to raiſe a claim on the poſſeſſions of their poor neighbours. The ſoldiers then without pay, and deſtitute of all other means of getting a livelihood, were obliged to apply to the rich, who lent them money, but at an exorbitant intereſt; nay, if we believe Tacitus (2), intereſt was not then regulated by law, as it was afterwards, but exacted at the pleaſure of the rich. The debtor was obliged to engage his little inheritance, and it often happened, that the little aſſiſtance he received from the rich, coſt him his liberty. For according to law the creditor might arreſt his debtor, and keep him priſoner in his houſe, where the poor man was treated as a ſlave; nay he was often laſhed and cruelly tormented by his unmerciful creditor. Thus under pretence of law and ſtrict juſtice, the people ſuffered daily the ſevereſt injuries and ill uſage (3), being obliged to yield up their lands, in order to pay, beſides the principal, the heavy and accumulated intereſt. Such was the humanity of the ſo much celebrated ancient Romans!

(2) *Annal.* 6. p. 204. of Mr. Gordon's tranſlation.

(3) Livius, lib. 2. cap. 23. Vertot, *Hiſt. des Revol. Rom.* tom. 1. liv. 1. 57, &c.

[C] *The Conſul's Edict was not very faithfully executed.*] Servilius did indeed endeavour to perform his promiſe, and to engage the Senate to aboliſh all the debts. But Appius, who thought the leaſt alteration of the laws extremely dangerous, openly oppoſed his collegue's intentions. He gave all creditors leave to impriſon their debtors; and the applauſe he received from

the year's end, when new Conſuls (*d*) were choſen. The people again refuſed to march againſt the enemy, and the Conſuls having endeavoured to terrify them by ſeizing ſome of the moſt ſeditious, the populace reſcued them out of the Lictor's hands. The Senate finding how the authority of the ſupreme Magiſtrates was ſlighted, conſulted what was to be done upon this urgent occaſion. Their ſentiments were divided [*D*], but Appius ſoon united them, by propoſing to create a Dictator. This ſeemed indeed very ſevere, and even dangerous; but faction and private intereſt, which always did and always will prevail in publick councils, determined the Senate in favour of Appius's opinion. Nay ſome of the youngeſt Senators propoſed to make him Dictator, which would have been of fatal conſequence, ſince it would have entirely alienated the people at a time when ſeveral neighbouring nations were already in arms, and ready to fall upon the Romans. But the Conſuls and the oldeſt Senators warded off the blow, and procured M. Valerius to be choſen, a man, who by his mild temper might mitigate the ſeverity of a Magiſtracy of its own nature, but too awful and dreaded (*e*). However the Dictator could not put an end to the civil broils, for finding he could not prevail with the Senate to annihilate the people's debts, he abdicated the Dictatorſhip; and the Senate being reſolved not to yield to the people's deſire, a great number of the Citizens left Rome and retired to Mount Velius, afterwards called the Sacred Mount, three miles diſtant from Rome. This retreat put the Senate under great conſternation, and was by ſome aſcribed to the creating of a Dictator, by which they that were condemned by the Nobles were deprived of the benefit of the Valerian Law, which allowed them to appeal to the people. This was inſinuated by M. Valerius, who added, that the ſovereign power committed to one man, as it was by the Dictatorſhip, would at laſt deſtroy the Commonwealth; that this novelty and alteration in the government was owing to the ſevere and haughty diſpoſition of Appius, and of thoſe who were in the ſame ſentiments with him; that they had no other view but to raiſe the power of the Nobles upon the ruins of the publick Liberty, and to reduce the Citizens to the mean condition of ſubjects and ſlaves to the Senate. Appius anſwered with his uſual ſteadineſs and reſolution, but at the ſame time with moderation and mildneſs [*E*]; and as Valerius and Menenius Agrippa had been of opinion that the Senate ſhould ſend deputies to the rebels, in order to appeaſe them, and invite them to return home; Appius on the contrary maintained, that ſuch a conduct would be a ſure token

(*d*) A. Virginius Tricaſtus, *and* T. Vetuſius Geminus.

(*e*) Livius, ibid. cap. 23—30. p. 39—42.

from the rich, as well as the curſes of the poor, equally concurred to confirm this Magiſtrate in his rigorous reſolution. They that were arreſted appealed to Servilius, and repreſented to him the promiſes he made them before the war, and their own ſervice againſt the enemy. They loudly entreated him, that as a Conſul he would defend his fellow-citizens, and as a General not abandon thoſe ſoldiers, who fought ſo bravely under him. But Servilius, who was of a mild and timorous temper, durſt not openly declare himſelf againſt the whole body of Patricians, and by wavering betwixt both parties, that of the Nobles, and that of the people, he offended them both, and drew upon him the hatred of the latter, and could not ingratiate himſelf with the former. The Senate look'd upon him as an ambitious but weak man; and the people thought he had deceived and betrayed them; ſo that it ſoon appeared he was become as odious as Appius himſelf (4).

(4) Livius, ibid. cap. 27. Vertot, ibid. p. 77, 78.

[*D*] *Their ſentiments were divided.*] There were three different opinions propoſed. P. Virginius ſaid, they ought not to aboliſh the debts of all the people indifferently, but only of thoſe who in the late wars had faithfully ſerved the Commonwealth. This, he added, was in juſtice due to them, and they had a right to expect it, ſince Servilius promiſed it; and it was with this hope that they had followed him againſt the enemy. T. Largius, who had been a Dictator, repreſented that this was not a time to do ſtrict juſtice, or to reward only ſuch as deſerved it. That the whole people was involved in heavy debts, and thereby ruined. That if the debts of ſome were aboliſhed, whilſt others remained under an obligation to pay theirs, this would rather increaſe than aſſuage the ſedition. That therefore nothing leſs than a general abolition could reſtore the publick tranquillity. Appius rejected both theſe propoſals. "All this mutiny and "rebellion, ſaid he, does not proceed from the peo- "ple's miſery, but is rather the effect of an unbound- "ed and immoderate licentiouſneſs, which the ſedi- "tious are pleaſed to call Liberty. This riot and "diſturbance is owing to the ill uſe the people make "of the Valerian Law. The Majeſty of the Conſuls "is violated with impunity, becauſe the rebels have "the liberty to appeal from the ſentence juſtly pro- "nounced againſt their crime, to their accomplices "in that ſame crime. What order, what regularity "will there ever be in a State, where the laws and "decrees of the Magiſtrate are ſubject to the appeal "and judgment of an unruly populace, who have "no other guide but their folly and paſſion?" This was the reaſon why Appius propoſed to create a Dictator, that there might be a Magiſtrate, from whoſe judgment there was no appeal (5).

(5) Livius, ibid. cap. 29. Vertot, ibid. p. 79, 80.

[*E*] *Appius anſwered with his uſual ſteadineſs and reſolution, but at the ſame time, with moderation and mildneſs.*] Thus he ſpoke, addreſſing himſelf to M. Valerius: "If you had been contented with only delivering "your opinion, without attacking me unjuſtly, you "would not have expoſed your ſelf to hear ſome un- "welcome truths. But before I lay them before this "Aſſembly, it is but juſt that I ſhould anſwer your "charge againſt me. Pray tell me, Valerius, who "are thoſe Romans, whom I have proſecuted to force "them to pay what they owe not. Name, if you "can, thoſe Citizens, whom I kept in irons. Go to "Mount Velius (6), and look whether among the "number of rebels, if you can find but one only, "who complains that he left the city for fear of "being arreſted by me. On the contrary, all the "world knows that I have acted with my debtors as "with my clients and my friends; and without hav- "ing any regard to old debts yet unpaid, I have aſ- "ſiſted them freely in their wants, and as much as it "was in my power, the Citizens have always been "free. I don't pretend by ſaying this, that my con- "duct ought to be a rule for other people. I will "always maintain the laws in favour of thoſe who "will have their recourſe to them. I am even per- "ſuaded, that with regard to certain debtors, "thoſe who lead a debauched and luxurious life, it is "as juſt to demand payment, as it is honourable and "generous to quit it to thoſe who are peaceable and "laborious, and by misfortunes fall into extreme "miſery and want. Such has been conſtantly my "conduct; thoſe are the ſevere and haughty princi- "ples, with which I am charged. But, ſay they, "I have declared myſelf a Partiſan of the Nobles, "and it is by my counſel and advice that they have "invaded the Government. This crime, Gentle- "men, added Appius turning himſelf to the Chiefs "of the Senate, this crime is common both to you "and

(6) Where the rebels had retired.

ken of weakneſs in the Senate, and conſequently raiſe the ſpirits of the rebels; "If of "their own accord, added he, they return to their duty, we muſt treat them with mode- "ration; but we muſt purſue them ſword in hand, if they perſiſt in their rebellion." Appius's ſentiment was followed by all the rich Senators, and by the young men; the Conſuls on the contrary, and moſt of the old Senators, men naturally timorous, thought a civil war was the greateſt misfortune that could befal the State. They were ſupported by thoſe Senators, who had nothing more in view but the conſervation of liberty, and who were afraid, leſt ſome ambitious and enterpriſing men ſhould take hold of this opportunity of a civil war to invade the ſovereign power. But theſe Patriots could ſcarce get any attention, ſuch were the cries and threatnings that were heard from all ſides. The young Senators, proud of their birth, and jealous of the prerogative of their rank, and in all likelihood animated by Appius's example, went ſo far as to inſinuate to the Conſuls that they ſuſpected them. They put them in mind that they repreſented the perſon of the antient Kings, and that they ought to maintain the Kingly power veſted in them, together with the authority of the Senate, againſt the bold enterpriſes of the people. Nay ſome of the moſt hot and violent of theſe Senators added, that if the leaſt attempt was made againſt their authority, they would take up arms to maintain in their order that power which they had received from their anceſtors (*f*). However the Conſuls, who were reſolved to pleaſe the people, found means by threats and other artifices to win thoſe who were moſt exaſperated [*F*], ſo that Appius, ſtill firm and ſteady in his opinion, and incapable of altering it but by force of argument, remained on the contrary ſide, with only a few of his relations, who thought themſelves bound in honour not to forſake him. That great man being perſuaded in his conſcience, that all negotiation with the rebels would be deſtructive of the Senate's authority, addreſſed himſelf to both the Conſuls in theſe words: "Though you ſeem to be reſolved to treat with the people, and to accept "the terms they ſhall propoſe to you; and however thoſe who were of a contrary ſenti- "ment, may have altered their mind either through weakneſs or out of intereſt; yet I "ſtill

(*f*) Dionyſ. Halicar. lib. 6.

"and to me. The government naturally belongs "to you; and you are too prudent and wiſe, ever to "yield it up to a licentious populace, to that wild "beaſt, that hearkens only to its flatterers, but whoſe "ſlaves often become its tyrants. And this we are "to apprehend from Valerius, who being eſteemed "in the Republick only by the honours we have "conferred upon him, now makes uſe of them to "deſtroy our laws, to alter the conſtitution of our "Government, and by baſe arts and flatteries to pave "himſelf the way to tyranny. You have heard him; "and you may have underſtood from his diſcourſe, "that being perfectly acquainted with the pernicious "deſigns of the rebels, he will diſpoſe you to hearken "to new demands; and under pretence of aſking ſure- "ties for the liberty of the people (7), his only aim "is to oppreſs that of the Senate. But let us come "to the principal ſubject for which we are this day "aſſembled. I maintain, that to alter the laws of "any State, is to ſhake the very foundations of it; "and that we cannot annul thoſe bonds and contracts "between private men, without wounding the publick "faith, and deſtroying that *original contract*, on which "all ſocieties of men are grounded. Will you now "grant to thoſe rebels, who are ready to turn their "arms againſt their own country, what you have of- "ten ſo wiſely refuſed to ſubmiſſive and faithful Citi- "zens, to ſoldiers, who fought under your banner? "Depend upon it, if you yield up this article con- "cerning the debtors, you will at the ſame time "give occaſion to new demands and pretenſions. "The ringleaders of the ſedition, in concert with "Valerius, will ſoon demand the liberty of in- "termarrying with our families; and after that, they "will pretend a right to enjoy the higheſt poſts in "the State. May the tutelary Gods of Rome grant, "that the government of this Republick do not fall "into the hands of a vile populace, who will ſoon "puniſh you for your weakneſs, and even baniſh you "out of your country! But the arms of the rebels "are formidable: Why! have you not in your power "their wives and children, as ſo many hoſtages and "ſecurities againſt them? But ſuppoſe that they have "no more regard for their own blood, than they have "for the laws of the State; have they Generals, have "they proviſions, have they money to carry on this "raſh enterprize? And during the winter, which "draws near, what will become of them deſtitute "as they are of bread, without any place of retreat, "without being able to move one ſtep, but they muſt "fall into our hands. If they think to go to our "neighbours, will they not find there, as well as at "Rome, the whole government lodged with the No- "bles; and what other condition can rebels and de- "ſerters expect, but that of miſerable ſlaves? But "perhaps they will join with our enemies, and all to- "gether come and beſiege Rome, now deprived of "the inhabitants neceſſary to defend it: as tho' the "whole ſtrength of the Commonwealth conſiſted in "theſe rebels only. Have we not among the Patri- "cians a conſiderable number of young men, full of "vigour and courage? Our Clients, who are the moſt "ſound part of the State, are they not attached to "its true intereſt, as well as we? If there be occa- "ſion, let us even arm our ſlaves; let us make of "them a new but obedient people. They have learnt "under us and by our example how to make war. "With how much courage will they not fight, if li- "berty be the recompence of their courage and brave- "ry? If all this does not ſeem ſufficient, call back "your Colonies. You know, by the laſt ſurvey, that "the Commonwealth conſiſts of one hundred and thir- "ty heads of families; and ſcarce the ſeventh part of "them is to be found among the malecontents. "Laſtly rather than receive laws from theſe re- "bels, let us grant to the Latins the freedom of Ro- "man Citizens, which they have ſo long requeſted "of us. You will immediately ſee them fly to your "aſſiſtance, and you will want neither ſoldiers nor "citizens. In a word, I am of opinion, that we "ought not to ſend any deputies to the rebels, nor "do the leaſt thing that might betray either fear or "forwardneſs (8)."

(7) Valerius had inſinuated, that it was proper to create a new Magiſtrate, who would be the guardian of the liberty of the people. Accordingly, two Magiſtrates were created under the name of TRIBUNES OF THE PEOPLE.

[*F*] *The Conſuls —— by threats and other artifices found means to win thoſe, who were moſt exaſperated.*] The two Conſuls having conſulted together ſecretly, reſolved to let the paſſion of the Senate cool; for which purpoſe they deferred the deciſion of this affair to the next meeting. In the mean time they laboured to win thoſe, who had moſt violently oppoſed this propoſal. To terrify the young Senators, they threatened to deprive them of the right they enjoyed, to vote in the Senate. As it had not yet been determined at what age a man might have a vote, the Conſuls gave the young Senators to underſtand, that if they did not behave themſelves with more modeſty and moderation in that venerable Aſſembly, they would exclude them from it, by determining at what age a man ſhould be admitted into the Senate. Theſe young Senators valuing their dignity more than their virtue, theſe Romans, who were thought to be ſo reſolute and brave, ſtooped at the Conſul's threatning, and aſſured them,

(8) Dionyſ. Halicarn. lib. 6. Vertot, *ubi ſupra*, p. 94—99.

" ſtill perſiſt in my opinion, that as we cannot have too much regard for the miſery of " a people ſubmiſſive and obedient, ſo I aſſert, that all negotiation with them is danger- " ous, as long as they continue in arms." But as the Senate was now come to a fixed reſolution, this diſcourſe of Appius was hardly attended to, and he was looked upon as a man zealous indeed for the glory of the Senate, but who had too great an opinion of his own wiſdom, and was, either out of vanity, or through the ſtiffneſs of his temper, incapable of altering his mind (*g*). The reſult of the negotiation with the rebels was, that two Tribunes of the People ſhould be created. Appius oppoſed this with all his power; he repreſented with the utmoſt force of eloquence, heightened with indignation, all the evils which this innovation in the government would occaſion in time; and as if his zeal or his anger ſerved him inſtead of a Divine inſpiration, he foretold to the Senate, that by their weakneſs and too eaſy temper, they were eſtabliſhing a Tribunal againſt themſelves, which would inſenſibly raiſe an oppoſition to their own authority, and deſtroy it at laſt entirely. But the ſtrongeſt repreſentations are to no purpoſe, where private intereſt prevails over Patriotiſm. Appius's diſcourſe was conſidered as that of a man obſtinately adhering to his own ſentiments, and angry becauſe they were not approved and followed. The Senate had ſoon occaſion to repent of their remiſſneſs; they found in the affair of Coriolanus what a dreadful power they had lodged with the people, by granting particular Magiſtrates to them. This Appius repreſented in a very eloquent and ſtrong Oration, which Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus relates (*b*), but too long to be here tranſcribed [*G*]. Though Appius appeared hitherto very zealous for maintaining the authority of the Senate, yet he alſo ſhewed by his conduct, that he was heartily in the real intereſt of the people. This appeared not only by his behaviour towards thoſe who were in his debt (*i*), but alſo by his conduct in the diſpute, which aroſe concerning the diſtribution of the conquered lands. For his opinion in this affair was, that to prevent the juſt complaints of the people, the Senate ought to chooſe ten Commiſſioners, who ſhould be appointed to make a ſtrict enquiry concerning thoſe lands which originally belonged to the publick; that part of them muſt be ſold for the uſe of the publick treaſure; that another part of them be diſtributed among the pooreſt Citizens, who had no land of their own; that marks ſhould be put every where to diſtinguiſh the limits of every one's poſſeſſions, the want of ſuch marks having occaſioned the grievance, of which the people then complained. What remained of the publick lands he propoſed to let out only for five years together, at a reaſonable rent, which rent was to be laid out in corn for thoſe Plebeians who ſerved in the army, and for their pay. This he thought would hinder the people from thinking any more of having the lands divided anew amongſt them; they would rather chooſe to have corn, money, and a ſettled allowance during the whole campaign, than a piece of ground, which they ſhould be obliged to cultivate. He added, that he knew of no other method to reform ancient abuſes, than to put things again on the ſame foot on which they were at firſt eſtabliſhed. His advice was followed, though moſt of the Senators holding lands, which originally belonged to the Commonwealth, could not bear the very name of an inquiry; yet to impoſe upon the people, they made a *Senatus Conſultum*, or a Decree, according to Appius's motion; but it was not put in execution till thirty five years after, when our Appius's grandſon was made the firſt of the *Decemviri*. We hear nothing of our Appius, after this decree concerning the publick's lands. For the Appius Claudius, who was Conſul in the year 282, or 283, and who killed himſelf, was the ſon of our Appius, as appears by Livy's own words, who calls him *Appius Claudius Ap. Filius* (*k*); ſo that Moreri ought not to have confounded them, as he has done. We ſhall give an account of this Appius in the following article.

(*g*) Idem, ibid.

(*i*) See the beginning of the remark [*E*].

(*b*) Lib. 7.

(*k*) Lib. 2. cap. 56. p. m. 54. Col. 2.

APPIUS

them, that they would always be ready to follow his ſentiments. Theſe two Magiſtrates employed another artifice againſt the party of the rich, who conſtantly oppoſed the aboliſhing of the debts. They let them know, that if at the next meeting of the Senate, they came not to a reſolution more agreeable to the common intereſt of all the Citizens, they would bring this affair before the people. They alſo repreſented, that if once the Aſſembly of the people had this affair before them, it was to be apprehended leſt they ſhould carry their authority ſtill farther, and do themſelves juſtice for all the vexations and injuries they pretended to have ſuffered from the Patricians (9). By this means the Conſuls gained the majority in the Senate; ſo true is Livy's reflection, of which we have given the ſenſe above (10), and which in his own words is thus: *Factio Reſpectuſque rerum privatarum ſemper offecere, officientque publicis conſiliis* (11).

(9) Vertot, ibid. pag. 101, 102. Dionyſ. Halic. lib. 6.

(10) Towards the quotation (*e*).

(11) Livius, lib. 2. cap. 30. pag. m. 42. Col. 1.

[*G*] *Too long to be here tranſcribed.*] We ſhall give only an abſtract of it. He repreſented to the Senate how well grounded his fears were, when he foretold, that the Tribunes, theſe new Magiſtrates of the people, would ſoon incroach upon the power and authority of the Senate. He obſerved, that what was tranſacted then and what had paſſed before was a ſure proof, that the people intended a change in the Government; how they had turned the condeſcenſion of the Senators againſt themſelves, pretending to cite them before their own Tribunal; which appeared by the example of Coriolanus, whom the people would try and judge, maintaining they had a right to do it by the Valerian Law (12). " But do not we all know, ſays " Appius, that this law, by which a man may ap- " peal from the Senate to the people, relates only to " poor plebeians, who being deſtitute of protection, " may be oppreſſed by a powerful party. The very " words of that Law are expreſly to this purpoſe. It " is there ſaid in ſo many words, that a Citizen con- " demned by the Conſuls, ſhall be at liberty to ap- " peal to the people. Valerius Publicola intended " only by this law to open a Sanctuary for the fortu- " nate, who might complain to have been unjuſtly uſed " by corrupt or paſſionate judges. What relation is " there between ſuch a law and the caſe of a Senator, " a man of a rank ſuperior to that of the people, " and who is accountable for his conduct and acti- " ons to the Senate alone? But to ſhew that the Va- " lerian Law regards only the plebeians, name but " one Patrician, who ſince nineteen years that this " law has been aboliſhed, was cited before the people (13)." Thus Appius pleaded the cauſe of Coriolanus, who as well as himſelf was a ſtrenuous aſſertor of the Senate's authority.

(12) *Lex Valeria.*

(13) Dionyſ. Hal. lib. 6.

P.

APPIUS CLAUDIUS SABINUS ſon of the preceding, inherited a very conſiderable eſtate from his father, with a large number of clients; but at the ſame time he had the ſame haughty temper and unconquerable firmneſs, which rendered his father ſo odious to the people. This was the reaſon that, when he firſt petitioned for the Conſulſhip, in the year of Rome 272 (*a*), he could not obtain it [*A*]. But though he did not enjoy that high poſt then, yet by his prudent and wiſe conduct in the Senate, he found means to engage the multitude to follow the Conſuls againſt the enemy. He underſtood the force of this maxim *divide & impera*, that is, "divide and you ſhall reign." For as the Tribunes, by the influence they had over the people, prevented them from liſting themſelves into the army, even at a time when the Æqui and Veii were plundering and deſtroying every thing in the neighbourhood of Rome, Appius made a motion, which proved very ſucceſsful. He repreſented, "that the power of the Tribunes was "dreadful only by their union; that if the oppoſition of one Tribune was ſufficient to "ſuſpend the execution of a decree from the Senate, it had the ſame effect with regard "to the deliberations and councils of his own Collegues the other Tribunes. That it "was not impoſſible to be jealous of one another's credit and authority; that therefore "it would be proper to ſow diſcord and diſſentions amongſt them, and ſecretly to gain "ſome of them to the intereſt of the Senate (*b*)." The Fathers followed his advice, and prevailed with four of the Tribunes, who by favouring the Senate rendered void and uſeleſs the oppoſition of the other Tribunes. Some time after Appius was made Conſul (*c*), without having in the leaſt petitioned for it; for it was obſerved that he was ſo far from making the leaſt intereſt for that high dignity, he did not even deign to appear before the Aſſembly of the People the day he was choſen (*d*). His Collegue in the Conſulſhip was T. Quintius Capitolinus, a man of a mild and inſinuating temper, who had gained the love of the people, though he was at the head of the oppoſite party. The Senate had choſen him in hopes that his example and moderate counſels might in a manner ſoften and allay the too haughty and proud behaviour of Appius, who had indeed his father's ſteady zeal for the intereſt of the Senate; but the heroic conſtancy and reſolution of the father was in the ſon degenerated into obſtinacy and ſeverity; for he was naturally proud, though not ambitious; would carry every thing by authority, without ever employing thoſe inſinuating arts, which have ſo great a power over the unthinking multitude. This man the Senate thought proper to oppoſe to Volero a Tribune of the People; who under pretence of promoting the intereſt of the Plebeians, was labouring to undermine the authority of the Senate and Patricians. Appius oppoſed with all his might the enterpriſe of Volero, who to make the people maſters of the elections, would have them made by *Tribes*, that every Citizen, whether an inhabitant of Rome or of the Country, might give his vote; and that with regard to the Tribunes, they ſhould be choſen without a decree of the Senate, and that the Aſſembly in which they were to be choſen ſhould be held without taking the Auſpices. This Volero required, becauſe all the Prieſts and publick Miniſters of Religion being Patricians, it was in their power to interpret the Auſpices according to the intereſt of their own order. Volero demanded beſides, that not only the Tribunes, but alſo the Ediles ſhould be choſen after the ſame manner, and that every affair, of which the people had a right to judge, ſhould be decided by ſuch an aſſembly, which was in fact to deprive the Senate of all power and authority, and lodge it with the people. Quintius, a man of a mild temper, and though not popular, yet a republican, was of opinion, that ſomething muſt be yielded to a brave people, who daily ſhed their blood for the Commonwealth. But Appius, proud and ſevere, maintained that this was betraying the intereſt of the Senate; that this indulgence was not the effect of kindneſs towards the people, but only diſcovered the weakneſs of the government; and concluded, that after ſo many uſeleſs diſcourſes that had been made on the ſubject before them, nothing but a bad attempt could repreſs the ſeditious enterpriſes of the Tribunes: "Let all "the Patricians, ſaid he, with all their clients, take up arms, diſperſe the people, and "kill indifferently all thoſe who ſupport ſo pernicious a ſcheme." The Senate did not think

(*a*) 482 before Chriſt.

(*b*) Livius, lib. 2. cap. 44. pag. 48, 49.

(*c*) A. U. 283; 471 before Chriſt.

(*d*) Dionyſ. Hal. lib. 9.

[*A*] *This was a reaſon why he could not obtain the Conſulſhip.*] The Senators, to maintain the dignity and authority of their Order, intended to make the choice of one of the Conſuls to fall upon Appius, but the people would by no means come into that deſign. The Senate perſiſting in their reſolution, and the people in their obſtinacy, the Conſuls could not be created. Some of the Senators, who were of a ſtrict and ſevere temper, would have a Dictator. But as there were reaſons to apprehend a general inſurrection, thoſe of the Senators, who were more moderate and prudent, thought it was not proper to venture the ſupreme authority againſt the fury of the people, who perhaps in theſe circumſtances would not ſubmit even to a Dictator, which would be of the moſt dangerous conſequence. The Senate therefore only created an *Inter-Rex*, as had been done during the Kingly Government, when the throne was vacant. This Magiſtracy laſted only five days. A. Sempronius Atratinus was at this time choſen by the Senate, and was ſucceeded five days after by Sp. Largius. This Magiſtrate repreſented to the Senate, that if they obſtinately perſiſted in their reſolution to promote Appius to the Conſulate, it was to be feared, that they would occaſion a very dangerous ſedition, in which perhaps they might loſe the right they enjoyed, of having the Conſuls choſen in a manner, by which they could almoſt command the choice. That it was prudence and wiſdom to avoid carefully whatever might in the leaſt affect or deſtroy ſo valuable a privilege, which they might make uſe of even in favour of Appius himſelf, in a more favourable opportunity. In ſhort Largius managed them ſo dexterouſly, that he made them conſent to have one of the Conſuls choſen by the people, who ſhould name a perſon amongſt thoſe Senators that were the moſt favourable to the multitude, and that the Senate ſhould chooſe the other (1). Thus Appius for this time was obliged to drop his pretenſions to the Conſulſhip.

(1) Dionyſ. Hal. lib. 6.

think it prudent or ſafe to follow his advice; but this ſhews how violent a man he was (e). He gave another inſtance of it ſoon after, in an aſſembly of the people, in which he ſpoke to them in a manner ſo haughty and reproachful, that he raiſed their fury, and narrowly eſcaped being killed [B], notwithſtanding his dignity of Conſul (f). The ſame year Appius went againſt the Volſci. When he found himſelf without the walls of Rome, veſted with that unbounded authority, which always accompanies a military command, he made his ſoldiers keep ſo ſtrict a diſcipline, that they aſcribed this ſeverity rather to his vengeance than to neceſſity. This rigour embittered them all againſt him, ſo that when he conducted them againſt the enemy, they refuſed to fight and ran away [C]. When they were returned to the territories of the Republick, Appius made them encamp, and to puniſh their voluntary cowardiſe, he ordered thoſe officers and Centurions to be beheaded, who abandoned their poſt, and *decimated* (g) his whole army. When Appius was returned to Rome, he exaſperated the people again by oppoſing the Agrarian Law (b). This affair was vigorouſly purſued the next year uuder the new Conſuls L. Valerius Publicola, and Tib. Æmilius Mamercus, who were in the people's intereſt [D]. Appius

(e) Idem, ibid.

(f) Idem, ibid. Livius, lib. 2. cap. 56. p. 54.

(g) Put to death every tenth ſoldier.

(b) The Law concerning the diſtribution of the lands.

[B] *Appius ſpoke to them in a manner ſo haughty—— and narrowly eſcaped being killed.*] He ſpoke with ſo much anger, that his diſcourſe had the ſame effect upon the people, as the moſt ſeditious harangues of the Tribunes, and only exaſperated more and more the plebeians, and alienated their hearts from the Senate. For in a manner, which the Patricians themſelves blamed, and which was odious to the people, he upbraided them with their late retreat to the ſacred Mount, with the creating of Tribunes, which, he ſaid, had been extorted from the Senate only by an open revolt and the threatnings of a civil war. No wonder, if a Tribunal erected by rebels, produced nothing but tumults and ſeditions. Theſe would end only in the total deſtruction of the Commonwealth, in which the leaſt tract of the ancient Government was no more to be found. The moſt ſacred laws were aboliſhed, the Conſular power deſpiſed, the dignity of the Senate diſgraced. The inſolence of the Tribunes proceeded ſo far, that they wanted to baniſh from future elections the *Senatus-Conſultum*, and the Auſpices; that is, all that was moſt ſacred in Religion, and moſt venerable in the Government. With a new Government, they would ſoon bring new Gods; and having aboliſhed the Senate, whoſe authority they were daily undermining, they would raiſe upon its ruins a ſupreme Council, compoſed only of the Tribunes of the people. He prayed to the Gods, to take away his life before he became a witneſs to ſo dreadful a revolution. "And, added he, turning himſelf to the people, to "let you know my ſentiments, I publickly declare, "that I will conſtantly oppoſe a law ſo unjuſt; and I "hope that before your Tribunes can publiſh it, I "ſhall make you feel how far the power of a Con"ſul reaches." Such haughty and opprobrious language filled the people with rage and fury. Lictorius, the eldeſt of the Tribunes, anſwered him, "It was "well known he was of a family in which pride "and inhumanity were hereditary; that his father had "been the moſt cruel enemy the people ever had; "and that he himſelf was rather a tyrant than a "Conſul. But, added Lictorius, notwithſtanding "your dignity and power, as a Conſul, I ſwear, that "the law concerning the elections of the Tribunes and "Ediles, ſhall paſs this very day, or I will loſe my "life in the attempt." He then commanded Appius to go out of the Aſſembly, that he might not occaſion new tumults when the votes ſhould be gathered (2). Appius deſpiſed the Tribune's command, and told him, he ought to know, that tho' a Tribune, he was only a private perſon, without any real Magiſtracy, and whoſe power conſiſted only in oppoſing ſuch Decrees of the Senate, as might be prejudicial to the plebeians. Then calling about him all his relations, friends, and clients, who were very numerous, he put himſelf in a condition to repel force by force. It was immediately proclaim'd by Lictorius's command, that the College of the Tribunes ordered the Conſul to be carried into priſon; whereupon one of the Tribunes officers was ſo bold as to attempt to arreſt the firſt Magiſtrate of the Commonwealth. But the Senators and Patricians, with the numerous band of Appius's clients, ſurrounded and ſaved him. Lictorius enraged at this advanced, and entreated the people to aſſiſt him. A terrible ſedition enſued, and would not have ceaſed without much bloodſhed, if Quintius had not engaged ſome ancient and venerable Senators to convey Appius away, whilſt he himſelf ſhould endeavour to appeaſe the raging multitude. But the night approaching forced both parties equally embittered againſt one another, to ſeparate. The next day the tumult began afreſh. The people ſtirred up by the Tribunes, and eſpecially by Lictorius, who had been wounded the day before, poſſeſſed themſelves of the Capitol, and ſeemed to be reſolved to carry on an open war againſt the Patricians. The Senate immediately met, not only to conſider how to appeaſe the ſedition, but alſo to endeavour an agreement between the Conſuls; one of whom, being the moſt moderate, was of opinion that ſomething was to be done in favour of the people; but Appius proteſted he would die rather than comply in the leaſt with the rebels deſire. Theſe tumults continued ſome days; but at laſt the Senate, by Quintius's advice, conſented that the Tribunes Law be publiſhed, notwithſtanding the ſtrong oppoſition of Appius, who called Gods and men to witneſs, that the Commonwealth was betrayed, and that a Law was paſſing more prejudicial to the Senate's authority, than even that, which had been publiſhed on the ſacred Mount (3). In the firſt election that happened after this Law was made, the Patricians would not aſſiſt at it, that they might not be confounded with the vileſt populace. They were headed by Appius, who was ſtill more exaſperated againſt the Senate than againſt the people. It was a ſhame, he ſaid, that the Senate ſhould forſake him in an undertaking, in which they themſelves had engaged him, by raiſing him to a dignity, for which he did not ſue. He afterwards ſhewed that the victory, which the Tribunes had gained over him, had neither humbled his pride nor broken his courage.

(2) Idem, lib. 9. Livius, lib. 2. cap. 56.

(3) Livius, ibid. Dionyſ. Halic. ibid.

[C] *The ſoldiers refuſed to fight and ran away.*] They had made a kind of conſpiracy rather againſt his glory than againſt his life. To hinder him from gaining the victory and deprive him thus of the honours of a triumph, they reſolved unanimouſly not to reſiſt the enemy. Accordingly as ſoon as the Volſci approached, the Romans threw away their arms, fled ſhamefully, and thought they did not buy too dear the affront they did to their General, if it coſt them but the loſs of their own honour. Appius in the utmoſt concern did all that lay in his power to rally his ſoldiers, and lead them back againſt the enemy; he prays, he threatens, but to no purpoſe. Some ran from him, not to hear his reproaches; others, tho' not wounded, ſhew him ligatures and bandages, which they had purpoſely put over ſome ſound part of their body, to be excuſed from fighting, and earneſtly requeſt to be conducted to the camp, in order to have their pretended wounds dreſſed. Nay they all promiſcuouſly ran to the camp, without waiting for the order of the General. The Volſci purſued them, and began to attack the trenches of the camp. But here the ſoldiers ſhewed, that if they had not fought, it was not out of fear and cowardiſe; and by defending their camp bravely, they made their General ſenſible, that they could have won the victory if they had been willing (4).

(4) Livius, lib. 2. Dionyſ. Halic. lib. 9. Valer. Maxim. lib. 9. cap. 3. p. m. 304.

[D] *The new Conſuls were in the people's intereſt.*] The diſtribution of the lands was almoſt entirely in the

pius oppoſed them with as much haughtineſs, as though he had been ſtill a Conſul, or even veſted with a perpetual Dictatorſhip. Yet to ſhew that he did not intend to ſupport thoſe who had uſurped the lands which belonged to the publick, he propoſed that all thoſe lands, to which thoſe who poſſeſſed them could not prove a juſt claim, ſhould be confiſcated to the uſe of the publick. Though this propoſal ſeemed very juſt, it was liked neither by the rich nor the poor, becauſe the rich would have been deprived of this poſſeſſion without any advantage to the poor; yet as in the main Appius was againſt diſtributing the lands among the people, he was highly applauded by moſt of the Senators, who dreaded an inquiry. But the Tribunes incenſed againſt him, becauſe in him they found united the hatred and oppoſition of all the Patricians, reſolved to ruin him. They cited him before the people as a declared enemy of publick liberty; this was uſually the crime of thoſe, who were guilty of none, and whom the people wanted to deſtroy. The Senate took this affair to heart as their own, and looked upon Appius as the undaunted aſſertor of their rights. Moſt of the Patricians would ſollicit the people in his behalf, but he refuſed their interceſſion with his uſual courage and conſtancy. He altered neither his dreſs (*i*), nor his language; and on the day appointed, he appeared in the aſſembly of the people, amidſt all his accuſers, with the ſame dignity, as though he had ſtill been a Conſul, and their Judge. The Tribunes reproached him with the cruelty of his adminiſtration, and his inhumanity, in having put to death by the common executioners more ſoldiers than the enemy had killed in the heat of the battle; and to render him ſtill more odious, they upbraided him with his father's ſevere conduct. But Appius anſwered all theſe charges with ſo much ſtrength and eloquence, that the people aſtoniſhed and aſhamed durſt not condemn him. The Tribunes, who were afraid leſt he ſhould be acquitted, put off the judgment of his cauſe to another day, under pretence that the night drawing on there would not be time enough to collect the votes. Appius, who underſtood that at laſt he muſt fall a ſacrifice to the Tribunes hatred and malice, voluntarily put an end to his life, as Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus relates (*k*), though, according to Livy (*l*), he died of ſickneſs, *morbo moritur*. His corpſe was brought into the publick place, and his ſon came to make his funeral oration according to cuſtom. The Tribunes pretended to oppoſe it, under pretence that Appius ought to be conſidered as a criminal, ſince having been accuſed he had not been acquitted before his death. But the people, more generous than the revengeful Tribunes, reverſed their oppoſition, and heard with pleaſure the praiſes of an enemy whom they could not but eſteem, and whom they no longer feared (*m*).

(*i*) They, who were accuſed, uſually put on a mourning dreſs.

(*k*) Dionyſ. Halicar. lib. 9.

(*l*) Lib. 2. cap. 61. p. m. 56. Col. 2.

(*m*) Idem, ibid.

the power of the Conſuls, who by the Senate's Decree made under the Conſulſhip of Caſſius and Virginius, were authoriſed to make the enquiry concerning the lands, and to divide them amongſt the people. The Tribunes, who had this affair at heart, found means to prevail upon the Conſul Æmilius, who promiſed them to favour their pretenſions. Valerius alſo had ſome particular reaſons to ſoften the people, who were exaſperated againſt him. When the affair came before the Senate, Æmilius, the father of him that was then Conſul, openly pleaded the cauſe of the people; "Nothing, ſaid he, appears to me more unjuſt, than "that a few perſons only ſhould enrich themſelves "by the ſpoils of the enemy, whilſt all the reſt of "the Citizens groan in miſery and poverty. The poor "plebeians are afraid of having any children, to "whom they can leave nothing but their want and "misfortune; and whereas every one ſhould cultivate "his own land to get a livelihood, they are now ob"liged to labour like ſlaves upon the lands of the "Patricians. Such a ſervile way of living, is not "very proper to raiſe the courage of a Roman; there"fore my opinion is, that our Conſuls ought imme"diately to chooſe the Decemvirs, that they may "make a diſtribution of the lands, which belonging "to the publick, ought to turn equally to the ad"vantage of every private man." Appius anſwered, "That, if the people were miſerable, it was owing "only to their own luxury and intemperance; that "they had had lands even from the foundation of "Rome; that the Conſuls had often yielded to them "all the ſpoils they had made in the enemy's terri"tories; and that if an exact enquiry was made, it "would be found, that thoſe, who had the greateſt "ſhare in the booty, were now the pooreſt of all "the Citizens. That as long as theſe plebeians lived "in ſloth and luxury, it was not in the power of the "State to enrich them. More than fifty Conſulates "had now paſſed, ſince the Decree for diſtributing the "lands had been made, and during all that time "none of the Conſuls ever thought of putting it in exe"cution, becauſe they perfectly well knew, that by "ſuch a Decree the Senate only intended to appeaſe "the ſedition, and to give the people time to con"ſider the injuſtice, and even the impoſſibility of "their pretenſions. Beſides, the ancient Conſuls "knew that this Decree was become void by pre"ſcription, and they were not willing to undertake a "commiſſion which was expired." Appius added, as a compliment to the Conſuls then in being, that there was no reaſon to fear, that they, wiſe and prudent men as they were, would undertake ſuch an affair, without the authority and concurrence of the Senate (5).

(6) Dionyſ. Halic. lib. 9.

P.

APROSIO (ANGELICO) born at Vintimiglia in the Republick of Genoa the 29th of October in 1607, has had great reputation among the Learned, and compoſed a great number of books. There are many learned men ſprung from his family (*a*). He was but fifteen years old when he entered into the order of the Auguſtins, and was ſo reſpected there, that at laſt he obtained the charge of Vicar General of the Congregation of our Lady of Conſolation at Genoa (*b*). As ſoon as he had finiſhed his ſtudies, he was thought fit to teach; ſo he taught Philoſophy five years; after which he travelled into ſeveral parts of Italy, and fixed at Venice in the year 1639, at the Convent of St. Stephen, where he taught polite Learning (*c*). One of the things, which have been to his glory, was the Library of the Auguſtins of Vintimiglia, which was his work, and a ſhining proof of his love for books, and of the habit he had acquired of knowing them well (*d*). He publiſhed a book concerning this Library, which is very much ſought after by the curious [*A*].

(*a*) See the following article.

(*b*) Michel Juſtiniani, *Scrittori Liguri*, p. 63.

(*c*) Philippus Elſſius, *in Encomiaſtic. Auguſtiniano, apud* Juſtinianum, p. 63.

(*d*) Raffael Soprani, *li Scrittori della Liguria*, pag. 21.

curious [*A*]. Beſides, he was mightily pleaſed with diſguiſing himſelf under fictitious names in the title pages of his books. Perhaps he durſt not write under his true name upon ſubjects not quite conformable to a religious life, ſuch as were the diſputes of the wits concerning the Adonis of the Cavalier Marino [*B*], and points of that nature [*C*]. Perhaps he was naturally pleaſed with ſearching after different alluſions, or with perplexing thoſe who love to take off the maſk from a diſguiſed Author. He loved this employment well enough himſelf [*D*]. However if you conſult the Authors who have given us a catalogue of the writers of Liguria (*e*), you will find by the title of his works that

(*e*) Raffael Soprani & Michel Juſtiniani, *en* 1667; Auguſtin Oldoïni, *en* 1680.

[*A*] *He publiſhed a book concerning the Library of the Auguſtin Monks at Vintimiglia, which is much ſought after by the curious.*] Morhof had heard this book much talked of; but he did not know that it had been printed. He mentions it in ſeveral places of his *Polyhiſtor* (1), publiſhed in 1688, and always as if he did not believe that work had been yet publiſhed. It is nevertheleſs certain that the *Bibliotheca Aproſiana* was printed at Bologna, anno 1673, and that Martin Fogelius (2), Profeſſor at Hamburgh, had a copy of it, as Morhof might have ſeen in the Catalogue of that Profeſſor's books; for he quotes that Catalogue (3), which was printed in the year 1678. See what Mr. Placcius obſerves in his *Invitatio amica* publiſhed at Hamburgh in the year 1689. He adds, that he has mentioned that work of Aproſio in his *Pſeudonymie* (4), and refers us to the Notes upon the Catalogue of Rhodius (5). Indeed, he tells us at page 150 of his *Pſeudonymie*, that he learnt by a letter from Mr. Magliabecchi to Martin Vogelius, that Aproſio under the feigned name of *Cornelio Aſpaſio Antivigilmi tra i vagabondi di Tabbia detto l'Aggirato* had publiſhed a book in 12, in the year 1673, entitled *Bibliotheca Aproſiana, paſſa tempo Autonnale*. In the notes upon the Catalogue of Rhodius, what Scavenius had ſaid is called in queſtion, that Aproſio had written a book intitled *Bibliotheca Apocryphorum*, wherein he reſtored ſeveral works to their real Authors (6). That is made a doubt of, becauſe in the Catalogues of Aproſio's works there is no mention of this *Bibliotheca Apocryphorum*, but only of *Bibliotheca Aproſia*. But it is thought that Scavenius might eaſily change *Aproſia* into *Apocrypha*. It is a little ſtrange that Father Oldoini has not mentioned the *Bibliotheca Aproſiana paſſa tempo Autonnale*, as he did not publiſh his *Athenæum Liguſticum* till the year 1680. It is very true that he does enumerate amongſt Aproſio's writings the *Bibliotheca Aproſiana* and *Antiquitates Abintimillienſes*; but in ſuch a manner as would incline one to think that that work had not yet been printed. Mr. Teſſier in 1686 has rather left the matter in doubt than decided any thing (7). Morhof remarks that Mr. Leti cites an Author, who has quoted the ſecond tome of the Aproſian *Bibliotheca*. *Producit idem Leti ex Abbate Libanoro, pag.* 379, *locum, quo tomus ſecundus Bibliothecæ Aproſianæ citatur, quo multi continentur ab Hieron. Savanorola manuſcripti libri* (8). i. e. "Leti produces a paſſage from "the Abbot Libanori, pag. 379, wherein the ſecond "tome of the *Bibliotheca Aproſiana* is quoted, in which "are contained many manuſcript books by Jerom "Savanorola."

This citation from Mr. Leti is very juſt: and by it and ſome other conſiderations, I am verily perſuaded that Morhof does not quote *l'Italia regnante* upon the credit of others; but that he had read it himſelf. How then comes it to paſs that he does not know that the *Bibliotheca Aproſiana* was printed at Bologna by the Manoleſſi, in the year 1673 in 12? Does not Mr. Leti poſitively affirm it in the 377th page of the fourth part of his *Italia regnante*, and does not he quote long paſſages of that book of Aproſio? He adds, that the Author having given an account of his Life to page 262, names after that, to page 666, divers Writers who had given him their works (9); and that the firſt volume only contains ſuch Writers whoſe names begin either with the letters A, B, or C. He believes that the following volumes will be ſpeedily printed; but he had been aſſured that the ſecond was not publiſhed, from whence he concludes that the Father Libanori, who quotes it, had only ſeen it in manuſcript (10). That work of Mr. Leti was printed in 1676.

[*B*] *Perhaps he durſt not write under his true name upon the diſputes of the wits concerning the Adonis of the Cavalier Marino.*] The Cavalier Stigliani having publiſhed the book of *l'Occhiale*, or *the Spectacles*, which is a ſmart cenſure of the Adonis, found himſelf attacked on all ſides (11). It was perceivable how much Italy was at that time infatuated with the Adonis. People ran into the quarrel as to a fire; but amongſt all who took up the pen for the Cavalier Marino, *no body ſhewed more zeal for the Adonis, nor more fire againſt the enemies of that Poem than Father Aproſio de Vintimiglia, an Auguſtin Monk* (12). He publiſhed *l'Occhiale Stritolato di Scipio Glareano per riſpoſta al Signor Cavaliere Fra Tomaſo Stigliani* (13). i. e. "The "Spectacles broken by Scipio Glareano, being an an"ſwer to Signor Cavaliere Fra Tomaſo Stigliani." *La Sferza Poëtica di Sapricio Saprici, lo Scantonata Accademico Heteroclito per riſpoſta alla prima cenſura dell' Adone del Cavalier Marino, fatta dal Cavalier Tomaſo Stigliani* (14). That is, "The poetical Scourge of "Sapricio Saprici, being an anſwer to the firſt "cenſure of the Cavalier Marino's Adonis, by Cava"lier Tomaſo Stigliani." *Del Veratro, Apologia di Sapricio Saprici, per riſpoſta alla ſeconda cenſura dell' Adone del Cavalier Marino, fatta dal Cavaliere Fra Tomaſo Stigliani.* i. e. "Hellebore, an Apology of "Sapricio Saprici, being an anſwer to the ſecond "cenſure of Cavalier Marino's Adonis, by Cavalier "Fra Tomaſo Stigliani." This work is divided into two treatiſes (15): it was an Hellebore given at two doſes. He wrote againſt the ſame Stigliani, *Il Vaglio Critico di Maſoto Galiſtoni da Terama ſopro il mondo nuovo del Cavalier Fra Tomaſo Stigliani da Matera* (16). i. e. "The critical Sieve "of Maſoto Galiſtoni da Terama for the new world "of the Cavalier Fra Tomaſo Stigliani da Matera." *Il Burato, Replica di Carlo Galiſtoni al Molino del Sig. Carlo Stigliani* (17). i. e. "The Bolter, or the Re"ply of Carlo Galiſtoni to the Mill of Sig. Carlo "Stigliani." Note that Maſoto Galiſtoni da Terama is the Anagram of Tomaſo Stigliani da Matera, and that inſtead of putting in the title *in Trevigi, per Girolamo Righettini*, it is ſo, *in Roſtock, per Willermo Wallop*, becauſe that Righettini was a Bookſeller of but little note. Aproſio gives that account in pages 112 and 113 of the *Bibliotheca Aproſiana* (18).

[*C*] *His writings treated of ſubjects remote from a religious life —— or points of that nature.*] I don't think that the diſputes about the Cavalier Marino's Adonis were more remote from a monaſtick profeſſion, than the following works. *Annotationi di Oldauro Scioppio all' Arte de gli Amanti dell' Illuſtriſſimo Signor Pietro Michele Nobile Veneto* (19). *Lo Scudo di Rinaldo, overo lo Specchio del diſinganno, opera di Scipio Glareano* (20). *Le Bellezze della Beliſa Tragedia dell' Illuſtriſſimo Signor D. Antonio Muſcettola, abbozzate da Oldauro Scioppio Academico Incognito, Geniale, &c* (21). There are ſeveral ſuch like compoſitions amongſt the writings of Angelico Aproſio that are not printed; but it muſt not be denied, I, That there are likewiſe to be ſeen amongſt them the *Lectures* which he made *upon the Prophet Jonas*, in the Church of our Lady of the Conſolation, at Genoa, in the year 1649, and the following (22). II, That he publiſhed in 1643, under the name of Oldauro Scioppio, the Italian tranſlation which he had made of the Spaniſh Sermons of Auguſtin Oſorius.

[*D*] *The buſineſs of unmaſking diſguiſed Authors was what he took great delight in.*] It was not abſolutely without foundation that Scavenius aſſerted, that Aproſio had written a book called *Bibliotheca Apocryphorum*, where he had reſtored ſeveral performances to their real Authors; for it is to him that two writings are aſcribed, one whereof is intitled, *La Viſpera alzata Nezataſte di alcuni Scrittori che andarono in Maſchera ſupri del tempo di Carnevale*; and the other, which is only a ſequel to the foregoing, is called *Pentecoſte di alcuni*

(1) Pag. 38, 59, 144.

(2) Or *Vogelius*.

(3) *Polyhiſt.* pag. 37.

(4) Num. 74.

(5) Pag. 27, 28.

(6) See the note [*D*].

(7) Teiſſier, *Catalog. Auctorum Biblioth. &c.* pag. 18.

(8) Morhof, *Polyhiſt.* p. 38.

(9) *Narrando la ſua Vita con l'inſerirvi varie curioſita intorno ad amici ſuoi.* Leti, *Ital. regn.* Parte 4. p. 378.

(10) Ibid. pag. 379, 380.

(11) *See* Baillet, *Jug. ſur les Poëtes* tom. 4. p. 198.

(12) Ibid. pag. 200.

(13) Printed at Venice in 1641.

(14) Printed at Venice in 1643.

(15) One printed in 1645, the other in 1647, at Venice.

(16) Printed at Trevigio, in 1637.

(17) Printed at Venice in 1642.

(18) Leti, *Italia regnante*, Part 4. pag. 360.

(19) Printed at Venice in 1642.

(20) Printed at Venice in 1642.

(21) Printed at Lovain in 1664.

(22) Soprani, *Scrittori della Liguria*, p. 23.

that he assumed a thousand fictitious names, sometimes that of *Masoto Galistoni*, sometimes that of *Carlo Galistoni*, sometimes that of *Scipio Glareano*, sometimes that of *Sapricio Saprici*, sometimes that of *Oldauro Scioppio*, &c. You may find his life in the book intitled *La Bibliotheca Aprosiana*. Several Authors have given him great commendations, and some perhaps have passed the bounds of reason (*f*). He was admitted amongst other Academies into that of *gli Incogniti* of Venice, as appears by the book intitled *Le Glorie de gli Incogniti, overo gli huomini illustri dell' Academia de' i Signori Incogniti di Venetia* [*E*], where there is a large encomium on him. He was alive in the year 1680, when Oldoini published his *Athenæum Ligusticum*.

(*f*) *Magnifica ejus & planè invidenda elogia adferuntur à* Gregorio Leti, *Italia regnante*, Part 4. lib. 3. pag. 377. *Polyhist.* Morhofii, pag. 38. See also p. 144.

Autori Anonimi è Pseudonimi scoperti per Mantissa della Necatasse della Visiera alzata Father Oldoini does not tell us whether these two works were printed or not; he only says that Aprosio wrote them under another name: and one cannot conclude that they were printed, from what he cites in the following page, *La Visiera alzata evulgata sub nomine Friani Forbottæ*; "The Visiera alzata was published under the name "of Frianus Forbotta;" for he plainly acquaints us that this Forbotta is a distinct person from Angelico Aprosio (23). There is no room to doubt but that the two works which he attributes to our Aprosio were the same which he has spoken of in the Journal of Leipsic (24). They were printed at Parma in 1689. The name which stands in the front is *Jean Pierre Villani de Sienne, Academicien Humoriste, Infecond, & Genialis*. It appears that they had been dedicated as early as the year 1678 to Messieurs Magliabecchi.

(23) Oldoïnus, *in Append.* Athen. Ligust.

(24) *Mense Jul.* 1690. p. 363.

[*E*] *It appears by the book entitled* Delle Glorie de Gli Incogniti, *that he was a Member of that Academy.*] It was printed at Venice in 1647, in 4to. Father Labbe thought that John Francis Lauredan was the Author of it (25); but others did not think so, for this, amongst other reasons, that the Elogium of Lauredan, which is in that book, is too pompous to be attributed to Lauredan himself (26). It is supposed that the verses which are at the beginning of the work, and which compliment Lauredan, not as the Author of the book, but as the Founder of the Academy *de gli Incogniti*, have been the occasion of Father Labbe's mistake.

(25) Labbe, *Bibliot. Bibliothecar.* p. 118. edit. anni 1678.

(26) Placcius *de Anonymis*, pag. 115. See in the same Vol. the *Catal. of Rhodius*, p. 25, 26.

APROSIO (PAUL AUGUSTIN) a Civilian, and Apatiste Academician of Florence, was born at Vintimiglia, of one of the principal families of the place, and which can boast of having produced, from the beginning of the seventeenth Century, to the year 1667, nine Doctors of Law, and one Physician. He of whom I am speaking having studied at Genoa under the Jesuits, went to Rome, to study the Law there. He was received Doctor in the year 1649; after which he returned home, bought many curious books, and retired to a country house, that he might peaceably enjoy the pleasure of reading and composing. He wrote *Notes upon the Belisa of Antonio Muscetola*, which have been printed with the *Bellezze della medezima abozzate da Oldauro Scioppio*, in 1664. When *le Soprani*, from whom I borrowed this article, published his Catalogue of the Writers of Liguria in 1667, our Aprosio laboured at a great work of morality on the defeat of the capital vices, by the contrary virtues. (*a*) Oldoini informs me that this work was printed at Genoa in 1674, and dedicated to the Prince of Monaco.

(*a*) *Strage de Vitii capitali trionfati dalle Virtu opposte.*

APULEIUS (LUCIUS) a Platonist known to all the world by the famous work of the *Golden Ass*, lived in the second Century, under the Antonines [*A*]. He was of Madaura a Roman Colony in Africa [*B*]. His family was considerable [*C*].

[*A*] *He lived in the second Century, under the Antonines* (1).] Peter Pithon strongly rejecting those who say that Apuleius lived after Theodosius, proves that he lived about the time of Antoninus Pius, and afterwards (2). This opinion is built upon such good reasons, that I do not find any one that does not embrace it. It is manifest that one Scipio Orsitus, that one Lollianus Avitus, that one Claudius Maximus, that one Lollius Urbicius, of whom Apuleius speaks as persons then living, lived under the Antonines. Father Noris makes a wrong criticism upon Elmenhorst: he imputes to him the having acknowledged his ignorance concerning the time in which Apuleius lived (3), and shews him two passages of the Apology of Apuleius, in one of which Antoninus is not honoured with the title of *Divus*, and the other mentions the Proconsul Lollianus Avitus, who was Consul in 144. The absence of *Divus* is a pretty good proof that Antoninus was still alive. Father Noris would not have been in the wrong, if he whom he criticises had not said as follows: *Quo anno natus* (Apuleius) *non liquido liquet. Verisimiliter tamen possumus adserere eum temporibus Antonini Pii Divorumque fratrum vixisse. Meminit enim * Lolliani Aviti, Lollii † Urbicii Pudentis, & ‡ Scipionis Orphiti Coss. qui sub Antonino præcipue floruerunt, summis macti honoribus, ut constat ex* L. 3. ff. de his quæ in testament. delent. & L. 3. §. 2. ff. de Decurion. (4). i. e. "In what year he "(*Apuleius*) was born, is not very clear. But we "may with probability assert, that he lived in the "time of Antoninus Pius and his brothers. For he "makes mention of Lollianus Avitus, Lollius Urbi"cius Pudens, and Scipio Orphitus the Consuls, who "principally flourished under Antoninus, and obtain"ed the highest honours." The passage, wherein Antoninus is not called *Divus*, contains the reproaches which Apuleius casts upon his wife's son, on his producing some love-letters of his mother. *Hucusque à vobis miserum istum puerum depravatum, ut matris suæ epistolas, quas putat amatorias, pro tribunali Proconsulis recitet apud virum sanctissimum Claudium Maximum, ante has Imperatoris Pii statuas filius matris suæ pudenda exprobret stupra, & amores objectet* (5). Jonsius is doubly mistaken, when to prove that Apuleius lived in the time I have assigned him, he says that this Philosopher gives Antoninus Pius the title of *Divus* (6). The fact is false, and no consequence can be deduced from it.

(1) And not under Domitian, with Apollonius of Tyana, as Anastasius Nicæus, *Quæstione* 23 *in Scripturam*. Observe that others ascribe this work to *Anastasius Sinaïta*.

(2) Pithœus, *Adversarior.* lib. 2. cap. 10.

(3) Noris, *Cenotaph. Pisan.* pag. 33.

* *Apolog.* p. 289. *Capitol. Antonino*, 27.

† *Apolog.* pag. 274. *Capitolin. Pertinace*, 78.

‡ Apuleii, *Floridor*, p. 357, 358.

(4) Elmenh. *in Vitâ Apuleii.*

(5) Apuleii *Apologia*, p. 327.

(6) Jonsius, *de Script. Histor. Philos.* p. 267.

[*B*] *He was of Madaura, a Roman Colony in Africa.*] This city, which belonged to Syphax, was given to Masinissa by the Romans. *Neque hoc eo dixi, quo me patriæ meæ pæniteret, etsi adhuc Syphacis oppidum essemus: quo tamen victo, ad Masinissam regem concessimus, munere populi Romani, ac deinceps veteranorum militum novo conditu, splendidissima colonia sumus* (7). i. e. "Nor did I say this, as if I repented of my coun"try, tho' we were a town of Syphax: which being "overcome, we were given to Masinissa by the Ro"man people, and since by a new foundation of ve"teran soldiers we are become a splendid Colony." A little before, he had said there was no shame in participating, like Cyrus, of different nations. *De patriâ meâ verò quod eam sitam Numidiæ & Gætuliæ in ipso confinio meis scriptis ostendisti, quibus memet professus sum . . . . Seminumidam & Sæmigætulum, non video quod mihi sit in ea re pudendum, haud minus quam Cyro majori, quod genere mixto fuit, Semimedus ac Semipersa.* i. e. "But as to my country, it is shewn to "be on the borders of Numidia and Gætulia in my "own writings, wherein I have professed myself half

(7) Apul. *Apologia*, p. 289.

able [C]. He was well educated; he had a fine perſon; he had wit, and became learned; but he made himſelf be ſuſpected of Magick, and this ill character does great injury ſtill to his memory. He ſtudied firſt at Carthage, then at Athens, afterwards at Rome [D], where he learnt the Latin tongue, without any body's help. An inſatiable curioſity to know every thing engaged him to undertake ſeveral journies, and to enter himſelf into ſeveral ſocieties of religion [E]. He had a mind to ſee the bottom of their pretended myſteries, and it was for that reaſon that he deſired to be initiated amongſt them. He

" a Numidian and half a Gætulian, I do not ſee that " I have any more reaſon to be aſhamed of this, " than Cyrus the Great had of being a mixt breed, " half a Mede and half a Perſian." A certain man, who had a mind to ſet up for a general Cenſor, about the end of the ſixteenth Century falls in this place into our hands. After having ſaid that Lucian, under the pretended ſhape of an aſs, teaches a thouſand obſcenities, he adds, *Apuleius hunc imitatus, ut vir Græcus ſe Latinè neſciviſſe ingenuè, confeſſus in Aſino aureo planè rudit* (8). i. e. " Apuleius imitating " him, and as he was a Greek being ignorant of La- " tin, as he ingenuouſly confeſſes, quite brays in his " golden aſs." Firſt it is not true, that Apuleius confeſſes he does not underſtand Latin: he ſays only, 1, that he did not underſtand it, the firſt time he came to Rome; 2, that he learned it without a maſter. In the ſecond place it is not true that he was a Greek. Madaura was a Roman Colony; and when he endeavours to juſtify himſelf by the example of the other Poets, he quotes the Greeks as foreigners, and the Latins, as his countrymen. *Fecere tamen & alii talia, & .... apud Græcos Teius quidam .... Apud nos verò Ædituus & Portius, & Catulus* (9). The truth of it is, the Latin tongue was not common at Madaura. Apuleius, a ſon of one of the principal Magiſtrates, underſtood nothing of it when he came to Rome. The ſon of his wife Pudentilla underſtood only the Punic with a little Greek, which his mother being originally of Theſſalia had taught him. *Loquitur nunquam niſi Punicè, & ſi quid adhuc à matre Græciſſat: Latinè enim neque vult neque poteſt* (10).

(8) Claudius Verderius, *in Auctores pene omnes Cenſion.* p. 73. This book was printed at Lyons in 1586, in 4°.

(9) Apuleii *Apologia*, p. 278.

(10) Ibid. pag. 336.

[C] *His family was conſiderable.*] His Father's name was Theſeus. It is known only by theſe words: *Si contentus lare parvulo, Theſei illius cognominis patris tui virtutes æmulaveris* (11). He had born the office of Decemvir at Madaura. It was the principal poſt of a Colony. *In quâ coloniâ patrem habui loco principe Duumviralem, cunctis honoribus perfunctum* (12). His mother's name was Salvia (13); ſhe was originally of Theſſalia and deſcended from the family of Plutarch. He ſays ſo himſelf, at the beginning of his Romance. Saint Auguſtin acknowledges in his fifth Letter, that Apuleius was of a good family. See below the note [E], quotation (18).

(11) Apul. *Metam.* lib. 1. pag. 112.

(12) Idem, *Apologiæ*, pag. 289.

(13) Idem, *Metamorph.* lib. 2. pag. 115.

[D] *He ſtudied firſt at Carthage, then at Athens, afterwards at Rome.*] We ſhould not find this gradation, if we were to ſtop at the Prologue of his Romance, ſeeing he ſays nothing in it of Carthage. He contents himſelf with ſaying that his firſt ſtudy was the Greek language in Greece, and that afterwards he came to Rome, where he ſtudied Latin without the help of any maſter. *Ibi linguam Attidem primis pueritiæ ſtipendiis merui, mox in urbe Latia advena ſtudiorum Quiritium indigenam ſermonem ærumnabili labore, nullo magiſtro præeunte, aggreſſus excolui.* This narration is deceitful: it is far from being exact; it muſt be rectified by other paſſages of Apuleius. Should we be ſurprized at an Author's making an ill relation of another's actions? does not he ſometimes relate his own very confuſedly? Here follow other paſſages of our Author. He tells the Carthaginians, that he had ſtudied amongſt them in his infancy, and had alſo there began to embrace the ſect of the Platoniſts. *Sum vobis nec lare alienus, nec pueritiâ inviſitatus, nec magiſtris peregrinus, nec ſectâ incognitus. .... Enimverò & pueritia apud vos, & magiſtri vos; & ſecta, licet Athenis Atticis confirmata, tamen hic inchoata eſt* (14): to which he adds, *Hanc ego vobis mercedem, Carthaginienſes, ubique gentium dependo pro diſciplinis, quas in pueritiâ ſum apud vos adeptus. Ubique enim me veſtræ civitatis alumnum fero* (15). i. e. " I pay " you this reward, O Carthaginians, every where for " the learning I had amongſt you in my childhood. " For I declare myſelf every where a child of your " city." Some pages after, he enumerates the ſciences he ſtudied at Athens. *Prima cratera Litteratoris ruditatem eximit; ſecunda Grammatici doctrinâ inſtruit: tertia Rhetoris eloquentiâ armat. Hactenus à pleriſque potatur. Ego & alias crateras Athenis bibi; Poeticæ commentam, Geometricæ limpidam, Muſicæ dulcem, Dialecticæ auſterulam, enimvero univerſæ Philoſophiæ inexplebilem, ſcilicet nectaream* (16). i. e. " The firſt " cup, of the Schoolmaſter, takes off ignorance: the " ſecond, of the Grammarian, furniſhes with learn- " ing: the third, of the Rhetorician, arms with elo- " quence. Thus deep moſt perſons drink. But I " drank of other cups alſo at Athens: the fictitious " one of Poetry, the clear one of Geometry, the ſweet " one of Muſic, the rough one of Dialectic, nay and " the inexhauſtible, nectareous one of univerſal Phi- " loſophy." Some will have it that he ſtudied in Greece at two different times; firſt, before he ſtudied at Carthage, and afterwards when he had ſtudied in that city. They ſay nothing of Rome: and pretend it was at Carthage that he learned Latin (17). This laſt fact is evidently proved falſe by the Prologue of the *Golden Aſs*.

(14) Idem, Floridor. pag. 359.

(15) Idem, ibid. pag. 361.

(16) Idem, ibid. pag. 363.

(17) He ſpent the firſt years of his infancy in Greece, and the following at Carthage, where he learned Latin without a maſter; and with a good deal of labour. He began alſo to ſtudy Philoſophy there. He went afterwards to Athens, where he learned Poetry, &c. Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 2. pag. 722.

[E] *His inſatiable curioſity to know every thing engaged him to .... inliſt himſelf in ſeveral religious Societies.*] He makes himſelf ſpeak theſe words in the third book of the Golden Aſs. *Paveo & formido ſolidè domus hujus operta detegere, & arcana dominæ meæ revelare ſecreta. Sed melius de te doctrinâque tuâ præſumo, qui præter generoſam natalium dignitatem, præter ſublime ingenium, ſacris pluribus initiatus, profecto noſti ſanctam ſilentii fidem* (18). i. e. " I am " afraid and dread to reveal the ſecrets of this houſe. " But I preſume better of you and your doctrine, " who beſides the honour of your generous birth, " beſides your ſublime genius, having been ini- " tiated into many rites, know full well the ſacred " obligation of ſilence." He finiſhes his romance with a narration of his entrance into the Religion of Oſiris. It was at Rome, that he had this honour. He was not long in the lower claſs of the initiated; he ſoon aroſe to the higheſt degrees. *Denique per dies admodum pauculos, Deus Deûm magnorum potior, & majorum ſummus, & ſummorum maximus, & maximorum regnator Oſiris non in alienam quampiam perſonam reformatus, ſed coram ſuo illo venerando me dignatus affla- mine, per quietem præcipere viſus eſt. .... Ac ne ſacris ſuis gregi cætero permixtus deſervirem, in collegium me Paſtophororum ſuorum, imo inter ipſos Decurionum quinquennales elegit.* i. e. " At laſt for a very few days " the greater God of great Gods, and the greateſt of " greater, and the Ruler of the greateſt, Oſiris, not " being changed into any other form, but plainly " thought fit to afford me his venerable inſpiration, " and ſeemed in my ſleep to command me .... and " that I might not ſerve in his rites, mixed with the " reſt of the troop, he choſe me into the college of his " *Paſtophouri*, nay into the very *Decuriones quinquenna- les.*" Before he came to Rome, he had been initiated into the myſteries of Iſis: they were the firſt fruits of the recovery of his human ſhape. He mixes, in the deſcription of theſe ceremonies, abundance of noble ſentiments, and ſuch as are not unworthy the true Religion. As for example: *Te jam nunc obſequio religionis noſtræ dedica, & miniſterii jugum ſubi voluntarium, nam cum cæperis Deo ſervire, tunc magis ſenties fructum tuæ libertatis* (19). i. e. " Now dedi- " cate thyſelf to the obedience of our Religion, and " ſubmit thyſelf willingly to the yoke of the Mini- " ſtry; for as ſoon as thou haſt begun to ſerve the " Goddeſs, thou wilt perceive the fruit of thy liber- " ty." Thoſe who accuſed him of magic, objected to him amongſt other things, that he kept I know not what in his handkerchief with a particular ſuperſtition. This is his anſwer: *Vin dicam cujuſmodi illas res in ſudario obvolutas laribus Pontiani commendarim? Mos tibi geretur. Sacrorum pleraque initia in Græcia participavi.*

(18) Apuleii, *Metamorph.* pag. 136.

(19) *Metamorph.* lib. 11. p. 264.

He ſpent almoſt all his eſtate in theſe travels [F], inſomuch, that being returned to Rome, and deſiring to dedicate himſelf to the ſervice of Oſiris, he had not money enough to ſupport the expence of the ceremonies of the reception. He pawned even his clothes to raiſe the neceſſary ſum (a): after which he got his livelihood by pleading cauſes; and, as he was very eloquent, and was maſter of a ſubtle genius, he did not want cauſes, and even thoſe very conſiderable ones (b). But he rendered his circumſtances more eaſy by a good marriage, than by his pleadings. A widow named Pudentilla, who was neither young nor handſome, but wanted a huſband, and was very rich, liked him greatly [G]. He

(a) See the note [F].

(b) *Quæ res ſummum peregrinationi meæ tribuebat ſolatium, nec minus etiam victum uberiorem ſubminiſtrabat. Quidni? Spiritu faventis eventus quæſticulo fovenſi nutrito per patrocinia ſermonis Romani... quam nunc incontanter gloriosa in foro redderem patrocinia.* Apuleius, *Metam.* lib. 11. pag. 272. edit. Elmenhorſtii, an. 1621, in 8vo.

participavi. Eorum quædam ſigna & monumenta tradita mihi à ſacerdotibus ſedulo conſervo. Nihil inſolitum, nihil incognitum dico. Vel unius Liberi patris ſymmiſtæ, qui adeſtis, ſcitis quid domi conditum celetis, & abſque omnibus profanis tacitè veneremini. At ego, ut dixi, multijuga ſacra, & plurimos ritus, varias ceremonias, ſtudio veri & officia erga Deos didici. Nec hoc ad tempus compono, ſed abhinc fermè triennium eſt, cum primis diebus quibus Oeeam veneram, publicè diſſerens de Æſculapii majeſtate, eadem iſta præ me tuli, & quot ſacra noſſem percenſui. Ea diſputatio celebratiſſima eſt, vulgo legitur, in omnium manibus verſatur..... Etiamne cuiquam mirum videri poteſt, cui ſit ulla memoria religionis, hominem tot myſteriis Deûm conſcium, quædam ſacrorum crepundia domi adſervare, atque ea lineo texto involvere, quod puriſſimum eſt rebus divinis velamentum (20). i. e. "Would you have "me tell you what ſort of things I kept wrapt up in "my handkerchief and recommended to the Lares "of Pontianus? you ſhall be obeyed. I was initiated into moſt of the rites in Greece. I carefully "preſerve ſome ſigns and monuments of them which "were delivered to me by the Prieſts. I mention "nothing unuſual, or unknown. Even you the *Symmiſtæ* of Father Bacchus, who are preſent, know "what you keep laid up at home, and ſilently revere "in the abſence of the profane. But I, as I ſaid "before, have learned many ſacred things, and many rites, and various ceremonies, out of deſire after truth and duty to the Gods. Nor do I make "this for the preſent occaſion, but it is now three "years, ſince when I firſt came to Oeea, I diſputed "publickly concerning the majeſty of Æſculapius, "and mentioned theſe very things, and related how "many ſacred things I was acquainted with. That "diſputation is very famous, is frequently read, and "is in every one's hands.... Can it now ſeem ſtrange "to any one, who has any memory of Religion, that "a man conſcious to ſo many myſteries of Gods "ſhould keep at home ſome *crepundia* of their rites, "and wrap them up in a linnen cloth, which is the "moſt pure covering for divine things." It is probable, that if Apuleius was a Magician, his crime was incomparably leſs than that of the modern Magicians, becauſe he did not know that they were nothing but evil Spirits, who ſet themſelves to do certain things in the preſence of certain ceremonies. He thought with the Platoniſts, that the good Spirits were capable alſo of doing it (21). I have quoted Saint Auguſtin in the text of this article, who bears witneſs that Apuleius had a religious dignity, which gave him the ſuperintendance of the combats of Gladiators. *Sacerdos Provinciæ pro magno fuit, ut munera ederet venatoreſque veſtiret* (22). Laſtly, I find that our Author had conſecrated himſelf to the worſhip of Æſculapius, one of the principal Divinities of the Carthaginians, and that he had a dignity alſo in this College. *Principium mihi apud veſtras aureis auſpicatiſſimum ab Æſculapio Deo capiam, qui arcem veſtræ Carthaginis indubitabili numine propitius reſpicit. Ejus Dei hymnum Græco & Latino carmine vobis ſic canam, jam illi à me dedicatum. Sum enim non ignotus illius* SACRICOLA, *nec recens cultor, nec ingratus* ANTISTES (23). i. e. "I ſhall begin in the moſt auſpicious "manner with the God Æſculapius, who moſt undoubtedly looks down with favour on your Carthage. I will ſing you a hymn in Greek and Latin verſe, which I have dedicated to him before. "For I am neither one of his unknown PRIESTS, "nor a new worſhipper, nor an unpleaſing PRELATE."

(20) Idem, *Apolog.* p. 309, 310.

(21) See the diſpute of St. Auguſtin againſt the opinion *de* Apuleius in the 8th book of *Civit. Dei*, chap. 19, &c.

(22) *Auguſt.* Epiſt. 5.

(23) Apuleius, *Florid.* pag. 361.

[F] *He ſpent almoſt all his wealth in his travels.*] This was not the only cauſe of the poverty into which he fell: he was at other more laudable expences: at leaſt he boaſted of them, when he anſwered the reproach which had been thrown on him on account of his miſerableneſs. *Ad iſtum modum deſponſus ſacris, ſumptuum tenuitate contra votum meum retardabar: nam & viriculas patrimonii peregrinationis attriverant impenſæ* (24). i. e. "Being thus devoted to ſacred "things, I was retarded contrary to my deſire by the "ſmallneſs of my fortune: for even the charges of "my travelling had worn out my ſmall patrimony." It is thus that he ſpeaks, when he repreſents the difficulty he found himſelf in at Rome, on account of his vocation to the brotherhood of Oſiris. He was engaged to this myſterious congregation; the promiſes were given; but as nothing is done for nothing, ſomething was to be paid for the inaugural ceremonies, and he had not wherewithal to ſupply that expence. He was obliged, in a manner, to ſell as far as his very ſhirt: the Divinity, that preſſed him, ſhewed him there was no other remedy. *Jamque ſæpiculè non ſine magna turbatione ſtimulatus, poſtremo juſſus veſte ipſa mea quamvis parvula diſtracta ſufficientem corrasi ſummulam, & id ipſum præceptum fuerat ſpecialiter. An tu, inquit, ſi quam rem voluptati ſtruendæ molireris laciniis tuis nequaquam parceres, nunc tantas ceremonias aditurus impœnitendæ te pauperiei contaris committere* (25)? i. e. "And now being often ſpurred "on not without great diſturbance, at length being "commanded, I ſold even my poor cloaths, and "ſo ſcrap'd up a little ſum that was ſufficient, and "that was particularly commanded. Would you, "ſays he, ſpare a rag if you was about ſatisfying "of your pleaſures; and now you are about to enter "into ſuch great ceremonies, do you ſtick at committing yourſelf to a poverty that is in no wiſe to be "deſpiſed?" At that time, he aſcribes his indigence only to the expences of his travels; but on the other occaſion which I have mentioned, he ſays he had expended a great deal upon good works, in ſuccouring his friends, in acknowledging the cares of thoſe who had inſtructed him, and in giving portions to the daughters of ſome of them. He adds, he ſhould have made no difficulty to purchaſe the contempt of his patrimony at the expence of his whole patrimony: a contempt which is more valuable than the patrimony itſelf. This is ſpeaking like a Philoſopher. *Si tamen neſcis* (it is thus that he addreſſes his diſcourſe to his accuſer (26)) *profiteor mihi ac fratri meo relictum à patre H-S. vicies, paulo ſecus; idque à me longa peregrinatione & diutinis ſtudiis, & crebris liberalitatibus modicè imminutum. Nam & amicorum pleriſque opem tuli; & magiſtris plurimis gratiam retuli, quorundam etiam filias dote auxi. Neque enim dubitaſſem equidem vel univerſum patrimonium impendere, ut adquirerem mihi quod majus eſt, contemptum patrimonii.* He had made very ſolid and very moral reflections upon poverty (27).

(24) Apuleius, *Metam.* lib. 11. pag. 271.

(25) Idem, ibid.

(26) Apuleius, *Apol.* p. 288.

(27) Idem, ibid. pag. 285, 286, 287.

[G] *A widow who was neither young nor handſome, but wanted a huſband,.... liked him greatly.*] Apuleius's accuſer affirmed ſhe was ſixty years of age (28): whence he expected to prove that the paſſion ſhe had conceived for the accuſed was not natural, but the effect of ſome magical charm. Apuleius ſhewed that ſhe was not above forty, and that if ſhe had ſpent near fourteen years of it in widowhood, it was not on account of any averſion ſhe had to marriage, but on account of the oppoſitions of her father-in-law: that in fine, this ſtate of continency had ruined her health, inſomuch that the Phyſicians and Midwives had agreed, that there was no better remedy for the ſuffocations that tormented her, than marriage (29). A woman who is told that, and who has no time to loſe, if ſhe has a mind to make uſe of her remaining years of fertility, has no occaſion to be compelled by ſorcery to chooſe a huſband. This was Apuleius's reaſoning, and is pretty ſtrong. *Eo ſcrupulo liberata, cum à principibus viris in matrimonium peteretur, decrevit*

(28) Idem, *Apolog.* p. 317, 330.

(29) Idem, ibid. p. 330.

He was not backward, he was not ſollicitous about reſerving his good mien, his neatneſs [*H*], his wit, and his eloquence, for ſome young wench; he readily married the rich widow in a country houſe near to Oea, a maritime city of Africa. This marriage drew

crevit ſibi diutius in viduitate non permanendum. Quippe ut ſolitudinis tædium perpeti poſſet; tamen ægritudinem corporis ferre non poterat. Mulier ſanctè pudica, tot annis viduitatis ſine culpa, ſine fabula abſuetudine conjugis torpens, & diutino ſitu viſcerum ſaucia, vitiatis intimis uteri, ſæpe ad extremum vitæ diſcrimen doloribus obortis exanimabatur. Medici cum obſtreticibus conſentiebant, penuria matrimonii morbum quæſitum. Malum indies augeri, ægritudinem ingraveſcere: dum ætatis aliquid ſuperſit, nuptiis valetudinem medicandam (30). It is a misfortune to a woman, that there are ſome trials, in which one is obliged to ſpeak a hundred things in full court, which one would rather conceal, whether the natural infirmity has more or leſs ſhare in it than the moral (31). If it had not been for ſuch a trial, Apuleius would never have been brought to diſcover the cauſe of the diſorders with which Pudentilla had been tormented during her widowhood. She found in it however ſome little alleviation; for ſince ſhe had ſuffered ſo much, it was a ſign ſhe had not made uſe of the true remedy. This conſequence was not alledged to the Judges; but it was affirmed that this widow had lived chaſtly, and that there had gone no evil report concerning her. To return to her age: I ſay Apuleius was younger than ſhe, for ſhe had a ſon who had been Apuleius's companion at Athens (32); but I add that he did not marry her without hopes of having children by her. He ſhews this, when he makes anſwer to the reproach that had been caſt on him, for going into the country to be married. After having anſwered, that this courſe had been taken to avoid the expences which would have attended their wedding in the city, he adds, that the country is a place much more favourable to fruitfulneſs than the city, and that to lie on the graſs, and under the ſhade of elms, and in the midſt of an infinite number of productions that grow out of the fruitful boſom of the earth, cannot fail of aſſiſting a new married couple who deſire to have children. He would have done well to keep this thought for his *Florida*, I mean for thoſe rhetorical declamations, wherein he gives a looſe to all the falſe thoughts of his imagination. This place ſpoils his apology, and is fit neither for the Judges to whom he ſpoke, nor for the cauſe which he pleaded. *Immo ſi verum vis, uxor ad prolem multo auſpicatius in villa quam in oppido ducitur: in ſolo uberi, quam in loco ſterili; in agri ceſpite, quam in foci ſilice, mater futura in ipſo materno ſi nubat ſinu, in ſegete adulta ſuper fœcundam glèbam. Vel enim ſub Ulmo marita cubet in ipſo gremio terræ matris inter ſoboles herbarum, & propagines vitium, & arborum germina* (33). We ſhall ſee by and by (34), that it was declared in full court, that Pudentilla was not handſome, and that her contract of marriage contained ſome clauſes which ſuppoſed ſhe was ſtill young enough to have children.

(30) Idem, ibid. pag. 318. CERTAIN trials, why diſpleaſing to the ſex.

(31) See below the note [*I*].

(32) Apuleii, *Apolog.* p. 320.

(33) Apulei, *Apolog.* p. 329.

(34) In the note [*I*].

[*H*] *His good mien, his neatneſs, &c.*] Here are ſome parts of his picture. *At illa obtutum in me converſa, En, inquit, ſanctiſſimæ Salviæ matris generoſa proles. Sed & cætera corporis inexplicabiliter ad regulam congruentia, inenormis proceritas, ſucculenta gracilitas, rubor temperatus, flavum & inaffectatum capillitium, oculi cæſii quidem, ſed vigiles, & in aſpectu micantes prorſus aquilino, quoquo verſum floridi: ſpecioſus & immeditatus inceſſus* (35). i. e. "But ſhe "turning herſelf upon me, ſaid, behold the generous "offſpring of thy moſt holy mother Salvia. But the "other parts of thy body are formed according to an "inexplicable ſymmetry, thy proportionable heighth; "thy ſlenderneſs without leanneſs; thy colour freſh "without being red; thy hair yellow without art; "thy eyes, though grey, yet quick and with the vi-"vacity of an eagle, and ſhining; thy gate agree-"able, without affectation." His accuſers reproached him with his beauty (36), his fine hair, his beautiful teeth, and his looking-glaſs. On the two firſt heads he anſwered, that he was ſorry the accuſation was falſe. *Quod utinam tam gravia formæ & facundiæ crimina verè mihi approbaſſet! non difficile ei reſpondiſſem quod Homericus Alexander Hectori:*

(35) *Metamorph.* lib. 2, pag. 115. See alſo lib. 1. pag. 112.

(36) *Accuſamus apud te Philoſophum formoſum, & tam Græcè quam Latinè probè nefas! diſertiſſimum.* Apuleius, *Apolog.* p. 275.

Ὅυτι ἀποβλητ' ἐπὶ σοῖσι μετὰ φρεσὶν ἠδὲ δόσησι·
Ὅσσα κεν αὐτοὶ δῶσιν, ἑκὼν δ' οὐκ ἄν τις ἕλοιτο.

Hæc ego de forma reſpondiſſem. Præterea, licere etiam Philoſophis eſſe vultu liberali. Pythagoram, qui primum ſeſe Philoſophum nuncuparit, eum ſui ſæculi excellentiſſima forma fuiſſe: item Zenonem..... Sed hæc defenſio, ut dixi, aliquam multum à me remota eſt: cui, præter formæ mediocritatem, continuatio etiam litterati laboris omnem gratiam corpore deterget, habitudinem tenuat, ſuccum exorbet, colorem obliterat, vigorem debilitat. Capillus ipſe, quem iſti aperto mendacio ad lenocinium decoris promiſſum dixêre, vides quàm nos ſit amœnus ac delicatus, horrore implexus atque impeditus, ſtuppeo tomento aſſimilis, & inæqualiter hirtus, & globoſus, & congeſtus: prorſus inenodabilis diutina incuria, non modò comendi ſed ſaltem expediendi & diſcriminandi (37). i. e. "I wiſh he had juſtly re-"proached me with theſe grievous crimes of beauty "and elegance: I ſhould have made no difficulty to "have anſwered him as Paris did Hector in Homer.

(37) Idem, ibid. and pag. 276.

"——Nor thou deſpiſe the charms
"With which a lover golden Venus arms;
"Soft moving ſpeech, and pleaſing outward ſhow,
"No wiſh can gain 'em, but the Gods beſtow.
Pope.

"I ſhould have added, that Philoſophers alſo might "have a handſome face. That Pythagoras, who "firſt called himſelf a Philoſopher, was the moſt "beautiful man of his time; likewiſe Zeno..... "But this defence, as I ſaid, is very remote from "me; who, beſides the indifference of my perſon, have, "by a continuance in learned labours, worn off all "grace from my body, emaciated my plumpneſs, "dried up my juices, obliterated my colour, and "weakened my vigour. My hair, which they have "with an open lie reported to be effeminately long, "is, you ſee, quite the contrary, uncurled and tang-"led, more like ropes, and uneven and clotted; "quite paſt being untangled, through a continual "neglect not only of trimming, but even of opening "and parting it." With regard to the third head, he did not vindicate himſelf from having ſent a friend ſome powder that was good to clean the teeth, and adding ſome verſes, that contained an exact deſcription of the effects of this powder: he maintained that all who ſpoke in publick ought to keep their mouths clean. He had there a fine field of defending his own cauſe, and turning the ridicule upon his adverſary, though probably he had given way to criticiſm, out of too great an affectation to diſtinguiſh himſelf amongſt the Learned. See how eaſy ſome cauſes are to defend, though perhaps one may be a little in the wrong. *Vidi ego dudum*, he anſwered (38), *vix riſum quoſdam tenentem, cum mundicias oris videlicet orator ille aſpere accuſaret, & dentifricium tanta indignatione pronunciaret, quanta nemo quiſquam venenum. Quidni? crimen haud contemnendum Philoſopho, nihil in ſe ſordidum ſinere, nihil uſpiam corporis apertum, immundum pati ac fœtulentum; præſertim os, cujus in propatulo & conſpicuo uſus homini creberrimus: ſive ille cuipiam oſculum ferat, ſeu cum cuiquam ſermocinetur, ſive in auditorio diſſertet, ſive in templo preces alleget. Omnem quippe hominis actum ſermo præit: qui, ut ait poëta præcipuus, è dentium muro proficiſcitur.* That is, "I ſaw ſome who could ſcarce keep from laughing, "when that Orator ſharply accuſed the cleanlineſs of the "mouth, and pronounced tooth-powder with as great "an indignation as one would have ſpoken of poiſon. "It is no contemptible crime truly for a Philoſopher, "to ſuffer nothing naſty about him, to ſuffer no part "of his body which is open to be unclean and ſtinking: "eſpecially the mouth which uſes to be moſt in view; "whether he offers to ſalute any one, or diſcourſes "with any one, or diſputes in the auditory, or prays "in the temple. For the diſcourſe of every man "goes before his action; which as a great Poet ſays, "comes forth from the wall of the teeth." We may

(38) Idem, ibid. pag. 277.

drew on him a troubleſome law-ſuit; the relations of this Lady's two ſons pretended that he made uſe of witchcraft to gain her heart, and her money [*I*]; they accuſed him of being a Magician (*c*), not before Chriſtian Judges, as a Commentator (*d*) pretends, that St.

(*d*) Leon Coqueus *in* Auguſtin. *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 8. c. 19. p. 790. ed. Francof. an. 1661, in 4to; but he is miſtaken: St. Auguſtin ſays quite the contrary.

(*c*) The accuſer's name was *Sicinius Æmilianus*. He was Pudentilla's firſt huſband's brother. Apuleius, *Apologiæ initio.*

form the ſame judgment of the laſt accuſation. It is no crime for a Doctor in any faculty to have a looking-glaſs; but if he was to conſult it too much when he dreſſes himſelf, he might very juſtly be cenſured. In the time of Apuleius, morality was much more rigid than at preſent, with regard to outward appearances; for he durſt not acknowledge that he made uſe of his looking-glaſs. He maintains he might have done it, and proves it by ſeveral philoſophical reaſons, which, to ſay the truth, are much more ingenious than judiciouſly placed; but he denies his conſulting his looking-glaſs. *Sequitur de ſpeculo longa illa & cenſoria oratio, de quo pro rei atrocitate penè diruptus eſt Pudens, clamitans,* Habet ſpeculum Philoſophus, poſſidet ſpeculum Philoſophus. *Ut igitur habere concedam, ne aliquid objeciſſe te credas, ſi negaro, nam tamen ex eo me accipi neceſſe eſt exornari quoque ad ſpeculum ſolere. Plurimis rebus poſſeſſu careo, uſu fruor: quod ſi neque habere utendi argumentum eſt, neque non utendi non habere, & ſpeculi non tam poſſeſſio culpatur quam inſpectio, illud etiam doceat neceſſe eſt quando & quibus præſentibus in ſpeculum inſpexerim, quoniam, ut res eſt, majus piaculum decernis ſpeculum Philoſopho, quam Cereris mundum profano videre* (39). i. e. "Now follows that long and cenſorious "Oration, where Pudens is almoſt burſt with the "heinouſneſs of the thing, crying out, *The Philoſopher "has a looking-glaſs, The Philoſopher keeps a looking-glaſs.* "To grant you therefore that I have one, leſt you "ſhould think you have made any objection, if I "ſhall deny it, it does not neceſſarily follow that I "am uſed to dreſs my ſelf at a glaſs .... I enjoy "the uſe of many things which I do not poſſeſs; "but if neither the having one is an argu-"ment of the uſing it, nor the not having one "of not uſing it, and not ſo much the poſſeſſion as "the uſing of a looking-glaſs, is blamed, he ought "to ſhew when, and in whoſe preſence I made uſe "of a looking-glaſs, becauſe, as the matter ſtands, "you make a looking-glaſs a greater crime in a Phi-"loſopher, than for a profane perſon to behold the "ſecrets of Ceres."

(39) Idem, ibid. p. 281, 282.

Obſerve Juvenal's invective againſt the Emperor Otho, who reckoned his looking-glaſs as one of the principal parts of his equipage for war.

Ille tenet ſpeculum pathici geſtamen Othonis,
Actoris Aurunci ſpolium: quo ſe ille videbat
Armatum, cum jam tolli vexilla juberet.
Res memoranda novis annalibus atque recenti
Hiſtoria, ſpeculum civilis ſarcina belli (40).

That is,

"He holds the mirrour pathic Otho bore
"(AURUNCANE ACTOR's ſpoils) that when he wore
"His arms he viewed himſelf in; when he gave
"The battles ſignal, and bid the enſigns wave.
"A gallant ſubject! for new annals fit,
"And ſhould in our times hiſtory be writ.
"A looking-glaſs did load the Gen'ral's care,
"And was the baggage of a civil war.
Sir Tho. Staplyton.

(40) Juvenal, Sat. 2. ver. 99.

Moreover, it ſeems to me, (but I dare not affirm it,) that Apuleius had his own caſe in view, when he deſcribed that of Marſyas in one of his Orations. He ſuppoſes that Marſyas began with praiſing his tangled locks, his rough beard, and his hairy breaſt, and with reproaching Apollo with an extreme neatneſs. *Marſyas, quod ſtultitiæ maximum ſpecimen eſt, non intelligens ſe deridiculo haberi, priuſquam tibias occiperet inflare, prius de ſe & Apolline quædam deliramenta barbare effutivit; laudans ſeſe quod erat & coma relicinus, & barba ſqualliduſ, & pectore hurſutus, & arte tibicen, & fortuna egenus; contra Apollinem, ridiculum dictu, adverſis virtutibus culpabat. Quod Apollo eſſet & coma intonſus, & genis gratus, & corpore glabellus, & arte multiſcius, & fortuna opulentus .... Lingua fatidica ſeu tute oratione, ſeu verſibus malis, utrobique facundia æquipari ..... Riſere Muſæ, cum audirent hoc genus crimina, ſapienti exoptanda, Apollini objectata* (41), *& tibicinem illum certamine ſuperatum, velut urſum bipedem, corio exacto nudis & laceris viſceribus reliquerunt* (42). i. e. "Marſyas, which is the greateſt mark of folly, not "underſtanding that he was looked upon with con-"tempt, before he began to blow upon his pipe, "firſt of all barbarouſly blabbed out ſome ravings "concerning himſelf and Apollo; praiſing himſelf "for having his hair tangled, his beard ſlovenly, "and his breaſt hairy, for being a piper by trade, "and neceſſitous: on the other ſide he ridiculouſly "blamed Apollo for the oppoſite virtues. That he "was long haired, handſome faced, ſmooth, skilled "in various arts and wealthy ..... that he was "every way equal in propheſying, either in proſe "or verſe, and eloquence. The Muſes laugh-"ed, when they heard ſuch crimes objected to Apollo, "as every wiſe man would have deſired, and when "the piper was overcome they left him, like a two-"footed bear, with his skin ſtript off, and with na-"ked and torn bowels." Obſerve, Apuleius affirms his accuſer was nothing but an ill-favoured country fellow: *Mihi iſtud crede quamquam teterrimum os tuum minimum à Thyeſta tragico demutet, tamen profecto diſcendi cupidine ſpeculum inviſeres, & aliquando relicto aratro mirarere tot in facie tua ſulcos rugarum. At ego non mirer, ſi boni conſulis me de iſto diſtortiſſimo vultu tuo dicere, de moribus tuis multo truculentioribus reticere* (43)? i. e. "Believe me, though your "moſt ugly face is very little different from that of "the tragic Thyeſtes, yet truly you might go to a "looking-glaſs to learn, and leaving the plough, "might ſometimes wonder at ſo many furrows of "wrinkles in your face. But I cannot wonder, if "you take it well that I ſhould ſpeak of that moſt "diſtorted face of yours, and be ſilent concerning "your much more horrid manners."

(42) Apuleius, *Floridor*, p. 341.

(43) Apuleius, *Apol.* p. 284.

(41) See the application which is made of this paſſage in the *Nouvelles de la République des Lettres*, Sept. 1685, Article 7.

[*I*] *He was accuſed of making uſe of Magick arts in order to get poſſeſſion of his wife's heart and money.*] Apuleius was under no neceſſity of making any great defence with regard to this firſt article; for as Pudentilla was determined from conſiderations of health to enter upon a ſecond marriage, even before ſhe had ever ſeen this pretended Magician, the youth, good mien, pleaſant converſation, wit, and the other agreeable qualities of Apuleius were a charm more than ſufficient to engage the heart of this Lady. He had the moſt favourable opportunities in the world of gaining her friendſhip, for he lodged ſome time at her houſe: Pudentilla's eldeſt ſon was entirely fond of him; he was deſirous of the match, and ſollicited him to think of it (44). Apuleius managed all his advantages with a great deal of addreſs, and turned into ridicule the allegations of his accuſers with ſmart and agreeable turns. "You make a wonder of it, ſays he, "that a woman ſhould marry again after having "lived a widow thirteen years: it is much more "wonderful that ſhe did not marry again ſooner. "You think that Magick muſt have been employed "to prevail with a widow of her age to marry a "young man; on the contrary, this very circum-"ſtance ſhews how little occaſion there was for Ma-"gick." *Cur mulier libera tibi nupſit poſt annos tredecim viduitatis? Quaſi non magis mirandum ſit quod tot annis non nupſerit, ... At enim major natu non eſt juvenem aſpernata. Igitur hoc ipſum argumentum eſt nihil opus magiâ fuiſſe ut nubere vellet mulier viro, vidua cælibi, major juniori* (45). If the decree of the Judges had been formed upon the ſentence that was pronounced in a like caſe, by the mother of Alexander the Great, it would have been admirable. Ὁ βασιλεὺς Φίλιππος ἤρα Θετταλῆς γυναικὸς αἰτίαν ἐχούσης κατεφαρμακεύειν αὐτόν· ἐσπούδασε οὖν ἡ Ὀλυμπιὰς λαβεῖν τὴν ἄνθρωπον ὑποχείριον· ὡς δὲ εἰς ὄψιν ἐλθοῦσα, τό, τε εἶδος ὑπερεπῆς ἐφάνη, καὶ διελέχθη πρὸς αὐτὴν οὐκ ἀγενῶς οὐδὲ ἀσυνέτως, χαιρέτωσαν (ἔφην ἡ Ὀλυμπιὰς) αἱ διαβολαί. σὺ γὰρ ἐν σιωπῇ τὰ φάρμακα ἔχεις (46). i. e. "King Philip was in love with a wo-"man of Theſſaly who was accuſed of having be-"witched him. Olympias endeavoured to get the "woman into her hands. As ſoon as ſhe came into "her preſence, and both appeared beautiful, and "ſpoke

(44) Idem, ibid. pag. 320.

(45) Idem, ibid. pag. 291.

(46) Plutarch. *in Præcept. conjug.* pag. 141. B. See the note [*L*] of the article GRANDIER.

St. Auguſtin aſſures us, but before Claudius Maximus Proconſul of Africa, and a Pagan. He defended himſelf very ſtrongly; we have the *Apology* that he pronounced before the Judges; it is a very fine piece (*e*): it ſhews examples of the moſt ſhameful artifices, that the falſhood of an impudent calumniator is capable of exerciſing [*K*]. It has been obſerved that Apuleius, with all his Magick, could never obtain any Magiſtracy, altho' he was of a good family, had been very well educated, and his eloquence was very much eſteemed (*f*). It was not out of a philoſophical contempt, they ſay, that he lived out of political

(*e*) Auguſtinus, *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 8. cap. 19.

(*f*) St. Auguſtin made this remark in his 5th Epiſtle. See the note [*L*] at the end.

" ſpoke to her neither abjectly nor imprudently: " Let there be an end (ſays Olympias) of your accu- " ſations; for you have your incarnations in your " own perſon." Thus much for the article of the conqueſt of the heart. The other, which is that of the money, cauſes ſome ſuſpicions, not of Magic, but of avarice. One can hardly believe but this marriage was a ſacrifice to reaſons of intereſt. However, let us not condemn Apuleius without hearing him. He offers to prove by his marriage-contract, that he got nothing of Pudentilla, but only a promiſe of a very moderate ſum, in caſe he ſurvived her, and had children by her. He ſhews by ſeveral facts, how diſintereſted his conduct had been, and how reaſonable it was for him to exact of his wife the ſum ſhe had promiſed him. It was then that he was obliged in full court to make confeſſions, which Pudentilla would have been glad to excuſe. He ſaid ſhe was neither handſome nor young, nor a ſubject that could any ways tempt him to have recourſe to enchantments, and that there was no room to wonder that ſhe had given great advantages to ſuch as him. *Quod inſtitui pergam diſputare, nullum mihi cauſam fuiſſe Pudentillam veneficiis ad nuptias prolectandi. Formam mulieris & ætatem ipſi ultro improbaverunt, idque mihi vitio dederunt talem uxorem cauſa avaritiæ concupiſſe, atque adeo primo dotem in congreſſu grandem & uberem rapuiſſe* (47) . . . . . *Quamquam quis omnium vel exigue rerum peritus culpare auderet, ſi mulier, vidua & mediocri forma, & non ætate mediocri nubere volens, longa dote & molli conditione invitaſſet juvenem neque corpore, neque animo, neque fortunâ pœnitendum* (48) . . . . . He ſays that Pontianus the ſon of Pudentilla propoſed the marrying his mother to him only as a burthen, and as the action of a friend and a Philoſopher; I mean an action more ſuitable for a friend of Pontianus and a Philoſopher, than a match that might afford at the ſame time both riches and beauty. *Conſidere ſeſe ſore ut id onus recipiam, quoniam non formoſa pupilla, ſed mediocri facie mater liberorum mihi offeratur. Sin hæc reputans formæ & divitiarum gratiâ me ad aliam conditionem reſervarem, neque pro amico neque pro philoſopho facturum* (49). He raiſes extremely the advantages of a maid above a widow. " A fine girl, ſays he, let her be " ever ſo poor, brings you a large portion, a heart " quite new, the flower and the firſt-fruits of her " beauty. It is with a great deal of reaſon that all " huſbands ſet ſo great a value on the flower of vir- " ginity. All the other goods that a woman brings " them, are of ſuch a nature, that they may return " them again if they have a mind to be under no " obligation to her; ſhe may take them back, ſhe " may recover them. That alone cannot be reſtor- " ed; it always remains in the poſſeſſion of the firſt " ſpouſe. If you marry a widow, and ſhe quits you, " ſhe carries away with her all that ſhe brought " you, you cannot boaſt of retaining the leaſt thing " that belonged to her." He obſerves many other inconveniencies that attend the marrying of widows, and concludes, that it would have coſt Pudentilla a good deal to marry, if ſhe had not found a philoſophical humour in him. *Virgo formoſa, etſi ſit oppidò pauper, tamen abunde dotata eſt. Affert quippe ad maritum novam animi indolem, pulcritudinis gratiam, floris rudimentum. Ipſa virginitatis commendatio jure meritoque omnibus maritis acceptiſſima eſt. Nam quodcunque aliud in dotem acceperis, potes cum libuit ne ſis beneficio obſtrictus omne ut acciperas retribuere: pecuniam renumerare, mancipia reſtituere, domo demigrare, prædiis cedere. Sola virginitas cum ſemel accepta eſt reddi nequitur. Sola apud maritum ex rebus dotalibus remanet. Vidua autem qualis nuptiis venit talis divertio digreditur. Nihil affert irrepoſcibile, ſed venit jam ab alio præflorata: certe tibi, ad quæ velis, minime docilis: non minus ſuſpectans novam domum, quam ipſa jam ob unum divortium ſuſpectanda: ſive illa morte amiſit maritum, ut ſævi ominis mulier, & infandi conjugii, minime appetenda; ſui repudio digreſſa eſt, utramvis habebat culpam mulier: quæ aut tam intolerabilis fuit ut repudiaretur, aut tam inſolens, aut repudiaret. Ob hæc & alia viduæ dote auctæ preces ſolicitant. Quod Pudentilla quoque in alio marito feciſſet, ſi Philoſophum ſpernentem dotis non reperiſſet* (50). One might make a good many reflections upon this diſcourſe of Apuleius, if one had nothing elſe to do; but how haſty ſoever I may be to paſs on to other articles, I ſhall ſpeak of two things; one is, that this good which is never taken back out of the hands of a huſband, is very chimerical; there is never a baker nor a butcher that would lend ſixpence upon this unperiſhable poſſeſſion: the other is, that Apuleius had not conſidered the diſadvantages of widows in every reſpect. A Canon of Paris who embraced the Proteſtant religion at G. in 1672, ſoon picked out from amongſt the reſt of the women that he ſaw at church, a young, handſome, rich widow. He ſoon found an opportunity of ſpeaking to her, and the more he ſaw her, the more he thought her for his purpoſe. But as he had brought nothing from France but the good plight of perſons of his profeſſion, and ſome lights into the abuſes of Popery, he was refuſed with ſome indignation. He acquainted me with this refuſal, and complained leſs of the refuſal itſelf than of the manner of doing it (51). I repreſented to him ingenuouſly that he was in the wrong to quarrel about it, conſidering the preſent ſtate of his own fortune and the rank of the Lady. He confeſſed ſhe was a little too rich for ſuch a man as him; *but*, continued he, *there muſt be a large abatement made on account of her not having had any children; that alone makes a deduction of thirty or forty thouſand livres. Without the preſumption of her being barren, I ſhould look upon her as a better match than I do, if it were not that my only brother has no heirs, and that my family is in danger of being extinct, if I leave no poſterity.* I was not willing to enter into a diſpute with a man that had examined this matter ſo preciſely: I left him all his compenſations and eſtimations; and contented my ſelf with believing that the deſire of keeping his family from being extinct, had been a grand ſource of all his diſcoveries in religion.

Reflection of a converted Canon on a widow who had no children.

[*K*] *We find in his Apology ſome examples of the moſt ſcandalous frauds that calumny can invent.*] I will only produce one, to ſhew that in all ages the ſpirit of calumny has been buſied in forging proofs out of looſe paſſages, or by unfair repreſentations of what ſome one or other has ſaid or written. The accuſers of Apuleius, in order to convict him of magick, quoted a letter that his wife had written during the time of his addreſſes to her. They urged that in this letter ſhe had confeſſed that Apuleius was a Magician, and that he had bewitched her. It was no difficult matter for them to gain credit to this; for they only read ſome certain words of her letter without connecting them either with what went before or followed after, and no body moved for the reading the whole: but Apuleius put them to confuſion by cauſing the whole paſſage of Pudentilla's letter to be read; from whence it appeared that far from complaining of Apuleius, ſhe juſtified him, and bantered his accuſers ſmartly. See her words, in which you will find that the very ſame terms may be interpreted an accuſation or juſtification of Apuleius, according as they are diſjoined from what goes before, or are connected with it. Βυλομένῳ γάρ μοι δι' ἃς εἶπον αἰτίας γυμνάσαι, αὐτὸς τοῦτο ἔπεισας ἀντὶ πάλαι αἰρεῖσθαι, θυμοῦσθαι τὸν ἄνδρα καὶ σπουδάζειν αὐτὸν εἰωθὸς ἦθος δι' ἐμοῦ παῦσαι. νῦν δὲ ὡς μοχθηροὶ ὑμᾶς καλοσθῆς τε ἀναπείθουσι, αἰφνίδιον ἐγένετο Ἀπολλῶς μάγος, καὶ ἐγὼ μεμάγευμαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ. καὶ ἰδοὺ. καὶ ἤδεται νῦν πρὸς ἐμοί, ἔτι σωφρονῶ (52). i. e. " For when I had an inclination

(50) Idem, ibid. pag. 352.

(51) He never ſpoke of it, without ſaying, *Eſt modus in rebus.*

(52) Apul. *Apolog.* pag. 326.

(47) Apuleius, *Apolog.* p. 331.

(48) Idem, ibid. pag. 332.

(49) Idem, ibid. pag. 320.

political employments, for he thought it an honour to have the office of a Prieſt, which gave him the direction of the publick games; and he diſputed briſkly againſt thoſe who oppoſed the erecting of a ſtatue with which the inhabitants of Oea would have honoured him (*g*). Nothing ſhews more plainly the impertinent credulity of the Heathens, than their ſaying, that Apuleius had done ſo great a number of miracles [*L*], that they equal or rather ſurpaſs thoſe of Jeſus Chriſt. There are many without doubt who take for a true hiſtory all that he relates in his *Golden Aſs*. I wonder that St. Auguſtin has wavered upon that ſubject (*h*), and that he did not certainly know that Apuleius had only given this book as a romance (*i*). He was not the inventor of it; the ſcheme was more ancient, as Moreri partly diſcovered [*M*] in the words of Voſſius which he did not well underſtand. Some Heathens have ſpoken of this Romance with contempt [*N*]. Apuleius

(*g*) *Pro ſtatuâ ſibi apud Oenſes locanda ex qua civitate habebat uxorem, adverſus contradictionem quorundam civium litigaret, quod poſteros ne lateret ejuſdem litis orationem ſcriptam memoriæ commendavit.* Auguſtinus, Epiſt. 5.

(*h*) Idem, *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 18. cap. 18.

(*i*) *Sermone iſto Mileſio, varias fabulas conſeram,* Apul. *in Prologo Aſini aurei.*

"clination to marry for reaſons I mentioned to you, "you your ſelf perſuaded me to take him before all "others, admiring the man, and endeavouring thro' "me to make one of our family. But now you are "ſet upon by ſpiteful and malicious men, Apuleius "forſooth is turned Magician all of a ſudden, and "has bewitched me. It is certain that I love him. "Come now to me while I am yet in my ſenſes." Apuleius greatly heightened the guilt of ſuch impoſtures. His words deſerve to be written in letters of gold, and fixed up in a thouſand places, to confound, if poſſible, thoſe traducers, who in every age and country make uſe of ſuch fraudulent practices. *Multa ſunt quæ ſola prolata calumniæ paſſunt videri obnoxia. Cujavis oratio inſimulari poteſt, ſi ea quæ ex prioribus nexa ſunt principio ſui defraudentur, ſi quædam ex ordine ſcriptorum ad libidinem ſupprimantur, ſi quæ ſimulationis cauſâ dicta ſunt, adſeverantis pronunciatione quam exprobrantis legantur* (53). i. e. "There "are many things *(ſays he)* which ſingly conſider'd "may ſeem liable to reproach: for example, any "man's words may be conſtrued in a criminal ſenſe, "if one ſentence be diſjoined from the foregoing "with which it bears a connection; or if ſome things "be taken out of their proper order and ſuppreſſed "at will, and eſpecially if thoſe words againſt which "the accuſation is laid, be pronounced in the man"ner of an aſſertion inſtead of that of a reproach."

(53) Idem, ibid.

[*L*] *The Heathens gave out that he wrought a great number of miracles.*] One would ſcarce believe that this had been reported, were it not atteſted by creditable perſons: but we find that this impertinence of the Heathens was ſo much talked of in the time of St. Auſtin, that this great Prelate was deſired to confute it. *Precator acceſſerim ut ad ea vigilantius reſpondere digneris, in quibus nihil amplius Dominum quam alii homines facere potuerunt, feciſſe vel geſſiſſe mentiuntur. Apollonium ſiquidem ſuum nobis & Apuleium alioſque magicæ artis homines in medium proferunt, quorum majora contendunt extitiſſe miracula* (54). i. e. "It is my humble requeſt that you will vouchſafe to "give a full anſwer to thoſe writings in which they "falſely pretend that our Lord neither did nor wrought "any thing more than other men were able to do; "and they produce their Apollonius, Apuleius and "other Magicians, who, they maintain, wrought "even greater miracles than his." St. Auſtin contented himſelf with this reply, that if Apuleius had been ſo powerful a Magician as was pretended, he would never have lived, as ambitious as he was, in ſo low a condition: That beſides he had made a defence againſt the charge of magick, as a great crime (55). His pretended miracles were talked of long before the time of St. Auſtin; for Lactantius expreſſes his ſurprize, that the Author whom he had refuted did not join Apuleius with Apollonius of Tyana. *Voluit oſtendere Apollonium vel paria, vel etiam majora feciſſe. Mirum quod Apuleium prætermiſit, cujus ſolent & multa & mira memorari* (56). Apuleius has met with the fate of a great many others, in that his miracles have only been talk'd of after his death; his accuſers laid nothing to his charge but trifles; or brought but very weak proof of any thing that carried the appearance of ſorcery. But I can't tell how to reconcile St. Auſtin with Apuleius. The one ſays that Apuleius could never advance himſelf to any poſt of judicature, *ad aliquam judiciariam Reipublicæ poteſtatem* (57). The other boaſts of poſſeſſing the very poſt that his father had born, who had gone through all the chief employments of his country. *In qua Colonia patrem habili loco principe Duumviralem cunctis honoribus perfunctum. Cujus ego* LOCUM *in ea Republica exinde ut participare* CURIAM *cœpi, nequaquam degener, pari ſpero honore & exiſtimatione tueor* (58). i. e. "In which Colony my father filled the head "poſt, being one of the Duumviri, after having gone "through the moſt honourable offices in the State. "From whom I hope I have not degenerated ſince "my firſt having a ſhare in the Government, but "that I diſcharge the ſame office with equal credit "and reputation."

(54) Marcellinus *ad* Auguſtin. Epiſt. 4. *inter* Epiſt. Auguſtini. See alſo the 49th *Letter* of St. Auguſtin, p. 208.

(55) Auguſtinus, Epiſt. 5.

(56) Lactant. *Divin. Inſtitut.* lib. 5. cap. 3. See alſo St. Jerom on the 81ſt Pſalm.

(57) Auguſtinus, Epiſt. 5.

(58) Apul. *Apolog.* pag. 289.

[*M*] *Moreri has hinted that he was not the inventor of his Golden Aſs.*] We ſhall firſt of all give you his own words: "*The Metamorphoſis of the Golden Aſs* is "a paraphraſe of what he had borrowed from Lu"cian, who himſelf had taken it from Lucius Pa"trenſis, of whom Photius ſpeaks. . . . . It is e"qually probable that Apuleius borrowed from him "the ſubject of the fable, which he has modelled "in his own way; for he was very well ſkilled in "the Greek and Latin tongues." In order to form a true judgment whether Moreri deſerves to be criticiſed on or not, we muſt compare what he ſays with that paſſage of Voſſius from which he has copied. *De ætate* Lucii Patrenſis *non liquet, niſi quod antiquior credatur Luciano, quippe qui inde compilaſſe videatur Lucium ſeu Aſinum ſuum, uti ex Luciano poſtea Aſinum ſuum Aureum exſcripſit Apuleius: niſi is potius ex eodem Lucii fonte ſua hauſit, & hoc ſanè verisimilius eſt. Nempe ut Lucium in epitomen redegit Lucianus, ita paraphraſin Lucii ſcripſit Apuleius, ſed ille Græcè, hic Latinè* (59). i. e. "We have no farther knowledge "of the time when Lucius Patrenſis lived, than that "he is look'd upon to be more ancient than Lucian, "ſince as he ſeems to have ſtolen from him his Lu"cius or Aſs, as Apuleius afterwards from him wrote "his Golden Aſs: Unleſs he took it from the ſame "original of Lucius, and indeed this ſeems more "likely: namely that as Lucian epitomized Lucius, "ſo Apuleius wrote a Paraphraſe on Lucius, but the "former in Greek, the latter in Latin." It is plain that Moreri miſtook the meaning of Voſſius; and that he ſhould not have ſaid that the work of Apuleius is a Paraphraſe of that of Lucian, but that Lucius Patrenſis had been abridged by Lucian, and paraphraſed by Apuleius. The argument that Moreri couches in theſe words, *for he was very well ſkilled in the Greek and Latin tongues*, is not the leaſt concluſive. Only put this Logick in form, and you will find in it this Euthymeme. *He was very well ſkilled in the Greek and Latin tongues; therefore he has taken from the original the ſubject of this fable, which he has modelled after his own fancy; that is to ſay, therefore he has not paraphraſed Lucian but Lucius Patrenſis.* This Euthymeme will appear quite ridiculous, when we conſider, that there is as much neceſſity of knowing the Greek tongue in order to borrow from Lucian as from Lucius; and there is no manner of occaſion to underſtand Latin, *to model after his own fancy* a ſubject borrowed from Lucius. Can't Mr. de la Fontaine, if he pleaſes, model after his own fancy a Tale taken from Ouville? It would be of greater uſe than is imagined, to criticiſe on the falſe Logick of Authors. Young men who have a genius for compoſition, might very ſoon reap great advantage from ſuch a piece of criticiſm.

(59) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Græc.* pag. 517, 518.

[*N*] *Some Heathens have ſpoken of his Romance with contempt.*] There needs no other proof of this than the Letter which the Emperor Severus ſent to the Senate, in which he complains to them of the honours that had been paid to Clodius Albinus. Amongſt other encomiums they had given him the title of learned.

leius was extremely laborious [O]; he compoſed ſeveral books [P], ſome in verſe, others in proſe, of which there is but part that has reſiſted the injuries of time. He delighted in declaiming, and he did it with the applauſe of all the audience. When he declaimed at Oea, the Auditors cried out with one voice that they ought to confer on him the honour of Citizen (k). Thoſe at Carthage heard him favourably, and erected a ſtatue for him (l); ſeveral other cities did him the ſame honour (m). It is ſaid that his wife held the candle to him whilſt he ſtudied; but I do not think that we ought to take that literally; in all likelihood it is a figure of the Gauliſh eloquence of Sidonius Apollinaris, *Legentibus meditantibuſque candelas & candelabra tenuerunt* (n). Several Criticks have publiſhed notes upon Apuleius [Q]. I do not know (o) that there are any other French tranſlations of the *Golden Aſs*, beſides the old French one [R]. This book is juſtly taken for

(k) Apul. *in Apol.* p. 320.
(l) Idem, *Florid.* p. 355, & *ſeq.*
(m) Ibid. pag. 356.
(n) Sidon. Apollin. Epiſt. x. lib. 2.
(o) This was written in 1694.

The Emperor could not bear that that title ſhould be given to a man who had only ſtuffed his head with tales and rhapſodies taken from Apuleius. *Major fuit dolor quod illum pro literato laudandum plerique duxiſtis, quum ille næniis quibuſdam anilibus occupatus inter Mileſias punicas Apuleii ſui, & ludicra literaria conſeneſceret* (60). i. e. "It was matter of greater grief to "me that moſt of you ſhould think him deſerving of "the name of Learned, who ſpent his years in com- "poſing idle Ballads, and was taken up with the "Mileſian Tales and other ludicrous writings of his "favourite Apuleius." Macrobius has allotted to the peruſal of nurſes all ſuch romances as the Golden Aſs of Apuleius. *Vel argumenta fictis caſibus amatorum referta quibus vel multum ſe Arbiter exercuit, vel Apuleium nonnunquam luſiſſe miramur. Hoc totum fabularum genus quod ſolas aurium delicias profitetur, è ſacrario ſuo in nutricum cunas ſapientiæ tractatus eliminat* (61). i. e. "Or ſtories filled with feigned ad- "ventures of lovers, ſuch as either Petronius Arbi- "ter took ſo much pains in writing, or the eaſy pen "of Apuleius is admired for. All this kind of fa- "bles, whoſe ſole drift it is to delight the ear, Phi- "loſophy baniſhes from its ſacred cloſet to the nurſe- "ry."

(60) Jul. Capitolin. *in Clodio Albino* cap. 12.

(61) Macrobius Saturnalium, lib. 1. cap. 2.

[O] *He was extremely laborious.*] See his own words in his anſwer to his antagoniſt on the ſubject of Eloquence. *De eloquentiâ verò, ſi qua mihi fuiſſet, neque mirum neque invidioſum deberet videri, ſi ab ineunte ævo uni ſtudiis literarum ex ſummis viribus deditus, omnibus aliis ſpretis voluptatibus, ad hoc ævi, haud ſciam annè ſuper omnes homines impenſo labore, diuque noctuque, cum deſpectu & diſpendio bonæ valetudinis, eam quæſiſſem* (62). i. e. "And as to eloquence, "if I could never lay any claim to it, it neither "ought to be thought ſtrange, or envied, ſeeing from "my younger years to this very time I have wholly "applied myſelf to the ſtudy of letters, deſpiſing all "other pleaſure in compariſon of it, and have ſought "it, perhaps with more pains than any other man, "both day and night, even to the neglect and loſs "of my health."

(62) Apul. *in Apolog.* p. 276.

[P] *He compoſed ſeveral books.*] See the Diſſertation *de Vitâ & Scriptis Apuleii*, which Wower has prefixed to his edition, and which Mr. Fleuri, Scholiaſt to the Dauphin, has cauſed to be printed at the beginning of his. One may ſay that Apuleius was an univerſal Genius; for there are few ſubjects he has not treated of. He has tranſlated *Plato's Phædo*, and *Nicomachus's Arithmetick*: He has written a treatiſe *de Republicâ*, *de Numeris*, *de Muſicâ*: We meet with quotations out of his *Table-Queſtions*, his *Letters to Cerellia*, which were ſomewhat too looſe, his *Proverbs*, his *Hermagoras*, his *Ludicra*. He ſpeaks himſelf of this laſt: *Legerunt è* Ludicris *meis epiſtolium de dentifricio, verſibus ſcriptum* (63). i. e. "They read, "ſays he, out of my *Ludicra* a little Epiſtle on Tooth- "powder, in verſe." We have ſtill left his treatiſes *de Philoſophiâ naturali*, *de Philoſophiâ morali*, *de Syllogiſmo categorico*, *de Deo Socratis*, *de Mundo*, and his *Florida*. I am not willing to paſs by here the opinion of a learned Critic (64), touching his *Letters to Cerellia*. He thinks that the name of Cicero ought to be inſerted in that paſſage of Auſonius where mention is made of theſe Letters; for it is Cicero who is reproached for having indulged too great familiarities with Cerellia, and for having written to her too freely; for this reaſon we muſt read it thus in Auſonius, *Eſſe Apuleium in vitâ Philoſophorum, in Epigrammatis amatorem, Ciceronis in præceptis omnibus exſtare ſeveritatem, in Epiſtolis ad Cerelliam ſubeſſe petulantiam*. i. e. "That Apuleius was a Philoſopher in his Life, in his "Epigrams a downright Lover; that Cicero was "ſevere in all his precepts, but too wanton in his "Letters to Cerellia."

(63) Idem, ibid.

(64) Fredericus Gronov. *in Auſon. Cent. Nuptial. in editione Auſonii, Amſtelodami*, an. 1671, pag. 516.

[Q] *Several Critics have publiſhed notes upon Apuleius.*] Philip Beroaldus publiſhed very full ones on the *Golden Aſs* at Venice, in folio, 1594; which have been reprinted ſeveral times in 8vo, at Paris and other places. Godeſchalc Stewechius, Peter Colvius, John Wower, &c. have beſtowed ſome labour upon all the works of Apuleius. Priceus has publiſhed ſeparately the *Golden Aſs*, and the *Apology*, with a great number of obſervations (65). The notes of Caſaubon, and thoſe of Scipio Gentilis upon the *Apology*, are had in great repute. The former came out in 1594, the latter in 1607. The beſt edition of his book *de Mundo* is that of Leyden, in 1591, in 8vo. We owe that to Bonaventure Vulcanius. Give me leave to ſay by the way, that this treatiſe is little elſe than a tranſlation of a like work aſcribed to Ariſtotle. The book *de Deo Socratis* has been publiſhed with the notes of Joſias Mercerus (66). The Author cited will fully inform you of every thing concerning the editions of Apuleius (67). He has not mentioned in particular that of Baſil, *apud Henricum Petri*, in 1560, in 3 vol. 8vo; nor that of the ſame city, *apud Sebaſtianum Henric. Petri*, in 1620, in 2 vol. 8vo; nor that of Lyons, in 1614, in 2 vol. 8vo, which exactly reſembles that printed at Leyden, every part of which he takes particular notice of, and which he dates 1614. I queſtion whether or no he did not take Lyons (*Lugdunum*) in France for Leyden (*Lugdunum Batavorum*) in Holland.

(65) *The Apology*, printed at Paris 1635, in 4to. *The Golden Aſs*, printed at Gouda 1653, in 8vo.

(66) Printed at Paris 1624, in 12mo.

(67) Joh. Albertus Fabricius, *in Bibliotheca Latinâ*, p. 135, & *ſeq.*

[R] *I know of no other tranſlations of the Golden Aſs, than what are in old French.*] If I am not miſtaken John Louveau is the Author of the firſt. *La Croix du Maine* makes mention of it, though without taking notice of the year in which it firſt appeared (68); he only ſays that it was printed at Lyons. It was reprinted at Paris by Claudius Micard 1584. A certain Jeſuit of Montlyard has tranſlated it and given a Commentary upon it. The two editions that I have ſeen of it are, one from the copy printed at Paris by Abel Angelier, 1612; the other at Paris by Samuel Thibauſt, 1623. The preface is pretty long, and contains critical remarks on ſeveral faults of John Louveau.

(68) La Croix du Maine, *Bibliotb. Franc.* pag. 238.

But I have juſt now diſcovered that la Croix du Maine and du Verdier Vau-Privas have ſpoken of a tranſlation, probably more antient than that of John Louveau. They ſay that George de la Bouthiere, or de la Boutiere, a native of Autun, has tranſlated into French the *Metamorphoſis* or *Golden Aſs* of Apuleius (69). The one ſays that this verſion was printed at Lyons by John de Tournes and William Gazeau, 1553. The other that it was printed by John de Tournes 1516 (70). There is a fault of the preſs in this laſt date; and it is very plain, that if we place the figures in their true order, it muſt be 1556. Now as the ſame Bibliographer has ſaid that the tranſlation of John Louveau was printed in 1558 (71), there is reaſon to ſuppoſe that it was later than that of George de la Bouthiere.

(69) La Croix du Maine, pag. 118. Du Verdier, pag. 448.
(70) Du Verdier, *Bibliotb. Franc.* pag. 448.
(71) Ibid. pag. 716.

Since the firſt edition of this Dictionary, there has come out at Paris a tranſlation of one part of the *Golden Aſs*. The *Journal des Savans* of the ninth of January 1696, makes mention of it. Mr. le Baron des Coutures publiſhed, with notes in 1698, his French verſion of the treatiſe *de Deo Socratis*.

for one continued Satyr on the diſorders which the Magicians, the Prieſts, the Diſſolute, the Thieves, &c. at that time ſpread all over the world [S].

[S] *This book is juſtly taken for one continued Satyr on the diſorders which the Magicians and Prieſts at that time ſpread all over the world.*] Theſe are the words which I find in the notes of Mr. Fleuri: *Tota porro hæc Metamorphoſis Apuleiana, & ſtylo & ſententia, Satyricon eſt perpetuum (ut rectè obſervavit Barthius, Adverſ. lib. 51. cap. 11.) in quo magica deliria, ſacrificulorum ſcelera, adulterorum crimina, furum & latronum impunitæ factiones, palam differuntur* (72). i. e. "This whole Metamorphoſis of Apuleius is "both in its ſtyle and meaning one entire Satyr (as "Barthius rightly obſerved, Adverſ. lib. 51. ch. 11.) "in which the idle fancies of Magicians, the roguery "of Prieſts, the crimes of fornicators, and the tole-"rated factions of thieves and robbers are expoſed to "open view." He adds, that thoſe who ſeek after the Philoſopher's ſtone, pretend to diſcover ſome ſecrets concerning this great work. A man that would take the pains, and had a ſuitable capacity, (for he ſhould have a very great one) might make a very curious and inſtructive Commentary on this Romance, and from which one might learn a great many things that former Commentators, though very good in other reſpects, have not touched upon. There are ſome very looſe paſſages in this book of Apuleius. It is thought that the Author has therein inſerted ſome Epiſodes of his own invention, and among others that of Pſyche. *Horum certè noſter ita imitator fuit, ut è ſuo penu innumerabilia protulerit, atque inter cetera venuſtiſſimum illud Pſyches Ἔκφρασιν* (73). Our Author was confeſſedly ſo ſkilful an imitator of things in this way, that he publiſhed ſeveral of his own, and among the reſt that very beautiful Epiſode of Pſyche. This Epiſode has in our days furniſhed Moliere with a ſubject for an excellent play, and Mr. de la Fontaine has taken occaſion to make a very pretty Romance upon it.

(72) Julius Floridus, *Comment. ad uſum Delphini in Apul.*

(73) Idem, ibid. pag. 2.

AQUÆUS (STEPHEN) in French *de l'Aigue* [A] Lord of Beauvais in Berri (a), his native country, was eſteemed for his military actions and his writings [B], under the reign of Francis I. Not that his *Commentary upon Pliny*, which is the beſt of his works, is in the main very good [C]; but it was remarkable at that time, that a Gentleman could do ſo much. This Commentary was printed in the year 1530. F. Hardouin was not very well acquainted with this date [D].

(a) Du Verdier, *Bibliotb. Franſoiſe*, p. 278.

[A] *His name in French was de l'Aigue.*] This is the Gaſcon word for Water. This Author ſtyles himſelf Stephen de Laigue, called Beaulnois *, at the beginning of his tranſlation of Cæſar, in the edition I make uſe of, which is the Paris one, printed by Peter Gualtier, in 1546, in 12.

* *Beaulnois:* This muſt be an error of the preſs, inſtead of *Bauvais* or *Beaulvois*, for the Author uſed to write either way the name of his Lordſhip (a). [Crit. Rem.]

(a) From the Crit. Rem. at the end of the French edition of Mr. Bayle's Diction. 1734.

[B] *He was eſteemed for his military actions, and his writings.*] Father Hardouïn makes him this compliment: *Vir nobilis in primis,, ac militia quoque exacta egregiè ſordidus* (1). The works which he publiſhed are; *An excellent treatiſe containing the properties of tortoiſes, ſnails, frogs and artichoaks*, printed at Lyons in 8vo (2); *Julius Cæſar's Commentaries of the war of the Romans, and other military expeditions made by him in Gaul and in Africa*, printed at Paris 1531, in folio. Du Verdier quotes this edition (3). La Croix du Maine ſpeaks of the Paris edition, printed by the Angeliers in 1539 (4), but does not ſay a word of that which I mentioned above in the remark [A]. We ſhall now proceed to his Commentary on Pliny.

(1) Harduinus, *Præfat. in Plinium.*

(2) Du Verdier, *Bibliotb. Franc.* pag. 278. La Croix du Maine takes notice of the Paris edition in 1530.

(3) Du Verdier, *Bibliotb. Franc.* pag. 278.

(4) La Croix du Maine, *Bibliotb. Franc.* pag. 76.

[C] *His Commentary upon Pliny . . . . . is not very good in the main.*] It is more conſiderable for its bulk, than for the learning it contains. The Author acts the part of a Plagiary in his corrections, and paſſes over almoſt all the difficult places. Father Hardouin's character of him is this: *Commentarios ſcripſit in omnes Plinii libros; ſed mole magis quam eruditione inſignes. Nec verò emendationes ullas habet, quam quas à Rhenano mutuatus eſt: & ea ferè in quibus ſalebrarum eſt aliquid aut ambagis ſilet is, ceu foveam, ſecurus prætergredi* (5). i. e. "He wrote, ſays he, Com-"mentaries on all the books of Pliny, but more con-"ſiderable for their bulk than learning. Nor has "he made any other emendations than what he bor-"rowed from Rhenanus; and where there happens "to be any thing difficult or perplext, he takes care "to avoid it as he would do a pit-fall." He gave into that fault of a great many other writers; of making advantage of another's labour, without naming his benefactor; and when he did mention his name, it was only when he wanted to find fault with him. Rhenanus was not ſilent upon this occaſion. See his words in a † letter to a Phyſician of the Cardinal of Mentz: *Hoc mirum quod quum ex meis caſtigationibus nonnihil ſit adjutus, nuſquam tamen mei mentionem facit, niſi quoties vult reprehendere* (6). i. e. "It "is ſtrange that he who had received ſome aſſiſtance "from my emendations, ſhould never mention me "but when he had a deſign to cenſure." The general character which he gives this book deſerves a place here. *In primis ipſum volumen non eſt exiguum, ex variis congeſtum autoribus, quod uſui pauperculis eſſe poſſit, qui non habent Bibliothecam inſtructam, puta Ariſtotelem & Albertum de Animalibus, Raphaelem Volaterranum, ex quo integra fermè capita autor tranſcripſit, bona fide, hoc eſt una cum ipſis mendis ne ſyllabâ quidem mutatâ, Cælium Rhodiginum, Columellam etiam, Palladiumque & ſimileis ſcriptores. Nam hoc præcipuè habet ſtudio, citare teſtimonia autorum qui cum Plinio faciunt, de verbis ipſis minimum ſollicitus, quod illi penitus puerile videtur. In ſumma liber talis eſt, qui ſi non magnoperè juvet, excitet tamen literas, & Plinium ipſum vulgo fortaſſis commendet, quæ mihi res in primis grata eſt* (7). i. e. "In the firſt place it is a volume "of no ſmall ſize, being collected out of various Au-"thors, and therefore may be of great uſe to the "poorer ſort of people who cannot afford to furniſh "a Library with ſuch ſort of books as *Ariſtotle, Albertus de Animalibus, Raphael Volaterranus* (from "whom he has tranſcribed entire chapters word for "word, with faults and all, without ſo much as al-"tering a ſyllable) *Cælius Rhodiginus, Columella, Palladius*, and the like. For he mightily affects to "quote teſtimonies out of Authors, who agree with "Pliny, tho' not ſo exact as to keep to the very "ſame words, which he looks upon to be puerile. "Upon the whole it is a book, which, if it does "not greatly improve learning, may ſerve to propa-"gate it, and cauſe Pliny to be underſtood by the "common people, which I very much approve of."

(5) Harduinus, *Præfat. in Plin.*

(6) See the 50th Letter of the *Centuria Epiſt. Philolog.* publiſh'd by Goldaſt, pag. 196. edit. of 1674.

(7) Paris edit. *ubi ſupra.*

† The Letter, in which Rhenanus ſpeaks of Aquæus's Pliny, is dated March 1531 or 1532 new ſtyle. That learned Gentleman died in 1537; about the ſame time died Germain de Bris, in Latin *Brixeus*. John Voulté made an Epitaph for them both. (Hendecaſill. 10, 4to, and in 24. 1537) (β). [Crit. Rem.]

(β) Paris ed. *ubi ſupra.*

[D] *Father Hardouïn was not very well acquainted with the date of the edition of Aquæus's Commentaries upon Pliny.*] He obſerves that Sigiſmond Gelenius publiſhed a volume of Corrections on Pliny, in 1535; and that the year after, Beatus Rhenanus put out his labours on the ſame Author, and that at the end of four years more Aquæus, of whom we are ſpeaking, printed his Commentary (8). According to that, he muſt have publiſhed them in 1540. But it is certain they were publiſhed in 1530. I fancy that Father Hardouïn fell into this miſtake for want of knowing that Gelenius took Pliny in hand twice before his edition of 1535 (9); and ſo it is poſſible that Aquæus's book might be later by five years than the firſt Corrections of Gelenius.

(8) Harduinus, *Præfat. in Plin.*

(9) See the 69th Letter of the 30th book of Eraſmus, pag. 1957.

AQUAVIVA (ANDREW MATTHEW) Duke of Atri in the Kingdom of Naples, and ſon of JULIUS AQUAVIVA, Count of Converſano [*A*], added to the ſplendour of his birth a great ſhare of learning, which rendered him very illuſtrious towards the end of the fifteenth Century, and the beginning of the ſixteenth. He was not contented with ſtudying, and becoming familiar with the learned, but he employed himſelf alſo in compoſing of books, and acquitted himſelf very honourably, as appears by his work intitled *Encyclopedia*, and by another, wherein he treats of moral virtue [*B*]. He alſo compoſed a book *de Re Equeſtri*. But before he applied himſelf to letters with ſo much ardour, he had given to the profeſſion of arms all that his birth could require of him; and he ſignalized himſelf in it, although fortune had been very adverſe to him. He was at two loſt battles, and was wounded and taken priſoner. Study comforted him in his priſon, and he was ſo happy as to obtain his liberty of Ferdinand King of Aragon, when Gonſalvo, ſurnamed the Great Captain, would have ſent him into Spain with the other priſoners. After that he enjoyed peacefully the ſweets of a private life in the midſt of books, and the converſation of men of letters, by whom he was very much praiſed and honoured [*C*]. He inſpired the ſame deſire of ſtudy in his brother Belliſarius, who alſo became an Author [*D*]. Our Aquaviva would have been happier, if he had been a better œconomiſt, but becauſe he had ſpent too much for many years, he found at laſt he was not able to ſpend enough. He died at Converſano, being ſeventy two years old, when the French army, under the conduct of Lautrec, ravaged Apulia (*a*) in the year 1528.

(*a*) *Ex* Jovii *Elog. doctor. Vir.* cap. 63.

[*A*] *He was ſon to Julius Aquaviva, Count of Converſano.*] This Count diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his valour in ſeveral engagements, and he commanded the army of Naples, when he was killed in a ſkirmiſh during the ſiege of Otranto by the Turks, in 1480 (1). His ſon, who is the ſubject of this article, was a long while inconſolable for this loſs (2).

(1) See the *Hiſt. of Mahomet II.* by Guillet, tom. 2. pag. 373.

(2) See the verſes that Marullus addreſſed to him, *Epigramm.* lib. 1. pag. 16.

[*B*] *He wrote a treatiſe on the ſubject of moral Virtue.*] Paulus Jovius ſeems to ſay that it was a Commentary on Plutarch's treatiſe of moral Virtue; and the modern Author of the Notes upon the Latin Poems of Sannazarius is of the ſame opinion. *Librum nempe nobilem, cui* Encyclopædia *nomen, itemque Commentarium in Plutarchum de Virtute morali* (3). i. e. "He "wrote an excellent book entitled *Encyclopædia*, and "alſo a Commentary on Plutarch's treatiſe on moral "Virtue." But I do not find that the expreſſions of Paulus Jovius are clear enough to rely on. I am therefore inclined to ſuſpend my judgment on this matter. See the words of this Author: *Nemo ex his qui illuſtribus orti familiis noſtrâ ætate claruerunt.... Andreæ Matthæo Aquavivio.... ſe luculentius optimis diſciplinis exornavit; uti præclarè conſtat eo Libro nobili pariter ac erudito, qui* Encyclopædia *inſcribitur, & de morali Virtute Plutarchi plenior liber ſubtili & copioſo Commentario perſimilis oſtendit* (4). i. e. "Of all the "Perſons of Quality who have been famous in our "age, no one was a more accompliſhed Scholar than "Andrew Matthew Aquavivius, as abundantly ap"pears by his famous and learned book entitled *En*"*cyclopædia*, as alſo by that larger work of his con"taining an ingenious and learned Commentary on "Plutarch's book upon moral Virtue." This ſeems to imply an elaborate paraphraſe on this treatiſe of Plutarch.

(3) *Notæ ad Sann. Elegias*, pag. 188. edit. Amſtel. 1689.

(4) Paul. Jov. *Elog.* cap. 63. pag. 158.

Since the firſt edition of this Dictionary, I have found that Paulus Jovius expreſſes himſelf improperly; for the title of our Author's work in the Naples edition, printed in 1526, in folio, runs thus: *Commentarii in tranſlationem libelli Plutarchi Chæronei de Virtute morali.... liber primus.* The title of the German edition in 1609, in 4to, is longer. *Illuſtrium & exquiſitiſſimarum Diſputationum libri quatuor, quibus omnes divinæ & humanæ ſapientiæ, præſertim animi moderatricis, Muſicæ atque Aſtrologiæ arcana, in Plutarchi Chæronei de Virtute morali præceptionibus recondita, ſummo ingenii acumine retecta patefiunt, & figuris ſuo quæque illuſtrantur, &c.* Neither Toppi, from whom I take this (5), nor Leonard Nicodemo, make any mention of the work intitled *Encyclopædia*.

(5) Toppi, *Biblioth. Napol.* p. 14.

[*C*] *He was very much praiſed and honoured by men of learning.*] Alexander ab Alexandro dedicated to him his *Dies Geniales*. Pontanus dedicated to him his firſt book *de Rebus cæleſtibus*, as alſo his treatiſe *de Magnanimitate*. Sannazarius has praiſed him with great delicacy upon his being (as has been ſaid ſince of Monſieur de Montauzier),

Favori de Pallas, quelque nom qu'on lui donne,
Ou celui de Minerve, ou celui de Bellone.

"Of Pallas doubly favour'd, brave and ſage,
"Well ſkill'd in war, deep read in wiſdom's page.

See the laſt Elogy of the ſecond book, towards the latter end, and the ſecond Epigram of the ſecond book. As to the forty fourth Epigram of the ſame book, I am in doubt whether it is in praiſe of the Aquaviva we are ſpeaking of or not, as the Author of the Notes upon Sannazarius was of opinion (6); for it is addreſſed *ad Neritinorum Ducem*, who, according to Paulus Jovius, was Belliſarius Aquaviva, brother to Andrew Matthew. No more is the firſt Elogy of the third book, in my opinion, to be applied to this laſt, but to Julius Aquaviva his father. See in the Author I have quoted the names of ſeveral writers who have celebrated our Andrew Matthew (7).

(6) *Notæ in Sannaz.* p. 188.

(7) Nicodemo, *Addizz. alla Biblioth. Napolet.* pag. 11, 12.

[*D*] *His brother Belliſarius alſo became an Author.*] He wrote a treatiſe *de Venatione*, which he dedicated to John Matthew his brother; another *de Aucupio*, another *de Principum Liberis educandis*, another *de Re militari*, and another *de ſingulari Certamine*. Theſe works were firſt printed at Naples in folio, 1519, and afterwards reprinted at Baſil in-8vo, 1578, by the care of Leunclavius, with Manuel Palæologus on the Education of Kings.

☞ AQUILA, ſurnamed *Ponticus*, the Author of a Greek tranſlation of the Old Teſtament [*A*], was born at Sinope, a city of Pontus. He flouriſhed about the year 128 (*a*). Epiphanius in his book *de Ponderibus & Menſuris* (*b*) tells us that he was συγγενὴς or kinſman to Hadrian; but the *Chronicon Paſchale* obſerves (*c*), that he was συγγενὸς or father-

(*a*) Clerici *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* pag. 593. edit. Amſtelodami 1716.

(*b*) Pag. 170. tom. 2. edit. Petav.

(*c*) *Ad Olympiad.* 227, 4. pag. 255. edit. Pariſ. *apud* Clericum, *ubi ſupra.*

[*A*] *Author of a Greek tranſlation of the Old Teſtament.*] He publiſhed two verſions of it; in one of which he took a greater freedom in repreſenting the ſenſe of the original, and endeavoured to preſerve the entire meaning of it, without confining himſelf to a literal tranſlation. In his other verſion he tranſlated word for word, without even excepting thoſe, which cannot well be rendered into Greek; and particularly the word את *eth*; which, when it is the ſign of the accuſative caſe among the Jews, had no particular force in it, and yet becauſe in other caſes it ſignifies *with*, Aquila rendered it by the Greek word σὺν, without any regard to the genius of the Greek Language (1). St. Jerom in his Letter to Symmachus (2), ſays, that our Aquila was a man of too great exactneſs in his tranſlation, and attempted to render not only

(1) Clerici, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* p. 594. edit. Amſtelod. 1716.

(2) *Apud* Cave, *Hiſt. Litter.* pag. 35. edit. Colon. Allobrog. 1720.

father-in-law to that Emperor. These accounts are entirely fabulous, though it is difficult to assign the origin of them. Nor is there any greater regard to be had to what Epiphanius relates afterwards, that when Hadrian resolved upon rebuilding of Jerusalem, he appointed Aquila to take care of that design, who, while he was employed at Jerusalem in that affair, was converted to the Christian faith, and baptized by the disciples of the Apostles, who returned thither from Pella [*B*]. But upon his refusing to abandon his former customs and practices, and giving himself up to the study of judicial Astrology, and defending very strenuously an Astronomical fatality, he was excommunicated. This reproach, says Epiphanius, exasperated him in such a manner, that he abjured the Christian religion, became a proselyte to that of the Jews, and submitted to the circumcision. He afterwards applied himself to the study of the Hebrew tongue, in which he gained so perfect a knowledge, that he gave a more accurate version of the Old Testament than ever had been seen before. Mr. Le Clerc observes upon this story, that if we had the same liberty of explaining it, as we have with regard to the fables of the Poets, we might perhaps conjecture, that Aquila was one of the Sect of the old Nazarenes, who fled with the rest of the Christians to Pella, just before the siege of Jerusalem; and that he learned the Hebrew language of the Nazarenes of his time, in which they were well skilled,

only the words themselves, but even the Etymologies of them; upon which he was justly rejected: *Aquila proselytus, & contentiosus interpres, qui non solum verba, sed & etymologias verborum transferre conatus est, jure projicitur à nobis.* But in other passages of his writings that Father speaks of him in a much more favourable manner. He tells in his *Quæst. 2. ad Damas.* (3), that he render'd the original word for word with all the proper care and fidelity, and not in too scrupulous a manner, as some imagined: *Aquilam non contentiosius, ut quidam putant, sed studiosius verbum interpretari ad verbum.* In his *Letter to Marcella* (4) he calls him the most accurate Explainer of the Hebrew words: *Verborum Hebræorum diligentissimum Explicatorem.* He observes likewise in his Letter to the same Marcella (5), that he had compared Aquila's edition with the Hebrew originals, for fear lest perhaps the Synagogue should have made any alteration in it out of hatred to Christ. But after all he confesses, that he had found a great many things, which tend to the confirmation of our faith: *Aquilæ editionem cum voluminibus Hebræorum confero, nequid forsitan propter odium Christi Synagoga mutaverit; & ut amicæ menti fatear, quæ ad nostram fidem pertineant roborandam, plura reperio.* He very often prefers Aquila's translation to that of the Septuagint; and particularly in his *Quæstion Hebraic. in Genes.* iii. *p.* 216. *Melius puto illud, quod habetur in Hebræo, Aquila transtulit.* It is certain, that the ancient Christians had a great esteem for his versions; which is greatly recommended by Origen in his Commentary upon St. John (6), and upon Genesis *Tom. III.* and his *Philocal. c.* 14. where he says, that *Aquila endeavoured to translate in the best and most exact manner possible:* κυριώτατα ἑρμηνεῦσαι φιλοτιμούμενον. The same Father also observes in his *Answer to Africanus* (7), that *Aquila confined himself to the Hebrew Idiom,* and that *the Jews esteem him as the best Interpreter of the Scripture*; and that *his translation was generally used by those, who are ignorant of the Hebrew tongue, because he has render'd the sense of the original in the most accurate manner:* Οὕτω γὰρ Ἀκύλας δηλοῖ τῇ Ἑβραικῇ λέξει ἐπόδυσιν εἶναι. Φιλοτιμότερον πεπιστευμένος παρὰ Ἰουδαίοις ἑρμηνεῦσαι τὰς γραφὰς, ᾧ μάλιστα ἐμέβησαν οἱ ἀγνοοῦντες τὴν Ἑβραίων διάλεκτον χρῆσθαι, ὡς πάσων μᾶλλον ἐπιτετευγμένῳ. Wetstein in his Observations upon this passage of Origen has collected the various opinions of the ancients with regard to Aquila's translation. However notwithstanding all that is said concerning the Accuracy of it, and its Conformity with the Letter of the Hebrew Original, Dr. Cave remarks, that the ancients frequently complain, that it is not faithful in many places. Eusebius, in a manuscript Fragment mentioned by that Writer, says, that Aquila published his Translation with an insincere view, and with a design to prejudice Christianity. Dr. Cave likewise observes, that he undertook it in order to set aside that of the Septuagint, and to alter and pervert those testimonies of Scripture, which relate to our Saviour: *Novam Bibliorum versionem Græcam aggressus sit, eo præcipuè animo, ut LXXII interpretationem eluderet, & testimonia de Christo in Scripturis prolata perverteret, atque aliter ederet.* The *Catenæ* of the ancients, as well those which have been published, as those which are yet in manuscript, frequently animadvert upon his wilful or involuntary mistakes; and a Greek Chronographer, which was in manuscript in the possession of Dr. Thomas Gale, Dean of York, tells us, that *the impious Aquila, who perverted the Scripture in his translation of it, lived under the Emperor Hadrian:* Ἐπὶ Ἀδριανοῦ ὁ ἀσεβὴς Ἀκύλας, ὁ τὴν γραφὴν μεθερμηνεύσας ἐπὶ τοῦτο. An instance of this is alledged from *Isaiah* ix. 8. where the Septuagint say, that *God sent the Logos to Jacob* *; in which passage Aquila render'd the word λόγος by ῥῆμα, in order to prevent it from being applied to Christ the *Logos* or Word (8). Mr. le Clerc in his Ecclesiastical History takes notice of this imputation upon Aquila with regard to his insincerity in perverting designedly several passages, which favoured Christianity. But he remarks, that St. Jerom himself has acquitted him of this charge, and that learned men upon a critical examination of those passages, have shewn, that he was falsly accused. *Christiani Scriptores aliquot Aquilam insimulârunt malæ fidei in Versionibus suis, quasi quædam loca, quæ Christianismo favent, datâ operâ, pravè vertisset. Sed eum dudum absolvit Hieronymus, & viri etiam docti, eorum locorum examine, temerè accusatum esse ostenderunt.* There are some Fragments of this translation still extant in the writings of the ancients, which have been collected and published together by Nobilius, Drusius, and Dr. Walton. Mr. le Clerc regrets the loss of these versions of our Author; which might have been easily preserved and continued down to us, if the ancients had understood the proper use of them. They deserved, says he, to have been often transcribed at the common expence of the Churches, and reposited in the publick Libraries, in order that they might be handed down to posterity, which knew how to make a greater advantage of them. But the transcribers of those times were employed by persons of no learning in copying out an infinite number of useless Homilies and other trifling performances, while books of more consequence and value were neglected, to the irreparable loss of posterity. These complaints are and will be very frequent among learned men, who cannot but lament the destruction of so many noble treasures, while they have gained nothing but mere trifles in the room of them. *Utinam verò Versiones ejus ad nos usque pervenissent! Quod fieri facilè potuisset, si Veteres earum usum satis intellexissent. Dignæ erant, quæ Ecclesiarum publico ære sæpius exscriberentur, & in Bibliothecis reponerentur; ut ad posteritatem, quæ melius iis uti potuisset, propagarentur. Sed innumeris inutilibus homiliis, aliisque quisquiliis exscribendis, neglectis melioribus Libris, irreparabili posterorum damno Librarii sunt ab indoctis hominibus occupati. Quas querelas sæpius viris doctis amissorum thesaurorum, pro quibus carbones habemus, dolor expressit, & porro exprimet.*

[*B*] *Baptized by the Disciples of the Apostles, who returned thither from Pella.*] They returned soon after the year 70 of the Christian Æra, in which Jerusalem was taken and destroyed. And therefore Epiphanius in the passage quoted above in the text places this return of them too late, since very few or none of those, who had fled to Pella, were living under the Emperor Hadrian (9).

(3) Tom. 3. p. 35. *apud* Cave, *ubi supra.* See Father Simon's *Hist. crit. du Vieux Testam.* lib. 2. c. 2. pag. 236.

(4) Tom. 3. p. 96. *apud eundem.*

(5) Tom. 2. pag. 312.

(6) Tom. 8. pag. 131. *apud* Cave, *ubi supra.*

(7) Pag. 224. *apud* Cave, *ubi supra.*

* Our English translators have rendered it, *The Lord sent a Word into Jacob*; which shews, that they understood it in the same sense as Aquila.

(8) Cave, *ubi supra.*

(9) Clericus *in Not.* (3) *ad Hist. Eccles.* pag. 593.

ſkilled, and not of the diſciples of the Apoſtles who returned from Palla. This conjecture is founded upon a paſſage in St. Jerom's Preface to Eſdras, where he ſays concerning the Greeks, that *next to the ſeventy Interpreters, even at the time that the Goſpel of Chriſt ſhined forth, they read with great care the Jewiſh and Ebionite Interpreters of the Old Law, namely* AQUILA, *and Symmachus, and Theodotion, &c.* We ſhall give that Father's own words in the note [C]. It is not an improbable conjecture, that he had this particular from the Nazarenes, from whom he likewiſe received ſeveral other things relating to Aquila; for he ſhews from their teſtimony, that he was a diſciple of the Rabbi Akiba. There is ſome diſpute whether he is not the ſame perſon with Onkelos, the famous Paraphraſt upon the Pentateuch. Several of the Rabbis and of the Chriſtian writers maintain the affirmative, while others are of the contrary opinion. However it is certain, that moſt of the Jewiſh Authors repreſent Onkelos as more antient than our Aquila, and that there are a great many paſſages in the former tranſlated in a manner from thoſe of the latter (*d*).

(*d*) Calmet, *Diction. Hiſt. Critiq. &c. de la Bible*, tom. 1. pag. 264. edit. *de Geneve* 1730.

[C] *We ſhall give that Father's words in the note.*] *Poſt LXX Tranſlatores, jam Chriſti Evangelio coruſcante, Judæos & Ebionitas Legis Veteris interpres Aquilam videlicet, & Symmachum & Theodotionem curioſe legunt.* T.

☞AQUILIA an ancient and Patrician Roman Family [*A*], produced ſeveral eminent men, the moſt conſiderable of whom we ſhall mention in this article. The firſt is C. AQUILIUS TUSCUS, who was Conſul in the year 266 (*a*) [*B*] from the building of Rome, according to Sigonius (*b*), and vanquiſhed the Hernici (*c*). C. AQUILIUS FLORUS was Conſul in the year 424 (*d*) with L. Cornelius Scipio, and the next year being Proconſul, he obtained the honours of a triumph for the victories he had gained over the Carthaginians in Sicily and Sardinia (*e*). M. or MANIUS AQUILIUS was Conſul with Marius in the year 651 (*f*) from the building of Rome, and the next year being Proconſul he went into Sicily againſt the ſlaves, who had revolted under the conduct of one Athenio, who having killed his maſter, put himſelf at the head of a vaſt number of ſlaves. That man had gained already ſome victories, having defeated the army commanded by

(*a*) Or 267, according to Petavius.

(*b*) *Comment. in Faſtis.* Col. 98. *Oper.* tom. 1. P. 1. ed. Argelati, Mediol. 1732 fol.

(*c*) Livius, lib. 2. cap. 40.

(*d*) Eutrop. lib. 2. cap. 10.

(*e*) Tab. Capitol. *apud* Sigon. *ubi ſupra*, Col. 246.

(*f*) Sigon. *ad b. ann.* Petavius 653.

[*A*] *A Patrician Family.*] This we may ſafely affirm, ſince we find, that when Tarquin was expelled, this family was already ranked amongſt the Nobles (1). The Aquilii were the ſons of a ſiſter of L. Tarquinius Collatinus, who having been aſſiſtant in expelling the Tyrant, was made Conſul with Junius Brutus. Three perſons of this family were at that time Members of the Senate; but as they were ſtill young men, full of ambition, and fond of the pleaſures of a Court, they entered with ſome other young men, amongſt whom were two ſons of Brutus, into a conſpiracy to reſtore the abdicated King. But their plot being diſcovered, Brutus's children were by his own order beheaded before his eyes. Collatinus, who deſired to ſave the lives of his nephews, protracted that trial, that they might have time, and find means to defend themſelves. But he was diſappointed in his hopes; for the people unanimouſly ſentenced them to death, and they were immediately beheaded. Collatinus himſelf, who was odious to the people, becauſe he bore the name of Tarquinius, was obliged to abdicate the Conſulſhip, and went into a voluntary baniſhment (2). Livy ſpeaks (3) of Collatinus's abdication, before he mentions the conſpiracy of the Aquilii: but it is much more probable that the conſpiracy of his near relations created a ſuſpicion againſt him, which was ſupported by his being of the family, and bearing the name of Tarquin. And this is what Plutarch expreſly tells us. His words are (4): Ὁ δὲ Κολλατῖνος, ἦν μὲν, (ὡς ἔοικεν) ἐν ὑποψίᾳ τινὶ καὶ δι' ἃ συγγένειαν τῶν βασιλέων, ἔχθρᾳ δ' αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ τῷ ὀνόματι τῶν ὀνομάτων, ἀφεστιοῦμενοι τὸν Ταρκύνιον. ὡς δ' ταῦτα συνίδη, παντάπασι προστιθοῦσας, ἀφῆκε τὴν Ἀρχὴν ἑκὼν, καὶ τῆς πόλεως ὑπεξῆλθεν. i. e. "Collatinus, it ſeems, was already ſuſpected, becauſe "he was of the family of the Kings; and what rendered him ſtill more odious was the hateful name "of Tarquin, which he bore; and having beſides "given offence (by his behaviour with regard to his "nephews) he abdicated the Conſulſhip of his own "accord, and left the city." Tho' Collatinus's abdication was in a manner voluntary, yet, as Livy obſerves (5), he was prevailed upon by Brutus's exhortations and entreaties, and by the apprehenſion he was under, that if he did not abdicate voluntarily, he ſhould at the end of the year be ignominiouſly baniſhed, and have all his eſtate confiſcated. He therefore choſe to do of his own accord, what perhaps he might afterwards be forced to againſt his will. Cicero extolls the conduct of Brutus, for having obliged his collegue to abdicate, ſince this was neceſſary for the publick good. He adds, that Collatinus himſelf, tho' he ſuffered by it, could not but approve it, ſince whatever tends to the advantage of the publick, is for that very reaſon honeſt and good. Cicero's own words, of which we have given the ſenſe, are as follow: *Poſſitne id, quod utile videatur, fieri non turpiter? Cum Collatino Tarquinio Collegæ Brutus imperium abrogabat, poterat videri facere id injuſtè, fuerat enim in Regibus expellendis ſocius Bruti, & conſiliorum etiam adjutor. Cum autem conſilium hoc Principes cepiſſent, cognationem Superbi, nomenque Tarquiniorum, & memoriam regni eſſe tollendam, quod erat utilæ Patriæ conſulere, id ita erat honeſtum, ut etiam ipſi Collatino placere deberet* (6). Moreri, with his uſual accuracy, ſpeaks of the conſpiracy of the Aquilii, as if one perſon only of that family had been concerned in it; tho' Livy and Plutarch, whom he quotes, uſe the plural number, and the latter expreſly affirms, that three of the Aquilii were Members of the Senate.

(1) Livius, lib. 2. cap. 3, 4.

(2) Plutarch. *in Vita Publicolæ*, *Oper.* tom. 1. p. 98, 100. edit. Pariſ. 1624. fol.

(3) *Ubi ſupra*, cap. 2.

(4) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 100, D.

(5) *Ubi ſupra.*

(6) Cic. *Offic.* lib. 3. p. m. 186.

[*B*] *C. Aquilius was Conſul in the year* 266.] This is another proof that the Aquilii were Patricians; for none of the plebeians were ever admitted to the conſular dignity before Sextius Sentinus Lateranus, who was Conſul with L. Æmilius Mamercus (7) in the year 387 (8) from the building of Rome. Tho' we cannot poſitively affirm, that L. Aquilius was of the ſame family with the Aquilii mentioned in the foregoing remark, yet it is very probable, that if he had been of another family, the ancient Hiſtorians would have hinted it, which we do not find they do. Livy ſays (9), that C. Aquilius vanquiſhed the Hernicians, but that T. Sicinius the other Conſul, who fought againſt the Volſci, had no advantage over them. Whereupon Sigonius obſerves (10), that this Hiſtorian is very conciſe in relating what happened ſoon after the liberty of the Commonwealth had been reſtored, ſince he does not take notice of what is moſt glorious to the Romans, I mean, their triumphs over the Nations they had conquered. Whereas Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus tells us (11), that both the Conſuls were ſucceſsful in their expeditions, but that Sicinius having delivered the city from a formidable enemy, obtained the honours of the great triumph; and Aquilius, who had not been engaged in ſo dangerous a war, was only allowed the leſſer triumph, called in Latin *Ovatio*.

(7) Livius, lib. 6. cap. *ult.* and lib. 7. cap. 1.

(8) According to Sigonius, or 388, according to Petavius.

(9) Lib. 2. cap. 40.

(10) *Comment. in Faſtis*, Col. 97. *ad ann.* U. 266.

(11) Lib. 8.

by Pretorius, and made himself master of the camp of Servilius, and of that of Lucullus. Aquilius finding this enemy very resolute, and determined with his whole army to perish rather than surrender, thought the best method to vanquish him, was to cut off all his provisions, and force him by famine to throw down his arms. The soldiers, or rather slaves who were under Athenio's command, would readily have submitted, if they had not been afraid of the punishment they deserved, and would certainly have suffered. They chose therefore a voluntary death. Athenio fell into the hands of the Romans, but he escaped the punishment, being torn to pieces by the soldiers, who struggled and fought amongst themselves who should take him prisoner (*g*). Thus Aquilius put an end to that war so effectually, that till Cicero's time there was no insurrection of the slaves in Sicily (*b*). His conduct in that Island gained him the honours of the lesser triumph (*i*). It appears that he had no less bravery than conduct and prudence, for he had received a great many honourable wounds in the armies; but his covetousness is a blemish upon his character. He was accused by L. Fusius (*k*) of having embezzled the publick money, and was very eloquently defended by M. Antonius the Orator [*C*], and acquitted, though he was guilty. C. Aquilius Gallus a contemporary of Cicero, was a very eminent advocate, and had so much business, that he declined standing a candidate for the Consulship [*D*]. He was a great friend of Cicero, and had been Prætor with him (*l*) in the year 687 from the building of Rome (*m*). Aquilius was a judge in the cause of P. Quintius, which Cicero pleaded (*n*) [*E*], and it appears that this great Orator placed a great confidence in the Judge's integrity and mildness of temper. In another place (*o*) Cicero bestows a very fine encomium on this great man [*F*], who indeed deserved it, not only by the useful books he wrote (*p*), but also by the rules and directions which he gave during his Quæstorship, to prevent frauds in contracts. This rule was so useful [*G*], that Cicero calls it "a remedy against all sorts of rogueries,"

(*g*) Florus, lib. 3. cap. 19.

(*b*) Cicero *in Verrem*, lib. 4. *versus init.*

(*i*) Idem, lib. 2. *de Oratore*, num. 195. p. m. 160. ed. Oxon. 1714. 8vo.

(*k*) *Id. Offic.* lib. 2. and *in Bruto.*

(*l*) Ibid. lib. 3. p. m. 196.

(*m*) Oeuvres, *de St. Real.* tom. 3. p. 418, 421.

(*n*) Cicer. *Orat. pro P. Quintio.*

(*o*) *Orat. pro Cæcina.*

(*p*) See the remark [*G*].

Everriculum

[*C*] *He was accused of having embezzel'd the publick money, and was very eloquently defended by M. Antonius the Orator.*] Aquilius refused or perhaps scorned to answer for himself; and as he was sitting before the Judges, Antonius, who pleaded his cause, made him rise up, tore his cloaths from his body, and shewed before the Court the wounds, which Aquilius had received. The Judges moved at this sight, acquitted him (12). Antonius in pleading this cause was himself touched to the greatest degree. Tully introduces him (13) speaking after this manner: "Do not think "that I was cold and unmoved, when I had M. Aquilius to defend. How could I avoid being affected "with the deepest sorrow? I saw a man, who had been "Consul, a General who had been highly extolled "by the Senate, whom I remember'd to have seen "triumphant, now weak, sick, afflicted, in danger "of his life. This it was that grieved me; and I "did not endeavour to excite the compassion of others, "before I myself was full of compassion; and when "I made the old man rise, when I tore his garments, "and shewed his wounds; all this was not the effect "of art, but only of the deep concern, which I then "felt myself." Cicero's words deserve to be here transcribed; since they contain an excellent rule for Orators. *Nolite existimare —— me ipsum, cum mihi M. Aquilius in civitate retinendus esset, quæ in illa causa perorando fecerim, sine magno dolore feciſſe. Quem enim ego Consulem fuisse, Imperatorem ornatum à Senatu, ovantem in Capitolium ascendisse memuniſſem, hunc cum afflictum, debilitatum, mœrentem, in summum discrimen adductum viderem, non prius sum conatus misericordiam aliis commovere, quam misericordia sum ipse captus. Sensi quidem tum magnopere moveri judices, cum excitavi mœstum, ac sordidatum senem, & cum ista feci, quæ tu, Crasse, laudas, non arte, de quâ quid loquar nescio, sed motu magno animi, ac dolore, ut discinderim tunicam, ut cicatrices ostenderem.* Cicero observes upon this action of Antonius, that the Judges could not be so inflexible as to condemn Aquilius, lest it should seem, that this man, whose life had escaped the fury of the enemy, whilst he himself exposed it bravely, had been spared not for the glory of the Romans, but only to fall a sacrifice to the cruelty of his Judges. *Antonius eo adduxit eos*, says Cicero (14), *qui erant judicaturi, ut vererentur, ne, quem virum fortuna ex hostium telis eripuisset, cum sibi ipse non peperciſſet, hic non ad P. Romani laudem, sed ad judicum crudelitatem videretur esse servatus.*

(12) Flori *Breviar. in T. Liv.* lib. 70.

(13) *De Orator.* lib. 2. num. 194, 195. pag. 160.

(14) *In Verrem*, lib. 5. *vers. init.*

[*D*] *He had so much business that he declined standing a Candidate for the Consulship.*] Cicero tells us (15) this circumstance: he adds, that the ill state of health was also one reason, why Aquilius would not be Consul. *Aquilium non arbitramur (scilicet, Competitorem fori) qui & negavit, & juravit morbum, & illud regnum suum judiciale opposuit.* Upon which the Abbot of St. Real observes (16), that Aquilius, for the sake of his own reputation, was obliged to declare publickly his intention, since he was resolved not to petition for the Consulship. For it was a kind of dishonour for a man to decline that high post, when his age and birth gave him a right to it, unless he had very good reasons not to desire it.

(15) *Epist. ad Attic.* lib. 1. Ep. 1.

(16) *Oeuvres de St. Real*, tom. 3. pag. 421.

[*E*] *Aquilius was a Judge in the cause of P. Quintius.*] Cn. Dolabella the Prætor had chosen Aquilius to judge this cause. This Judge took three other persons well skilled in the Law to assist him, namely, L. Lucullus, P. Quintilius, and M. Marcellus. Aquilius alone was sworn, and tho' his three assistants sate with him upon the bench, yet they did not take any oath; for they were not there to judge, having not received the authority of Magistrates, but only to give their advice (17). We may observe here, that according to Hottomannus (18), C. Aquilius Gallus had studied the Law under Q. Mutius, a man extremely conversant in the Roman Laws.

(17) Tho. Freigius, *in Not. ad Cic. Orat.* tom. 1. pag. 4.

(18) *Apud eund.* ibid.

[*F*] *Cicero bestows a very fine encomium on this great Man.*] He praises him very much in his Oration for P. Quintius; but as Cicero was then but twenty six years old (19), and Aquilius already an old man and his Judge, it might be thought, that Cicero's praises were the effect of flattery. But he commends him still more in his plea for Cæcinna, which he spoke eleven years after the other. He says (20) that if Aquilius had been present, he would not have ventured to extol his virtue and wisdom, for fear of offending his modesty; but as he was absent he could speak more freely. Aquilius had given some advice to Cicero concerning the cause of Cæcinna; and as Cicero intended to alledge the authority of that great Man, it was proper for him to shew how much the opinion of so eminent a person was to be considered. He therefore tells the Judges, that the Romans had experienced the wisdom and prudence of Aquilius, who in explaining the civil Law had always taken care never to make it clash with justice and equity; who for many years had exerted his genius and his industry for the good of his country; who was a man of so much goodness and justice in all his decisions, that he seemed to have been made a Lawyer by nature itself, rather than by study; that he had so much experience and was so prudent, that by his assistance the civil Law had produced not a mere fruitless science, but even goodness itself.

(19) A. Gellius, lib. 15. cap. 28. Euseb. *in Chron.* A. 4. Olymp. 174.

(20) *Orat. pro Cæcinna.*

[*G*] *His Rule —— to prevent frauds in contracts.*] What this particular Rule was, we do not find. Cicero, who mentions it often, does no where, as we can find, tell us in what it consisted. But we

Everriculum malitiarum omnium (q). Dion Caſſius mentions (r) an AQUILIUS FLORUS, who with his ſon came to a very miſerable death. They had been of Marc Anthony's party againſt Octavius, and at the battle of Actium fell into the conqueror's hands, who ordered that they ſhould caſt lots who of them two ſhould be put to death. But the ſon, probably to ſave his father's life, offered his head voluntarily to the executioner, which his father ſeeing, killed himſelf out of grief and deſpair. We find in hiſtory ſome other perſons called *Aquilius*; but there is nothing very remarkable in their lives. We ſhall only give in the note a ſhort account of a Poet called AQUILIUS, whom Aulus Gellius mentions [*H*].

(q) *De Nat. Deor.* lib. 3.
(r) Lib. 51. p. m. 508.

we may know Aquilius's opinion concerning equity by the definition he gave of an *intended fraud*, which the Latins called *Dolus malus*. This according to him conſiſts "in feigning that we will do one thing, when "we really intend to do another;" *cum aliud eſt ſimulatum, aliud actum* (21), or, as Cicero expreſſes it in another paſſage (22), *Dolus malus ſimulatione & diſſimulatione continetur*; that is, "An intended fraud "conſiſts either in feigning or in diſſembling." Whence Cicero very juſtly concludes, that in all our dealings with others we muſt act with the utmoſt ſincerity; that we muſt not feign nor diſſemble the leaſt circumſtance on account of our private intereſt, either to ſell dearer or to buy cheaper. He alledges ſuch an inſtance of ſincerity and fair dealing, as could ſcarce be found in this age. Q. Scævola the ſon of Publius having bought a piece of land, found that it was worth more, than he had agreed for with the ſeller, and therefore added a large ſum of money to that which he had at firſt promiſed. Cicero's moral reflections on this ſtory are too long to be here inſerted. We muſt not omit to mention that ſome Authors are of opinion, that he wrote a whole treatiſe concerning Frauds. Some of his works, as that *De Poſthumorum Inſtitutione*, and *De Stipulatione* are quoted in the Code and in the Pandects (23).

(21) Lib. 3. *de Offic.* p. m. 197.
(22) Ibid. p. 198.

(23) Rutilius, *in Vita Juriſconſ.*

[*H*] *Aquilius, whom Aulus Gellius mentions.*] He tells us (24), that ſome of the Comedies, which bore the name of Plautus, were not written by him, but by M. Aquilius. The Comedies he names were *Gemini Lenones* (25), i. e. "The two Pimps;" *Condalium* (26), i. e. "The Ring;" *Anus*, i. e. "The old Woman;" *Bis compreſſa*, i. e. "The Maiden twice raviſhed;" *Bæotia*; Ἄγροικος or *Agreſtis*, i. e. "The Clown;" and *Commorientes*, i. e. "Perſons dying together." We may obſerve here, 1, that Athenæus relates that Philemon and Antiphanes wrote each of them a Comedy intitled Ἄγροικος, and that a Latin piece called *Agricus* is ſomewhere quoted (27). 2, The Play called *Commorientes* is expreſſly aſcribed to Plautus by Terence (28), who even deſcribes the ſubject of that Comedy, which Plautus, it ſeems, had borrowed from a Greek Poet. I wonder that Gellius, who endeavours to appear very accurate, did not take notice of that paſſage in *Terence*.

(24) Lib. 3. cap. 3. p. m. 214—218.
(25) Quoted by Priſcian lib. 6.
(26) Quoted by Varro, *de Ling. Lat.* lib. 5.
(27) *Vide* Thyſii & Oiſeli *Notas in A. Gell.* pag. 218. edit. Lugd. Batav. 1656, 8°.
(28) *In Prologo Adelphorum.*

P.

☞AQUILIUS [*A*] SEVERUS, a Spaniſh writer of the fourth Century was of the family of that Severus, to whom Lactantius dedicated two books of his Letters [*B*]. He wrote a book in the form of an Itinerary, which contained the whole hiſtory of his life, partly in proſe and partly in verſe (*a*). He gave it the title of the *Cataſtrophe* (καταστροφή) or *Tryal* (πεῖρα). He died under the reign of the Emperor Valentinian (*b*), that is, according to Du Pin (*c*), about the year 370. This is all that St. Jerom tells us of this Author, and all that we can poſſibly learn concerning him. Mr. Du Pin obſerves upon this occaſion, that works of the ſame kind with that of Aquilius, which contain an account of the lives of Authors, are very agreeable, when they are written by perſons of eminence and character, who have been employed in the management of affairs, or by thoſe whoſe lives have been full of extraordinary and ſurprizing incidents; and ſuch works are likewiſe very uſeful, when they are compoſed by men of virtue and merit. But when none of theſe circumſtances occur, books of that kind are commonly tedious and of no importance. It is probable, that the life of Aquilius was full of uncommon incidents, which induced him to write the Hiſtory of it, which he intitled the *Cataſtrophe* or *Tryal*. He ſhewed perhaps the wonderful conduct of Providence in the various events of his life. This is the only probable conjecture which we can fix upon, ſince we have no certainty in this point.

(*a*) The Greek tranſlation of St. Jerom *de Vir. Illuſtrib.* c. 111, ſays it was in *Heroic Verſe*, μέτρῳ ἡρῳκῷ.
(*b*) S. Hieron. *de Viris Illuſtribus*, cap. cxl.
(*c*) *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* tom. 2. p. 133. edit. *de Paris* 1693.

[*A*] *Aquilius.*] Honorius Auguſtodunenſis c. 112. calls him *Achilius*, which is agreeable to a MS. Copy, mentioned by Fabricius in his Notes upon St. Jerom *de Viris Illuſtribus* c. 111. who tells us, that the other MSS. conſulted by Suffridus Petri read it *Acilius*, as Martin Lipſius likewiſe remarked. Voſſius in his Book *de Poetis Latinis* obſerves, that other Copies have *Atilius* or *Cæcilius*; which Fabricius ſuppoſes that author had tranſcribed from Lilius Giraldus.

[*B*] *To whom Lactantius dedicated two books of his letters.*] Theſe letters are mentioned by St. Jerom *de Viris Illuſtrib.* c. 80, but are not now extant. Pſeudo-Dexter has borrowed the paſſage concerning Aquilius from that Father in his *Chronicle* under the year 370, where he tell us, that "Aqqilius Severus of To-"ledo, and of the ſame family with another Aquilius Se-"verus, to whom Lactantius addreſſed a volume of "Epiſtles, was in great reputation at that time." *Aquilius Severus domo Toletanus ex genere alterius Aquilii Severi, ad quem Lactantius nuncupavit volumen epiſtolarum, hoc tempore magno in pretio habetur.* We may obſerve here, that St. Jerom did not aſſert, that the perſon, to whom Lactantius wrote, was called *Aquilius Severus*, but only *Severus*. And therefore the name of Aquilius was added by Pſeudo-Dexter without any authority.

T.

AQUIN (PHILIP D') in Latin *Aquinas* or *Aquinius*, acquired much reputation by the knowledge of Hebrew, which he taught at Paris under the reign of Lewis XIII, and by the books that he publiſhed [*A*]. He was originally of Aquino * in the Kingdom of

* *Originally of Aquino.*] His name was Rabbi Mardocai or Mordecai. About the year 1610 the Jews expelled him out of their Synagogue at Avignon, becauſe he had ſome inclination for the Chriſtian religion. He went into the Kingdom of Naples, and was baptized at Aquino, for which reaſon it ſeems he took the ſurname of Aquino, of which he changed the termination, when ſome years after he retired into France with his whole family (*a*). [CRIT. REM.]

(*a*) Crit. Rem. at the end of the French edition of Mr. Bayle's Dictionary.

[*A*] *He acquired much reputation by the books which he publiſhed.*] The liſt of them is as follows: *Dictionarium Hebræo-Chaldæo-Thalmudico-Rabbinicum*, printed at Paris, 1629, *in fol.* The *roots of the Holy Tongue, ad formam Cubi Hutteri-*

of Naples (*a*), and from thence he took his name; but he was born in the country of Avignon †. He turned from Judaiſm, and had a penſion from the Clergy of France (*b*): there is mention made of him in the trial of the Marſhal d'Ancre [*B*]. Simeon de Muis has given him great praiſe [*C*]: Valerian of Flavigni, on the contrary, has ſpoken ill of him [*D*]. There was a LEWIS HENRY D'AQUIN contemporary with this, and well verſed in the Oriental Languages. I do not know whether he was his ſon or his brother (*c*)*. He tranſlated ſomething out of Hebrew into Latin [*E*]. He had likewiſe been Jew, and he was alſo a Penſioner of the Clergy. ANTHONY D'AQUIN who was firſt Phyſician to Lewis XIV was grandſon of Philip.

† *At Carpentras.*

(*a*) I know this only by hearſay.

(*b*) See the Epiſtle dedicatory to his *Interpretation of the Tree of the Cabala.*

(*c*) Monſieur Colomies thinks that he was his ſon.

* *There was one Lewis Henry . . . . . I don't know whether he was his ſon or his brother.*] He was his ſon, and was born at Avignon about the year 1600: he was the father of Anthony, &c. See F. Deſmoletz, *Continuation des Mem. de Liter. &c.* tom. 2. Part 2. p. 48 (*β*). [CRIT. REM.]

(*β*) Paris edit.

Hutterianiani, at Paris 1620, *in* 16°; an Italian tranſlation of *the Apophthegms of the antient Doctors of the Jewiſh Church*, collected by the Rabbin Simeon ſon of Gamaliel; * *the Expoſition of the thirteen ways which the ancient Rabbins make uſe of to explain the Pentateuch* (1); *the interpretation of the Tree of the Cabala, adorned with the cut of it taken from ancient Hebrew Authors*, printed at Paris, at the expence of the Author, 1625, *in* 8vo: *A Diſcourſe on the Tabernacle and Camp of the Iſraelites*, at Paris, by Th. Blaiſe, in 1623, *in* 4o; *Literal, allegorical and moral Explications of the Tabernacle which God ordered Moſes to build, of the veſtments of the Prieſts, and of the manner of conſulting the Breaſt-Plate under the ancient Law, together with the form of the Jewiſh Sacrifice; the whole curiouſly collected, and faithfully tranſlated from the moſt learned and ancient of the Hebrew Authors; together with a Diſcourſe on the Camp of the Iſraelites, and the Deſcription of the Precious Stones in the Breaſt-Plate of the High-Prieſt, added at the end of the ſecond Edition, reviſed by the Author*, printed at Paris, at the Author's expence, in 1624, *in* 4o: *Bechinas Olam, or an Examen of the World of Rabi Jacob; moral Sentences of the ancient Hebrews, and the thirteen methods by which they uſed to interpret the Bible*, at Paris, by John Lacquehaye, 1629, *in* 8vo; *Phil. Aquinatis, Hebraicæ Linguæ profeſſ. Lachrymæ in obitum illuſtriſſ. Cardinalis de Berulle: Pariſij apud Joannem Beſſin*, 1629, *in* 8vo.

(1) Printed at Paris 1620, in 4to.

* *The expoſition of the thirteen methods &c.*] Mr. Bayle ſhould have ſaid, that this work is in Latin. F. Le Long ſays, that this firſt Vol. *in* 4to. was publiſhed *under the name* of F. Arnoux; but he is miſtaken; it is only dedicated to that Father, then Confeſſor to Lewis XIII. (γ) [CRIT. REM.]

(γ) Paris edit.

[*B*] *Mention is made of him in the tryal of the Marſhal d'Ancre.*] The thing is too remarkable to be paſſed over. "Item it is proved by informations, as alſo "by the depoſition of Aquinas, heretofore a Jew, and "now a Chriſtian, (whom Conchine and his wife ſent "for to Moulins, where this ſame Aquinas was, in the "houſe of the criminal judge) (2), that Conchine and "his wife made uſe of the Cabala and Jewiſh Books. "It is alſo to be obſerved that this Aquinas depoſed, "that Conchine, in the preſence of his wife, had taken "away a chamber pot on account of impurity, and car-"ried out the picture of a Crucifix, for fear of their "preventing the effect which the ſaid Conchine and his "wife pretended would follow from reading ſome verſes "of the 51ſt Pſalm, *miſerere mei*, in Hebrew, which "they deſired Aquinas to read according to the form "that Montalto had ſometimes read it to them before."

(2) Perhaps he was there as Preceptor to Gilbert Gaulmin, who has confeſſed that he had been a diſciple of Philip Aquinas. *Integrum M. S. Librum*, ſays he, *ad Libros de vitâ & morte Moſis*, pag. 305. *ex Philippi D'Aquin præceptoris olim mei χειμηλίοις deſcripſimus.*

[*C*] *Simeon de Muis has given him great praiſes.*] See what he ſays on the 14 Verſe of the xxxv Pſalm. *Cum hic hærerem dubius, Philippus Aquinas, è Judæo Chriſtianus, vir raræ & exquiſitiſſimæ in Hebraicis literis doctrinæ, & quem nunquam fruſtra conſulas, fortè venit ad me viſendi gratiâ, & venit quidem optatus. Ille, ſtatim atque de re communicavi, ut ſingulos Bibliorum verſus, imo & voces ſingulas in numerato habet, ac tanquam digitos tenet, indicavit locum ex Eſaiæ* lxvi. v. 13. i. e. "While I was muſing what the meaning of this "paſſage might be, as good luck would have it, Philip "Aquinas, a Jewiſh Proſelyte to Chriſtianity, a man "of uncommon and excellent abilities in Hebrew learn-"ing, and who is never at a loſs to reſolve doubts, "came to make me a viſit. As ſoon as ever I com-"municated the matter to him, (for he has not only "every verſe but even every word of the Bible at "his fingers ends) he quoted to me that place of Iſaiah "in the lxvi Chap. and 13. v."

[*D*] *Valerian de Flavigni . . . has ſpoken ill of him.*] He was Hebrew profeſſor in the College Royal at Paris. He very roughly handled the Bible of Mr. le Jai; and maintained that the Hebrew text therein had been ſhamefully mangled by Philip Aquinas. *Tot ac tantis conſpurcatam maculis atque ſordibus, obſtetricantibus impuriſſimis manibus Philippi Aquinatis Avenionenſis, ex Judæo Chriſtiano, ut à planta pedis uſque ad verticem non ſit in eo ſanitas* (3); i. e. "So corrupted and "defiled with ſpots and blemiſhes, being firſt pol-"luted by the unclean hands of Philip Aquinas of "Avignon, that Jewiſh proſelyte to Chriſtianity, that "from the very beginning of the work to the end "there is not one ſound part in it.

(3) Flavigni, *in Epiſtola de Heptaplis Pariſienſibus, apud* Colomeſium, *Gall. Oriental.* p. 256.

[*E*] *Lewis Henry Aquinas tranſlated ſome piece from the Hebrew into Latin* (4).] See the title as follows. *Commentarius Rabi Levi filii Gerſonis in librum Jobi, ſeu in V prima capita, interprete Ludovico Henrico Aquino Lutetiæ*, printed at Paris by Th. Blaiſe, 1622, *in* 4to; *Scholia Rabi Salamonis Jarchi in librum Eſther: item excerpta quædam ex Talmudo & Jalcut in eundem librum, interpret. Lud. Henr. Aquino ibid.* 1622, *in* 4to.

(4) *See* Colomies, *Galliæ Oriental.* p. 254, 256.

☞ AQUINAS (ST. THOMAS), who is ſtil'd the *Angelical Doctor*, and whoſe works are very numerous [*A*], was of the antient and noble family of the Counts of Aquino, who were deſcended from the Kings of Sicily and Aragon. He was born in the Caſtle of Aquino in the *Terra di Lavoro* in Italy about the year 1224 (*a*), or in the beginning

(*a*) Du Pin, *Biblioth.* tom. 10. pag. 74. edit. Paris 1702; and Cave, *Hiſt. Liter.* pag. 636. edit. Colon, Allobrog. 1720.

[*A*] *Whoſe Works are very numerous.*] They contain ſeventeen volumes in folio, which were printed at Venice in 1490, Nuremberg in 1496, Rome in 1570, Venice in 1594, and Cologne in 1612. We ſhall give an account of them from Du Pin (1). The *five* firſt volumes contain his Commentaries upon the works of Ariſtotle; the *ſixth* and *ſeventh* a Commentary upon the four books of Sentences; the *eighth* Queſtions in Divinity, particularly ten Queſtions concerning the Power of God, ſixteen Queſtions concerning Evil, a Queſtion concerning ſpiritual Creatures, another concerning the Soul, a Queſtion concerning the Union of the Word, a Queſtion concerning the Virtues in general, another concerning Charity, another concerning brotherly Correction, a Queſtion concerning Hope, another concerning the Cardinal Virtues, twenty nine Queſtions concerning Truth, and twelve *quodlibetical* Queſtions. The *ninth* volume contains the Sum of the Catholick Faith againſt the Gentiles, divided into four books. The *tenth*, *eleventh*, and *twelfth* the ſum of Divinity with the Commentaries of Cardinal Cajetanus. The *thirteenth* conſiſts of ſeveral Commentaries upon the Old Teſtament, particularly a Commentary upon the book of Job, a literal and anagogical Expoſition upon the firſt fifty Pſalms, an Expoſition upon the Canticles, which he dictated upon his death-bed to the Monks of Foſſa nova, Commentaries upon the Prophecies of Iſaiah and Jeremiah, and upon the Lamentations, which the beſt Critics are of opinion were written by Thomas Anglicus. The *fourteenth* volume contains the Commentaries upon the Goſpels of St. Matthew and St. John; but that upon St. Matthew

(1) Pag. 74.

ginning of the year 1225 (*b*). His father was Laudolph Count of Aquino, and his mother Theodora the daughter of Count Theates (*c*). When he was five years of age he was committed to the care of the Monks of Mount Caſſino, under whom he ſhewed the marks of an excellent genius, till he was ſent to the Univerſity of Naples, where he ſtudied Logick under Peter Hibernus, and polite Literature under Martinus (*d*). In the year 1241 he entered himſelf into the Order of the Preaching Friars at Naples, without the knowledge of his parents. But his mother being informed of it, uſed her utmoſt efforts to divert him from his deſign; to prevent which the Dominicans removed him to Terracina, and then to Anagna, and at laſt to Rome. His

(*b*) Oudin, *Comment. de Scriptor. Eccleſ.* tom. 3. col. 254. edit. Lipſiæ 1722.

(*c*) Idem, ibid.

(*d*) Cave, *ubi ſuprà*.

was written by Peter Scaliger a Dominican Friar and Biſhop of Verona (2). The Commentary upon S. John was compiled by Reginald St. Thomas's companion, from the literal expoſition which he heard him make of that Goſpel. The *fifteenth* volume contains the *Catena* upon the four Goſpels extracted from the Fathers, and dedicated to Pope Urban IV. The *ſixteenth* volume conſiſts of the Commentary upon St. Paul's Epiſtles, and the Sermons of Aquinas preached on Sundays and the Feſtival of Saints (3). The *ſeventeenth* volume contains divers Tracts in Divinity, under the following titles; a Treatiſe againſt the Errors of the Greeks dedicated to Pope Urban IV; a Compendium of Divinity dedicated to Reginald a Monk of his Order, which ſome Writers aſcribe with great probability to Ulric of Strasburg; an Expoſition of ſome Articles againſt the Greeks, Armenians, and Saracens, dedicated to the Chantor of Antioch; a Treatiſe upon the two Precepts of Charity, and the ten Commandments of the Law; an Expoſition of the Lord's Prayer; an Expoſition of the Angelical Salutation; an Anſwer concerning an hundred and eight Articles extracted from the works of Peter de Tarentaſia, addreſſed to John de Verceil General of the Order of the Preaching Friars, but this is not ſuppoſed to have been compoſed by Aquinas; another Anſwer addreſſed to the ſame perſon concerning forty two Articles; an Anſwer concerning thirty ſix Articles, addreſſed to the Reader of Venice; another Anſwer concerning ſix Articles addreſſed to the Reader of Beſançon; a Treatiſe concerning the Difference between the divine and human Word; a Treatiſe concerning the Nature and Origin of the Word of the Underſtanding, *de naturâ & origine verbi intellectûs*: a Treatiſe upon ſeparate Subſtances, or of the Nature of Angels; a Tract concerning the Unity of the Underſtanding againſt the Averroiſts, who aſſerted all mankind had but one ſingle underſtanding; a Tract againſt thoſe, who endeavoured to divert men from entering into a religious profeſſion; a Treatiſe upon the Perfection of a ſpiritual life; a Tract againſt thoſe, who oppoſed the worſhip of the Deity and Religion, in which he defends the Orders of the Mendicant Friars in oppoſition to the books of *William de Sancto Amore*; four books of the Government of Princes, which were undoubtedly not written by St. Thomas, becauſe it is ſaid in that piece, that in the time of the Author Adolphus ſucceeded Rodolphus in the Empire, and Albert ſucceeded Adolphus, which did not happen till many years after the death of Aquinas; a Treatiſe of the Government of the Jews; a Treatiſe of the Form of Abſolution; an Expoſition of the firſt Decretal; an Expoſition of the ſecond Decretal; a Treatiſe of Lots; a Treatiſe of judicial Aſtrology; a Tract upon Eternity of the World; a Treatiſe concerning Fate; thirty ſeven (4) other Tracts in Logic and Natural Philoſophy; ſeven books of the Inſtruction of Princes, which are publiſhed in no edition except that of Rome; the Office of the Feſtival of the holy Sacrament written at the command of Urban IV, who appointed that ſolemnity. There is ſome reaſon to doubt whether St. Thomas compoſed the whole, or only made uſe of the office of the holy Sacrament, written by John the Clerk of Liege, and made ſeveral alterations in it. Henſchenius and Papebrock aſſert, that St. Thomas is not the Author of this office, which was compoſed by John of Liege abovementioned; which they endeavour to prove from the teſtimony of the Author of the Life of St. Juliana the Virgin, who aſſures us, that this Clerk of Liege wrote an Office of the holy Sacrament, conſiſting of hymns, anthems, reſponſes, leſſons, capitula's and collects; and they confirm this by the ancient books of the Church of St. Martin at Liege, in which part of the Office aſcribed to St. Thomas is to be found. Father Noel Alexander a Dominican affirms on the contrary (5), that this Office is the genuine work of St. Thomas; which he proves by the authority of William de Toco or Thoco, a contemporary Writer, who places this among the works of Aquinas; which is likewiſe done by Ptolomy of Lucca, Biſhop of Toricelli, the Scholar of St. Thomas, and by St. Antoninus. But, as Mr. Du Pin obſerves (6), it is eaſy to reconcile theſe two opinions by ſuppoſing, that St. Thomas made uſe of the office written by John the Clerk of Liege, and inſerted part of it in that, which is aſcribed to him, becauſe he had ſome ſhare in the compoſition of it, and reduced it to the form, which it is in at preſent. And therefore it is only ſaid in the Hiſtory of the Tranſlation of St. Thomas's body, that he put in order (*ordinavit*) the Office of the holy Sacrament. In this volume are contained likewiſe a Treatiſe upon the Sacrament of the Altar divided into thirty two chapters, aſcribed to Albertus Magnus by Trithemius; another Treatiſe upon the Sacrament of the Euchariſt, but it is doubted whether this was written by St. Thomas, as well as the following Tracts, concerning the Humility of Jeſus Chriſt; of the Love of Chriſt and our Neighbour, of divine Morals; of Bleſſedneſs; of the manner of Confeſſion; of Purity of Conſcience; of the Duty of a Prieſt; of the Maſs; of buying and ſelling for a time, which is aſcribed by ſome to James of Viterbo; a Letter upon the method of acquiring divine and human knowledge; a Treatiſe upon the Vices and Virtues; of Concordances; and of Uſury. Beſides theſe ſuſpected Tracts there are two others, which are thought to be genuine performances of Aquinas, the former an Expoſition upon Boethius's book concerning Weeks, and the latter Queſtions upon the ſame Author's book concerning the Trinity. At the end of this volume is added a Commentary upon the four books of the Sentences, which ſome Writers ſuppoſe to be doubtful. There have been publiſhed ſeparately under his name ſeveral other Commentaries upon the Scriptures, particularly upon Geneſis, Lyons 1573 in 8vo; upon the Prophecy of Daniel; upon the Books of the Maccabees, Paris 1596, 8vo; upon all the canonical Epiſtles, Paris 1543, 8vo, 1550, Lyons 1556, Antwerp 1592; and upon the Apocalypſe (7). But all theſe Commentaries are thought not to have been written by Aquinas; and the greateſt part of them are aſcribed to Thomas Anglicus (8). We have likewiſe a Commentary upon Boethius's *Conſolation of Philoſophy* publiſhed under S. Thomas's name at Louvain in 1487 in fol. and at Lyons in 1514 in 4to, which Du Pin ſuppoſes to be a genuine work of his, tho' Dr. Cave is of the contrary opinion. Several difficulties have been raiſed with regard to his *Summa Theologiæ*, which have occaſioned ſome Authors to doubt, whether he was really the Author of it. Cardinal Bellarmin in his *third Obſervation* upon St. Thomas in his book *de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis* under the year 1265, tells us, that it is very ſurprizing that a great part of the *Prima Secundæ* and *Secunda Secundæ* is found word for word in the firſt and third part of the *Speculum morale* of Vincent Bellovacenſis or de Beauvais. It does not ſeem probable, continues the ſame Author, that Vincent ſhould borrow his work from the book of St. Thomas, ſince he died in the year 1256, as Anthony Senenſis aſſures us from Vaſeus in his *Bibliotheca PP. Prædicatorum*; whereas St. Thomas died in 1274, and wrote his *Summa Theologiæ* in the latter part of his Life. On the other hand it is by no means credible, that St. Thomas ſhould borrow the *ſecond and moſt valuable part* of his *Sum* from any other Writer. To clear theſe difficulties the Cardinal could find no expedient,

(2) Du Pin, ibid. and Cave, p. 636.

(3) Cave, ibid.

(4) Dr. Cave ſays 36.

(5) See his Article.

(6) Pag. 75.

(7) Cave, pag. 637.

(8) Cave, ibid. and Du Pin, pag. 75.

His mother followed him thither, but could not obtain leave of the Monks to ſee her ſon; ſo that being highly incenſed at this treatment, with the aſſiſtance of her two elder ſons, ſhe ſeized the youth in his journey to Paris, whither he was ſent by the Monks of his order. She ordered him to be ſhut up in her caſtle, where he ſtudied the Scriptures with the greateſt application, and continued inflexible to all the entreaties and threats of his mother, and brothers, and ſiſter. Two years after he eſcaped out of the Caſtle by the window, and fled to Naples, and then to Rome. In 1244 he went to Paris with John the Maſter of the Teutonic Order, and having ſtaid there a ſhort time removed to Cologne, in order to hear the Lectures of Albertus Magnus. From thence he was invited again to Paris to read publick Lectures upon the book of *Sentences*, which he performed with great applauſe before a very large audience. In the year 1255 he was created Doctor of Divinity at Paris on the ſame day with Bonaventure. He returned to Italy in or before the year 1263, and was appointed *Definitor* of his Order for the Province of Rome; and having taught School Divinity in moſt of the Univerſities of Italy, he

dient, but to ſuppoſe, that the *Speculum morale* was not written by Vincent Bellovacenſis, but by ſome later Author, whoſe name was likewiſe Vincent, and who deſigned to give an abridgment of the *ſecond part* of St. Thomas's *Sum*. This he thinks is confirmed by this conſideration, that the *Speculum morale* ſeems much more ſolid than the *Speculum doctrinale, naturale, & hiſtoriale*, which were undoubtedly the performances of Vincent Bellovacenſis. *Mirum valde eſt, quod magna pars Secundæ, & Secunda Secundæ inveniatur iiſdem verbis in primo & tertio* Speculi Moralis *Vincentii Bellovacenſis. Et quidem non videtur Vincentius potuiſſe Speculum ſuum morale conficere ex doctrina & verbis S. Thomæ, cum ipſe obierit anno Domini* 1256, *ut teſtatur Antonius Senenſis ex Vaſco in Bibliotheca PP. Prædicatorum; & S. Thomas obierit anno Domini* 1274, *& in extrema ætate Summam Theologiæ confecerit. Sed neque eſt ullo modo credibile ſanctum Thomam Summæ ſuæ partem ſecundam, tamque nobiliſſimam ex alio ſcriptore hauſiſſe. In his anguſtiis nihil mihi occurrit, niſi Speculum illud morale fortaſſe non eſſe Vincentii Bellovacenſis, ſed alicujus authoris poſteriores; qui fortaſſe Vincentius etiam dicebatur, quique ſecundam partem S. Thomæ in compendium redigere voluerit. Id quod videtur poſſe confirmari eo quod Speculum morale gravius multo eſſe videatur, quam ſint Speculum doctrinale, naturale, & hiſtoriale, quæ tria ſine ullo dubio ſunt Vincentii Bellovacenſis.* Petrus de Alva, a Franciſcan, in his *Nodus indiſſolubilis de conceptu mentis & ventris*, publiſhed at Bruſſels in 1662 (9), has attempted to prove, that the *Summa Theologiæ* was not written by St. Thomas; but he was anſwered by Francis Janſſens, a Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Louvain in a book intitled, *Authoritas divi Thomæ Aquinatis V. Eccleſiæ Doctoris vindicata*, printed at Ghent in 1664. The learned Mr. Launoi, Doctor of Sorbonne, in a book of his entitled *Venerandæ Romanæ Eccleſiæ circa Simoniam Traditio*, printed at Paris 1675, likewiſe doubted whether the *Sum* is the genuine performance of St. Thomas, from the ſilence of Pope Clement VI, who in a Panegyric upon that Saint, which he pronounced ſoon after his canonization, and in which he gives an ample account of the works of that Author, makes no mention of this. Father Alexander wrote a Diſſertation in anſwer to this, inſerted in the 21ſt volume of his *Selecta Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ Capita*, in which he endeavours to invalidate all the objections urged by Launoi, Bellarmin, Peter de Alva, and others (10). He evinces St. Thomas's claim to this work from the teſtimonies of ſeveral Authors, who lived ſoon after him, particularly that of William de Toco, who was one of thoſe, that ſollicited to have him canonized, and who made an exact Catalogue of his works, among which his *Sum* holds the firſt rank; of William de la Mare, who oppoſing at the end of the thirteenth Century the doctrine of St. Thomas in a book of his intitled *Correctorium Operum Fratris Thomæ*, extracts moſt of the articles, which he objects againſt, from his *Summa Theologiæ*, as his principal work; of Ægidius Romanus, a Scholar of St. Thomas, who defended him againſt de la Mare; of John Lallemand and Nicholas Trivett, who wrote about the beginning of the following Century a Catalogue of the writings of St. Thomas; of St. Antoninus, and many others; without inſiſting upon Demetrius Cydonius a Greek, who tranſlated this work into the Greek language, and highly extolled the Author. It is evident therefore that the argument drawn from the ſilence of Clement VI is not equivalent to the teſtimonies of ſo many Writers, who were as ancient, or even older than that Pope. We may obſerve here that Aquinas did not finiſh his *Sum*, and that the concluſion of the laſt part was ſupplied by Peter de Alvernia, his ſcholar, who flouriſh'd about the year 1280, and who formed the greateſt part of that ſupplement from the other books of St. Thomas, and particularly his commentaries upon the maſter of the ſentences (11). With regard to the objection of Cardinal Bellarmin abovemention'd, that part of this work is to be found in the *Speculum Morale* of Vincent Bellovacenſis, the critics are divided in their opinions. Some of them alledge that perhaps the latter did not die till the year 1264, and that St. Thomas had already compoſed his *Secunda Secundæ*, which might therefore be communicated to Vincent. Others affirm that the *Speculum Morale* was not written by him; but that as this Author had never compoſed ſuch a work, or that, which he wrote, being loſt, ſome other perſon had ſubſtituted in the room of it theſe extracts from St. Thomas to render the performance of Vincent Bellovacenſis compleat. But theſe ſolutions, as Mr. Du Pin obſerves (12), are by no means probable; for in the firſt place almoſt all the authors, who have mentioned Vincent, tell us, that he died in 1256. And tho' we ſhould ſuppoſe that he lived till the year 1264, yet it is difficult to imagine, that he ſhould tranſcribe a work, which was not then publiſhed or finiſhed. Beſides, it cannot juſtly be ſaid, that he never wrote a *Speculum morale*, ſince he informs us in his preface, that it was one part of his work; and the antient writers, as Henry Gandavenſis and Trithemius, mention the latter, which begins with the words that are quoted by Trithemius as the beginning of the *Speculum Morale* of Vincent Bellovacenſis. On the other hand it appears, that St. Thomas's *Summa Theologiæ* is all written in the ſame ſtile and manner; and he quotes the *Secunda Secundæ* in the other parts of his work; whereas that of Vincent Bellovacenſis is a mere rhapſody extracted from different authors; and it is even ſaid, that he cites St. Thomas's ſum in his *Speculum Naturale* (13). The reader will find a very accurate examination of theſe difficulties, in Caſimir Oudin's *Commentarius de Scriptoribus Eccleſiæ antiquis eorumque ſcriptis* (14), wherein he determines, that St. Thomas Aquinas is the real author of the *Summa Theologiæ*. Before we conclude this note, it will not be improper to give an account of the plan of this celebrated work. In the firſt part, after the author has ſpoken in the firſt queſtion of the ſacred doctrine in general, he treats of God, his Eſſence, Attributes, and Operations, of the three divine perſons, the proceſſion of them, and their relations to each other, and laſtly of God conſidered with regard to his creatures, as their Creator and Preſerver. In the firſt part of the *ſecond* part he treats of the inclination of rational creatures towards God, of their ultimate end of the nature of thoſe actions, by which they may attain it, of the principle of them, of virtues and vices in general, of the laws and of Grace. In the ſecond part of the *ſecond*, he treats in particular of theological and moral virtues, and of every thing which relates to them. In the *third* part, he treats of the means, by which it is poſſible to approach to the Deity, and theſe means are the incarnation of Chriſt, and the Sacraments, that make the ſubject of this part; which concludes with queſtions relating to the four ends of man (15).

(9) *See* Oudin, tom. 3. Col. 354, 355.

(10) Idem, ibid. and Du Pin, p. 76.

(11) Du Pin, p. 76.

(12) Pag. 70.

(13) Idem, ibid. p. 71.

(14) Tom. 3. Col. 356, *& ſeq.*

(15) Du Pin, pag. 76.

he ſettled at laſt at Naples, where he received a penſion from King Charles, and ſpent the reſt of his life in ſtudy, reading of Lectures and the exerciſes of piety [*B*], and was ſo far from the views of ambition or profit, that he refuſed the Archbiſhoprick of that City, when it was offered him by Pope Clement IV. In 1274 he was ſent for to the ſecond Council of Lyons by Pope Gregory X, that he might read before them the book which he had written againſt the errors of the Greeks at the command of Urban IV: but he fell ſick in his journey at the Monaſtry of Foſſanova near Terracina, where he died on the ſeventh of March the ſame year, being fifty years of age (*e*). Volaterranus tells us (*f*), that as he was about to receive the Euchariſt juſt before his death, he prayed to our Saviour that he would pardon what he had written concerning the myſteries of his religion and the univerſal Church, where-ever it was falſe, and he reſigned up all his works to the judgment of the church. This fact is partly confirmed by another writer, who was his ſcholar [*C*]. Sixtus Senenſis and other writers give him a noble character [*D*]; and Father Rapin repreſents him as the great improver of School Divinity [*E*]. He was very little ſkilled in Hiſtory, or polite Learning, and knew nothing of the Greek Language, which was occaſioned

(*f*) Lib. 21. pag. 758.

(*e*) Cave, and Du Pin, *ubi ſupra*.

[*B*] *Spent the reſt of his life in ſtudy, reading of lectures and the exerciſes of piety.*] Pope John XXII. in the bull of the canonization of St. Thomas obſerves, that he was perpetually employed in the ſervice of God, or the proſecution of his ſtudies, or preaching, or in devout prayer, or meditating upon the ſcriptures, in which he had a very profound knowledge; ſo that his whole time, except what was neceſſary for the refreſhment of Nature, was devoted to the moſt valuable purpoſes. *Totus divinis operibus intentus, aut eruditioni, quâ præcellebat, aut prædicationi, quâ immotus erat, aut orationi, quâ devotus, aut ſcripturæ ſacræ, quâ profundus, ſedulus vacabat; adeo ut præter naturalis neceſſitatis aut quietis horas, nullum ſibi aut vix temporis ſpatium relinqueret otioſum.*

[*C*] *Partly confirmed by another writer, who was his ſcholar.*] This writer is *William de Thoco* or *Toco*, Prior of the Convent of preaching Friars at Beneventum, who was deputed by that order to ſollicit St. Thomas's canonization, and wrote a long account of his life (16). He tells in his xth Chapter N°. LIX, that as he was about to receive the Sacrament, he ſaid theſe words; "I receive thee as the price of the "redemption of my ſoul; for the love of thee I have "ſtudied, watched, and laboured; I have preach-"ed and taught thee; I have never advanc'd any "thing contrary to thee, and I am not obſtinate in "my own ſentiments. But if I have ſaid any thing "amiſs with regard to this ſacrament, I leave the "whole to the correction of the holy Roman Church, "in whoſe obedience I am now going to leave this "life." *Et præmiſſis aliquibus devotis verbis, ſumenda ſacramentum prædixit; Sumo te in pretium redemptionis animæ meæ, pro cujus amore ſtudui, vigilavi, & laboravi, te prædicavi & docui, nihil unquam contra te dixi, nec ſum pertinax in ſenſu meo. Sed ſi quid malè dixi de hoc ſacramento, totum relinquo correctioni ſanctæ Romanæ Eccleſiæ, in cujus obedientiâ nunc tranſeo ex hac vitâ.* Oudin (17) ſuſpects the truth of this ſtory, and obſerves, that *William de Thoco* might perhaps have been credited in relating it, if he had been preſent with St. Thomas when he died; but he did not compile the account of his life till fifty years afterwards, and then endeavoured to write in a rhetorical manner, and conſidered rather what might be ſaid, than the reality of the facts, which he relates.

(16) *See* Oudin, Col. 256, and 269.

(17) Col. 256.

[*D*] *Sixtus Senenſis and other writers give him a noble character.*] He tells us (18), that St. Thomas approached ſo nearly to St. Auſtin in the knowledge of true Divinity, and penetrated ſo deeply into the moſt abſtruſe ſenſe of that father, that, agreeably to the Pythagorean Metempſychoſis, it was a common expreſſion among all the men of learning, that St. Auſtin's ſoul had tranſmigrated into St. Thomas Aquinas. *In ſacris ſinceriori Theologiæ ſtudiis ita ſapientiſſimo Auguſtino proximus inceſſit, atque ita mentem ejus & omnes reconditos ſenſus introſpexit, exhauſitque, ut juxta Pythagoræ Metempſychoſin communi omnium doctiſſimorum adagio jactatum ſit, Auguſtini animam migraſſe in Thomam.* The reader may ſee many other encomiums upon him in Sir Thomas Pope Blount's *Cenſura celebriorum Autorum*. Julius Nigronius the Jeſuit, in the collection of his orations printed at Doway in 1614, has one intitled, *De imagine Dei in homine, & laudibus S. Thomæ Aquinatis*; i. e. "Of the image of God in Man, with an "elogium upon St. Thomas Aquinas." wherein he informs us, that Albertus Magnus, under whom he had ſtudied, ſoon obſerved the marks of a great genius in Aquinas, while he was under his care; and when St. Thomas's ſchool-fellows uſed to ridicule him on account of his ſilence, and gave him the title of the *dumb ox, bos mutus*, Albertus ſaid, that it was true, he was a dumb ox, but that he would ſome time or other low ſo loudly, that all the world ſhould reſound with the noiſe of it. *Eſt quidem, inquit, bos mutus, ſed tantum edet aliquando mugitum, ut eo terrarum orbis reſonet univerſus* (19). Olearius informs us (20), that ſome writers have affirmed, that there came a voice from Heaven to that purpoſe: *In ſcholis condiſcipulis ridiculum fuiſſe, & bovem, eo quod ſemper taceret, ac tantummodo audiret, appellatum, cælicâ vero, de edendo hujus bovis per totum orbem mugitu, voce notatum, vide Dorſchei* Epiſt. dedicat. ſuper Thom. Confeſſ. Fidei.

(18) *Biblioth.* lib. 4. pag. 308. *apud* Cave, pag. 636.

(19) Jul. Nigroni *Orat.* 22. n. 24. pag. 686.

(20) *Biblioth. Script. Eccleſ.* tom. 2. p. 204. edit. Jenæ 1710.

[*E*] *Father Rapin repreſents him as the great improver of ſchool divinity.*] He tells us in his *Compariſon between Plato and Ariſtotle*, chap. V. that tho' Ariſtotle's works had been condemned in a council held at Paris in 1209, and were ordered to be burnt, and the reading of them prohibited upon pain of excommunication, yet there were in that city three of the greateſt Divines of that time, who began to honour him with their works and commentaries, Alexander Hales, Albertus Magnus, and St. Thomas Aquinas, ſcholar of the latter. S. John Damaſcenus had firſt open'd the way to them; for having made a very exact abridgment of the logic and ethics of Ariſtotle, he formed an excellent ſcheme of divinity in his four books of *the Orthodox Faith*. It was upon this model that Peter Lombard collected the opinions of the Fathers in Divinity, near 400 years after St. John Damaſcenus, in his book of ſentences; a work, which St. Thomas brought to the utmoſt perfection by following ſo well that noble original, of which Damaſcenus and the maſter of the Sentences had the firſt pattern from Ariſtotle. But St. Thomas undertook to follow their ſteps without obſerving their method; for he took a very particular way of his own, by which he became the firſt founder of the ſcholaſtics, who were afterwards ſo much in vogue, and which he very probably had at firſt from the Arabians. Rapin obſerves, that he does not venture to affirm this abſolutely, but only ſubmits it as a conjecture to the judgment of the learned. When St. Thomas Aquinas was born, continues that critic, it was about 400 years ſince the Arabians had been the only men of learning, who ſtudied Philoſophy, while it was not above 100 years ſince the ſtudy of literature had been revived in Europe. Thoſe people, whoſe Empire was as great as that of the Romans, at leaſt for the extent of their conqueſts, which reach'd from the Indies to Spain, impreſſed their genius and manners, not only upon their own ſubjects, but likewiſe upon all nations, with whom they had any commerce, that is, over all Europe. While their ſtudies were confined to their religion, and the Mathematicks and Philoſophy, without any regard to eloquence, or any of the politer arts, painting and ſculpture being prohibited them by their law; it is no wonder that they made ſo great a progreſs in Metaphyſics, Logic, and Phyſic. So that after three hundred years employed in the explication of Ariſtotle, they made that ſtudy and their commentaries neceſſary to the Chriſtians, who began to apply themſelves to learning in the Weſt, upon

(g) Oudin, Col. 256.
(b) P. 38. in the *Compleat Hiſt. of England*, vol. 2. London 1706.

caſioned by the barbarity of the age in which he lived (g). The Lord Herbert of Cherbury in his *Life and Reign of King Henry VIII* (b) tells us, that one of the principal reaſons which induced that King to write againſt Martin Luther, was, that the latter had ſpoken

upon the revival of it about the end of the XIIth century, when Bagdat was taken by the Tartars. The Arabians being the only men of letters at that time, and having gained a great authority in the ſciences, had eſtabliſhed their manner of teaching in the ſchools. St. Thomas finding no other method, took them for his guide, and was afterwards followed by the ſcholaſticks. By this means thoſe barbarous terms, which had been made uſe of in the former Philoſophy without any ſcruple, were taken from Avicenna and the other Arabians, to whom they were very familiar and intelligible, and were introduced into the Latin tongue, which made an extravagant jargon. In this manner Philoſophy was corrupted by the commerce with thoſe, who were then maſters of it. Rapin obſerves likewiſe, that tho' St. Thomas had known any other manner of teaching Philoſophy, yet there was ſome reaſon for him to follow the Arabians in their particular ſcheme and method, in order to confound their pride, and to ſhew them, that the Chriſtian religion might eaſily be defended from their calumnies, even in their own way of teaching and following Ariſtotle, to whom they were ſo prodigiouſly attach'd.

It may not be improper here to give the reader an account of the origin and progreſs of School-Divinity, which owes ſo much to our Author. Dr. Cave has traced this very accurately in his *Conſpectus ſæculi ſcholaſtici*, in p. 615 of his *Hiſtoria Literaria*; wherein he obſerves that the School-Divinity, which had been introduced in the twelfth Century, received great improvements, and was univerſally followed in the thirteenth. The Chriſtian doctrines in the firſt Ages of the Goſpel were delivered in a clear and perſpicuous manner; and no ſubtle methods of diſpute were made uſe of but in oppoſition to the Pagans and Hereticks. The Catechumens were inſtructed in a ſhort Confeſſion of Faith, which contained the chief Articles of Religion, and was more fully explained in eaſy and obvious diſcourſes addreſſed to them. Of this kind are the *Catecheſes ad Illuminatos* of St. Cyril of Jeruſalem, and St. Gregory Nyſſen's *Sermones Catechetici*. The uſual Homilies to the people were an explication of ſome portion of Scripture, or an inforcement of ſome moral doctrine. But this plain and ſimple method of inſtruction fell afterwards into neglect, and a more ſubtle one was ſubſtituted in the room of it; as appears from the works of the pretended Dionyſius the Areopagite, which were forged in the fourth, or fifth, or ſixth Century. About the middle of the eighth Century John Damaſcenus was the firſt writer among the Greeks, who reduced Divinity to a more exact method, and divided its particular doctrines into their proper heads, in his four books *concerning the orthodox Faith*. In the Latin Church we find no writer attempted this deſign before Lanfranc Archbiſhop of Canterbury the Antagoniſt of Berengarius, who flouriſhed about the year 1070, and is ſaid to have put Divinity in a new form, tho' it is difficult to perceive this from thoſe works of his, which are now extant. In the beginning of the following Century Peter Abelard publiſhed three books of *an Introduction to Divinity*; by the aſſiſtance of which Peter Lombard about the middle of that Age compiled his four books of *Sentences* (from whence he is ſtiled *the Maſter of Sentences*) from the writings of the Fathers, and eſpecially of St. Auſtin. And now Divinity began to aſſume an entirely new form, and was reſolved into an infinite number of queſtions, which were debated in the moſt ſubtle manner imaginable. Lombard was followed in this by a variety of Authors, as Alexander Hales, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, Albertus Magnus, and many others; and they were afterwards divided into different parties and ſects, as the Nominals and Reals, the Thomiſts and Scotiſts, the Sententiarians and *Quodlibetarians*, who had prodigious conteſts with each other. At length the ſimple and pure doctrine of the primitive Chriſtians being neglected, there was ſcarce any thing ſtudied but School-Divinity; for the improvement of which the Ariſtotelian Philoſophy was called in to aſſiſt; and this Philoſophy was not learned from the Greek originals, but collected from the corrupt accounts of the Arabians, and from tranſlations which were ill performed, and worſe underſtood. However this Philoſophy was introduced into the Divinity of that Age; and Ariſtotle held the chair of St. Paul for ſeveral Ages. How great a ſupport this School-Divinity was to many of the peculiar doctrines of the Church of Rome, is obvious to every perſon. The authority of the Pope was likewiſe greatly inlarged by the Canon-Law, which had its origin about that time, and was promoted in the ſame manner. *Quantum ad plura Romanæ Eccleſiæ placita ſtabilienda contulerit nova hæc Scholaſtica Theologia, cæcus ſit oportet, qui non videt. Certè non minus quam Majeſtatis Pontificiæ auctoritatem longe lateque promoverit Jus Canonicum eodem ferè tempore natum, iiſdemque incrementis auctum* (21). But let us ſee here the judgment of Mr. Du Pin, a candid Roman Catholick, upon the writers of the thirteenth Century, and his account of the riſe of School-Divinity. He informs us (22), that the moſt conſiderable Writers of that Age are the Commentators upon Peter Lombard, whoſe book of *Sentences* was become the only Divinity, which was taught and learned in the Schools. But inſtead of following his method, and determining the queſtions which he had propoſed, by paſſages from the Fathers, they only made uſe of philoſophical principles and metaphyſical ſubtleties. They were not ſatisfied with explaining the text of his work, but they ſelected only the queſtions, and treated them in a quite different manner. So that what was called a Commentary was very far from deſerving that title, ſince it was a quite different work. They added likewiſe a great many other queſtions to thoſe, which he had propounded, and they inſerted them in their Commentaries upon his books, and handled them in diſtinct works, which were very often intitled *Quodlibetical Queſtions*. Some Divines thinking themſelves too much confined by the plan of the Maſter of *Sentences*, and being willing to take a greater ſcope, neglected his method, and formed to themſelves another in their writings, to which they gave the title of *the ſum of Divinity*. In theſe works they diſcuſſed an infinite number of theological or philoſophical queſtions, propoſed the arguments on both ſides, and determined them generally by philoſophical reaſonings and analogy; making uſe very often of the authority of Ariſtotle, and ſometimes of that of the Fathers, the paſſages from whom they extracted from Peter Lombard, Gratian, or the common Gloſs; ſo that their quotations were frequently not exact, becauſe they were taken upon the credit of others, without having recourſe to the originals, and becauſe theſe Writers wanted judgment and a true critical taſte. The ſtyle of theſe books is generally dry and barbarous, and almoſt always attended with obſcurity. Their manner of preaching likewiſe had very much of this ſcholaſtick method. Their Sermons were full of diviſions, diſtinctions, and low compariſons. It was very rare to find any points of morality unfolded and explained in their proper extent, or eſtabliſhed upon ſolid principles, and urged with eloquence and ſpirit. They contented themſelves with propoſing and explaining them in the common manner, and confirming them by ſome paſſages of Scripture, which were applied in a different ſenſe from the natural and true one. The Commentaries upon the Scripture were of two kinds; the one intitled *Poſtills* were ſhort notes, in which there was very often only a grammatical explanation of the words, and nothing but the more minute Circumſtances inſiſted on; the other were more extenſive, and conſiſted of allegories and myſtical thoughts. There are ſome works of Devotion, which tho' written with great ſimplicity, have ſomething of ſolidity in them. But there are others, which are compoſed in ſo myſtical a ſtyle, that they are abſolutely unintelligible. The Authors who have written upon the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church, employed themſelves only in ſeeking or inventing myſtical reaſons, which are the whole ſubject of their works. The Collections of and Commentaries upon the Decretals of the Popes engaged the application of thoſe,

(21) Cave, pag. 615, 616.

(22) *Biblioth.* tom. 10. cap. 4. pag. 57, 58. edit. Paris 1702.

ſpoken contemptuouſly of Aquinas. His authority has always been of great importance in the ſchools of the Roman Catholics; however it was not abſolutely deciſive in points of Divinity, but it has been lawful to recede from his opinions, as Dermicius Thaddæi (i) endeavours to prove in oppoſition to Bzovius. His chaſtity and other virtues were very remarkable

(i) *In Nitelâ Franciſc. Relig.* pag. 35, &c. *apud* Cave, *ubi ſupra.*

thoſe, who ſtudied Canon-Law. They found in this labyrinth, as Mr. Du Pin expreſſes it (23), ſufficient matter to employ their pen, and to compile very large works. Ancient Hiſtory and eſpecially that of the Church was extremely neglected in this Age. However ſome Authors undertook to give abridgments and indigeſted collections of an univerſal Hiſtory. Many of them wrote particular Chronicles of their churches and monaſteries, in which they introduced facts that did not deſerve to be mentioned. Others wrote the Hiſtory of the Croiſades of that time, or Relations of Voyages to the Holy Land; and of all the Hiſtorians of that age theſe latter are leaſt to be neglected. The Lives of Saints are rather Panegyricks upon them than hiſtorical Relations. We ſhall not inſiſt upon the prodigious number of Commentaries upon the books of Ariſtotle, and many other philoſophical writings, in which, as Mr. Du Pin obſerves, the greateſt men of that Age employed their time and labour to very little purpoſe. Theſe performances are now entirely neglected, and only to be found in the Libraries of old Monaſteries. There was a warm diſpute ſome years ago between two Members of the Romiſh Church concerning School-Divinity, an account of which may not be improper under this article. Father *de Benedictis* publick Profeſſor of Philoſophy in the Jeſuits College at Naples, publiſhed in 1688 four volumes of Peripatetic Philoſophy, in which he undertook to eſtabliſh the principles of Ariſtotle. This work of his being univerſally exploded, he wrote an abuſive piece, intitled *Lettere Apologetiche*, or *Apologetical Letters*, under the feigned name of *Benedetto Aletino*. Conſtantino Grimaldi therefore thought himſelf obliged to anſwer this Libel, and publiſhed his firſt Anſwer in 1699, and the two others in 1702 and 1703. Aletino replied to the firſt Anſwer in 1703, and to the third in 1705. Aletino's firſt Reply was intitled *Difeſa della Scholaſtica Teologia*, or *A Defence of School-Divinity*; and the ſecond, *Difeſa della terza Lettera di Benedetto Aletino*, or, *A Defence of Benedetto Aletino's third Letter*. With regard to Mr. Grimaldi's ſecond anſwer, containing the many groſs errors which are to be met with in Ariſtotle's works, Aletino thought fit not to reply, ſuch errors being undeniable. Mr. Grimaldi's anſwer to the *Apologetical Letters* was received not only in Naples, but in all the Univerſities of Italy with uncommon applauſe. He was actually preparing an anſwer to Aletino's replies, but diſcontinued his deſign upon the news of his adverſary's death. However, in the ſecond edition of his book publiſhed at Lucca 1725, in eight volumes in 4to, under the title of *Diſcuſſioni Iſtoriche, Teologiche, e Filoſofiche di Conſtantino Grimaldi, fatte per occaſione della Riſpoſta alle Lettere Apologetiche di Benedetto Aletino, &c.* he has taken care to anſwer the chief difficulties which they contain. This gave occaſion to the Jeſuits to repreſent the author to Pope Benedict XIII, and to Cardinal d'Althan the Viceroy of Naples as an Heretick, and his work as containing doctrines contrary to the purity of the faith. Upon this the Pope by a particular Bull prohibited the reading, vending, or keeping of it under pain of excommunication, and the Cardinal cauſed all the copies which were found at the Author's houſe to be thrown into the Sea. Some copies however were not long after driven aſhore by a ſtorm, and falling into good hands were preſerved. The Jeſuits likewiſe entered an action againſt Mr. Grimaldi as an heretick and ſower of heretical opinions, and would have compleated his ruin, having the Cardinal on their ſide, if he had not as a Senator and a Magiſtrate appealed to the Emperor, who ordered the cauſe to be removed to one of the Courts of Vienna (24). In the firſt volume he anſwers the firſt of Benedetto Aletino's *Apologetic Letters*. The main deſign of that Letter was to convince the world, that the modern Philoſophers pay no manner of deference to, nay, ſhew on all occaſions the utmoſt contempt for School Divinity, which the Jeſuit extols as the only weapon that can be uſed with any ſucceſs againſt thoſe who deny or impugn the myſteries of the Catholick Church. To this charge Mr. Grimaldi anſwers, that the deſpiſing of what they call *Scholaſtic Divinity*, is ſo far from being any reproach to the modern Philoſophers, that on the contrary they deſerve upon that very account to be highly commended by all men of ſenſe. He endeavours to prove this aſſertion, 1. By enquiring into the firſt origin of School Divinity, and ſhewing that the Apoſtles and primitive Doctors of the Church were altogether ſtrangers to that method of teaching the myſteries of the Chriſtian religion, which is now uſed in the ſchools, and was borrowed about the middle of the eleventh Century from the Pagan Philoſophers. 2. He ſhews, that moſt of the hereſies, ſchiſms, and inteſtine diſſenſions, which have in ſo cruel a manner rent the church, were entirely owing to the impertinent and abſurd diſtinctions and quibbles of the Schoolmen. 3. He enumerates the many evils which are daily occaſioned by the School Divinity, which with its vain and chimerical ſpeculations calls in queſtion the plaineſt truths, wreſts the true meaning of the holy Scriptures, gives riſe and even ſome appearance of truth to the moſt ridiculous and monſtrous opinions, occaſions and foments continual diſputes among the members of one and the ſame church, and keeps men otherwiſe of good parts buſied all their life-time in running after trifles. 4. He aſcribes to it the decay of Chriſtian piety, and the loſs of that ſimplicity and deference to the Scripture, which was ſo commendable in the primitive Chriſtians. 5. He ſhews that School-Divinity is of no uſe to convince Hereticks, to inſtruct the Faithful, or to give any account of the myſteries of the Chriſtian belief. 6. He obſerves what trifling, irreverent, and ſcandalous queſtions have been ſtarted by St. Thomas Aquinas, Albertus Magnus, and other Scholaſticks of great note. Such are, for inſtance, the following: *Quare Chriſtus non fuerit hermaphroditus: Quare non aſſumpſit fœmineum ſexum* (25): *Utrum eſſent excrementa in paradiſo* (26): *Utrum ſancti reſurgent cum inteſtinis* (27): *Utrum Chriſtus cum felle & ipſius receptaculo à mortuis ſurrexerit* (28): Albertus Magnus (29) employs no leſs than twenty four chapters in diſcuſſing the following queſtions, which ſtill afford great matter of debate to the Scholaſtics; *Whether the Angel Gabriel appeared to the Virgin Mary in the ſhape of a Serpent, of a Dove, of a Man, or of a Woman? Did he ſeem to be young or old? In what dreſs was he? Was his garment white, or of two colours? Was his linnen clean or foul? When did he appear? In the morning, at noon, or in the evening? What was the colour of the Virgin Mary's hair? Was ſhe acquainted with the mechanick and liberal Arts? Had ſhe any skill in Grammar, Rhetoric, Logic, Muſic, Aſtronomy, &c.? Had ſhe thorough knowledge of the Book of Sentences* (which was compoſed twelve hundred years after her death) *and of all the chapters it contains?* St. Antoninus, another Schoolman of great eminence, propoſes the following queſtions (30): *Utrum ſi Deipara fuiſſet vir, potuiſſet eſſe naturalis parens Chriſti: Utrum Maria gravida ſedente, Chriſtus ſederet, atque ipſa cubante cubaret.* To theſe Mr. Grimaldi adds a great many other no leſs, if not more, impertinent queſtions, which the modern Divines treat of in the ſchools; ſuch are theſe: *Utrum Verbum potuit hypoſtaticè uniri naturæ irrationali, putà Equi, Aſini, &c. Utrum potuit uniri hypoſtaticè naturæ diabolicæ, naturæ humanæ damnatæ, peccato, &c. In quo caſu veræ eſſent hæ propoſitiones, Deus eſt Equus, Aſinus, Diabolus, Damnatus, Peccatum, &c. Utrum Chriſtus reſurgendo reſumpſit præputium; ſi porro reſumpſit, quo pacto, quove modo ſervatur in terris?* This relick is lodged in the church of St. John Lateran at Rome, and is yearly expoſed in Eaſter-week to publick adoration. But what moſt of all alarmed both the Jeſuits and the Court of Rome, was the anſwer which he gave to Benedetto Aletino, where that Jeſuit extols the Scholaſtic Divinity, and prefers it to any other faculty, on account of the value which the Popes have always ſhewn for it; ſince they, though inſpired by the Holy Ghoſt, never come to

(23) Pag. 58.

(24) See the *Hiſtoria Literaria*, or an exact and early account of the moſt valuable Books, &c. vol. 2. num. 12. Art. 55. pag. 526, & *ſeq.*

(25) *S. Thomas in* 3 *diſtinctione* 12. *qu.* 3. *art.* 1. *Diſput.* 1.

(26) *Prima Part. qu.* 98. *& in* 3 *Geneſ.*

(27) *In* 4 *diſtinct.* 44.

(28) *Tertia Part. qu.* 54. *art.* 2.

(29) *In Lib. ſuper* Miſſus eſt.

(30) *In* 4 *Part. tit.* 15.

markable [*F*]. He was canonized by Pope John XXII in the year 1323; and Pius V, who was of the ſame Order with him, gave him in 1567 the title of the *Fifth Doctor of the Church*, and appointed his Feſtival to be kept with the ſame ſolemnity as thoſe of the other four Doctors (*k*).

(*k*) Oudin, Col. 255.

to any deciſion in matters of faith without conſulting firſt the Schoolmen, whoſe opinions they commonly find entirely agreeable to the inſpirations of the Holy Ghoſt. To this Mr. Grimaldi anſwers, that ſome Popes indeed have adviſed with the Schoolmen; but that every good Catholick has great reaſon to wiſh they had never hearkened to their ſpeculations. He produces here ſeveral inſtances of Popes, who, notwithſtanding their boaſted infallibility, have erred, and taught not only falſe, but heretical opinions, being miſled by the Scholaſtics.

[*F*] *His chaſtity and other virtues were very remarkable.*] Nigronius in his oration upon St. Thomas quoted above, tells us (31), that he preſerved himſelf pure and untainted from the moſt diſtant approaches to incontinence or immodeſty amidſt all the heat and temptations of youth; and that when he was ſollicited by a woman of ill character, who employed all the arts imaginable to gain the aſcendant over his virtue, at a time when there was all the opportunity of concealment, he continued inflexible to the power of her charms; and when ſhe ſtill urged him in the moſt alluring manner to an unlawful gratification, he took up a brand out of the fire, and obliged her to leave his chamber. The learned reader will not perhaps be diſpleaſed to ſee this ſtory repreſented in the pompous language of our orator. *Nam de virginali caſtitate nemo dubitat in eo, qui quâ ætate libidinis æſtus animum vehementius ad flagitia ſuccendit, & ingenita medullis voluptas ſenſus omnes appetitumque titillat; quo tempore fœmina petulans & procax habitu & affectu meretricio, Lenociniis oculorum, geſtuum illecebris, verborum blanditiis ad molliendum duriſſimum & conſtantiſſimum quemque hominem comparatis, adoleſcentulum aggreſſa, virginitatem ejus expugnatura, machinam blandiſſimæ perſuaſionis atque impuriſſimæ provocationis, ex opportunitate temporis, ſolitudine loci, jucundiſſimæ rei præſentia, validiſſimam admovebat; oppugnatus fortiter reſtitit; nihil labans ad impetum, nihil vacillans, ut ſcopulus immiſſis è ſævâ tempeſtate fluctibus verberatus, immobilis quoad pugnatum eſt, atque invictus ſtetit; tum generoſo animo non invictus modo, ſed etiam victor, in hoſtem convertens prælium, ad majorem ſui laudem, pro armis arrepto de cinctibus foci ſemiuſtulato ligno meretriculam conſcientiâ ſceleris confuſam, infelici præter opinionem eventu perturbatam, adoleſcentis modeſtiſſimi pudore conſtantiaque perterritam, abjectam, victam è cubiculo abegit, fugavit, ejecit.* His modeſty was no leſs eminent, for he was not the leaſt elated in his opinion of himſelf notwithſtanding the ſuperiority of his genius, the nobility of his deſcent, and the reputation which he had for profound learning. He refus'd a great many opulent preferments in the church, which were offered him. He behaved with the utmoſt civility to the moſt inconſiderable perſons of his own order, and paid the utmoſt deference to his ſuperiors. And Nigronius the Jeſuit quoted above, extols him highly for that perfect obedience, which he tells us St. Bonaventure, Umbert, Anthony, Laurence, and Ignatius recommend ſo much after the antient Fathers, St. Jerom, Caſſian, Climacus, Gregory, Dorotheus, and Bernard, and repreſent under all the ſtrong terms of an *unreſerved blind obedience: perfectioris illius obedientiæ, quam poſt veteres ſanctos patres Hieronymum, Caſſianum, Climacum, Gregorium, Dorotheum, Bernardum, Bonaventura, Umbertus, Antonius, Laurentius, Ignatius tantopere commendant, atque* injudicatam, indiſcretam, indiſcuſſam & cæcam *appellant, exempla daret interdum* (32). He was indefatigable in his application to learning, by which he gained ſo extenſive a knowledge, that he was extremely converſant not only in the Scriptures and Philoſophy, but even in the Orators, Divines, and Fathers, and in ſhort in all the beſt authors in every branch of Literature (33). Nigronius informs us (34), that his countenance ſeem'd to be ſurrounded with rays of light; that a ſtar ſhone for ſome time over his head; and that a comet appeared before his death, which vaniſhed as ſoon as he expired. *A viventis Thomæ vultu radii viſi ſunt elucere; ſtella ſuper caput aliquandiu ſplenduit; cometes ante mortem apparuit, qui ſtatim atque eſt mortuus evanuit.*

(51) N. 25. pag. 686, 687.

(32) Idem, N. 26. p. 689.

(33) Idem, pag. 690.

(34) Idem, pag. 691.

T.

☞ARABELLA STUART. The ſtory of this Lady being commonly known, we ſhould not have given an article of her in this place, were it not for certain particulars relating to her, and to the hiſtory of England, which are not generally obſerved. She was daughter to Charles Stuart, younger brother to King James the Firſt's father, by Elizabeth Cavendiſh (*a*). In the latter end of Queen Elizabeth's reign, the Pope (*b*) formed a deſign to raiſe Arabella to the throne of England [*A*], by marrying her to Cardinal

(*a*) Arthur Wilſon's *Life of K. James*, in the 2d vol. of the *Compleat Hiſtory of England*, pag. 702.

(*b*) Clement VIII.

[*A*] *The Pope formed a deſign to raiſe Arabella to the throne of England.*] None of the writers of the Hiſtory of England, not even Rapin, take notice of this particular: and I doubt whether it can be found any where but in the Letters of Cardinal d'Oſſat. But as he writes to the King of France (1), there is no reaſon to ſuſpect the truth of it. Here follows what he ſays (2): "The Pope thought firſt of the Duke of Parma, "as the eldeſt of the family, and related to himſelf. "His Holineſs will make intereſt firſt and only for "that Duke, if the Kingdom of England can be obtained without the means of Arabella. But if after "the deceaſe of the Queen, a party ſhould be formed "in favour of Arabella in England, and to render "the conqueſt of that Kingdom eaſier, it be found "neceſſary to join his forces to thoſe of that Lady, "the Pope would prefer Cardinal Farneſe, to the "Duke who was married; whereas the Cardinal be"ing a batchelor might be married to the Lady Ara"bella: and they thus uniting their intereſt would "ſooner and eaſier compaſs their deſign. And as in "every thing there muſt be ſome ſhew of juſtice, "it is pretended, that theſe two Princes are by their "mother's ſide deſcended from the true and lawful "Kings of England (3), and that for this reaſon they "have ſome right to the Crown of England; and I "think that without this pretence the Pope would "have had no thoughts of procuring that Crown "to them. Here your Majeſty will be pleaſed to "remember, that as early as the year 1591 there was "a book printed in Engliſh, and wrote by one "Pearſon *, an Engliſh Jeſuit, under the direction of "the Spaniards, which was diſpers'd thro' England, and "the Low Countries, and every where elſe, where they "thought it would be of ſervice. The intent of that "book was to perſuade the world, that for ſeveral "hundred years paſt there had been no lawful King or "Queen in England, the Author excluding them all "either as guilty of high treaſon, or diſinherited, or "baſtards, or hereticks, or for ſome other reaſon like "theſe. He alſo excluded of courſe all thoſe of the "royal blood, who were then living, all the near re"lations of the Queen, of the King of Scotland and "Arabella; and the Earls of Derby, Hertford, "Haſtings, &c. This he did to ſhew that the Crown "of England was devolved on the King of Spain "and his children." But as it was not probable that the other Princes of Europe ſhould connive at the ambitious deſigns of the King of Spain, d'Oſſat ſhews, that this King, ſeeing he could not ſucceed for himſelf, would willingly aſſiſt the Houſe of Farneſe to take poſſeſſion of the Crown of England; and to prove that there were great hopes of ſucceſs, he obſerves that his Holineſs had taken ſeveral ſteps, to ſupport the intereſt of Popery in this Kingdom. But by God's Providence, all the policy of the Court of Rome, and of the Spaniards was happily diſconcerted by the event (4). Upon which d'Oſſat ſays very juſtly (5): That

(1) Henry IV.

(2) *Letter* 299. pag. 45, &c.

(3) The Duke of Parma, and the Cardinal his brother, grounded their right to the ſucceſſion of England on their being deſcended from the daughter of a baſtard of King Edward IV. *Embaſſade de Beaumont.* tom. 2.

* The Cardinal means Father, *Parſons.*

(4) The Proclamation of King James.

(5) Tom. 5. *Letter* 342. p. 256.

Cardinal Farneſe, brother of the Duke of Parma (*c*). King Henry IV of France ſeemed inclined to enter into this project, becauſe he was apprehenſive leſt England ſhould become too powerful, if it was united with Scotland under the ſame King [*B*]. After the death of Queen Elizabeth ſome Engliſh Lords alſo concerted a ſcheme to make Arabella Queen of England, becauſe, ſays Thuanus (*d*), they were afraid leſt King James, being a foreigner, ſhould prefer the Scots before them, and confer all the poſts of honour and profit upon the former. They therefore conſpired to kill the King, and to crown Arabella. But this conſpiracy being detected, ſome of thoſe who were concerned in it, were capitally puniſhed, and the reſt obtained the King's pardon or a reprieve. This was perhaps the true reaſon why Arabella was confined to her houſe, though Arthur Wilſon (*e*) ſays, it was becauſe ſhe had been ſecretly married to Sir William Seymour [*C*] ſon to the Lord Beauchamp, and grandchild to Edward Earl of Hertford. Sir William, on account of the marriage, was committed to the Tower, and Arabella confined to her houſe at Highgate. But after they had ſuffered impriſonment for ſome time, they concluded to eſcape beyond Sea together, which proved very unfortunate to Arabella [*D*], who was taken and committed to the Tower, where ſhe died on the 17th of September 1615 (*f*). It was ſuſpected ſhe had been poiſoned [*E*]. After her death Sir William Seymour obtained leave to return home, and married the Lady Frances, daughter to the Earl of Eſſex (*g*).

(*c*) *Lettres du Cardinal d'Oſſat* tom 3. *Letter* 299. p. 45. edit. Amſt. 1732.

(*d*) *Hiſt.* l. 129. tom. 5. edit. 1620. p. 1056. fol.

(*e*) *Ubi ſupra.*

(*f*) Rapin, *Hiſt. d'Angl.* tom. 7. p. 102. Wilſon, *ubi ſupra*, places her death under the year 1616.

(*g*) Wilſon, *ubi ſupra*, p. 703.

That "the people of this Iſland have ſhewn that they "knew how to ſettle their own affairs ſecurely and with "diſpatch; by which the foreigners (6) have been "very much diſappointed in their hopes and deſigns; "and the Spaniards who are vexed at it more than "any body elſe, will be the moſt forward to congratu"late the King of Scotland."

(6) He means the Spaniards, the Pope, and the Houſe of Farneſe.

[*B*] *Henry IV was apprehenſive leſt England ſhould become too powerful, if it was united with Scotland.*] Henry had a great mind to prevent King James from obtaining the Crown of England, and for that reaſon he gave ſecret penſions to ſeveral perſons of Queen Elizabeth's Court (7). Cardinal d'Oſſat obſerves (8), that it would not be for the intereſt of France that the Kingdoms of England and Scotland ſhould be united under the ſame King. For, ſays he, ſince the Kings of England alone have formerly harraſſed France with greater terror and reſolution a longer time than any other King has done, what ſhould we not have to fear if to the power of England was added that of Scotland? Such an union is more formidable than ever in the perſon of the preſent King (James), ſince he is allied to one of the moſt potent Kings of the North (9); and beſides, he is nearly related to the Princes of Lorrain, who have cauſed lately ſo much trouble to our Kings, and occaſioned ſo much miſery and ſo many misfortunes to France, ſeeing that family is not yet extinct and is ſtill very powerful in the Kingdom (10).

(7) Ambaſſade de Beaumont, *apud* Oſſat, tom. 2. *Lett.* 49. pag. 58. note 11.

(8) Ib. *in Textu.*

(9) The King of Denmark, whoſe ſiſter he had married.

(10) He ſpeaks of the famous League, of which the Duke of Guiſe, a Prince of the Houſe of Lorrain, was the Head.

[*C*] *She had been ſecretly married to William Seymour.*] This is what Arthur Wilſon tells us, whoſe account is ſo particular on this occaſion, that there is no reaſon to doubt of it. Yet Thuanus a contemporary Author ſays (11), 1. that Arabella was married to the ſon of the Earl of Northumberland. 2. He places her marriage under Queen Elizabeth. Theſe two circumſtances cannot poſſibly be reconciled with Wilſon's account. Here follow Thuanus's own words; they contain alſo the proof of what we have ſaid in the text of this article (12), *Angli quidam Proceres, & alii ab Elizabetha ad honores provecti, ſeu gratia ſeu meritis, cum viderent novum Regem è Scotia quaſi alienigenam cum ſuis Scotis venientem, ſperatas dignitates ereptum ſibi iri illa gentis mutatione indignati, conſilium inter ſe cœperant regis interficiendi, quo facto Arbelam, quæ olim ſub Elizabetha ob clandeſtinas cum Northumbrii Comitis filio nuptias in carcerem conjecta fuerat, & poſtea libertati reſtituta, funerali Pompæ Reginæ interfuerat, in Reginam ſumpturi erant, & cum bona Philippi gratia uxorem Sabaudiæ Duci daturi.* i. e. "Some Engliſh Lords, and other perſons, on "whom Elizabeth had conferred honours either out "of favour or as a reward for their ſervices, ſeeing a "new King and a foreigner coming from Scotland, "and fearing that by this change they ſhould be de"prived of theſe dignities, which they expected, re"ſolved amongſt themſelves to kill the King. After "which Arabella, who during the reign of Queen "Elizabeth had been ſecretly married to the ſon "of the Earl of Northumberland, and was for that "reaſon put into priſon, and had been ſince ſet at "liberty, and was preſent at the Queen's funeral, was to be made Queen, and to be married "to the Duke of Savoy with the conſent of Philip" III King of Spain. Here we find another particular, namely, that Arabella was to be married to the Duke of Savoy with the King of Spain's conſent. This does not agree with what Cardinal d'Oſſat wrote to the King of France; but perhaps Thuanus was miſtaken, and wrote the Duke of Savoy inſtead of Cardinal Farneſe. Such differences and inconſiſtencies that we find in the account of contemporary writers, very much favour the ſyſtem of thoſe, who maintain that we muſt admit an hiſtorical Pyrrhoniſm; ſince it is almoſt impoſſible to ſift out the truth amongſt the contradictory accounts of Hiſtorians. Mr. Amelot alſo differs from Thuanus with regard to the reaſons he aſſigns for the conſpiracy of the Engliſh Lords. He tells (13), "That in the Lady Arabella's party were "all thoſe Engliſh Lords, who had been the Judges "of Queen Mary, and who fearing, leſt the King "of Scotland her ſon ſhould revenge her death upon "them, if ever he acceded to the Crown of England, "intended to marry Arabella with the Earl of Hert"ford, to exclude King James from the ſucceſſion." This is probable enough, tho' Amelot quotes no authority for it.

(11) *Hiſt.* lib. 129. p. 1056.

(12) Quot. (*c*).

(13) Notes upon Cardinal d'Oſſat. *Lett.* tom. 5 *Lett.* 299. p. 45. not. 1.

[*D*] — *Proved very unfortunate to Arabella.*] She and her husband had "appointed to meet at a certain "place upon the Thames. Sir William, leaving his "man in his bed, to act his part with the keeper, "got out of the Tower in a diſguiſe, and came to "the place appointed. She dreſſed like a young gal"lant in man's attire followed him from her houſe, "but ſtaying long above the limited time, made him "ſuſpicious of her interception; ſo that he went "away, leaving notice, if ſhe came, that he was "gone away before to Dunkirk. She good Lady "fraught with more fears, and lagging in her "flight, was apprehended and brought back to the "Tower (14)."

(14) Wilſon, *ubi ſupra.*

[*E*] *It was ſuſpected ſhe had been poiſoned.*] Several perſons ſeeing, that the trial of thoſe, who had been concerned in the murther of Overbury, made people talk again of the death of Prince Henry, thought, that Arabella might alſo have been poiſoned (15); ſince as ſhe was nearly and her husband's family at ſome diſtance allied to the Crown, this might eaſily inſpire the King with a ſtate jealouſy againſt her. For, as Wilſon obſerves (16), "ſuch a conjunction (of "her with Seymour) would not be admitted in the "Royal Almanack, ſo dreadful is every apparition, "that comes near Princes titles."

(15) Rapin, tom. 7. p. 102.

(16) *Ubi ſupra.*

P.

☞ARAGON (BEATRIX OF) was the daughter of Ferdinand I King of Naples and Sicily, who betrothed her, when ſhe was but a child, to the ſon of Marino da Marciano Duke of Seſſa (*a*). But Ferdinand broke off that match before they were of age

(*a*) A city with the title of Dukedom in the *Terra di Lavoro* in the Kingdom of Naples.

age to live together [A]. Beatrix was afterwards married to Matheo Corvino King of Hungary [B], and then to Ladiſlaus brother of the King of Poland, and who by her means became King of Hungary [C]. They lived ten years together; but Beatrix, on account of her age, being leſs agreeable, the King grew weary of her; the principal reaſon of which was perhaps, that he fell in love with Ann of Candale (b), a Lady famous for her beauty, and nearly related to Lewis XII King of France, with whom Ladiſlaus thought it his intereſt to enter into a ſtrict alliance, he therefore petitioned and obtained from Pope Alexander VI a ſentence by which his marriage was diſſolved (c) [D]. Mr. Bayle, who has copied (d) this account from Tomaſo de Tomaſi, alledges it as an inſtance to prove, that thoſe marriages are not always laſting, in which intereſt prevails, and that the great diſproportion of age in the married couple is an obſtacle to the gratification of the natural deſires in either ſex. Yet this is the misfortune of the widows of Kings and Princes, if they will marry again, that they are obliged either to diſgrace themſelves by an unequal match [E], or to marry ſuch perſons, whoſe age does not ſuit with

(b) She was the daughter of John de Foix, the ſecond of that name, and firſt couſin to Germain Foix.

(c) Tomaſo Tomaſi, *Vie du Duc de Valentinois*, p. 288. of the French tranſlation.

(c) *Rep. aux Queſt. d'un Provincial*, tom. 2. p. 271, &c.

[A] *Ferdinand broke off that match, before the young couple were of age to live together.*] The kingdom of Naples was at that time troubled by two factions, that of the houſe of Aragon, of which Ferdinand himſelf was, being the natural ſon of Alphonſus King of Aragon and Sicily; and that of the houſe of Anjou. One of the principal heads of this latter faction was the Duke of Seſſa. Ferdinand to amuſe him, and keep him from engaging any conſiderable enterprize, promiſed his daughter to the ſon of that Duke, and even ſent her to him. But as ſoon as the diſturbances of his Kingdom were ſettled, and he had no longer occaſion to fear the Duke, he broke off the match, and ſent for his daughter home (1). Mr. Bayle, from whom we have borrowed this, obſerves in a marginal note (2), that the French tranſlator of Cæſar Borgia's life has committed ſeveral egregious blunders in his verſion of the following paſſage. *Era queſta Beatrice figlia di Ferdinandi il vecchio, Rè di Napoli, prima promeſſa in matrimonio all pacciolo figliolo di Marino da Marciano Duca di Seſſa, e poi par la ſconfitta di queſti, e di gli Angioini, ritoltagli e maritata in prime nozze à Mattia Corvino.* That is, "This Beatrix was the daughter of Ferdi-" nand the old, King of Naples; ſhe was firſt pro-" miſed by her father to the ſon, yet a child, of " Marino da Marciano, Duke of Seſſa; but after the " defeat of that Duke, and of the Anjouines, her fa-" ther took her back, and married her firſt to Mat-" tia Corvino." The French tranſlator ſays, 1. ſhe was promiſed to *the Grandſon* of the Duke of Seſſa; 2. He did not underſtand the word *ritoltagli*, and tranſlates it *the taking* of that Duke *by the Anjouines*, which ſuppoſes that he was taken by thoſe of his own party. A ſtrange miſtake! This inſtance and a thouſand more, which could be alledged, ſhew how cautious we muſt be, when we read any tranſlation; ſince tranſlators are apt to commit ſo many errors.

(1) Jovian. Pontanus, *Hiſt. Neapol.* lib. 5. pag. 679, 686.

(2) *Reponſe aux Queſt. d'un Provincial.* tom. 2. p. 272.

[B] *She was married to Matheo Corvino, and afterwards to Ladiſlaus &c.*] Moreri ſays (3) that Corvino divorced her, and that ſhe was afterwards married to Ladiſlaus IV King of Bohemia. Here may be an error of the preſs, IV inſtead of VI, for this Ladiſlaus was the ſixth of that name both amongſt the Kings of Bohemia and thoſe of Hungary. But it does not appear that Corvino divorced his wife Beatrix; nay, it is probable he did not (4). This then is an error of Moreri. Another concerning Beatrix is to be found in his article of Ladiſlaus VI King of Hungary; where he tells us, that Beatrix, the widow of Mattheo Corvino, thought that Ladiſlaus would marry her, and that for this reaſon, ſhe ſupported his party; and then, at the end of the article he tells us, that Ladiſlaus was married to Anne de Foix (5); thus inſinuating that Beatrix was not married to him; tho' he had declared it expreſly in the article of CORVINO. Such is the inaccuracy and inconſiſtency of that Author.

(3) Article MATTHIAS CORVIN.

(4) See the remark [C].

(5) He ſhould have ſaid of *Candale*.

[C] *Ladiſlaus —— by her means became King of Hungary.*] This Princeſs (Beatrix) was endowed with ſo many eminent qualities, that by her virtues ſhe gained the hearts of all the Hungarians, and made them ſubmit with pleaſure to the authority of her former husband. This made Maximilian of Auſtria, and Ladiſlaus, two competitors for the Crown of Hungary think, that the beſt method to obtain it, was to marry Beatrix. The lot, or rather her choice fell upon Ladiſlaus, who was inaugurated King of Hungary, at Alba Regalis (6) in the year 1490. If Beatrix had gained the hearts of the Hungarians in ſuch a manner, that for her ſake they willingly obeyed her husband, it is probable, that he would have divorced her, as Moreri pretends.

(6) Tomaſo Tomaſi, *ubi ſupra.*

[D] *A ſentence by which her marriage was diſſolved.*] It was at that time ſo eaſy to obtain ſuch a ſentence from the Court of Rome, that Ladiſlaus reſolved to ſue for it; tho' this was a great blemiſh in his character, ſince he thus became guilty of the moſt heinous ingratitude. And as every thing was ſold at Rome for money, the Pope (7), without having any regard to the falſe pretences alledged by Ladiſlaus, nor to the honour and dignity of the Houſe of Aragon, pronounced in a full Conſiſtory a ſentence, by which he declared, that notwithſtanding the anſwers and proteſts of the Embaſſadors of Naples, the marriage of Ladiſlaus and Beatrix was null and void, commanding her to keep a perpetual ſilence, and to pay a fine of twenty five thouſand ducats: as tho' it had been treating her too favourably, to make her a preſent of ſo grievous a ſentence. This had been ſecretly conſented to by the King, who thus employed the dowry of his ſpouſe againſt herſelf, to make her fall a ſacrifice to the cruel treatment of an ungrateful husband, and of a Pope, who inſtead of being the Father of his whole flock, was the wicked Tyrant of the helpleſs and diſtreſſed (8).

(7) The famous Alexander VI.

(8) Tomaſo Tomaſi, *ubi ſupra.*

[E] *The widows of Kings and Princes are often obliged to diſgrace themſelves with an unequal match &c.*] Mr. Bayle's reflections upon this ſubject are ſo agreeable, that the reader will undoubtedly be pleaſed to find them here, tho' they may appear ſomewhat like a digreſſion. Mr. Bayle had ſaid (9), that ſeveral Queens had diſgraced themſelves, by marrying, after the death of their firſt husband, a perſon of a much lower rank. Upon which Bayle himſelf ſuppoſes, that the friend to whom he writes, had made the following obſervations. " It was thought very " ſtrange (10), that the widows of Princes ſhould be " treated with ſo much rigour, as tho' they ought to " be of the ſame humour with that King of Mace-" don (11), who would not enter the liſts, except " againſt a King. There are but few crowned Heads, " and it is very difficult for the widow of a King to " marry a King. Muſt they then defraud nature of " her due? And is not St. Paul's maxim (12), *It " is better to marry than to burn*, a rule for them as " well as for the reſt of mankind?" "But, anſwers " Mr. Bayle (13), this is altering the ſtate of the " queſtion. We don't pretend, that ſuch widow " Queens, who have not the gift of continence, and " cannot find an husband of the ſame rank with the " former, do commit a ſin, if they undermatch them-" ſelves; they are only accuſed of being of a conſti-" tution, which is ſo little commendable, that no " panegyriſt ſhould dare to mention it; nor would " any Poet venture to deſcribe it in an epitaph. " Whereas the contrary diſpoſition, the gift of con-" tinence, the power of reſiſting love, furniſh the " fineſt ſtrokes in the funeral oration of a Princeſs." " You know, that thoſe, who make the elogium of " Ann of Britany, never forget to obſerve, that *when " the Ladies of her Court, who were moſt intimate " with her, pitied her, for that being the widow " of Charles VIII, it was very difficult for her to " riſe again to ſo high a ſtation; becauſe King Lewis " XII* (14), *was married with Joan of France; ſhe " uſed*

(9) *Rep. aux Queſt. d'un Provin.* tom. 2. pag. 25.

(10) Ibid. pag. 266.

(11) Alexander. *See* Freinſhem. *Supplem. in Curtium*, lib. 1. cap. 2. fol. m. A. 3.

(12) 1 Cor. vii. 9.

(13) *Ubi ſupra.*

(14) The ſucceſſor of Charles VIII.

with theirs. Mr. Bayle mentions in the ſame place (*d*) another Princeſs of the houſe of Aragon [*F*], of whom we ſhall give a ſhort account in the laſt remark of this Article.

(d) Ibid. pag. 274.

" *uſed to anſwer, that ſhe would rather remain all* " *her life time the widow of a King, than to diſ-* " *grace herſelf by marrying a perſon of a lower rank*
(15) Brantome, *Dames illuſtres*, pag. 7. " (15). If the care of her ſalvation had obliged her " to make uſe of St. Paul's maxim, in an unequal " match, it might have been ſaid, that ſhe had leſs cou-
(16) Pag. 268. " rage and ſtrength of mind, than health and vigour. But " this very vigour would have been looked upon as a " weakneſs, and a very humbling and mortifying frailty." *Your friends*, adds Mr. Bayle (16), *were conſtantly exclaiming againſt the injuſtice of thoſe who paſs ſuch different judgments on both ſexes; they condemn in the women, what they don't blame in the men. —— You might have anſwered, that the injuſtice they complained of, gives the women a fair opportunity of acquiring much glory. For ſince cuſtom has eſtabliſhed this decency or decorum, it is an honour for them to ſubmit to the yoke, and a ſhame to ſhake it off. But, added they, muſt a Widow-Queen have been ſo jealous of her rank, that to keep it, ſhe ought never to think of marrying below her dignity, but may gratify her appetites ſecretly with ſome of her ſervants? Is it not much better for them, to marry a private perſon, than to do, what Bonna Sforza Queen Dowager of Poland did* (17)? *No, Sir, we don't require any thing like this; we grant, that of two evils, we muſt always avoid the greateſt, and that it is much better to undermatch one's ſelf, than to make love in a criminal manner. I maintain only that when a perſon of high rank has recourſe to an unequal marriage, it ſhews ſhe wants a very good quality, and a very great and glorious perfection. The obſervation, which ſome of your friends made, that the widows of Kings have better opportunities to avoid unequal marriages, is very juſt. For it muſt be confeſſed, that a nation who labours to fill a vacant throne, will endeavour to chooſe ſuch a perſon, as may marry the widow of the deceaſed. Nor is the widow herſelf behind hand; ſhe has generally a ſtrong party, who for her ſake will ſupport the intereſt of the perſon, who is diſpoſed to take her for his ſpouſe. Several inſtances might be quoted to prove that in Poland and Hungary, a new Monarch ſucceeded to the bed as well as to the throne of his predeceſſor. Nay, ſometimes a brother has married the widow of his brother* (18), *as tho' we lived ſtill under the Moſaic Law* (19)."

(17) See the remark [*G*] of the article ARAGON (ISABELLA OF).

(18) The King of Poland, John Caſimir, elected in 1649, married the widow of his brother Uladiſlaus.

(19) Bayle, ibid. p. 269, 271.

[*F*] *Another Princeſs of the houſe of Aragon.*] It is Sancia of Aragon daughter of Alphonſus II King of Naples, and daughter in law to Pope Alexander VI. The occaſion of her marrying a ſon of that Pope was as follows. " A confederacy was entered into " between the Pope and the King of Naples, for " defence of their reſpective territories, on condition, " that a determinate number of troops ſhould be " named for their mutual aſſiſtance, when either of the " parties ſhould be attacked; that his Holineſs ſhould " give Alphonſus the inveſtiture of the Kingdom of Na- " ples, and diminiſh the Tribute, which was uſually " paid on that account; that the Pope ſhould ſend an Apo- " ſtolick Legate to Naples, to aſſiſt at the corona- " tion of Alphonſus, and laſtly, that he ſhould pro- " mote Don Ludovic of Aragon, that King's Nephew, " to the Cardinalate (20). On the King's part it (20) Tom. Tomaſ. p. 49. Guicciard. lib. 1. pag. 15.
" was agreed; to pay his Holineſs immediately thirty " thouſand ducats (21), and that a marriage ſhould (21) Ibid.
" be concluded between the Lady Sancia, daughter " of Alphonſus, and Don Giaffre the Pope's young- " eſt ſon, which was to be conſummated as ſoon as " they were of age, giving Giaffre the title of Prince " of Squillace, and Count Cariati, to which he joined " a revenue of ten thouſand ducats a year; and his " perſon to be guarded by three hundred men at arms, " in the King's pay. Moreover, that the ſaid Gi- " affre ſhould have the Protonotarate of Naples given " him, which is one of the ſeven great offices of that " Kingdom; however, on this condition (by way of " pledge for his father's fidelity) that the ſaid Prince " Squillace ſhould reſide with Alphonſus at Naples " (22)." Lady Sancia, it ſeems, did not lead a ve- (22) Mr. A. Gordon's *Life of Alexander VI.* &c. p. 31.
ry regular life, as will appear by a paſſage from Tomaſo Tomaſi, who relates the ſtory of Beatrix of Aragon, only to cenſure Sancia, who had been extremely pleaſed, that a Frenchman had been killed in a duel by a Burgundian. To make her aſhamed of the delight ſhe took at ſo trifling an incident, the Hiſtorian ſets before her eyes, amongſt other misfortunes of her family, the divorce of Beatrix Queen of Hungary; then he adds (23), *Lady Sancia ſhould read with tears in her eyes, the hiſtory of theſe misfortunes, which attended the alliance of her family with the Houſe of Borgia. But being well verſed in the infamous arts of that Houſe, ſhe is readily diſpoſed to redeem her life at the expence of her honour, as well as of her chaſtity.* " This is an anecdote, adds (23) *Vie du Duc du Valentinois*, p. 290, of the French tranſlation.
" Mr. Bayle (24), of which I do not well know the (24) *Ubi ſupra.*
" particulars; however I underſtand by this, that La- " dy Sancia has made herſelf worthy of a place a- " mongſt the coquet Ladies, celebrated by Bran- " tome." She deſerved indeed to be placed there, but we don't find ſhe is mentioned by that Author; and as Mr. Bayle does not refer us to any particular paſſage, we may ſuppoſe, that ſhe is not amongſt thoſe perſons, of whom Brantome ſpeaks. The errors of Moreri will be more properly taken notice of under the article of BORGIA. In the mean time the reader may conſult the place referred to in the margin (25). (25) Mr. Gordon, *ubi ſupra*, in the Appendix, Art. 1. ſheet P. Ppppp.

ARAGON (ALPHONSUS V OF THE NAME, KING OF) look under the word NAPLES, ALPHONSUS I, of the name, KING OF NAPLES.

ARAGON (JANE OF) wife of Aſcanius Colonna, Prince of Tagliacozzi, was a very illuſtrious Lady in the ſixteenth Century. She was of Naples, and deſcended from the Kings of Aragon. The great wits of her time ſounded her praiſes in a very extraordinary manner [*A*]. The Philoſopher Auguſtin Niphus was not

[*A*] *The great Wits of her time ſounded her praiſes in a very extraordinary manner.*] I have never met with any Dictionary which takes notice of this Lady. This is a very great omiſſion, ſeeing there has not been perhaps a ſingle man or woman in the world whoſe merit has been extolled, either by ſo many wits, or in ſo many languages, as was that of Jane of Aragon in the 16th Century. The Poems which were wrote in honour of her, have been collected by Jerom Ruſcelli, and publiſhed at Venice, 1555, under the title of TEMPIO ALLA DIVINA SIGNORA DONNA GIOVANNA D'ARRAGONA, *fabricato da tutti i piu gentili ſpiriti, & in tutte le lingue principali del Mundo*, i. e. " A TEMPLE TO THE DIVINE LADY " JANE OF ARAGON, erected to her honour by all " the fineſt Wits, and in all the principal languages of " the world." The poetical Apotheoſis of this Lady was performed almoſt in the ſame manner as the canonization of Saints, and immediately ſeveral great Wits took it in their heads of their own accord to give proof of their devotion to this new Divinity, and to build her a Temple; and afterwards it was confirmed by a Decree, in the year 1551, at Venice, in the Academy *de Dubioſi*. After ſeveral deliberations and conſultations upon a queſtion that was propoſed, whether this Temple did not jointly belong to Lady Jane of Aragon, and the Marchioneſs du Guaſt her ſiſter, the Decree gave it, that upon conſideration of the oppoſition which was formerly made by the Pontifs againſt Marcellus, when he had a deſign to dedicate the ſame Temple to Glory and to Virtue, the Marchioneſs du Guaſt could have no ſhare in her ſiſter's Temple, unleſs by the means of ſome particular interpretations. Not only the Poets whoſe verſes Ruſcelli collected, but alſo himſelf in his Epiſtle Dedicatory in proſe to the Cardinal of Trent, and alſo in the Preface, make uſe of terms of adoration, and ſuch as ought to be appropriated to the Deity. It is true he qualifies it thus, that the adoration paid to this Lady was indirectly, and to be referred to the Supreme

Poetical DEIFICATION of this Lady.

not leſs earneſt to pay homage to her; he repreſented her ſo handſome, and he particulariſed the perfections of her body ſo much [B], that ſome Authors have ſaid that he has flattered her, and that love had thrown him into hyperboles [C]. They have even pretended that his quality of Phyſician had given him privileges, which had cauſed his paſſion

Supreme Being, who had bleſſed her with ſo many perfections. See his own words: *Queſta conoſcenza .... ha fatto queſti anni a dietro che conoſcendoſi in univerſale & in particolare da ogni piu raro giudicio i grand meriti, & il ſummo valore & la bellezza infinita di corpo & d'anime della Illuſtriſſima & Excellentiſſima Signora* DONNA GIOVANNA D'ARRAGONA, *ſi ſieno tutti i piu begli ſpiriti di commune conſentimente poſti a ſacrarle un Tempio, come a Donna interamente divina, & la quale, come nobiliſſima fattura & ſembianza del ſommo Iddio, meriti veramente d'eſſer con la lingua & col cruore adorata per immenſo honore del fattor ſuo; potendoſi degnamente da ciaſcuno far giudicio, quanto ſia infinito il ſapere, il potere, & l'amor verſo di noi di chi coſi (alla capacita della mente noſtra) infinitamente bella & perfetta, & degna d'eſſer adorata creatura, habbia potuto, ſaputo, & degnatoſi di voler fare in queſta eta noſtra.* i. e. "All perſons of "the moſt exquiſite taſte have for ſome years been ac- "quainted, either in whole or in part, with the great "merits, and the high value, and the infinite beauty "both of body and mind of the moſt illuſtrious and "moſt excellent Lady JANE D'ARAGONA, inſomuch "that all the great genius's were bent with one ac- "cord to conſecrate a Temple to her, as to a Lady "perfectly divine, who as the moſt noble fabrick and "form of Almighty God, truly deſerves to be adored "both with tongue and heart to the great honour of "her Maker: it being in the power of every one "to make a right judgment of the infinite greatneſs "of his wiſdom, power and love towards us, who "has been ſo powerful, wiſe and gracious, as to "make in this our age a creature (according to our "capacity) infinitely beautiful and perfect, and even "worthy of adoration." He ſays in the Preface, that the ſubſtance of all the pieces in his Collection is, *Che queſta gran Donna, come perfettiſſima di corpo & d'animo, & come particolariſſima fattura del ſommo Iddio, meriti d'eſſere adorata ad honore del fattor ſuo. Overo che ciaſcuno partitamente l'offeriſce il ſuo voto, a la purita dell' affetto ſuo.* i. e. "That this great Lady, "as being moſt perfect both in body and mind, and "a moſt ſingular fabrick of Almighty God, deſerves "to be adored to the honour of her Maker. And "every one ſhould offer his own vows in particular "to her, in the purity of his affections." The moſt harſh languages, and conſequently the moſt unfit for Poetry, as alſo thoſe which were the leaſt known, were all employed in the conſtruction of this Temple, as the Sclavonian, the Poliſh, the Hungarian, the Hebrew and the Chaldæan; and perhaps Mr. de Peireſc (1) is the only one, in honour of whom ſo great, if not a greater aſſemblage of languages was employed.

(1) See the remark [C] of his article.

[B] *Niphus was too particular in his deſcription of this Lady's body.*] Niphus dedicated to this Lady his treatiſe *of Beauty*; and in order to confute the opinion of the ancient Philoſophers, who maintained that there was no ſuch thing as perfect beauty in the univerſe, in his fifth chapter, he brings Jane of Aragon as an inſtance to prove the contrary. He enters into ſo particular a deſcription of parts in drawing the picture of this beautiful woman, that ſure nothing has paſſed ſo critical an examination in all that great number of portraitures which Mademoiſelle de Scuderi brought into faſhion by her Romances thirty or forty years ago (2). He is not content with deſcribing only thoſe beauties which were viſible, but he alſo proceeds on even to thoſe, *quas ſinus abſcondit*, and even to the proportion betwixt her thigh and her leg, and betwixt her leg and her arm. *Ventre ſub pectore decente, & latere cui ſecretiora correſpondeant. Amplis atque perrotundis coxendicibus, coxâ ad tibiam, & tibiâ ad brachium ſeſquialterâ proportione ſe habente* (3). There is prefixed to this treatiſe a letter of Cardinal Pompeius Colonna to Auguſtin Niphus, which gives teſtimony to the unparallel'd beauty and other excellent qualities of Jane of Aragon; and every body knows how competent a judge and critic a Cardinal of Quality is in theſe matters, *quàm elegans formarum ſpectator ſiem.* Read here the words of this letter: *Non vulgò ſpecioſiſſima quæque exponit natura: noſtro tamen ævo parens officioſa ac liberalis veluti Divinitatis æmula, ut perfectum admirandumque aliquid, Diiſque immortalibus quam ſimillimum gentibus proferret, Joannem Aragoniam Columnam procreavit, atque ab incunabilis ad hanc uſque ætatem, in qua eſt florentiſſima, per omnes pulchritudinis & venuſtatis numeros provexit, ut facilè principem locum inter formoſiſſimas vindicaret. Animum præterea ſingularibus & dotibus & virtutibus inſignivit, &c.* i. e. "It is not common for nature to diſ- "play all her beauties in the ſame ſubject; yet in "our age, like an indulgent and bountiful parent, "and as it were emulating Divinity itſelf, to give the "world a ſample of ſomething perfect, wonderful and "God-like, ſhe formed Jane of Aragon Columna; "and that ſhe might ſet her above competition even "with the handſomeſt of women, ſhe has led her "from the very cradle to her preſent prime of life "through all the different ſtages of comelineſs and "beauty; and has moreover endued her mind with "ſingular good qualities and virtues."

(2) This was written in 1692.

(3) Niphus, pag. 213. *Opuſculorum*, edit. Pariſ. 1645.

[C] *Some Authors ſay that Niphus has flattered her.*] Lewis Guyon could not believe that the Princeſs Jane of Aragon, of the illuſtrious Houſe of Columna, was poſſeſſed of all thoſe charms which Auguſtin Niphus has aſcribed to her: *but it is my opinion*, ſays he (4), *that he fell in love with her upon his having touched and ſtroaked ſeveral parts of her naked body when ſhe was ſick, as is cuſtomary for Phyſicians to do by the privilege of their profeſſion; and that being deſirous to obtain her good graces he publiſhed this book and dedicated it to her, knowing that there is nothing which ſo engages a woman's heart, as to perſuade her that you are captivated by her beauty.* After which he remarks, *that if this be ſo, he did not conſider the oath which was adminiſtred to him upon taking his Degree in Phyſick, which, among other prohibitions, forbids him to luſt after ſuch maids or women, as ſhall be his patients.* In the Table of Contents, he poſitively affirms, that *Niphus the Phyſician fell in love with Princeſs Jane of Aragon, upon his having had her as his patient.* This is going a little too faſt; he ought only to have given it as his conjecture. I confeſs that Niphus, who was one of the beſt Philoſophers of the laſt Age, was of a very amorous conſtitution; inſomuch that neither old age nor the gout could free him from this paſſion, which ſometimes cauſed him to act a very ridiculous part, even to that of dancing to the flute. *Suſceptis liberis, & ſeneſcente uxore, ſeptuagenarius ſenex puellæ citra libidinem impotenti amore correptus eſt uſque ad inſaniam; ita ut plerique philoſophum ſenem atque podagricum ad tibiæ modos ſaltantem miſerabili cum pudore conſpexerint* (5). i. e. "After hav- "ing had children of his own, his wife ſuperannuated, "and he himſelf ſeventy years of age, yet impotent "and old he doated to diſtraction on a young wo- "man; inſomuch that many, not without ſhame and "pity, have ſeen the old gouty Philoſopher dancing "to the pipe." I grant likewiſe that, being ſmitten with one of the maids of honour belonging to Jane of Aragon (6), he might have opportunities of being near this Lady, and warming himſelf before ſo great a fire; but it is no ways ſure that he forgot himſelf ſo far as to carry his views ſo high. Beſides as he did not practiſe Phyſick (7), tho' he had taken his Degree in it, it is not the leaſt probable that he was Phyſician to this Ducheſs; for perſons of her quality chooſe to apply, in caſe of ſickneſs, rather to a Phyſician of experience than one of ſpeculation, and who makes, as Niphus did, Philoſophy the chief of his profeſſion. So that I chuſe to ſay, that judgment not having been his prevailing talent, he took the liberty to ſpeak of things which he had never ſeen, and of applying his ideas to them. As to what Lewis Guyon obſerves, that this Princeſs was of the Houſe of Colonna, might be true on the mother's ſide, yet notwithſtanding he did not expreſs himſelf well. We have ſeen that Cardinal Pompeius Colonna calls her *Joannam Aragoniam Columnam*, probably becauſe ſhe was married to Aſcanio Colonna. Perhaps Auguſtin Niphus might

(4) Guyon, *Diverſes Leçons*, vol. 3. liv. 3. chap. 12.

(5) Jovius, *Elogior.* cap. 92.

(6) Naudæus, *in Judicio de Auguſt. Nipho.*

(7) *Medicinam licet circitoris inſtar aut periodentæ nunquam exercuerit, optimè tamen callebat.* Naudæus *in Judicio de Nipho.*

ſion for her [*D*]. Theſe thoughts appear to me very abſurd (*a*). It was not only her beauty that made her be admired: her courage, her prudence, and her capacity for great affairs diſtinguiſhed her extreamly from other women of quality (*b*). Under the Pontificate of Paul IV, ſhe had a ſhare in the reſolutions which were taken by the Colonna's againſt the intereſts of this Pope. She would have been impriſoned, if ſome regard had not been paid to her ſex; but on this conſideration they were contented with forbidding her to go out of Rome. However ſhe did not fail to contrive her eſcape very artfully (*c*) [*E*], that ſhe might be better able to favour the undertakings of her ſon, who was that Mark Anthony Colonna, who acquired afterwards ſo much glory at the battle of Lepanto. It does not appear that at that time ſhe agreed with her huſband; for ſhe was entirely in the intereſts of her ſon, when there was ſo great a miſunderſtanding between the father and ſon [*F*], that the latter contributed to the impriſonment of the former for a crime of ſtate. A ſad thing that a Lady of ſo great merit ſhould be very unhappy with

(*a*) See the note [*C*].

(*b*) See the note [*E*].

(*c*) In 1556. See the *Life of the Duke of Alva*, and hereunder the note (*I*).

Niphus cenſured.

might be cenſured more juſtly on his ſixty eighth chapter of his treatiſe *de Pulchro*, (of Beauty), where after having ſaid that Jane of Aragon was the only woman in that Age who deſerved the name of *happy*, ſeeing ſhe poſſeſſed thoſe two conſtituent parts of woman's felicity, beauty and virtue; he preſently after ſpeaks of Victoria Colonna, Marchioneſs of Peſcara, as of a ſhining pattern of beauty united with chaſtity.

A Remark on the touchings of Phyſicians.

[*D*] *It is ſaid of Niphus that his quality of Phyſician had intitled him to ſome priviledges with Jane of Aragon, which caus'd his paſſion for her.*] The Poets as well as others have long ago made reflections on this privilege of Phyſicians. See what Ovid makes the amorous Acontius to ſay.

Me miſerum! quod non medicorum juſſa miniſtro,
Aſtringoque manus, infideoque thoro.
Et rurſus miſerum! quod me procul inde remoto,
Quem minime vellem, forſitan alter adeſt.
Ille manus iſtas aſtringit, & aſſidet ægræ.
Invifus ſuperis, cum ſuperiſque mihi.
Dumque ſuo tentat ſalientem pollice venam,
Candida per cauſam brachia ſæpe tenet,
Contrectatque ſinus, & forſitan oſcula jungit,
Officio merces plenior iſta ſuo eſt. (*)

That is,

" Why ſit not I by your bed-ſide all day
" My mournful head in your warm boſom lay,
" Till with my fears the inward fires decay?
" Why preſs not I your melting hand in mine,
" And from your pulſe of my own health divine?
" But oh! theſe wiſhes all are vain; and he
" Whom moſt I fear, may now ſit cloſe by thee,
" Forgetful as thou art of heav'n and me.
" He that lov'd hand does preſs, and oft does feign
" Some new excuſe to feel thy beating vein.
" Then his bold hand up to your arm does ſlide,
" And in your panting breaſt itſelf does hide;
" Kiſſes ſometimes he ſnatches too from thee,
" For his officious care too great a fee." Duke.

(*) Ovid. *Heroid.* Epiſt. xx. ver. 133.

Remi Belleau in his Commentary on the ſecond book of *Ronſard's Amours* ſuppoſes that the 46th Sonnet was taken from this Epiſtle of Ovid. Here follow Ronſard's words:

Ha! que je porte & de haine & d'envie,
Au Medicin, qui vient ſoir & matin,
Sans nul propos taſtonner le tetin,
Le ſein, le ventre, & les flancs de m'amie.
Las! il n'eſt pas ſi ſoigneux de ma vie
Comme elle penſe, il eſt mechant & fin:
Cent fois le jour il la viſite, afin
De voir ſon ſein, qui d'aimer le convie.

But this difference is to be obſerved, that he whom Acontius complains of was betrothed to the ſick Lady, otherwiſe ſhe would not have had the aſſurance to confeſs, in her anſwer to Acontius, that this rival only kiſſed her now and then, *oſcula rara accipit*. Brantome quotes this Sonnet of Ronſard in ſome part of his Memoirs, and takes occaſion to be very witty upon it.

[*E*] *She was forbid to go out of Rome. However ſhe did not fail to contrive her eſcape very artfully.*] The paſſage I am going to cite from Anthony Maria Gratiani gives us, in elegant language, a full proof of this. *Joanna Arragonia, Marci Antonii mater, virilis audaciæ fœmina, quæ virorum quoque conſiliis apud filium habitis interfuerat, continere ſe domi, neque pedem inde efferre fuerat juſſa; id enim ſic indulſerat dignitati ejus Pontifex, ne in carcerem duceretur. Ea cum rem ſpectare ad arma bellumque, & primum Pontificiorum impetum in oppida filii fore intelligeret, veſtibus manè ſummo commutatis, cum filiâ & nuru, corruptis aut deceptis portæ cuſtodibus, egreſſa urbe, conſcenſis quos ad id præparaverat equis, protinus Neapolim aufugit. Pontifex, quanquam deceptum ſe deluſumque à fœmina graviter ferebat, acerbius tamen Hiſpanis, quorum ea conſiliis adminiſtrarentur, iraſcebatur* (8). i. e. " Jane of Aragon, the Mother of Marcus Antonius, a woman " of a maſculine courage, and who had borne a part in " the cabals of ſome men held at her ſon's houſe, was " ordered to confine herſelf to her houſe, and not ſo " much as to ſtir over the threſhold; for the Pope, " in regard to her dignity, had excuſed her from being ſent to priſon. But when ſhe ſaw the tendency " of affairs to arms and acts of hoſtility, and that the " firſt fury of the Pope's ſoldiers would be diſcharged " againſt the towns of her ſon, changing her cloaths " early in the morning, ſhe together with her daughter and ſon's wife, having either brib'd or paſſed " the watch, eſcaped out of the city, and getting on " horſe-back, having prepared ſome for that purpoſe, ſhe fled to Naples. The Pope, tho' he was " much chagrined to be overreach'd and outwitted " by a woman, yet was more incens'd againſt the " Spaniards, by whoſe contrivance theſe things were " managed." This eſcape and ſome other affronts put upon the Pope, ſo exaſperated him againſt the Colonna's, that he " diſpatched (9) a Mandate to Jane " of Aragon, by which he forbad her to marry any " one of her daughters, without his leave; thro' de- " fault of which, the marriage, tho' after conſumma- " tion, ſhould be void (10)."

(8) Gratianus, *de Caſibus Virorum Illuſtrium*, p. 322.

(9) Jan. 2. 1556.

(10) Fra. Paolo, *Hiſt. of the Council of Trent*, pag. 723. of Amelot's Tranſlation. Amſterdam edition, 1686.

[*F*] *She was at variance with her huſband, who himſelf alſo had a very great miſunderſtanding with his ſon.*] Cardinal Pallavicini remarks, that Aſcanius Colonna had behaved with ſo much inſolence towards his Creditors, that the Attorney Fiſcal cauſed him to be ſummoned to give an account of his conduct; and upon his not appearing, he was condemned for obſtinacy, and his lands confiſcated. Marcus Antonius his ſon, who had been at enmity with him a long time, took this opportunity to ſtrip his father, by poſſeſſing himſelf of his confiſcated lands, from which he drove away the Officers of juſtice, a little before the death of Julius III. *In ipſâ rei confectione, Marcus Antonius ejus filius, cui cum parente veteres & nunquam ſatis compoſitæ controverſiæ intercedebant, vim interpoſuit, eodemque tempore patrem oppidis ſpoliavit, ab eiſque Fiſci miniſtros procul habuit* (11). He went out of Rome contrary to the charge of Paul IV; which diſobedience joined to former provocations obliged this Pope to publiſh Manifeſto's both againſt the father and the ſon. The father pleaded his being kept priſoner at Naples as an argument that he could have no hand in plotting a rebellion: the ſon alledged that he had ſequeſtred the lands in the hands of Mendoza, who could not part with them without an order from the Emperor. Pallavicini makes no mention of the wife of Aſcanius Colonna, which I wonder at; but as we are aſſured from other hands that ſhe was engaged at Rome in the intrigues of her ſon, who was at variance with his father, we may make a ſhrew'd gueſs that ſhe was not upon the beſt terms with her husband. Gratiani ſpeaks in plainer terms of

(11) Pallavic. *Hiſt. Concil. Trident.* lib. 13. cap. 14. num. 9.

with her husband. This does not happen so seldom as one could wish amongst persons of her sex who have such great qualities. She shewed much constancy, when she lost her eldest son in 1551. What Aretin wrote to her upon it is seasoned with great praises. See the sixth book of his Letters, page the fifth (d). She had a sister, who was very handsome even in her old age, and who had a very famous daughter-in-law [G].

(d) Paris edition in 1609, in 8vo.

There are very few remarks in her article, which may not be lengthened. For which reason I shall add here in this new edition, as a supplement to what I have said already of the shameful conduct of Marcus Antonius towards his father. *Ante omnes* (12) *Colonniorum familia, magna in civitate pollensque pro illo* (Cæsare) *stabat, cujus princeps Martius Antonius, cum paulo antè Ascanium patrem, à quo hostili odio diffidebat, insimulatum majestatis in custodiam tradendum Neapoli curasset, aliquot oppidis intra fines Romanæ Ecclesiæ haud longè ab Urbe imperitabat.* i. e. "Above all the family of Colonna, which was very powerful and bore great sway in the city, was on Cæsar's side. The principal of which family, Marcus Antonius (who bearing an inveterate hatred to his father, had a little before got him impeached of treason, and imprisoned at Naples) governed some towns within the territories of the Roman Church not far from the city."

(12) Gratian. *de Casibus Viror. Illustrium*, pag. 320.

[G] *She had a sister, who was very handsome even in her old age, and who had a very famous daughter in law.*] See what a Spanish author says of these three Ladies... *Que cosas no podrian dezirse en laude y exaltation de la hermosissima Duquesa de Tallacoza, Donna Joanna de Aragon, muger de sangre real, y en summo grado casta, y buena? Y ansi de Donna Maria su Hermana, Marquesa del Vasto? Y de Donna Isabel de Gonzaga, su nuera* (13)? i. e. "What things "may not be said in the praise and exaltation of "the most beautiful Duchess of Tallacoza, Donna "Joanna of Aragon, a woman of Royal Blood, and "excellently chaste and good? as also of Donna Maria her sister, Marchioness del Vasto? and of Donna Isabel de Gonzaga her daughter in law." Donna Maria of Aragon, sister of Jane, was the wife of Alfonso d'Avalos, Marquis of Guast, one of the bravest Captains of Charles V. Sorbiere calls her Marchioness de Vasco, and ranks her among the learned women (14). Brantome, who was very full in her praise, places her amongst the long-liv'd beauties; for after relating the compliments which the Grand Prior of France made her in a very numerous company, *that her autumn surpassed all the springs and summers of those in the assembly*, he adds, *that she was in truth still a very handsome and amiable Lady, nay, even exceeded her two daughters, who were two very beautiful young Ladies, tho' she was at that time nigh sixty years of age* (15). The Grand Prior (16) *was smitten with her immediately*; but tho' he was deeply in love with the mother, yet he made his addresses to the eldest daughter, *por adombrar la cosa*, i. e. "to conceal the matter." At the end of *six years or more*, Brantome being returned to Naples, *he found her but very little altered, and still handsome enough*, as he says, *to make one break a commandment with her either in act or desire.* She died at Chiaia, in the house of Don Garzias of Toledo, Nov. 9, 1568, (17). I do not remember Brantome any where to have made mention of the sister of this Lady. It is true he in one place speaks of the wife of one Ascanio Colonna, who passed for the greatest beauty of Italy, and whom Barbarossa attempted to steal away to make a present of her to the Grand Signior; but he calls her Signora Livia (18) Gonzaga (19); which proves that it is not her who is the subject of this article, tho' by the description which Augustin Niphus gives of her beauty, we must think her not less capable than the other of inspiring Barbarossa with so bold a design. Thuanus has spoken of this Mary of Aragon: he says that the island of Ischia was chiefly remarkable for having been the retreat of this Lady. *Dragutes... Æuariam insulam arce munitissima, quæ inter duas terras saxo imposita est, sed maximè Mariæ Arragoniæ Alfonsi Avali Vastii viduæ secessu nobilem, petit* (20). i. e. "Dragutes... "goes to the island Ænaria which is famous for a "strong fortified castle situated upon a rock betwixt "two plains, but most famous for having served Mary "of Aragon widow to Alfonsus Avalus Vastius for a "place of retirement." The same Jerom Ruscelli, whom I have mentioned above, who shewed so much zeal to immortalize Jane of Aragon, spared no pains to sound forth the praises of Mary. He did not content himself with using the strongest expressions that his imagination could furnish him with in describing the perfections of this Lady; but he also collected several pieces of poetry wherein she had been idolized by the greatest wits of the age, and caused them to be printed at the end of his commentary upon the Sonnet of John Baptist of Azzia, Marquis d'Ella Terza. This Sonnet was composed in praise of *l'Illustrissima & excellentissima Signora la Signora Donna Maria d'Aragona, Marchesa del Vasto.* This Commentary of Ruscelli was printed at Venice, 1552, *in* 4°, *per Giovan Griffio*, and contains seventy three pages. The Marchioness is there represented as the *Archetype and Criterion of beauty*; so that, to use the commentators words, the true way of knowing whether other women surpass each other in beauty, is to see how far they resemble her. *Secondo che in altre vedra le fattezze del volto & di tutto il corpo che habbian somiglianza, ò s'avicino poco ò molto à quelle di lei, cosi giudicare, che le Bellezze di quelle tali, sieno piu ò meno perfette, come del Paragon dell' oro habbiam detto. Et da tale essempio, ò idea, ò piu tosto vero Archetipo qui in terra della vera Bellezza corporale, formar poi le regole, le ragioni, le misure, i gradi, & le proportioni della Bellezza intera & perfetta* (21). i. e. We are to observe in other Ladies what similitude in the features of the face and the proportion of the body they bear to her, and as they more or less resemble her, we may judge their beauty to be more or less perfect, as gold is tried by the touch-stone. And from such a pattern, or idea, or rather Archetype of true personal beauty we may form afterwards the rule, the reason, the measure, the degree of the portion of intire and perfect beauty." He makes her no less beautiful in mind than in body; and says that Giraldi having had the honour to see her and hear her speak, continued for some time quite astonished, and uncertain, whether she was more to be admired for her beauty or adored for her wit. *Al cospetto di questa divinissima Signora condottosi gia il Signor Giovan Battista Giraldi Cinthio, & contemplando attentissimamente l'una & l'altra Bellezza, che à gli occhi del corpo & à qui della mente gli si rappresentavano della vera Bellezza del volto dalla splendor de gli occhi, dalla soavità della favella, dalla leggiadria & maestà del sembiante, & dalla maraviglia dé modi & delle maniere veramente angeliche, stette lunga pezza tra se stesso attonito, & stupefatto, & dalla somma Bellezza del corpo, che primieramente s'offeriva à gli occhi suoi, dovea tosto resolversi, che questa fosse da lui da amarsi sopra ogn' altra cosa mortale. Poi passando subito col pensiero à quella dell' animo, che gli si rappresentava per quei modi & per quelle maniere gia dette, si mutava di opinione, & risolversi, che quella sola Bellezza dell' Animo, dovesse come cosa divina & celeste, con intera humilta & divotione adorarsi* (22). i. e. "John "Baptista Giraldi Cinthio being on a time introduced to this most divine Lady, and contemplating "with the greatest attention, the beauty both of her "body and mind, that of her body appearing from "the lustre of her eyes, the sweetness of her speech, "the grace and majesty of her mein, and a truly angelical air and manner, stood a long time astonished and stupified, and was ready to determine "from the beauty of her person, which first presented it self to his eyes, that she was to be loved "by him above any other mortal. But afterwards "making a sudden transition in his thought to the "beauty of her mind, he changed his opinion, and "came to his resolution, that this alone ought, as "a divine and celestial thing, to be adored with "humility

(13) Joan. de Spinosa, *Dialogo en laude de las Mugeres*, folio 90 *verso*.

(14) Sorbiere, *Lettre* 15. p. 73.

(15) Brantome, *Dames Galantes*, tom. 2. pag. 243, 245.

(16) It was Francis of Lorrain, General de Galeres, son of Claudius the first Duke of Guise. This journey to Naples was made in 1559.

(17) Tomaso Costo, *Compendio dell' Istoria del Regno di Napoli*, Part 3. folio 59.

(18) He should have called her *Julia*. We shall speak of her under the article of GONZAGA.

(19) Brantome, *Dames Illust.* pag. 283.

(20) Thuan. *Hist.* lib. 11. *ad ann.* 1552. pag. 222.

(21) Ruscelli, *Lettura sopra uno Sonnetto dell' illustriss. Signor Marchese della Terza alla divina Signora Marchesa del Vasto*, folio 57.

(22) Ruscelli, ibid.

of her Deification (*e*), that ſoon after her temple had been ſet out by the care of Jerom Ruſcelli, there was a gallant Author who dedicated many images to it [*H*]. The life of the Duke of Alva will furniſh me with new particulars concerning the broils, which obliged this Lady to fly from Rome in the year 1556 (*f*) [*I*]. She was then very old, according to the Hiſtorian of the Duke of Alva. She muſt then have enjoyed a very long life, for ſhe died in the month of October 1577 (*g*). She had given to the Capuchins of the holy Sacrament in 1575, the ground where they have built the Monaſtery they have at Rome (*h*). She was very liberal to the Jeſuits; for ſhe rebuilt the church of St. Andrew, which the Biſhop of Tivoli gave them in 1566 (*i*). Hitherto I have been ſilent as to her Genealogy; it is high time I ſhould obſerve that ſhe was daughter of Ferdinand of Aragon Duke of Montalto [*K*], third natural ſon of Ferdinand I King of Naples.

(*e*) Underneath, in the note [*A*].

(*f*) See the notes [*E*] and [*F*].

(*g*) Tomaſo Coſto, *Compendio dell' Iſtoria di Napoli*, Parte 3. folio 168.

(*h*) See the *Ritratto di Roma Moderna*, p. 541 of the Roman edition in 1653.

(*i*) Ibid. p. 540.

" humility and devotion." The Madrigal, which he compoſed upon this problem, is at the end of this paſſage.

[*H*] *A gallant author .... dedicated ſeveral images to her temple.*] This was Giuſeppe Betuſſi. He publiſhed at Florence, in 1566, a Dialogue intitled, *le Imagini del Tempio della Signora Donna Giovanna Aragona.* It is a Book of a hundred and twenty one pages, where the elogies of ſeveral perſons of the fair ſex are artfully interwoven with thoſe of the Goddeſs of the Temple.

[*I*] *Here follow ſome new particulars concerning the broils which obliged her to flee from Rome in* 1556.] This is what I find in the Hiſtory of the Duke of Alva printed in Latin at Salamanca, 1669, and in French at Paris, 1699. " Jane of Aragon, mother " of Marcus Antonius Colonna, Ducheſs Dowager of " Paſſiano, ... remained at Rome, being detained " by way of hoſtage, and kept a priſoner at ſight " by the Caraffes, who becoming more remiſs " by reaſon of the truce, and the ways being left " open, the Ducheſs went out of Rome on foot, " with her two daughters, pretending ſhe was going " to divert herſelf in a vineyard, lying at ſome di- " ſtance from the ramparts. Tho' ſhe was very old " yet ſhe kept walking on foot till ſhe was beyond " ſight of the watch and centinel; after which ſhe " got on horſeback and mounted her two daughters, " each with a Gentleman behind who held them in " their arms; and with this equipage, unworthy of " her, but ſuitable to her preſent condition, ſhe " made her eſcape to the camp. The Duke of Alva " received her there with inexpreſſible joy, and as " the great age of this Lady left no room for ſuſ- " picion, he embraced her, but contented himſelf with " ſaluting her two daughters, who out of reſpect to " the Duke unveiled themſelves. *Methinks*, ſays he, " coming up to her, *I ſee the famous Clelia who fled,* " *not from the camp of the enemy into the city,* " *prompted thereto by the ſole love of her country, but* " *from the city into the camp, urged by the force of* " *maternal affection....* The Ducheſs was charmed " with the civilities of the Spaniſh General, and ex- " preſſed her gratitude in a thouſand thanks. How- " ever, ſhe could not be perſuaded to continue in " the camp in regard to the age of her daughters. " The Duke conſented to her deſire, and ſhe re- " tired into Campania, accompany'd by her ſon, " and eſcorted by a ſquadron of Horſe, which the " Vice-Roy allowed her, more to do her honour " than to ſerve any occaſion ſhe had for it (23)."

(23) *Vie du Duc d'Albe*, liv. 4. chap. 19. pag. 381. *à l'année* 1556.

It will be proper, before we conclude this article, to ſay ſomething of the misfortunes of her husband. *He was priſoner in the New Caſtle at Naples, having been accuſed by his own ſon of hereſy, and conſpiring againſt his Catholick Majeſty* (24); and when the Duke of Alva arrived at Naples, in the year 1556, he went to ſee him in his priſon (25), *and heard all that he had to ſay to him, ... he comforted the good old man as much as he could, and gave him the whole caſtle for his priſon, having till that time been confined to a little cloſe Tower; he relieved the diſtreſſes he was reduced to, as well with money out of his own purſe, as by allotting him a penſion out of his ſon's eſtate... Notwithſtanding he did not reſtore him to his liberty, his accuſations being ſupported by too great a number of probable circumſtances, and believed by a great many people not to be without a ſtrong foundation. Beſides he would thereby have offended Philip, who kept Aſcanius priſoner the reſt of his days, tho' without depriving him of thoſe conveniences and advantages which the goodneſs of the Duke had indulged him.*

(24) Ibid. chap. 2. pag. 341.

(25) Ibid. p. 342.

The Hiſtorian remarks that *this fact* (26) *has never been thoroughly cleared up*, and he blames Count Noel for accuſing the Duke of Alva of having behaved with too much rigour towards the father of Marcus Antonius Colonna.

(26) That is, the Accuſation of Aſcanio Colonna.

[*K*] *She was daughter of Ferdinand of Aragon, Duke of Montalto.*] Anthony his ſon ſucceeded him in the Duchy of Montalto and married Hippolita della Rovere, and afterwards Antoinette de Cardona, and was father of another Anthony. This laſt, being the fourth Duke of Montalto, was married to Mary de la Cerda, daughter to the Duke de Medina Celi, and afterwards to M. Louiſa de Luna. He had ſeveral children who all died young except one daughter named Mary, who was heireſs to the Duchy of Montalto, and married in Sicily to Don Francis de Moncade, Prince of Paterno (27).

(27) Taken from a Memoir communicated by Monſ. Minutoli.

ARAGON (ISABELLA OF) daughter of Alphonſus Duke of Calabria, ſon of Ferdinand King of Naples, was wife of John Galeas Sforza Duke of Milan. This Duke was under the tuition of Lewis Sforza his uncle, before his marriage, and was no leſs ſo after he had eſpouſed Iſabella of Aragon in the year 1489 (*a*) with much magnificence [*A*]. The counſels of this Princeſs, who was as ambitious as fair, gave him the courage to ſhew that he would fully enjoy all his rights (*b*), but he had to do with a ſtrong party; his tutor was the moſt intriguing man in the world, and the moſt capable of maintaining himſelf againſt the juſt pretenſions of his nephew. He fell in love with the Princeſs Iſabella the firſt time he ſaw her; and, as ſhe was at preſent no otherwiſe the wife of John Galeas than by proxy, he did not deſpair of marrying her, and excluding his nephew. He opened this deſign to the Princeſs, and aſſured her that ſhe ſhould more certainly command if ſhe married him, than if ſhe was the wife of John Galeas. This propoſal was ſtrongly rejected. The tutor was not diſheartened; he cauſed his nephew not to conſummate

(*a*) Corio, *Hiſt. di Milano*, Parte 6. p. 879. *editione dell' an.* 1646. in 4to.

(*b*) Varillas, *Hiſtoire de Charles VIII.* liv. 2. pag. 157.

[*A*] *She was married to John Galeas Sforza Duke of Milan .... with much magnificence.*] See Triſtan Calchus, an Author of that time (1), *in Nuptiarum Mediolanenſium Deſcriptione.* Father Menetrier quotes a pretty long paſſage out of him, which contains the Deſcription of the magnificent ſupper that Bergonce Botta, a Gentleman of Lombardy, gave Duke Galeas and his bride, when he received them in his houſe at Tortona. Each courſe was accompanied *with a kind of Opera, which the reſtoring of theſe entertainments began to render agreeable, more by the grace of novelty, than by the other beauties, which have been given them ſince* (2).

(1) Konig is groſsly miſtaken, in making him live in 1672.

(2) Menetrier, *des Repreſentations en Muſique*, pag. 157.

consummate the marriage; and it is said that he even made use of a magical girdle [B]. In the mean time he caused his own marriage with Isabella to be negotiated at the court of Naples. Ferdinand seemed to agree to it, but the Duke of Calabria would not consent to it (c). Lewis Sforza was therefore obliged to deliver up the prey to John Galeas, but he did not renounce his vengeance, and he destined Isabella of Aragon for a principal victim. He abridged her of several things which suited either with her taste or her diversion (d), and he married a Princess, who disputed every thing with her. The young Isabella had so many vexations to go through in this conflict, and in this faction, which well deserves to be described [C], that she gave her father and her grandfather to understand that if they did not take her out of that misery, she would attempt her own life (e). These Princes were in no condition to bring Lewis Sforza to reason; for he was one of the instruments of drawing the French into Italy, which ruined the whole house of Aragon that reigned at Naples. He carried his wickedness so far as to make away with his nephew (f) [D]. It would be in vain to say that John Galeas died of

(c) Ibid. liv. 3. p. 210, 211.

(d) Ibid. liv. 2. pag. 157.

(e) See the note [C].

(f) *Conjuge Joanne Galeatio ordata est; eo quidem luctuosius ac miserius, quod is veneficio sublatus crederetur.* Jovius, *Elog.* l. 5. p. 422. i. e. "She lost "her husband "John Galeas, "and what increased her "grief and misery was, that "he was thought "to be taken off "by poison.

[B] *Her husband did not consummate the marriage, and it is said that use was made of a magical girdle.*] Guiccardini says there was such a report, and that all Italy was persuaded of the truth of it. *E manifesto*, says he (3), *che quando Isabella figliuola d'Alfonso andò a congiugnersi col marito, Lodovico come la vidde, inamorato di lei desidero ottenerla per moglie dal padre: è a questo effetto operò (così fu allhora creduto per tutta Italia) con incantamenti è con malie che Giovan Galeazzo fu per molti mesi impotente alla consummatione del Matrimonio: alla quel cosa Ferdinando harebbe acconsentito, ma Alfonso repugnò, onde Lodovico escluso di questa speranza, presa altra moglie & havutone figlivoli, voltò tutti i pensieri à trasferire in quegli il Ducato di Milano.* i. e. "It is "certain, that when Isabella the daughter of Alphonsus went to be joined to her husband, as soon "as Lewis saw her, being enamoured with her, he was "desirous of obtaining her for his wife from her father; and to compass this the better (as was at that "time believed all over Italy) he made use of inchantment and witchcraft, so that John Galeas "was incapable of consummation for many months. "Ferdinand consented to his proposal, but Alphonsus refused; upon which Lewis being excluded "from any hope, took another wife and had children by her, and turned all his thoughts on transferring upon them the Dukedom of Milan." Mr. Varillas, as far as I have been able to observe, does not touch upon this particular: he contents himself with saying, that Lewis Sforza *hindred the consummation of the marriage for above three months* (4). He says plainly enough, that the hindrance came only from the two parties, being not suffered to come together; for he says the father of the bride *thought his honour engaged . . . . not to suffer Lewis Sforza to separate the new married couple any longer; that he threatned to complain of it to all Europe, and to raise it up in arms to avenge his quarrel* (5). This was a great piece of malice and a very insupportable violence of the Guardian.

(3) Guiccardini, lib. 1. pag. 15.

(4) Varillas, *Hist. de Louis XII.* liv. 1. pag. 47.

(5) Varillas, *Hist. de Charles VIII.* liv. 3. pag. 211.

[C] *The kind of faction, with which she had to deal, deserves to be described.*] As Mr. Varillas seems to have succeeded in describing this, I believe the relation of his own words here will be thought a curious passage. It belongs so much the more necessarily to this article, as it serves to shew the humour, wit and qualities of the mind of Isabella of Aragon. "Lewis "Sforza gave up Isabella to his nephew . . . . and, "to procure her a rival who should controul her on "all occasions, he sought out the Princess Alphonsina, daughter of Hercules d'Este Duke of Ferrara. "Alphonsina was like Isabella in every thing, only "she was not so handsome. They were both full of "their birth to no purpose, seeing they had nothing "to reproach one another with in this point, and "that there was bastardy in both their Genealogies *. "They were excessively high-spirited, which arose "from a very great ambition. They were chaste "more out of glory than disposition. Isabella had "resolved upon marriage, and Alphonsina aspired to "it, with a greater desire of partaking of the power "of their husbands than of their beds. Both of "them were fond of luxury; and tho' they had "been brought up where nothing but parsimony was "esteemed, yet they were prodigal, and had a humour of spending as much as was in their power. "The Duke of Ferrara did not deliberate a moment, whether he should grant Alphonsina to Lewis "Sforza. He had no portion to give her, and besides there was room to hope that she would be "Duchess of Milan. She was therefore readily sent to "Lewis Sforza, who had two sons successively by "her. This fruitfulness gave her occasion to insult "Isabella, who had lain in the second time of a "daughter: but jealousy had already sown discord "between them. Alphonsina could not bear the "beauty of Isabella should be commended in her "presence, because she imagined that she was reproached at the same time with the want of it; "and Isabella was no less disgusted at the extraordinary honours which were paid to Alphonsina, because she thought they were due only to her. They "both lived in the same palace, and both eat at the "same table. Every day they had an infinite number of occasions to augment their aversion, and "the Courtiers furnished them with the greatest part. "They were very assiduous about Alphonsina, because "her husband distributed the favours; and went to "Isabelly only for form sake. She was quite in despair, and it was this neglect as well as the little "money that was afforded for her diversions, that "made her write to her father and grandfather, that "she would attempt her own life if they did not deliver her out of captivity. Alphonsina, for her "part, was so tired of Isabella, that to get rid of "her, she sollicited Lewis Sforza her husband to make "her Dutchess as he had promised her, and to add "the quality of Duke of Milan to that of Administrator of this Duchy (6)." Mr. Varillas had said in the same History (7), that Isabella had written *to the Duke of Calabria her father, and to the King of Naples her grandfather, letters, of which the greater part are still remaining* (8), *wherein she complained of her misfortune in the most pathetic terms. She painted them in a manner so lively as was enough to draw tears from the most obdurate eyes: she pretended she had enslaved herself only out of obedience, and threatned to lay violent hands on herself, if she was not soon set at liberty.*

(6) Varillas, *Hist. de Charles VIII.* liv. 3. p. 211.

(7) See p. 158.

(8) He quotes in the margin the *History of Bernardin Corio.*

[D] *Lewis Sforza carried his wickedness so far as to make away with his nephew.*] I shall make use again of Mr. Varillas's own words. This is what he says under the year 1494, after having conducted his King as far as Pavia. "Lewis Sforza, being persuaded "that it was time to get rid of his nephew Duke "John Galeas, had, as is said, given him some of "those slow poisons, which produce consumptive "symptoms in the human body; to give a greater "probability to the report which was spread at the "same time, that the disorder of this young Prince "came only from too great a fondness for the "beauty of his wife. The Physicians had no hopes "of his cure, when the King, as he passed through "Pavia, where he lay sick, could not forbear visiting him. His Majesty did not speak to him "about any business, because Lewis Sforza had made "such pressing instances to be present at this interview, which they did not dare to refuse him. He "only shewed his concern to see his cousin german * "in so miserable a condition, and endeavoured to "flatter him with some hopes of recovery; but "John Galeas, who found himself dying, and never "questioned its being thro' the wickedness of his "uncle,

* Borso d'Este, great grandfather to Alphonsina's father, and Ferdinand Isabella's grandfather by the father's side, were bastards.

* They were the sons of two sisters, Princesses of Savoy.

of being too fond of his wife; the tradition, which has imputed his death to the ambition of his uncle has prevailed [*E*]. The Princeſs Iſabella retired to Naples, after the French had taken Milan, and ſeemed the moſt afflicted of all the Princeſſes her relations, who were very numerous in the Iſle of Iſchia, when King Frederick was obliged to ſurrender at the diſcretion of Lewis XII, in 1501 (*g*). She did not go out of mourning for a long time; ſhe loſt within the ſpace of a few years her grandfather, her huſband, her father, her brother, her uncle, and her ſon [*F*]. The chief conſolation ſhe had left was to ſee that Lewis Sforza, her perſecutor, expiated his crimes in France, in a hard captivity, which ended only with his death. She had another conſolation, as ſenſible, or perhaps more ſenſible than this; that her only daughter, Bonna Sforza, was married to Sigiſmond King of Poland. She retired into a city of the Kingdom of Naples, which had been given her for her jointure (*b*), and lived there in ſuch a manner, as ſhewed that the reverſe of fortune had not abated that air of royal grandeur in which ſhe had been brought up. She died of a dropſy; but ſhe had time to go on a pilgrimage to Rome under the Popedom of Leo X. She went on foot to the Vatican, followed by a great number of Ladies dreſſed like brides. All the city ran to this ſight (*i*). It were to be wiſhed for her memory, that we could here finiſh her article, without adding a ſequel, which is a little diſagreeable, but we are not maſters of the facts. Her own Panegyriſts have concluded as follows. This Lady, whoſe conduct in her youth raiſed her a great reputation for virtue, gave room for ſlander, when ſhe was upon the decline, and admitted of the gallantries of Proſper Colonna, with very little regard for her reputation [*G*]. Her daughter, the Queen Dowager of Poland, being retired to the ſame part of the Kingdom

(*g*) Gratianus, *de Caſibus Viror. illuſtrium*, p. 41.

(*b*) At *Bari*: ſee the laſt note.

(*i*) Jovius, *Elog.* lib. 5. pag. 422.

" uncle, took advantage of this conjuncture. He " had now no longer any concern about himſelf, and " thinking only of his ſon and daughter whom he " was to leave in the world, he recommended them " to the King with abundance of tears, which ſhew- " ed ſufficiently, that if his Majeſty did not take par- " ticular care of them, he foreſaw that they would " be poiſoned as well as himſelf. The Ducheſs his " wife to compleat the tragedy, threw herſelf at the " King's feet, according to the Italian Authors, who " are in this point more to be credited than Commines, " who will have it to be at the feet of Lewis Sforza. " She was too haughty to ſtoop ſo low as that; and " if ſhe could have brought herſelf to it, ſhe was too " well convinced that her ſubmiſſion would be to no " purpoſe. She did not ſpeak of her children, be- " cauſe ſhe ſuppoſed the tears of her husband would " have their effect in this point: ſhe employed her's " for her father, and the King made her no other re- " ply, than that the expedition of Naples was too " far advanced, to be left unfiniſhed (9)."

(9) Varillas, *Hiſt. de Charles VIII.* liv. 3. p. 253.

[*E*] *It would be in vain to ſay that John Galeas died of being too fond of his wife: the tradition of his being poiſoned has prevailed.*] Guiccardini acknowledges that the firſt was reported; but nevertheleſs he gives as the general opinion of all Italy, that this Prince died of the poiſon that Lewis Sforza had given him. *Fu publicato da molti la morte di Giovan Galeazzo eſſere proceduta da coito immoderato; non dimeno ſi credette univerſalmente per tutta Italia, che e' fuſſe morto, non per infermita naturale ne per incontinentia, ma di veleno: e Teodoro da Pavia, uno de' Medici Regii, il quale era preſente quando Carlo lo viſitò, affermò haverne veduto ſegni manifeſtiſſimi. Ne fu alcuno, che dubitaſſe che ſe era ſtato veleno, non gli fuſſe ſtato dato per opera del zio* (10). Jovianus Pontanus affirms, that every body ſpoke in plain terms of this abominable crime of Lewis Sforza. *Ludovicum Sfortiam, qui pubeſcentem primo, dein adoleſcentem jam ætatem Joannis Galeatii fratris filii Mediolanenſis Ducis procuratione hactenus ac patrocinio tutatus eſt ſuo, veneno illum è medio ſuſtuliſſe cives, advenæ, peregrini, paſſim atque impune omnes prædicant. . . . . Fora, porticus, plateæ, circulique infimorum cujuſque generis hominum nefandi criminis accuſationibus . . . imprecationibus etiam maximè diris plena undique circumſonant* (11). i. e. " Lewis Sforza, who was guardian and afterwards " patron to John Galeas his brother's ſon, is openly " and with impunity declared to have poiſoned him, " by citizens, ſtrangers and foreigners univerſally. " . . . . The market-places, porches, ſtreets, and cir- " cles of the very loweſt people reſound on all ſides " with accuſations of the moſt horrid crime . . . and " the moſt dreadful imprecations." The crowd of Hiſtorians run that way, Bernardin Corio (12), Peter Bembus (13), Vianoli (14), &c.

(10) Guicciardini lib. 1. pag. 27. *ad ann.* 1494.

(11) Jovian. Pontan. *de Prudentiâ*, lib. 4. *initio.*

(12) Corio, *Hiſt. Mediolan.* Part 7.

(13) Petr. Bembus, *Hiſt. Venet.* lib. 2. folio 30.

(14) Vianoli, *Hiſt. Venet.* Part 2. pag. 20.

[*F*] *She loſt within the ſpace of ſome years her huſband, her father, her brother, her uncle, her ſon.*] Paulus Jovius eloquently deſcribes this long ſeries of misfortunes, but he has not always obſerved the order of them: he has placed the death of the husband before that of the grandfather. As to the ſon of our Princeſs, he ſays the French took him away from his mother, and carried him to France, to make him a Monk, and that he died by a fall from his horſe. *In venatione currentis equi lapſu in Heduis exanimatus eſſe nunciaretur. Hunc enim vel invita depoſcentibus Gallis tradiderat, à quibus cucullati ſacerdotii habitu in opulenti ſacerdotii cœnobium idcirco conjectus fuerat, ne Sforziani Regni legitimæ prolis hæres ſupereſſet* (15). Bernardin Corio gives a moving deſcription of the grief into which this Princeſs was plunged, when ſhe ſaw at once her husband in the grave, her ſon excluded from the Duchy of Milan, and the wife of Lewis Sforza upon the throne. *Li ſuoi fautori cridando Duca, viſito* (Ludovico) *il Tempio di Divo Ambroſio, e le campane in ſegno de letitia fece ſonare, il morto corpo di Giovanne Galeazo anchora eſſendo nel Domo ſcoperto, e quaſi univerſalmente da tutti pianto è condolato il miſerando e pietoſo caſo. Iſabella ſua mugliere a Pavia con li poveri figlioletti veſtiti de lugubre veſtimenti, come pregionera ſi recluſe entro una camera, e gran tempo ſtette giacendo ſopra la dura terra, che non vide aere. Doverebbe penſare ogni lettore l'acerbo caſo de la ſconſolata Duciſſa, e ſe piu duro il cuore haveſſe che diamante, piangerebbe a conſiderare qual doglia dovea eſſere quella de la ſciagurata e infelice mugliere, in uno punto vedere la morte del giovenetto e belliſſimo conſorte, la perdita de tutto lo imperio ſuo, e li figlioletti a canto orbati de ogni bene, il patre e fratello con la caſa ſua expulſi dal Neapolitano Reame, e Ludovica Sforza con Beatrice ſua mugliere nel modo dimoſtrato havergli occupata la Signoria.* i. e. " Duke Lewis " viſited the church of St. Ambroſe, and cauſed " the bells to ring for joy, the corps of John Galeas " being ſtill in the Dome uncovered, and his piteous " caſe being as it were univerſally bewailed and la- " mented. Iſabella his wife being at Pavia with her " poor little children cloathed in mourning habits, " ſhut herſelf up in a chamber as a priſoner, and con- " tinued a long time lying on the hard ground, with- " out ſeeing the light. Every reader muſt needs " perceive the hard caſe of this diſconſolate Ducheſs, " and a heart harder than adamant will melt at the " conſideration of the anguiſh of this miſerable and " unhappy wife, who at the ſame time ſaw the death " of a young and moſt beautiful conſort, the loſs of " of all her dominions, and her children almoſt de- " prived of every thing, her father and brother with " their family driven out of the Kingdom of Na- " ples, and Lewis Sforza with his wife in the man- " ner we have ſhewn in poſſeſſion of the ſovereign- " ty."

(15) Jovius, *Elogior.* lib. 5. pag. 422.

[*G*] *She gave room for ſlander when ſhe was upon the*

6 *the*

Kingdom of Naples, there followed this example of her mother [*H*]; ſo true is it that it is the moſt common and the moſt inevitable ſtumbling block to the glory and merit of women, for them to live in a publick character. They are expoſed to go aſtray ſooner or later. *Serius ocius ſors exitura.*

Our Iſabella died the 11th of February 1524, as is mentioned in her epitaph, related by Mr. Miſſon, in the ſecond volume (*k*) of his *Journey through Italy.*

(*k*) Page 41 of the third edition.

the decline, and admitted the gallantries of Proſper Colonna, with very little regard for her reputation.] I learn this from Paulus Jovius, in the elogium he has made of this Princeſs. He concludes with a *but*, which contains the ſtory. *Cæterum in hac eximiæ virtutis fœminâ improbæ plebis rumor non mediocriter pudoris decus perſtrinxit, ob id gravior, quod quum florente ætate impenetrabilem pudicitiam prætuliſſet, in ipſo demum ætatis flexu, Proſperum Columnam ſibi cultum & officium aſſiduè tribuentem, ſæpeque procacem ad urbaniores jocos admitteret* (16).

(16) Jovius, *Elogior.* p. 424.

(17) Monſ. Varillas, in the *Hiſtoire de Louis XII.* lib. 1. pag. 47, ſays, that Louis Sforza finding himſelf compelled to go out of the Duchy of Milan, made over to the Ducheſs Iſabella the Duchy of Barri and the Principality of Roſſano, which had been given him as a recompence for having re-eſtabliſhed the houſe of Aragon on the throne of Naples.

[*H*] *Bonna Sforza, her daughter, ... followed this example of her mother.*] Thuanus tells us more ill of the daughter, than Paulus Jovius does of the mother. The reader may judge of it by comparing the paſſages: *Eodem tempore, Bona Sforția, Sigiſmundi Auguſti Poloniæ Regis parens . . . . filii pertæſa, Sarmatiâ relictâ, in Italiam venit, & honorificè Venetiis excepta eſt . . . . unde paratam triremem conſcendens in Apuliam ad Barium navigavit, cujus urbis poſſeſſio gentilitio Aragoniæ gentis jure dotale & hæreditarium illi erat* (17). *Ibi ſolute & diſſentiente à priore vitæ ratione poſteà vixit, conſuetudine cujuſdam Papaciudæ non ſatis honeſtè uſa, cui & omnia bona teſtamento præteritis liberis reliquit, & fama ac bonis decoctis haud multo poſt in ſummâ egeſtate & infamiâ deceſſit* (18). i. e. "At the ſame time, Bona Sforția, mother of "Sigiſmund Auguſtus King of Poland . . . . being "weary of her ſon, left Poland, came into Italy, "and was honourably received at Venice . . . whence "getting on board a galley, ſhe went into Apulia to "Barri, the poſſeſſion of which was the hereditary "eſtate of the Houſe of Aragon and her Dowry. "There ſhe afterwards lived in a looſe manner, and "differently from her former courſe of life, having "a diſhonourable familiarity with one Papacauda, to "whom ſhe gave all her goods by will, excluding her own children, and afterwards having deſtroyed both her reputation and fortune died not "long after in the greateſt want and infamy." Thus ſpeaks Thuanus of the Queen Dowager of Poland. He affirms, that after having ruined her fortune and reputation ſhe died in poverty and infamy. What can we add to this elogium?

(18) Thuanus, *Hiſt.* lib. 16. *ad ann.* 1555, pag. 326.

ARAGON (MARY OF) wife of the Emperor Otho III, and daughter of a King of Aragon, ſcandalized her character by her wantonneſs, which at laſt brought her to the puniſhment of being burnt by fire. She had the addreſs to procure for her waiting woman a young man, whom ſhe loved, and diſguiſed in a woman's habit (*a*). It muſt not be aſked whether ſhe uſed moderation; her conſtitution, and the conſtant opportunities tell ſufficiently that her pretended waiting woman did not want employment, and that ſhe attended all the motions of the Court. The Emperor having perceived this ſecret villany, was willing to lay the ſhame intirely on the Empreſs, and ſo in preſence of many witneſſes he made the young man be undreſt, and upon the diſcovery of his ſex, he condemned him to the fire. He was ſo good-natured as not to puniſh his wife, he hoped ſhe would reform her conduct for the future, but he was deceived: ſhe afterwards became deſperately in love with a young Count near Modena, and ſoon made her declaration to him; for ſhe was readier to court than be courted on ſuch occaſions. The Count being as chaſte as fair, withſtood all her advances, or rather the violent attacks that were made upon him, but if in that he imitated Joſeph, he had not the ſame good fortune to get rid of her for a priſon. The Empreſs complained to her huſband that this Count had ſpoken to her of love, and demanded that this preſumption ſhould not go unpuniſhed. The credulous Otho did not fail to behead the accuſed. But ſee how the accuſer had her turn. The Count ſeeing himſelf condemned, and hoping for no mercy, and being nevertheleſs unwilling to unravel the whole myſtery, had made his wife promiſe that ſhe would juſtify him to Otho as well as ſhe could. She kept her word to him, preſerved his head, and took an opportunity, when the Emperor was giving juſtice in a general Aſſembly, which he held in the midſt of a great plain near Placentia; ſhe took, I ſay, this time to demand that the murderer of her huſband ſhould be puniſhed. The Emperor, who did not know her, promiſed her juſtice, according to all the rigour of the Laws. Upon that the Counteſs ſhewed him the head of her huſband, and offered to juſtify his innocence by the proof of the fire. Her offers were accepted. A red hot iron was brought; ſhe took it, and held it as long as they demanded without being burnt, and then aſked boldly for the head of Otho, who was convicted of being the murderer of her huſband; laſt ſhe was contented with having the Empreſs puniſhed, whom Otho condemned to be burnt (*b*). This happened about the end of the tenth Century.

(*a*) *Secum muliebri habitu circumduxit juvenem quo cum congrediebatur quotidie, quandoquidem eâ pro cubiculariâ utebatur*: i. e. "She carried a "young man about with her diſguiſed in a "woman's habit, whom ſhe "enjoyed every "day, being taken for her "waiting woman." Munſteri *Coſmographia*, lib. 3.

(*b*) Gotfrid. Viterb *Chronic.* Part 17. Alb. Krantz. Cuſpinian. *in Othone III.* Sigonius, quoted by Maimbourg; *Decadence de l'Empire*, p. 118.

ARAMONT * (GABRIEL D') Ambaſſador of France to Conſtantinople, under the reign of Henry II, was a Gentleman of Gaſcoigne, who worthily acquitted himſelf of his employment. The Conſtable Montmorenci, examining the overture that Pope Paul III had made him, that the only way to take Placentia out of the hands of the Emperor was to bring the Turkiſh Fleet upon the coaſts of Naples and Sicily, obliged the King his Maſter to negotiate that affair with Soliman. They choſe Aramont for this buſineſs. He was neither leſs ſkilful nor leſs experienced then La Foret, Rincon, and Paulin, who had preceded him in this Embaſſy. He ſet him friends at the Port, who gained him free acceſs, and ſecret audiences; he knew how to turn things ſo well, that he reconciled Soliman, who had been prejudiced a little againſt the French. The only doubt that remained was to know about what the Fleet of his Highneſs ſhould be

* *Arament.* This Article is without any date. Mr. Bayle ſhould have obſerved, that the City of Tripoli was taken in September 1551. It appears that he returned to France in 1552. [CRIT. REM.]

be employed, for which reaſon Aramont returned quickly to France, to conſult with his Maſter how to employ uſefully the ſuccours of the Grand Seignior. The King and the Conſtable told him they had intelligence in the Iſland of Corſica, and that it would be eaſy to make themſelves maſters of it, provided the Turkiſh and French Fleets attacked them at the ſame time. He parted with this project to communicate it to the Grand Seignior, but as ſoon as he was landed at Malta, he was inſtantly deſired by the Grand Maſter (*a*) to go and find the Turkiſh Generals who had beſieged Tripoli in Barbary, and to employ his credit, and the authority of Henry II, to oblige them to raiſe the ſiege. He complied with this, and appeared at the camp of the Turks when their batteries began to play (*b*): He had many conferences with Sinan Baſſa, and with Dragut, in which he ſhewed them that they were engaged in an enterprize entirely oppoſite to the treaty which Soliman was going to conclude with France, ſince his Highneſs had agreed to attack only the Emperor, and that Tripoli belonged to the Order of Malta. They anſwered him that the Knights of Malta were perjured, who notwithſtanding the oath they had made to Soliman, when they were treated with ſo much honour upon their leaving Rhodes, inceſſantly made hoſtilities againſt the Turks. They added that they had orders to drive them out of Africa, and that they could not delay the execution of this order. Aramont did not want excuſes, nor replies; and ſeeing he could not gain any thing of Sinan Baſſa, he reſolved to ſet out in haſte for Conſtantinople, to obtain of Soliman, if it was poſſible, that they ſhould not take Tripoli. But as his credit and intrigues were not unknown to the Baſſa, he could not obtain leave to continue his journey till after the taking of Tripoli. He ſaved the life and liberty of the French that were in that place, and was alſo at a feaſt to which Sinan and Dragut invited him after their conqueſt. Charles the Fifth was too good a Politician not to make uſe of this event: he took occaſion from it to publiſh that France had contributed to the taking of Tripoli. Henry II did all he could to anſwer this complaint [*A*]. I have not had time to ſearch into the conſequence of the negotiations and adventures of Aramont. I know very well that ſometimes his diſpatches were intercepted, and that the Emperor made uſe of it to reproach the French with their intelligence with the Turks [*B*]. The relation of his Embaſſy is in manuſcript in the Library of Mr. de Lamoignon (*c*).

(*a*) He was a Spaniard named Omeda.

(*b*) See the judgment that has been made of this conduct by Mr. de Wicquefort, in his treatiſe of the *Ambaſſador*, Book 2. Sect. 30. pag. 110.

(*c*) Varillas, *Hiſt. de Henri II.* pag. 200.

I have

[*A*] *Henry II did all he could to anſwer the complaint of Charles V, that Aramont and the French had contributed to the taking of Tripoli* (1).] The grand maſter of Malta accuſed our Aramont of having driven the Governor of Tripoli to capitulate. Thuanus, refuting this accuſation declares that the Conſtable under Montmorenci, who was very powerful at that time, had charged this Ambaſſador to teſtify to the Grand Maſter his particular attachment to him, and to the intereſts and proſperity of the Order. This Hiſtorian adds, that he has ſeen letters wherein the Conſtable ſhews a great deal of concern for the loſs of Tripoli, and that theſe letters cannot be ſuſpected of any diſſimulation, becauſe they were written to a perſon, to whom the Conſtable ſpoke his thoughts very freely (2). But when Henry II knew that the partiſans of the Emperor accuſed the French Ambaſſador of having contributed to this conqueſt of the Ottomans, he diſpatched a Gentleman to the Grand Maſter, to complain of the reports that were ſpread, and to aſk him how Aramont had conducted himſelf in this affair. He declared, he would cauſe him to be chaſtiſed, as the caſe required, if he was found in any fault; but hoped at the ſame time that if the Ambaſſador was innocent, the Grand Maſter would be pleaſed to give a public teſtimony of it. The Grand Maſter's anſwer fully acquitted Aramont. *Quo in negotio nullum officium prætermiſiſſet ut ordini ea in re noſtro gratificaretur, hoc enim à V. M. enixe ac religioſe ſibi injunctum. Præterea ut quorum culpa ea clades accepta eſſet certò cunctis conſtaret, undique probationes collegimus, & inquiſitione diligenti ſuper ea re habitâ nihil comperimus quo Aramontium cladi cauſam dediſſe, aut deditionis auctorem, fuiſſe credi debeat. Quinimo ex equitibus captivis .... didicimus eum non ſolum omni culpa vacare, ſed multis beneſactis totum ordinem ſibi devinxiſſe, ac proinde non recte nec ſecundum rationem factum exiſtimamus ut is rumor ſparſus ſit* (3); i. e. "In which buſineſs he omitted nothing "that might gratify our Order, as being earneſtly and "religiouſly enjoined him by your Majeſty. Beſides, "that it may appear manifeſtly to all who is to be "blamed for that misfortune, we have collected proofs "on all hands, and upon a diligent inquiry have found "no reaſon to lay any part of it on Aramont. We "have learned moreover from the captive Knights "that he is not only blameleſs, but that he has laid "the whole Order under obligations to him, and "therefore we are of opinion that this report is ſpread "without either juſtice or reaſon." The King of France did not fail to produce this anſwer in all the courts of Europe, to ſhew that his enemies vented wrongfully and without foundation every thing that might render him odious. *Eas literas.... poſtea Rex per Oratores ſuos paſſim publicari juſſit, quâ publicatione compreſſis Cæſarianorum querelis ac rumoribus, evulgata in Gallici nominis invidiam fama pariter conquievit* (4). That was ſufficient to ſhew that the partiſans of Charles V were miſtaken in this point; but thoſe who did not love France excuſed themſelves eaſily. We imagine without difficulty, when it ſuits with our inclinations, that we may interpret every thing in a certain ſenſe, according to the ſyſtem that has once been built upon very probable reaſons. It is in truth an inexhauſtible ſource of falſe judgments; but provided they ſerve our purpoſe, we are in no great pain about them.

(1) Varillas, *Hiſt. de Henri II.* liv. 2. pag. 198, *& ſeq.* under the year 1551. *See* Thuanus *alſo*, lib. 7. pag. 155.

(2) To Briſſac, who commanded in Piedmont.

(3) Thuan. lib. 7. *ſub fin.*

(4) Idem, ibid.

[*B*] *Aramont's intercepted letters were made uſe of to reproach the French with their intelligence with the Turks.*] Charles V, in a letter which he wrote in 1552 to the Princes and States of the Empire, is aſtoniſhed that the French Ambaſſador ſhould think he had juſtified his maſter with regard to his correſpondence with Soliman: "Have I not, ſays he, he "Memoirs of Aramont drawn up at Conſtantinople "which confirm the truth of the alliance being ma-"naged againſt a Chriſtian Prince between the Port "and France." *Jam quod de communicatis cum Turco conſiliis obiter perſtringit, quaſi abunde purgatum exiſtimet, qua fronte excuſare poteſt? atqui penes me habeo Aramontii Gallici legati commentarios Byzantii ſcriptos, & ad Regem per Coſtam Centurionem quendam miſſos, qui ſocietatis cum Turcis in Chriſtiani nominis Principem initæ plenam fidem faciunt* (5). Mr. Varillas obſerves, that *the Pope and the Emperor already deſigned to accuſe the King of France, in full council, of holding intelligence with the Infidels, and produce to that purpoſe ſome intercepted letters of Aramont, to which it was eaſy to give an ill ſenſe, becauſe the truth was explained in it but by halves* (6). But what have we to do with an ill ſenſe, ſeeing it was paſt all doubt that Aramont negotiated a treaty between France and the Port againſt the Houſe of Auſtria? Was not that ſufficient to prove the intelligence of which they had a mind to accuſe Henry II? The beſt method that France could take was not to conteſt the fact, but to inſiſt

(5) Idem, lib. 10. pag. 213.

(6) Varillas, *Hiſt. de Henri II.* liv. 2. pag. 202.

I have juſt read a thing which ought to ſerve as an addition to this Article. *The Iſles d'Or in Provence*, that is, the Iſles d'Hieres, *were raiſed to a Marquiſate by letters from King Henry II, confirmed at the Parliament of Aix; and with this Marquiſate was inveſted and enſeiſined the Lord of Aramond, Ambaſſador from France to Conſtantinople, to keep it in fief of the King, at the expreſs charge of building in theſe Iſles, Caſtles, Towers and Fortreſſes, to the ſum of fifty thouſand crowns* (d).

(d) St. Lazare, *Hiſtoire des Dignitez Honoraires de France*, pag. 400. edition de Paris, 1635, in 8vo.

inſiſt upon the equity of it, by ſhewing that when religion is not concerned, but only the oppoſing an invaſion of one's territories, one ought to be permitted to get allies whereever one is able. If Charles V had not always had a good ſupply of them amongſt the Chriſtian Princes, Papiſts or not Papiſts, he would have known well enough how to find them amongſt the Infidels, and to make more advantage of them than France did. He had much more addreſs than Francis. With him, the Turkiſh fleets would not have been uſeleſs, as they were with the French, who concerted things ſo ill, that we are either aſhamed of them or pity them, or make a jeſt of them when we read the Hiſtory of thoſe times. Integrity would not be unſerviceable on theſe occaſions. It would hinder us from reproaching our enemies with alliances with Hereticks, or Infidels, when we perceived our ſelves to be ready to make the ſame alliances, if the maxims of State requir'd it. Where then would be the perſons, who could make pathetic harangues, preſent fine memorials, and make a hundred fine common places? All that muſt be laid aſide; we ſhould do our ſelves a great prejudice: We ſhould throw no duſt in the eyes; we ſhould not ſtir up the people: we muſt renounce a thouſand exquiſite praiſes, and a hundred pompous titles.

Accuſat Manilia ſi rea non eſt (7).

(7) Juvenal. Sat. 6. *verſu* 243.

" ——— ———Manilia will,
" If not Defendant, be the Plantiff ſtill."
Sir Rob. Stapylton.

Uſually in this caſe we do not leave off reproaches, till we deſerve them ourſelves.

☞ARATUS a Greek Poet, was born at Soli or Solæ [*A*], a city in Cilicia, and flouriſhed about the beginning of the hundred and twenty fourth Olympiad, in the reign of Ptolomy Philadelphus King of Egypt, and Antigonus Gonatas King of Macedon, the ſon of Demetrius Poliorcetes. His father's name was Athenodorus, and his mother's Lenodata, or according to others Letophila. He ſtudied under Dionyſius Heracleotes, and was familiar with King Antigonus abovementioned and his wife Phila [*B*]. He had three brothers, Myris, Kalondas, and Athenodorus, who is ſaid to have been the firſt, that vindicated Homer's Poems againſt Zoilus. He was preſent at the marriage of Antigonus, and continued at his court the reſt of his life (*a*). His *Phænomena*, which are ſtill extant, might perhaps give him a title to the character of an Aſtronomer, as well as of a Poet. He wrote this Poem in Greek verſe, and it was tranſlated into Latin by Cicero, who tells us in his firſt book *de Oratore*, that the verſes of Aratus are very noble and beautiful, but that the Author did not underſtand Aſtronomy; and it is ſaid, that he borrowed his materials from Eudoxus. We ſhall give the judgment of Quintilian and other writers concerning this Poet in the note [*C*]. Cicero's tranſlation of his Poem is objected to by the Critics in ſeveral places; but theſe defects may ſufficiently be excuſed, by conſidering that he was very young when he made that verſion. Our Poet had the honour of being tranſlated into Latin by other hands beſides Cicero; for there is a tranſlation of him, which is publiſhed under the name of Germanicus Cæſar, and another under that of Feſtus Avienus. The Scholiaſt upon the ſixth Idyllium of Theocritus tells us, that he was an intimate friend of our Author. There is a good edition of his Poem publiſhed by Grotius at Leyden in 4to 1600, in Greek and Latin, in which we have the text of Aratus with the Fragments of Cicero's Latin Verſion, which Grotius has ſupplied where it was defective, and the tranſlations of Germanicus and Avienus; all which the editor has illuſtrated with curious

(*a*) *See* Baillet, *Jugemens des Savans ſur les Poetes Grecs*, tom. 3. Part 1. n. 1126. p. 427. edit. Amſterdam 1725.

[*A*] *He was of Soli or Solæ.*] The Greeks, who lived here amongſt the Cilicians, having corrupted their language, it came to paſs that thoſe who ſpoke barbarouſly were called Σολοικοι, i. e. *dwellers* at Solæ, and a corrupt dialect σολοικισμὸς, *a ſolæciſm*. This city was afterwards called *Pompeiopolis* from Pompey the Great, who tranſported ſome Pirates thither.

[*B*] *He was familiar with King Antigonus abovementioned, and his wife Phila.*] Suidas mentions an Epigram, that he wrote on this Phila, who was the daughter of Antipater. He went to Macedon at the time of the celebration of the nuptials of Antigonus and Phila, and was greatly careſſed by them, and lived in that court till the time of his death.

[*C*] *We ſhall give the judgment of Quintilian and other Writers concerning this Poet in the Note.*] Quintilian in the tenth Book of *his Inſtitutiones Oratoriæ* (1) obſerves, that his ſubject has nothing of the *pathos*, no variety, no fictitious perſons introduced ſpeaking, with the other ornaments, which have ſo great an effect in other kinds of Poetry; however, that he was very capable of executing the deſign which he undertook. *Arati materia motu caret, ut in quâ nulla varietas, nullus affectus, nulla perſona, cui uſquam ſit oratio; ſufficit tamen operi, cui ſe parem credidit.* Mr. Baillet in his *Jugemens de Savans* (2) has rendered this paſſage in this manner; " the *Diction* of Aratus " has no flowers nor ornaments, nor epiſodes, nor " poetical variety, nor any of the qualifications which " touch the minds of thoſe, who read Verſes; " but Quintilian adds, that he was very able to per- " form the task, which he had attempted." *Cependant Quintilien écrit, que la diction d'Aratus n'a ni fleurs ni ornemens, ni epiſodes, ni varieté poetique, ni aucune de ces qualités, qui touchent le cœur de ceux qui liſent des vers; mais il ajoute qu'il étoit fort capable d'exécuter le deſſein qu'il avoit entrepis.* This is undoubtedly a very inaccurate repreſentation of Quintilian's ſenſe; who, as it appears from the latter part of the paſſage quoted above, intimates that Aratus did not attempt to maintain the character of a Poet in the ſubject, which he treats of, and therefore confined himſelf only to the verſification, And therefore what Mr. Baillet ſays afterwards, *that Quintilian is not very conſiſtent with Cicero, either with regard to his ſubject on the form and ſtructure of his Verſe*, is a miſtake in that critic, ſince Quintilian is ſo far from cenſuring the verſification of Aratus, that on the contrary he confirms what Cicero ſays, that his Verſes are very beautiful and good; *ornatiſſimos atque optimos*. Mr. Baillet obſerves, that his ſubject was not well adapted for Poetry; which he ſuppoſes to be the reaſon why Ludovico Caſtelvetro in his *Commentary upon Ariſtotle's Art of Poetry* conſiders him rather as a Verſifier than as a real Poet.

(1) Cap. 1.

(2) Tom. 3. Part 1. n. 1126. pag. 428. edit. Amſterd. 1725.

curious notes. It is evident that this Poet was highly valued among the Antients, ſince we find ſo great a number of Scholiaſts and Commentators upon him [*D*], among whom are Ariſtarchus of Samos, the two Ariſtyllus's the Geometricians, the two Evænetus's, Crates, Numenius the Grammarian, Pyrrhus of Magneſia, one Thales, Zeno, and ſeveral others, whoſe works are loſt (*b*). There are ſeveral other works alſo aſcribed to him [*E*]. Virgil has tranſlated a great many entire lines from this Author [*F*]. St. Paul has given a kind of ſanction to our Poet by quoting him [*G*].

(*b*) Idem, pag. 429.

ARATUS

[*D*] *Scholiaſts and Commentators upon him.*] We have a catalogue of them at the end of the *Iſagogical Treatiſe* publiſhed under the fictitious name of Eratoſthenes or Hipparchus upon the *Phænomena* of Aratus. But we are not to imagine, as Mr. de la Monnoye obſerves in his Notes upon Mr. Baillet's *Jugemens des Savans* (3), that the Authors there mention'd to the number of thirty ſeven were all of them Commentators upon this Poet, ſince ſeveral of them only made ſhort remarks occaſionally upon ſome paſſages of his Poem; and Callimachus, who is ranked among thoſe that commented upon Aratus, only ſpeaks of him as an imitator of the *Aſtronomics* of Heſiod.

(3) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 429.

[*E*] *There are ſeveral other works aſcribed to him.*] Suidas mentions Hymns to Pan, σποιδοφόροι, παίγνια, Aſtrology and Aſtrotheſy, a Compoſition of Antidotes, ἀνθρωπογονία,, an ἐπιθυτικὸν on Theopropus, an ἠθοποιία on Antigonus, an Epigram on Phila the daughter of Antipater and wife of Antigonus, an Anatomy on Pauſanias the Macedonian, an Epicedium of Cleombrotus, a Correction of the Odyſſey, and ſome Epiſtles in proſe.

[*F*] *Virgil has tranſlated a great many entire lines from this Author.*] I ſhall give a few inſtances.

Καί μιν πτιφαίνοι δύω πόλοι ἀμφοτέρωθεν·
Ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν ἐκ ἐπίοπτος, ὁ δ' ἀντίος ἐκ βορέαο
Ὑψόθεν ἀκρεμονῆος· δύω δέ μιν ἀμφὶς ἔχουσαι
Ἄρκτοι ἅμα τροχόωσι· ——————
Τὰς δὲ δ' ἀμφοτέρας οὐ ποταμοῖο ἀπόῤῥωξ,
Εἰλεῖται, μέγα θαῦμα, θράκων, περὶ τ' ἀμφὶς ἰαγὼς (4).

(4) Aratus *in Phænomenis.*

Mundus ut ad Scythiam Riphæaſque arduus arces
Conſurgit; premitur Libyæ devexus in Auſtros.
Hic vertex nobis ſemper ſublimis; at illum
Sub pedibus Styx atra videt, manesque profundi.
Maximus hic flexu ſinuoſo elabitur Anguis
Circum, perque duas in morem fluminis Arctos;
Arctos, Oceani metuentes æquore tingui (5).

(5) Virg. *Georg.* lib. 1. ver. 240.

" As, ſteep, to Scythian heights the world aſcends,
" Downwards the ball to Lybian tempeſts bends:
" This Cove to us is ſtill ſublimely high,
" And that below, Styx, and the Ghoſts deſcry:
" Here the vaſt Snake in winding circles glides,
" And either Arctos, like a ſtream, divides.

Σῆμα δέ τοι ἀνέμοιο καὶ οἰδαίνουσα θάλασσα
Γιγνέσθω καὶ μακρὸν ἐπ' αἰγιαλοὶ βοόωσιν,
Ἀκτή τ' εἰνάλιοι, ὁπότ' ἔνδοθι ἠχήσωσαι
Γίγνωνται, κορυφαί τε βοώμεναι οὔρεος ἄκραι (6).

(6) Aratus *in* Διοσημείοις.

Continuo ventis ſurgentibus, aut freta ponti
Incipiunt agitata tumeſcere, & aridus altis
Montibus audiri fragor: aut reſonantia longe
Litora miſceri, & nemorum increbeſcere murmur (7).

(7) Virg. *Georg.* lib. 1. ver. 356.

" For e'er the riſing winds begin to roar,
" The working Seas advance to waſh the ſhoar:
" Soft whiſpers run along the leafy woods,
" And mountains whiſtle to the murm'ring floods:
Dryden.

Ἡελίοιο δέ τοι μηλέτω ἐκάστιθεν ἰόντος,
Ἠελίῳ καὶ μᾶλλον ἐοικότα σήματα κεῖται,
Ἀμφότερον, δύνοντι, καὶ ἐκ πηράτης ἀνιόντι (8).

(8) Aratus *in* Διοσημείοις.

Sol quoque & exoriens, & cum ſe condet in undas;
Signa dabit (9).

(9) Virg. *Georg.* lib. 1. ver. 438.

" And thus the Sun, as riſing he appears,
" Or dipt in Ocean, various ſigns declares."

[*G*] *St. Paul has given a kind of ſanction to our Poet by quoting him.*] It is in his ſpeech to the Athenians (10), wherein he tells them that *ſome of their own Poets have ſaid*, τοῦ γὰρ καὶ γένος ἐσμὲν, i. e. " for we are " alſo his off-ſpring." Theſe words are the beginning of the fifth line of the Phænomena of Aratus. The uſe the Apoſtle makes of this quotation from our Poet is to urge that, ſeeing we are the off-ſpring of God, we ought to think more highly of the divine Nature, than to imagine it can be like gold or ſilver or any other human workmanſhip. The Poets were in a manner the Prophets of the Pagan Religion. They preſerved the Genealogies of the Gods and the chief ceremonies of their worſhip. St. Paul quotes Aratus here, who is his own countryman, they being both natives of Cilicia. The ſenſe of the whole paſſage, which the Apoſtle alludes to, is as follows: *It is our duty to begin with Jupiter, whom it is not lawful to forget. Every thing is full of Jupiter; he fills the ſtreets, the publick places, and the aſſemblies of men. All the ſea and the heavens are full of him; and in every place we have all of us need of Jupiter.* Father Calmet upon this paſſage of St. Paul obſerves, that he did not deſign to conſider Jupiter as a real Being; but only to aſſume his name as that of God, as it was underſtood by the Pagans, before whom he ſpoke; and he drew an argument againſt them from their own principles. If it be true that Jupiter or the Deity be every where, and that we have need of his continual influence and concurrence for our ſubſiſtence, God cannot certainly be corporeal, nor at a diſtance from us, nor unaffected by what we do. Lucan in the 9th book of his Pharſalia has a fine paſſage to this purpoſe:

(10) Acts, chap. xvii. ver. 28.

Jupiter eſt quodcunque vides, quocunque moveris.

" Jove is whate'er you ſee, wheree'er you move."

And again,

Jovis omnia plena.

" All things are full of Jove."

The Stoics and the Platoniſts were of opinion, that God was the Soul of the World, and that he gave life, and being, and motion to all creatures. This notion may be underſtood in a good ſenſe, ſince it is certain that God is the firſt principle of all things. But if it be taken in a corporeal ſenſe, ſo that God is ſuppoſed to exiſt in parts in different beings, as thoſe Philoſophers ſeem to inſinuate ſometimes, this is abſolutely inconſiſtent with the Nature of God. Virgil in his fourth book of *Georgics* ſays,

——— *Deum namque ire per omneis*
Terraſque tractuſque maris, cœlumque profundum;
Hinc pecudes, armenta, viros, genus omne ferarum,
Quemque ſibi tenues naſcentem arceſcere vitas.

" —— God the whole created maſs inſpires;
" Thro' heav'n and earth, and ocean's depth he
" throws
" His influence round, and kindles as he goes.
" Hence flocks, and herds, and men, and beaſts,
" and fowls
" With breath are quicken'd, and attract their
" ſouls." Dryden.

There is a very remarkable paſſage in Apuleius's tranſlation of the book *De Mundo*, wherein we are told, that it is an ancient opinion, and one, that has entirely poſſeſſed the minds of all mankind, that God is the original Author and Source of all being, and the Preſerver of thoſe things, which he created. Nor is there any thing endowed with ſuch an innate power as to be able to ſubſiſt by its own nature, ſeparate from the aſſiſtance of God. The Poets have follow-

ed

ARATUS of Sicyon was the ſon of Clinias [*A*] and Ariſtodama. His father having been killed by Abantidas, who had made himſelf the Tyrant of Sicyon, Aratus, then but ſeventeen years old, narrowly eſcaped with his life [*B*]. He was ſent ſecretly to Argos, where his father's death and his own misfortunes ſoon inſpired him with a great averſion for tyranny, which ſtill encreaſed as he grew up. In his younger years he took ſo much delight in exerciſes of his body [*C*], that he in a manner neglected the ſtudy of Eloquence, ſo neceſſary for a man who was once to be at the head of a powerful Commonwealth. Yet it appears by his Commentaries, of which we ſhall ſpeak hereafter, that he was not entirely unacquainted with that art. As he advanced in years, his great virtues and ſhining qualifications drew upon him the eyes of all thoſe, who as well as himſelf were baniſhed their native country; and ſcarce was he twenty old, but he undertook to deliver Sicyon from tyranny, which he accompliſhed according to his wiſhes [*D*] (*a*). This happened in the fourth year of the hundred and thirty firſt Olympiad (*b*). A great many Citizens who had been baniſhed by the Tyrants, or who had voluntarily left the City, returned home upon the reſtoration of liberty. They immediately claimed their

(*a*) Plutarch, *in Arato, Oper.* tom. 1. p. 1020.

(*b*) 501 ſince the building of Rome, 253 before Chriſt. Petav. *Rat. Temp.* Part. 1. lib. 4. cap. 4. p. m. 130.

ed this opinion, and affirmed that "all things are "full of Jove," *Jovis omnia plena*, by means of whoſe preſence not only the thinking faculty, but even the eyes and ears and the ſenſible ſubſtance exert their power. *Vetus opinio eſt, atque cogitationes omnium hominum penitus inſedit, Deum eſſe originis & haberi auctorem, Deumque ipſum ſalutem eſſe & perſeverantiam earum, quas effecerat, rerum. Neque ulla res eſt tam præſtantibus viribus, quæ viduata Dei auxilio ſui natura contenta ſit. Hanc opinionem vates ſequuti profiteri auſi ſunt* omnia Jove plena eſſe, *cujus præſentia non jam cogitatio ſola, ſed oculi & aures & ſenſibilis ſubſtantia comprehendit.* We may obſerve here, with Father Calmet, that the example of St. Paul, who cites a Pagan Poet, may ſerve to juſtify thoſe, who make uſe of ſuch kind of teſtimonies in their diſcourſes. Clemens Alexandrinus tells us in the ſixth book of his *Stromata*, that St. Paul adviſed the Chriſtians to read ſometimes the writings of the Heathens, and among the reſt thoſe of the Sibyls and of Hyſtaſpes, and he gives an account of the Apoſtle's diſcourſe upon that ſubject. But it is very probable, that Clemens, who frequently paid regard to books of little or no authority, took this ſtory from ſome ſpurious writers; and that thoſe, who forged the pretended writings of the Sibyls and Hyſtaſpes, might have invented likewiſe this account in order to give a ſanction to their books.

have paſſed for the moſt inconſiderate and imprudent man, if his undertaking had not been attended with ſucceſs. Aratus at firſt conſulted with ſome of his fellow exiles, what place it would be proper firſt to ſeize upon, whence they might make war againſt the tyrant. Whilſt they were debating this point, a priſoner, who had made his eſcape out of priſon, came to Argos, and ſhewed Aratus and his friends a place where it was eaſy to get over the wall of Sicyon, and ſo into the city. Aratus ſent immediately ſome perſons to enquire into this affair, who on their return confirmed the former account, but added that the only difficulty was to continue undiſcovered; becauſe there was a Gardiner, who lived juſt by the only place, where they could get into the city, and who had ſeveral little dogs, which would certainly diſcover them by their barking. To remove this difficulty, Aratus ſent five perſons before hand, who were to pretend they were travellers, and endeavour to get a lodging at the Gardiner's, in order to lock him up with his dogs. There was another difficulty to be removed. Nicocles the tyrant of Sicyon had ſome ſuſpicions againſt Aratus, and conſtantly kept ſpies at Argos, who narrowly watched all Aratus's actions. He therefore to amuſe and delude them, feigned to be entirely given up to pleaſure, which ſucceeded ſo happily that Nicocles's ſpies laugh'd at him, for being afraid of a young man, who in his baniſhment, thought of nothing, as they imagined, but his diverſions. But when the time appointed for the expedition came on, Aratus went immediately with his friends and as many perſons free or ſlaves as he could aſſemble, to that part of the wall which had been marked to them. It was not without difficulty that they got over it, having been very near diſcovered by a party of ſoldiers, who paſſed their rounds, and alſo by the Gardiner's dogs, and by a greyhound, who all fell a barking, and alarmed the watch; who asked what was the matter? But the perſon to whom the greyhound belonged, anſwered, that the dogs barked only at the patroll. Whether he thought ſo himſelf, or whether ſuſpecting Aratus's deſign, he had a mind to favour it, is not known; however this gave Aratus and his ſoldiers a great deal of courage, becauſe they thought that they ſhould find many perſons in the city, who would ſupport and aſſiſt them in their undertaking. After ſome difficulties they got over the walls, and went directly to Nicocles's houſe. They took them all priſoners without killing any of them. Aratus ſent immediately to all his friends, who were in the city. It began now to be day light; the people, without knowing what was the matter, aſſembled in the market place; whither he ſent a perſon to declare, that Aratus, the ſon of Clinias, exhorted all the citizens to aſſert their liberty. The people in hopes now, that this was the moment they had long wiſhed for, went in a body to Nicocles's houſe and ſet it on fire. The tyrant finding in what danger he was, made his eſcape through ſubterraneous paſſages. The people and ſoldiers knowing that he was gone away extinguiſhed the fire, and plunder'd his houſe, which Aratus did not think proper to prevent. Plutarch, who gives us this account obſerves (9), that the liberty of Sicyon was reſtored without bloodſhed; not one ſingle perſon having been killed or wounded on either ſide.

(9) Ibid. p. 1029, 1030, 1031.

(1) *In Arato, Oper.* tom. 1. pag. 1028.
(2) *In Corinthiacis, ſive* lib. 2. p. 99.

[*A*] *The ſon of Clinias.*] This is what Plutarch (1) and Pauſanias (2) tell us for fact. But as there muſt always be ſomething extraordinary in the birth of great men, and it is thought a conſiderable addition to their glory, to be deſcended from ſome God, the Sicyonians pretended that Aratus was the ſon of Æſculapius, who, as they ſaid, had lain with Aratus's mother under the ſhape of a dragon (3); and there was in Pauſanias's time in the Temple of Æſculapius at Sicyon the ſtatue of a woman ſitting upon a Dragon. The people ſaid this woman was Aratus's mother, the Dragon repreſenting Æſculapius, who was thought to be his father (4). We may obſerve by the way, that Clinias Aratus's father had been for ſome time the chief Magiſtrate of Sicyon (5).

(3) Pauſan. *in Meſſen. ſive* l. 4. p. 243.

(4) Pauſan. *in Corinth.* p. 103.

(5) Ibid. p. 99.

[*B*] *Aratus—narrowly eſcaped with his life.*] The tyrant was reſolved to kill the youth, who wandering up and down the city, without knowing whither to retire, or where to find any aſſiſtance, entered ſecretly into an houſe, in order to hide himſelf. It happened to be the houſe of Abantidas's own ſiſter, but ſhe was married to Prophantus the brother of Clinias, ſo that ſhe was Aratus's aunt. That generous Lady hid him in her houſe till night, and then ſent him ſafely to Argos (6).

(6) Plutarch. *ubi ſupra.*

[*C*] *He took much delight in exerciſes of his body.*] Finding that as he grew up his body was ſtreight and well ſhaped, and his conſtitution ſtrong, he exerciſed himſelf in wreſtling. He engaged in what the Greeks called *Pentathlon* (πένταθλον), which conſiſted of five different exerciſes, *boxing*, *running*, *leaping*, *wreſtling*, and *throwing of iron balls* (7); and won the prize in thoſe games (8).

(7) The Greek word is δίσκος, which ſignifies a *ball of iron, braſs, ſtone*, or *wood*, which the Athletæ uſed to throw into the air, as high as they could, to exerciſe themſelves.

(8) Plutarch. *ubi ſupra.*

[*D*] *He undertook to deliver Sicyon, and accompliſhed it.*] The manner in which he performed it is very ſurprizing. It appeared ſo chimerical to ſeveral of thoſe to whom Aratus propoſed his deſign, and who endeavoured to diſſuade him from it, that he would

their former eſtates, which had been confiſcated by the Tyrants, and given to others. This threw Aratus into the utmoſt perplexity, becauſe it was like to occaſion a civil war. However, he found means to prevent this evil. He bought the eſtates of thoſe who were poſſeſſed of them, and returned them to their old proprietors (*c*) [*E*]. Sicyon being now free, Aratus thought that the beſt method to ſecure it againſt the power of the Macedonians, was to unite it to the Commonwealth of the Achæans, whoſe manners and laws he had always approved (*d*). Eight years after this, being appointed General of the Achæans for the ſecond time, he made himſelf maſter of the ſtrong Caſtle of Corinth (*e*), which had been truly called the fetters of Greece, becauſe it entirely commanded the paſſage from Peloponneſus into the other parts of Greece (*f*). It was therefore of great ſervice to all Greece when he took that Caſtle out of the hands of the Macedonians, tho' perhaps the means he employed cannot be excuſed but [*F*] by this maxim, that every artifice is honourable and lawful againſt thoſe, whoſe power is to be dreaded. The Corinthians having thus recovered their liberty through the ſurrender of their Caſtle by the Macedonians, united themſelves by Aratus's advice to the Commonwealth of the Achæans (*g*). This happened in the firſt year of the 134th Olympiad (*h*). The ſame year he took by ſtratagem the city of Megara, and ſubjected it to the Achæans. The ſucceſs which attended all his undertakings, gained him much credit amongſt the Achæans; and to ſupport his reputation, he directed all his views and deſigns to theſe ends only, the

(*c*) Pauſanias *in Corinthiac.* p. 99.

(*d*) Pauſan. ibid. p. 100. Polyb. *Hiſt.* lib. 2. pag. 180. ed. Caſaubon, 8vo.

(*e*) Called in Greek Ἀκροκόρινθος.

(*f*) Plutarch. *ubi ſupra*, p. 1034.

(*g*) Polyb. lib. 2. p. 181.

(*h*) Ibid. *Hiſt.* Polyb. *Syncpſ. Chronol.* p. 1595. This was in the year of Rome 510, 243 before Chriſt.

[*E*] *He bought the eſtates of thoſe, who were poſſeſſed of them, and returned them to their old proprietors.*] Pauſanias relates this in a few words, and as he is very ſhort in his account of Aratus, he does not tell us, whence Aratus could get money enough to buy ſo many eſtates, ſince according to Plutarch (10), there were about five hundred and eighty perſons, who returned to Sicyon. But the laſt mentioned author tells us, that Aratus had received of Ptolomy, King of Egypt, a preſent of twenty five talents (11). This money he diſtributed amongſt the poor citizens, and employed alſo part of it to redeem ſuch as had been made ſlaves. But he wanted a much larger ſum to buy the eſtates of thoſe who had been baniſhed. He therefore reſolved to go himſelf into Egypt, where he more and more inſinuated himſelf into the friendſhip of Ptolomy, who promiſed him an hundred and fifty talents, of which he gave him immediately forty. Thoſe Aratus carried with him into Greece; the reſt of the money was ſent afterwards at different times, but very faithfully. Plutarch, who relates this, tells us, that one of the reaſons of Ptolomy's friendſhip for Aratus was, that he had made the King a preſent of ſeveral paintings and pictures from Greece, Aratus having a very good taſte for painting. What Plutarch adds, is ſtill more to the honour of Aratus, and ſhews his moderation, and the modeſt opinion he had of himſelf. He had been choſen judge to compoſe the difference, which had ariſen concerning the confiſcated eſtates of the exiles, with a full power to determine what he thought proper and convenient. But he was not ſo preſuming as to take upon him alone ſo great a truſt: he choſe fifteen citizens to aſſiſt him in the diſcharge of it; and with much care, prudence and labour reſtored a perfect friendſhip and harmony amonſt all the inhabitants; which gained him an univerſal love and eſteem, ſo that not only the whole commonwealth conferred great honours upon him, but even the exiles, to whom he had reſtored their ancient eſtates, erected at their own coſt a ſtatue to him, on which they engraved a very noble inſcription. Antigonus King of Macedon, ſeeing that Aratus had eſcaped the hatred and envy of his citizens, by his prudence, and that he was very much in favour with Ptolomy King of Egypt, reſolved to render him ſuſpicious to that King, or at leaſt to procure his friendſhip for himſelf; but finding that he was proof againſt his preſents, he ſent him part of the ſacrifice he had offered to the Gods of Corinth (12), which was a very great honour; and being at ſupper with a great many perſons, he ſpoke very much in praiſe of Aratus; "I thought, ſaid he, that this young "man was only of a generous temper, and zealous "for the good of his fellow citizens. But I find "that he is alſo a very good judge of the lives and "actions of Kings, and knows how to ſet a juſt va"lue upon them; for he deſpiſed us formerly (mean"ing himſelf and his Macedonians) all his hopes "and expectations being turned towards a foreign "aſſiſtance (that of King Ptolomy); and he was amaz'd "at the power of Egypt, when he heard of their "elephants, their fleets, their magnificent court. "But ſince he has conſidered all this more diſtinctly, "he has found, that it is nothing, but a mere ſhew "and ſhadow, and has entirely devoted himſelf to us. "I will therefore love this youth, and for the future "employ his aſſiſtance in every thing; and I com"mand you all to be his friends." Such a diſcourſe being ſpoken before a great many people, there were not wanting thoſe, who out of envy againſt Aratus, were very forward in writing it to Ptolomy, in order to render Aratus ſuſpicious to him: and indeed he ſucceeded ſo ar, that Ptolomy wrote expoſtulatory letters to Aratus (13), which Aratus could probably anſwer without much difficulty, tho' Plutarch does not ſpeak of his anſwer.

(10) Ibid.

(11) That is, 4687 pounds ten ſhillings, if meant of Attic money; or 11250 pounds of Alexandrian money, as we may ſuppoſe, ſince it was a preſent made by a King of Egypt. *See* Prideaux. *Connex.* vol. 1. Pref. p. 21. 8vo, edit.

(12) Then in the power of the Macedonians.

(13) Plutarch. *ubi ſupra* p. 1033.

[*F*] *The means he employed cannot be excuſed, but &c.*] We may obſerve in the firſt place, that the Achæans were in full peace with Antigonus, when Aratus made himſelf Maſter of Corinth; but it will perhaps be ſaid in his behalf, that to deliver a country from ſlavery is always a laudable action; that when a tyrant breaks thro' all the ties of ſociety, we are for that very reaſon diſengaged from all obligations, with regard to him; that the Macedonians having no right to rule over the Corinthians, Aratus or any other perſon might aſſiſt them and reſtore their liberty, without breaking thro' the rules of morality, or offending againſt the law of nature. We ſhall not therefore cenſure Aratus on that account. But the method he employed, to make himſelf maſter of the caſtle of Corinth, ſeems to have ſomething in it very mean, and below the dignity of a man of courage. The fact according to Plutarch is as follows (14). There were four brothers Syrians by birth; One of them, called Diocles, was a ſoldier of the garriſon in the caſtle; the three others having ſtolen the Kings money, were fled to Sicyon, and hid themſelves at a Silverſmith's, named Ægia, who ſometimes worked for Aratus. One of theſe Syrians ſpeaking often with Ægia happened to tell him, that going to his brother in the caſtle, he had perceived a place, whence it would not be very difficult to get into it. You fools, ſaid Ægia to him, you amuſe yourſelves with ſtealing a little of the King's money, which cannot much diſconcert his affairs, when it is in your power to ruin them intirely in an hour's time, and procure to yourſelves immenſe treaſures. Don't you know, that thieves are capitally puniſhed as well as traitors? Erginus, (this was the Syrian's name,) took the hint, and promiſed immediately that he would try to prevail upon his brother. He went to him directly, and returning ſoon after, he gave his word to Aratus that he would conduct him to a place, where the wall of the caſtle was not above fifteen feet high, and that his brother Diocles would do what lay in his power to aſſiſt him in the taking of the caſtle. Aratus agreed with him, that if the enterprize ſucceeded, he would give him ſixty talents; if they did not ſucceed, but eſcaped with their lives, he would make each of them a preſent of a horſe, and gave them one talent beſides. The traitors had bargained that the ſixty ta-

(14) Ibid. pag. 1035.

the expulſion of the Macedonians out of Peloponneſus, and the aſſerting of the common liberty of Greece (*i*). As he found that gold was a ſhorter method to win people than arms, he often made uſe of it. He gave an hundred and fifty talents to Diogenes, Governor of ſeveral cities (*k*) for the Macedonians, to ſurrender them to the Achæans, which he did. He alſo perſuaded Ariſtomachus the Tyrant of Argos to reſtore the liberty of that city [G], and to join it with the Achæans (*l*). But, as Pauſanias obſerves (*m*), things do not conſtantly happen according to men's wiſhes. Aratus, who had been labouring to diminiſh the power of the Macedonians, was at laſt obliged to have recourſe to Antigonus their King; for Cleomenes King of Lacedæmon having gained a complete victory over the Achæans, commanded by Aratus himſelf, this General began to be apprehenſive for the liberty of the Achæans and of Sicyon his own country. He had ſo much the more reaſon to dread the power of Cleomenes, that this King had entered into an alliance with the Ætolians [H] and with Antigonus, who after the death of Demetrius King of Macedon, was left by him Guardian of Philip his ſon, ſtill an infant (*n*). Aratus therefore thought it was neceſſary to diſengage Antigonus from the alliance, and to draw him over to the intereſt of the Achæans; and though this was for ſeveral reaſons a very difficult undertaking [I], yet Aratus, by his great prudence and wiſdom,

(*i*) Polyb. lib. 2. pag. 181.

(*k*) Pyræum, Munichia, Salamin, *and* Sunium.

(*l*) Plutarch. *ubi ſupra*, pag. 1043. Pauſan. *in Corinth.* pag. 100. Polyb. *ubi ſupra.* p. 183.

(*m*) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 100, 101.

(*n*) Polyb. lib. 2. p. 183, &c.

lents ſhould be depoſited in Ægia hands; but Aratus had not the money ready, nor was he willing to borrow it, leſt it ſhould create ſome ſuſpicions of his deſign; ſo that he was obliged to pledge his plate, and his wife's jewels into Ægia's hands. This being done Aratus went to the caſtle in the night time, attended with all the people, whom he could conveniently bring with him, without being diſcovered, and by the aſſiſtance of Diocles made himſelf maſter of the place, not without the utmoſt danger of his life. Plutarch obſerves on this occaſion, that Aratus had a very elevated mind, and was ambitious of raiſing his reputation by the moſt glorious actions; ſo that knowing that Epaminondas and Phocion were conſidered as the beſt and moſt juſt men amongſt the Greeks, becauſe they deſpiſed the largeſt preſents, and would not recede in the leaſt from the ſtricteſt virtue for the ſake of money, he alſo would not ſcruple to ſacrifice immenſe ſums, even without the knowledge of his citizens, for the intereſt of his country. This indeed is a very glorious action. But it may be queſtioned, whether the treachery he employed, and the uſe he made of ſuch abandoned wretches, deſerve all the commendation Plutarch beſtows upon it.

[G] *He perſuaded Ariſtomachus the Tyrant of Argos to reſtore the liberty of that city.*] Plutarch's account is more full than that of Polybius and Pauſanias; therefore we think it proper to inſert it in this place. He tells us (15), that when Aratus ſaw all the countries near Sicyon enjoy their liberty, he grieved at the ſlavery under which thoſe of Argos ſtill lived, and reſolved to kill Ariſtomachus their Tyrant. He ſoon found people who entered into his deſign; they were headed by Æſchylus and Charimenes the Poet. But as they had no ſword, the Tyrant having prohibited all perſons under ſevere penalties to wear one, Aratus procured a great many ſmall daggers, which he ſent ſecretly to Argos. Charimenes having admitted into the conſpiracy a perſon, whom Æſchylus and his aſſociates did not approve of, they reſolved to perform their deſign without Cleomenes's aſſiſtance; who out of revenge diſcovered the whole plot to Ariſtomachus, which obliged the conſpirators with all ſpeed to take refuge at Corinth. However Ariſtomachus was ſoon after killed by his own ſlaves, and was ſucceeded by Ariſtippus, a more cruel and blood-thirſty Tyrant. Aratus having aſſembled as many men able to bear arms as he could, went immediately to Argos, in hopes that he ſhould find the people ready to ſhake off the yoke of ſlavery; but to his great diſappointment he perceived, that when men are once uſed to a baſe and ſlaviſh ſubmiſſion, they obey willingly, and don't feel the weight that oppreſſes them. Not one perſon ſtirred to ſecond Aratus, ſo that he was obliged to retire, leaving his Achæans the blame of having taken up arms in the midſt of peace. Antigonus accuſed them before the Mantineans, and Aratus not appearing to defend his cauſe, the Achæans were condemned to pay a fine of thirty *Minæ*, that is, about ninety three pound of our money (16). Ariſtippus alſo reſolved to kill Aratus, with the aſſiſtance of King Antigonus. Plutarch gives us afterwards a large account of a battle between the Achæans and thoſe of Argos, in which Aratus was wounded, but won the victory, and would in all probability have reſtored the Liberty of the Argives, had not Agias and Ariſtomachus the younger (probably the ſon of the former) entered the city with an army, and invaded the Government. It was this ſecond Ariſtomachus whom Aratus engaged to reſtore the liberty of Argos. It may perhaps ſeem unaccountable, how one man, or if you will one nation, could oblige ſo many Tyrants to abdicate the ſovereign power they had invaded. But Polybius, that judicious and accurate Hiſtorian, accounts for it in a very reaſonable manner. He tells us (17), that Demetrius, who had ſucceeded to Antigonus in the Kingdom of Macedon, ſupported the petty Tyrants of Peloponneſus by his forces and by his money; but Demetrius, who reigned but ten years, being dead, thoſe Tyrants being deprived of the aſſiſtance they uſed to receive, and fearing Aratus, who would abſolutely put an end to the ſlavery of all the Greeks; they were ſo much the more inclined to abdicate their power: That great rewards and honours were promiſed to thoſe, who did it voluntarily; whereas thoſe, who refuſed, were threatened with the utmoſt dangers from the Achæans, who were commanded by Aratus.

(15) Pag. 1038.

(16) According to Mr. Brerewood, *apud* Prideaux, *ubi ſupra.*

(17) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 182.

[H] *Cleomenes had entered into an alliance with the Ætolians.*] The Achæans were grown ſo powerful by Aratus's prudent conduct, that the Ætolians naturally envious, and uſed to aggrandiſe themſelves by wicked practices, could not bear their proſperity. They reſolved to diſunite the Achæans, and knowing that Antigonus bore impatiently the loſs of Corinth, and was for that reaſon a ſecret enemy to the Achæans, they reſolved to enter into an alliance with him. They alſo thought that if they could draw the Lacedæmonians into the ſame deſign, it would be very eaſy to cruſh the power of the Achæans, if they were attacked at a proper time by all theſe forces at once. This would probably have ſucceeded, if the Ætolians had not omitted to take notice of one thing, which they ought above all others to have conſidered, I mean, that they were to contend with Aratus, a man who knew admirably well how to extricate his country out of the utmoſt difficulties; ſo that they not only failed of ſucceſs, but in the event their undertaking proved favourable to their enemy, and ſerved to ſtrengthen not only the authority of Aratus himſelf, but alſo the power of the Achæans (18). See the following remark.

(19) Ibid. pag. 183, 184.

[I] *This was for ſeveral reaſons a very difficult undertaking.*] Aratus knew that Antigonus had made an alliance with the Ætolians, but he was alſo perſuaded, that Kings don't look upon any one as naturally their friend or their enemy, but that their private intereſt is the only conſideration by which they judge with whom they are to enter into an alliance. He therefore reſolved to apply to Antigonus, to repreſent to him the conſequences of his alliance with the Ætolians and with Cleomenes, and to perſuade him to join his forces with thoſe of the Achæans. But he did not judge it proper to do this openly for ſeveral reaſons. For he was certain, that the Ætolians and Cleomenes would not fail to oppoſe his propoſal, and to defeat it if they had the leaſt hint of it. He was alſo ſen-

wiſdom compaſſed his deſign, and drew Antigonus with his Macedonians into Greece, for which he is cenſured by Plutarch [K]. If Aratus was prudent in his reſolutions, and happy in thoſe enterpriſes, which could be executed by artifice, he was not ſo at the head of an army, as appears from the battle he loſt againſt the Ætolians (o), in which Polybius obſerves he committed a great many faults [L]. However he defended himſelf before the general Council of the Achæans in ſuch a manner, that he entirely appeaſed their anger, and gained their favour to ſuch a degree, that they reſolved to follow always his advice for the future (p). After Antigonus's death, Aratus and his ſon were in high eſteem with Philip II King of Macedon (q), who in a more particular manner diſtinguiſhed Aratus the father, not only becauſe he had been the friend of Antigonus, but alſo becauſe he was a man of a conſummate wiſdom and prudence, and had a very great authority amongſt the Achæans. But Apelles, who had great credit with the King, endeavoured more than once to raiſe ſuſpicions in his mind againſt Aratus, who being innocent, had not much trouble to defend himſelf; but the particulars of this, if inſerted here, would too much ſwell this article. We muſt however obſerve here, that Polybius tells

(o) In the 4th year of the 139th Olympiad. *See* Polyb. lib. 4. p. 394. and *Hiſt.* Polyb. *Synopſ. Chronol.* p. 1595.

(p) Polyb. ibid.

(q) Ibid. p. 480.

ſible that the Achæans themſelves would be extremely diſcouraged, if they knew that their affairs were come to ſuch a deſperate ſtate, that he was obliged to court the aſſiſtance of an enemy, and did not think it ſafe to truſt to them alone. He reſolved then not to communicate his deſign to any perſon, but to tranſact that affair alone; which obliged him to ſay and do many things in publick, contrary to what he thought, in order to conceal his undertaking. This is alſo the reaſon, why he did not mention any thing of this in his Commentaries (19). The method he took to compaſs his deſign, was as follows: He knew that the Megalopolitans had always been very much attached to the Kings of Macedon, and did not doubt but that, if they were too cloſely preſſed by Cleomenes, they would implore Antigonus's aſſiſtance. There were two Citizens of Megalopolis, Nicophanes and Cercidas, between whom and Aratus's father there had been an intercourſe of hoſpitality. They were very proper perſons for Aratus's deſign; who having had a ſecret converſation with them, he engaged by their means the Council of Megalopolis to ſend Embaſſadors to the aſſembly of the Achæans, to conſult with them whether in the preſent conjuncture of affairs it was not proper to apply to Antigonus. Nicophanes and Cercidas were accordingly ſent to the Achæans, who having agreed to the propoſition of the Megalopolitans, the ſame Embaſſadors went directly to Antigonus, and gave him to underſtand that this propoſal, which they made to him, of entering into an alliance againſt Cleomenes and the Ætolians came originally from Aratus himſelf. Antigonus approving this prudent deſign of Aratus, wrote to the Megalopolitans that he would aſſiſt them, provided the Achæans conſented to it; upon which the former earneſtly deſired the Achæans to ſend for Antigonus. Aratus was extremely pleaſed at it; not only becauſe he found that Antigonus was well diſpoſed towards him, notwithſtanding all the endeavours of the Ætolians, but alſo becauſe he ſaw that Antigonus was applied to by the general conſent of all the Achæans. For tho' he earneſtly wiſhed to defend them without any foreign aſſiſtance, yet in caſe they wanted it, he was very glad that Antigonus was called not by him alone, but by the whole body of Achæans; leſt if any misfortune ſhould be occaſioned to the Achæans by the Macedonians, the blame ſhould be laid upon him. The reſolution being then taken in the Council of the Achæans, to make uſe of Antigonus's aſſiſtance, Aratus ſtood up, and having firſt commended their reſolution, and ſaid a great many things in praiſe of Antigonus's readineſs to aſſiſt them, he repreſented to them, that they ought by all means to endeavour to defend themſelves without any aſſiſtance, which would not only be very advantageous to them, but alſo very glorious. But if their arms were not ſucceſsful, if fortune turned againſt their wiſhes, then, and then only they were to recur to their friend. This was generally approved of by the whole Aſſembly; but ſuch was the event of the war, that the Achæans had ſoon occaſion to apply to Antigonus. Aratus's own ſon (20) was ſent to him, to confirm the former agreement. But here was a difficulty, which could not eaſily be removed. The Achæans had formerly taken the caſtle of Corinth, which the Macedonians were poſſeſſed of, and made the Corinthians free. It was thought, that Antigonus would not come to their aſſiſtance, unleſs Corinth was reſtored to the Macedonians, which the Achæans could not deliver to them, without the conſent of the Corinthians. However that difficulty was ſoon after removed by Cleomenes himſelf, who had made himſelf maſter of Corinth; ſo that Aratus, who had given Antigonus ſome hopes, that Corinth would be reſtored to him, was now diſingaged, ſince that city with its caſtle was no longer in the power of the Achæans. Antigonus then came to their aſſiſtance, and gained a compleat victory over Cleomenes, who afterwards retired to Lacedæmon, and then into Egypt (21).

(19) Ibid. pag. 180.

(20) Called Aratus as well as his father.

(21) Polyb. *ubi ſupra*, p. 186—214.

[K] *For which he is cenſured by Plutarch.*] Cleomenes had endeavoured to make an alliance between the Lacedæmonians and the Achæans; but, ſays Plutarch (22), Aratus either becauſe he feared Cleomenes, or becauſe he was envious on account of his unexpected ſucceſs, and thought it was a diſhonour to him, that he, who had been thirty three years at the head of the Commonwealth, ſhould permit his fame and power to be invaded by a young man, as Cleomenes ſtill was, reſolved firſt to deter the Achæans from the propoſed alliance; which not ſucceeding, he took a reſolution ſhameful to every Greek, but more ſo to him, and abſolutely inconſiſtent with the great and glorious actions he had performed before. He invited Antigonus into Greece, and filled Peloponneſus with Macedonians, whom he had himſelf formerly driven out of it, when he took the caſtle of Corinth. Nay the ſame Antigonus, whom he now called to his aſſiſtance, he had formerly endeavoured to render odious to all Greece, and even in his Commentaries, he abuſes and gives the hardeſt epithets to him. I do not ſay this, adds Plutarch (23), to cenſure Aratus, for he was one of the moſt eminent men of his age, and deſerved the greateſt encomiums; but that we may pity the weakneſs of men, who notwithſtanding their moſt ſhining actions, and the glory they obtain, cannot arrive at a virtue entirely free from all blemiſh and imperfection. But if the aſſiſtance of Antigonus and the Macedonians was abſolutely neceſſary for the ſupport of the Achæans, as appears from Polybius's account (24), how can Aratus be blamed, for having employed their aſſiſtance in ſo urgent an occaſion?

(22) *In Agid. & Cleomen. Op.* tom. 1. p. m. 831, & *ſeq.*

(23) Ibid. pag. 832.

(24) See the remark [I].

[L] *Polybius obſerves he committed a great many faults.*] Aratus had undertaken the expedition againſt the Ætolians ſome time before the Prætorſhip of his predeceſſor was expired, and before he could lawfully enter upon that poſt. This fault was ſo much the more conſiderable, that it was attended with imprudence; for Aratus knew by experience, that he had not been happy in the command of armies. Another fault was that he engaged in battle without a ſufficient number of troops, when he could eaſily have avoided it, all the neighbouring cities being at his command, and open to receive him where he might have aſſembled a larger army. But the greateſt fault, which Polybius finds in his conduct was, that being reſolved to fight, he did it with the utmoſt raſhneſs and imprudence. It is impoſſible to give a more particular account of the faults, which Polybius (25) finds in Aratus's conduct on this occaſion, without deſcribing the whole battle, in which he engaged againſt the Ætolians; but this would carry us too far. However we muſt obſerve here, that before

(25) *Hiſt.* lib. 4. p. 393, & *ſeq.*

tells us, that as long as King Philip hearkened to the counſels of Aratus, he was ſo far from doing the leaſt injury, that he did not even offend one ſingle perſon, but kept his ſubjects faithful and obedient, and gained the love and eſteem of all the Greeks (r). Yet he was not always pleaſed with Aratus's advice, for the latter having cenſured Philip, becauſe he unjuſtly attacked the Macedonians, Philip poiſoned him [M]. Thus died that great man, the reſtorer of his country's liberty. He was then Prætor or General of the Achæans for the ſeventeenth time (s), having enjoyed that high poſt every ſecond year, becauſe according to law a man could not enjoy it two years ſucceſſively. He was about fifty ſeven years old when he died at Ægium, a city of Peloponneſus, the ſecond year of the 141ſt Olympiad (t); he was interred at Sicyon, and received the greateſt honours from his countrymen [N]. His ſon, who had alſo been Prætor, was poiſoned by King Philip in a miſerable manner [O]. His poſterity ſtill ſubſiſted in Plutarch's time at Sicyon and Pellene (u). We ſhall ſay ſomething of Aratus the Father's Commentaries in a remark [P].

(r) *Excerpt. ex* Polyb. *Hiſt. de Virtut. & Vitiis* p. m. 1374.

(s) Plutarch *in Arato*, p. 1047.

(t) *Compare Hiſt.* Polyb. *Synopſ. Chron.* p. 1591, with p. 1604.

(u) Plutarch, p. 1052.

ARBAUD

fore Polybius gives an account of Aratus's errors, he beſtows a very great encomium upon him. "Aratus, ſays he (25), was perfectly well ſkilled in government: He was eminent for eloquence, judgment and ſecrecy; he knew how to ſoften by his mildneſs the civil diſcords amongſt his Citizens, and he had not his equal in forming friendſhip and alliances. Nor was any perſon more ſkilful in laying ſnares againſt the enemy; or in forming ſecret deſigns, which he uſed to perform with the utmoſt conſtancy and courage, as appears from the taking of Sicyon. But when he was at the head of an army, he was very ſlow in his reſolutions, and not very firm in the execution; nor could he bear the ſight of what is terrible. Hence it is that all Peloponneſus is full of the marks of the battels which he loſt. But ſuch is the fate of mankind; every virtue cannot be found in one and the ſame perſon, &c."

(23) Ibid. pag. 385.

[M] *Philip poiſoned him.*] The King employed for that purpoſe one Taurio, who governed under him in Peloponneſus. The poiſon, which Taurio gave Aratus, was ſuch, as did not kill him immediately, but threw him into a kind of a lingering conſumption. Aratus was not ignorant of it, but as the diſcovering of it would have been to no purpoſe, he diſſembled the fact, and feigned to be ſick (26). It was however diſcovered after the following manner. A ſervant of Aratus, called Cephalus, with whom he was very familiar, being in the room to attend him, perceived upon the ground ſome blood mixed with ſpittle. This, O Cephalus, ſaid Aratus, is the reward which I received from Philip for the conſtant friendſhip I have always had for him (27).

(26) Plutarch. *in Arato*, p. 1051.

(27) Polyb. lib. 8. p. 722.

[N] *He received the greateſt honours from his countrymen.*] The Achæans were reſolved to bury him in their own country, and to erect a ſumptuous monument to him. But the inhabitants of Sicyon thought it would be a very great diſhonour for them, if he was not buried in their own city, his native place. But as there was a law, very ſacred, by which it was prohibited to bury any perſon within the walls of the city, the Sicyonians ſent to conſult the Oracle of Delphi, and having received an anſwer according to their wiſhes, they brought the corps from Ægium, and with crowns on their heads, and dreſſed in white carried it to Sicyon dancing and ſinging all the while. They depoſited it in an elevated place, as a diſtinction worthy of the reſtorer of their liberty. His monument ſtill ſubſiſted in Plutarch's time, and was known by the name of *Aratium* (28). Pauſanias (29) ſays, that there was to be ſeen in his time at Sicyon a ſtatue of a man holding a ſhield in his hand, which ſtatue was ſaid to repreſent Aratus. This was not the only honour they did to his memory; they inſtituted a feaſt to him, and appointed ſacrifices to be offered up to him twice every year, firſt on the anniverſary of the day, in which he had delivered his country from ſlavery, ſecondly in the month in which he was born. The deſcription of the ceremonies performed on thoſe days may be read in Plutarch (30). In ſhort they neglected nothing that might ſerve to perpetuate his memory to the lateſt Ages, ſo that, as Polybius ſays, if the dead retain any ſenſe of what paſſes in this world, Aratus had reaſons to be thoroughly contented with the gratitude of his countrymen (31).

(28) Plutarch, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 1047.

(29) *In Corinth.* p. m. 98.

(30) *Ubi ſupra*, p. 1052.

(31) Polyb. lib. 8. p. 223.

[O] *His ſon was poiſoned by King Philip in a miſerable manner.*] Plutarch tells us (32) the poiſon, which Philip cauſed to be given to Aratus the younger, was ſuch, that it troubled his ſenſes and diſcompoſed his underſtanding in ſuch a manner, as to make him involve himſelf in the moſt ſhameful and abominable actions; ſo that, tho' he was ſtill young and in the flower of his age, yet death was to him not a misfortune but a remedy, and the end of all his woes. What theſe actions were, which Aratus in his madneſs did, we are not expreſly told; but Plutarch's expreſſions hint them ſufficiently; and therefore we ſhall tranſcribe here his own words, that the reader may examine, whether it be poſſible, that any poiſon whatſoever ſhould draw a man to ſuch kind of actions. Ὁ Φίλιππος ὑ θυμοειδους ἀλλὰ μανικὰς ἐξέστησε τοῦ λογισμοῦ φαρμάκοις, καὶ παρέτρεψεν εἰς δεινὰς καὶ ἀλλοκότους ἐπιφορὰς πράξεων ἀτόπων καὶ σὺν αἰσχύνῃ παθῶν ὀλεθρίων ἡγεμόνα. Let us obſerve here, that Philip had already before this diſhonoured Aratus, by debauching his wife (33).

(32) *Ubi ſupra.*

(33) Ibid. pag. 1050.

[P] *We ſhall ſay ſomething of Aratus's Commentaries.*] Polybius mentions them in ſeveral places (34), and even defends them againſt thoſe, who preferred Philarchus's Memoirs before thoſe of Aratus, who wrote the Hiſtory of his own time. Philarchus, according to Polybius, wrote rather like a Tragic Poet, than a judicious Hiſtorian; and endeavour'd by his deſcriptions to move the paſſions, and to excite the reader's indignation, or compaſſion. Whereas the duty of an Hiſtorian is not to fill the reader with admiration by new and ſurpriſing incidents, nor to invent ſuch diſcourſes and harangues, as the perſons introduced might probably have ſpoken; but to relate facts truly, and as they have really happened. But this is not ſufficient; an Hiſtorian muſt endeavour to find out the true cauſes and motives of men's actions; for if we are ignorant of theſe, we can neither blame nor praiſe them juſtly; nor will our compaſſion or indignation be reaſonable (35). Now it appears that Aratus's Hiſtory, which Polybius followed, was written in a very judicious manner, and that he did not barely content himſelf with relating facts, but alſo accounted for them by the real motives of thoſe perſons, to whom they related. Thus for inſtance, Philarchus, ſpeaking of Ariſtomachus, whom we have mentioned above (36), ſays, that this man, who was of a noble and ancient family, and who, if he had been the Tyrant of his country, it was to be excuſed, ſince the ſovereign power had been tranſmitted to him by his anceſtors, falling into the hands of Antigonus and of the Achæans, was carried to Cenchrea, and there put to death by ſuch terrible torments, that no man had ever ſuffered before the like cruelty. Upon this the Hiſtorian expatiates in ſo tragical a manner, as tho' he intended only to move the compaſſion and indignation of the reader. But he ought to have obſerved, that if Ariſtomachus was put to death in a cruel manner he had well deſerved it, ſince he had been a moſt cruel Tyrant. But after all, the only barbarous treatment he ſuffered was, that he was thrown into the ſea, for a puniſhment of what he had done at Cenchrea (37). Polybius alledges ſome other inſtances, by which it appears that Aratus's Hiſtory was written in a much more judicious manner, than that of Philarchus. The loſs of ſo valuable a work, highly eſteemed by a writer of ſo good judgment as Polybius, is certainly to be lamented. We ſhould find there a great many curious particulars, with which Aratus, writing what paſſed in a manner before his eyes, was perfectly acquainted, and which Polybius could not inſert in his Hiſtory, without tranſcribing entirely that of Aratus.

(34) Lib. 1. p. 3. lib. 2. p. 196. lib. 4. p. 376.

(35) Ib. p. 200.

(36) Remark [G].

(37) Polyb. ibid. p. 202, 203.

P.

☞ARBAUD (FRANCIS) Sieur de Porcheres, one of the firſt Members of the French Academy (*a*) in the ſeventeenth Century, was born in Provence, and was deſcended from the antient family of *Porchéres* [*A*]. He was the ſcholar and follower of Malherbe, and imitated him in the turn of his verſe. He was Tutor to the ſon of Mr. de Chenoiſe, and afterwards to the ſon of the Count Saint-Heran. The Abbé Bois-Robert, who was particularly eminent for the generous uſe which he made of his intereſt with Cardinal Richelieu, procured him a penſion of ſix hundred livres from that great man (*b*). In the year 1636, March 10, he ſpoke an Oration in the French Academy upon the *Love of the Sciences* (*c*). He retired at laſt into Burgundy, where he married, and died (*d*). He wrote a great number of verſes [*B*], which were never printed. But there are others, which were publiſhed, as particularly his *Paraphraſe upon the Pſalms of Degrees*, to which are added his *Poems upon divers Subjects*, Paris 1633 in 8vo (*e*). He had a brother, who had likewiſe a talent for Poetry [*C*].

(*a*) Peliſſon, *Hiſt. de l'Academie Françoiſe*, pag. 200. edit. 2. de Paris 1730.

(*b*) Idem, pag. 244, 245.

(*c*) Idem, p. 99.

(*d*) Idem, p. 245.

(*e*) Ibid. p. 378.

[*A*] *Deſcended from the ancient family of Porchéres.*] Mr. Peliſſon tells us, that Arbaud claim'd this honour, as well as Mr. de Porchéres-Laugier, tho' they did not acknowledge one another for relations. But Monſr. de Mazauges, *Preſident à Mortier* in the parliament of Aix, informed the Abbé Olivet (1), that there never was a family of the name of Porchéres in Provence. "Porchéres, continues he, is a little village "near Forcalquier, of which Arbaud was owner of "one part, and Laugier of the other. The name of "the family of the former is *Arbaud*, and it is a "noble and ancient family, which is divided into "ſeveral branches, one of which is ſtill ſubſiſting, "and appears with great diſtinction in the parlia"ment of Aix. The family of the latter is *Lau"gier*, of the branch of the Lords of *Verdaches*, and "it is very noble and ancient in our province. And "therefore thoſe two Authors ought to be called *Ar"baud de Porchéres*, *Laugier de Porchéres*, which is di"rectly contrary to what Peliſſon has done." Olivet is of opinion, that the Preſident de Mazauges, who is undoubtedly well acquainted with the families in his own Province, as he is particularly converſant in all kinds of literature, is right in his obſervation; and conſequently that Peliſſon ſhould be corrected in that paſſage.

(1) See his *Remarks* upon Peliſſon's *Hiſtory of the French Academy*, pag. 244, 245.

[*B*] *He wrote a great number of verſes.*] We find among Racan's Poems an Epigram in praiſe of Porchéres upon a Poem, which he wrote concerning *Magdalen*. The Abbé Olivet not being able to find it in the Libraries at Paris, wrote to the Preſident de Mazauges mentioned in the preceding note, whoſe anſwer contains ſeveral particulars relating to that Poem and the Author (2). "I have made a very "ſtrict enquiry after the Poem upon Magdalen. I "have even taken the pains to go to St. Maximin, "where our Poet was born. But my reſearches have "been in vain; and I have not been able to diſ"cover any of his compoſitions except a beautiful "Ode, which has a great deal of the manner of his "maſter Malherbe in it, and which he wrote in ho"nour of Cardinal Richelieu, in order to thank him "for the favour he had done him in giving him "a place in the Academy. This Ode very well de"ſerved to be mentioned by Peliſſon. I had ſome "account of a Sonnet (3) upon the eyes of the fair "*Gabrielle d'Eſtrées*, which gained him, as it is ſaid, "a penſion of fourteen hundred livres. But this ſto"ry ſeems to me a little doubtful, and is inconſi"ſtent with what he ſays himſelf in the preface "to his Pſalms, where he complains of the rigour "of his fortune." The Preſident then obſerves, that he was informed that Malherbe had educated him in his youth at Paris, and continued his affection for him as long as he lived, and left him half of his library in his will. That he married in Burgundy a young Lady of the family of la Chapelle Sénevois, by whom he had one ſon; and that he died there in the year 1640. But with regard to the Poem upon Magdalen, he is of opinion that it was never printed.

(2) Olivet, *Remarques & Additions ſur l'Hiſtoire de l'Academie par* Mr. Peliſſon, p. 246.

(3) This Ode is publiſhed in a Collection printed in 1607, intitled, *Le Parnaſſe des plus excellens Poëtes de ce temps, ou les Muſes Françoiſes ralliées de diverſes parts*, tom. 1. p. 286.

[*C*] *He had a brother who had likewiſe a talent for poetry.*] This appears from the letter of the Preſident de Mazauges to the Abbé Olivet quoted in the preceding note, in which he obſerves, that his name was JOHN ARBAUD, Sieur de Porchéres, and that he was Gentleman in ordinary to the King; but that his Poems were inferior to thoſe of his brother in point of judgment and correctneſs. He tranſlated alſo ſeveral of the Pſalms into French verſe, two editions of which have been publiſhed, the former at Grenoble in in 1651, and the latter more compleat at Marſeilles in 1684. T.

ARBRISSEL (ROBERT D') Founder of the Order of Fontevraud. See FONTEVRAUD.

☞ARBUTHNOT (ALEXANDER) was the brother of the Baron of Arbuthnot in the County or Shire of the Merns (*a*), a very antient and noble family [*A*]. He was born in the year 1538, and educated at the Univerſity of Aberdeen. Having finiſhed there the courſe of his ſtudies in polite Literature and Philoſophy, he was by his parents ſent over to France, where he ſtudied the Law for five years under the famous Cujacius, and having taken the degree of a Licentiate, he returned to Scotland in the year 1563. Finding upon his arrival that the Reformation prevailed, he declared himſelf for it, and was very inſtrumental in carrying on that glorious deſign. The Reformers prevailed with him to apply himſelf to Divinity, and to enter into Orders; but what ſort of Ordination he got we cannot learn. He was a Member of the general Aſſembly in the year 1568, and was ordered to reviſe a Book concerning *the fall of the Church of Rome* [*B*]. About

(*a*) See the *Appendix* to Spotſwood's *Hiſtory*, pag. 24.

[*A*] *A very antient and noble family.*] Sir George Mackenzie (1) tells us, that they had their firſt riſe from a Gentleman who came from the South, and married one of the daughters of Oloſard or Olyphant, Sheriff of the Merns, with whom he obtained the lands of Arbuthnot, from whence they had their ſirname. And he ſays, that he has ſeen a Charter granted by the Abbot and Convent of Kelſo in 1178, to Reginald, then elected to be Abbot of Arbroth, freeing him from his obedience and ſubjection to Kelſo; and amongſt the witneſſes is mentioned Richardus de Arbuthnot *Clericus Regis*; ſince which time they have had ſeveral honours conferred upon them, and about the year 1641 King Charles I. made (2) them Viſcounts of Arbuthnot (3).

(1) MS. Geneology of Scotland.

(2) Sir James Dalrymple's edit. of Camd. *Deſc. of Scotland*, p. 156.

(3) Mackenzie's *Lives of the Scots Writ.* tom. 3. p. 186.

[*B*] *A book concerning the Fall of the Church of Rome.*] In that book the King is called the Head of the Church. The Printer of that work had alſo printed a Pſalm-book with an obſcene Song at the end of it. The Printer was ordered by the Aſſembly (4) to call in theſe books, and to ſell no more of them, till ſuch time as he had changed the title of the one, and expunged the Song out of the other; and that for the future he ſhould not print any book without the Licence of the ſupreme Magiſtrate, nor any book concerning Religion, except it had been firſt reviſed by them (5). The Printer's name was Thomas Baſſanden (6).

(4) Petrie, *Church Hiſt.* p. 3. Cent. 16. pag. 359.

(5) I ſuppoſe the Author means the Aſſembly, though his words ſeem to relate to the Civil Magiſtrate.

(6) Mackenzie, ibid. p. 187.

About the ſame time he was appointed Miniſter of Arbuthnot, and Logy-Buchan, and ſoon after inſtalled Principal of the King's College at Aberdeen [C]. In the general Aſſembly held at St. Andrews in the year 1572 Arbuthnot was one of the Commiſſioners, who were appointed to meet at Mr. John Knox's houſe, to examine the new *Book of Policy*, and conſider what they could find therein, that was agreeable to God's Word, and for the advantage of the Kirk, and to report the ſame to the Aſſembly. But Petrie and Calderwood tell us (*b*); *That they knew not what was done in this conference. But*, ſays Calderwood, *we may eaſily collect that the Book was not approved, by a new Commiſſion appointed in the next Aſſembly to reviſe it; or elſe that the conference was not held.* Arbuthnot was choſen Moderator (*c*) in the Aſſembly which met at Edinburgh on the ſixth of Auguſt 1573, and in which ſeveral Biſhops were accuſed and condemned [D] for ſeveral offences either againſt morality, or againſt the laws and diſcipline of the Church. The next year in an Aſſembly held at Edinburgh in the month of March, George Douglas Biſhop of Murray being accuſed of fornication committed with the Lady Ardroſs (*d*), deſir'd leave to adviſe concerning his vindication

(*b*) *See* Calder, *Hiſtory of the Church of Scotland, ad ann.* 1572. p. 56.

(*c*) Petrie, pag. 379. Calder. pag. 63.

(*d*) Petrie, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 382. Calder. p. 64.

[C] *He was inſtalled Principal of the King's College at Aberdeen.*] The occaſion of it was as follows: Mr. John Erſkine Superintendant of Angus having got a Commiſſion from the Council and the general Aſſembly held at Edinburgh in July 1568, for viſiting the King's College at old Aberdeen, the Superintendant went thither in the month of June 1569, and having called the Maſters of the College before him, and they having refuſed, after two days conference with them, to ſubſcribe the Confeſſion of Faith, the following ſentence was pronounced againſt them (7): "I "John Erſkine Superintendant of Angus, Principal "of the King's College at Aberdeen and Merns, hav"ing Commiſſion of the Church, to viſit the Sheriff"doom of Aberdeen and Bamff, by the advice, "counſel, and conſent of the Miniſters, and Elders, "and Commiſſioners preſent, decern, conclude, and "for final ſentence, pronounce, that Mr. Alexander "Anderſon ſometimes Principal, Mr. Andrew Gal"loway ſometimes Sub-Principal, Mr. Andrew An"derſon, Mr. Thomas Auſtin, and Mr. Duncan No"ry, ſometime Regents in the College of old Aber"deen, are not to be reckoned Members of Chriſt's "Church; and therefore ſeclude them and every one "of them to teach privately or publickly in time "coming in that College, or any other part within "this realm, and decern them to remove forth of "the ſaid College with all diligence, that other godly "men may be placed there, for the upbringing "the youth in the fear of God, and good letters. "This our ſentence pronounced, we ordain to be pub"liſhed and intimated to the ſaid perſons, and to the "congregations of new and old Aberdeen, publickly "the next Sunday, the third of July inſtant." This ſentence was no ſooner put in execution, but Arbuthnot was inſtalled in the place of Anderſon (8).

(7) Petrie. *ubi ſupra*, p. 362.

(8) Mackenzie, ibid.

[D] *Several Biſhops were accuſed and condemned.*] The books of the Biſhops, Superintendants, and Commiſſioners of Viſitation were produced, and certain Miniſters appointed to examine them. Mr. John Douglas Archbiſhop of St. Andrews was accuſed of admitting a Popiſh Prieſt into the Miniſtry, to whom the Superintendant of Lothian had preſcribed certain injunctions, which he had not obeyed; for not viſiting his Dioceſe; not preaching for half a year before that time; for giving collation of a benefice, which was before beſtowed on a Miniſter, to another ſuſpected of Popery; for ſuffering the exerciſe to decay thro' his fault; for admitting ſome to functions in the Church, that were not ſufficiently qualified and examined; and laſtly that he viſited his Dioceſe by others and not himſelf. To the firſt of theſe the Archbiſhop anſwered, that he did not admit the Prieſt till he had openly recanted in the Church of St. Andrews. To the ſecond, he affirmed that he not only did viſit his Dioceſe, but preached perſonally to them, when either his health, or his ſtrength, which were much impaired by age, could permit him. The reſt he abſolutely denied. Whereupon the Aſſembly only ordered the Prieſt to ſatisfy the injunction preſcribed to him by the Superintendant of Lothian. Then Mr. James Paton Biſhop of Dunkell was accuſed, that tho' he was a Biſhop, yet he did not perform the office of a Biſhop; that he had not proceeded againſt Papiſts within his bounds; that he was ſuſpected of ſimony and perjury; for having made an agreement with the Earl of Argyle for the profits of the Biſhoprick, and accordingly at his admiſſion, contrary to his oath, had given acquittances, and the Earl had received the money. But it ſeems the Biſhop cleared himſelf ſo well, that they were found to be mere calumnies; for we do not find that the Aſſembly paſſed any cenſure upon him. Alexander Gordon, Biſhop of Galloway, was accuſed, that he intruded himſelf into the office of the Miniſtry within Edinburgh; that he enticed the people to rebellion againſt the King; that he refuſed to pray for him, and approved of the Queen's authority; that being diſcharged by the general Aſſembly from having any thing to do with the Pariſhioners of Holy-Rood Houſe, yet he compelled them to receive the Sacrament, and cauſed pretended bailiffs and ſoldiers to compel the people; that being ſworn to maintain the King's authority, and yield obedience to him, yet he had broken his oath, by ſitting in a Parliament for diſpoſſeſſing the King of his crown and authority; that he had given thanks publickly in the pulpit for the ſlaughter of Matthew Earl of Lennox, and exhorted the people to do the ſame; and laſtly, that he was a perverter of the people before and after the Reformation. The Biſhop could not deny his attachment to the Queen, and therefore he gave a general anſwer, that he was freed from all theſe things by the Act of Pacification agreed to between the Queen's and the King's friends. But the Aſſembly told him, that the States had not abſolved him as a Biſhop from the cenſure of the Church, ſo he was ordered, under the pain of excommunication, to do publick penance for three ſeveral Sundays, once in the Church of Edinburgh, another time in the Church of Holy-Rood-Houſe, and a third time in Queen's College Church. Calderwood ſays (9), "That ſeveral other enormities were laid to his "charge. He claimed the benefit of the Act of Pa"cification, agreed upon at Perth the 23d of Februa"ry, when the civil wars ended, to which Act the "reformed Biſhops, Abbots and Priors, having vote "in Parliament, condeſcended in the name of the "Kirk, and therefore alledged that he could not be "compelled to anſwer for any complaint given in "againſt him, for maintaining another authority, or "for any thing depending thereupon; and this an"ſwer he ſent to the Aſſembly by a ſervant. Where"upon the Aſſembly ſent one to the Regent and "Council, to aſk their advice. His Grace's anſwer "was, that he was willing to obſerve the heads of "the Pacification, but without prejudice to the diſci"pline of the Kirk, nor to the ſatisfaction to be made "for all notorious and open ſlanders. The Biſhop "being again ſummoned and not appearing, and in "reſpect his offences were notorious, it was con"cluded that he ſhould make his publick penance in "ſack-cloth three ſeveral ſabbath-days &c." Mr. Robert Pont was accuſed for non-reſidence in Murray, and for not viſiting the Kirks there; but he excuſed himſelf upon his being obliged to attend the Seſſion, being one of the Lords of the Seſſion. Whereupon the Superintendant of Lothian moved the queſtion, *Whether it was lawful by the Word of God, that the adminiſtration of the Word and Sacraments, and the adminiſtration of criminal and civil juſtice ſhould be ſo confounded, that one man ſhould have both charges*; and the Aſſembly agreed that it was *neither agreeable to the Word of God, nor to the practice of the primitive Church* (10).

(9) *Hiſt. of the Church of Scotland, ad ann.* 1572, p. 56.

(10) Mackenzie, ibid. p. 188-192.

tion till the tenth day of the month, and then refuſing to appear, the Aſſembly appointed Arbuthnot with others to call before them the Chapter of Murray, and to examine them, how they came to give the Biſhop their teſtimonial without juſt trial and due examination of his life, and qualifications in Literature. In the ſame Aſſembly Arbuthnot was appointed one of the Commiſſioners for drawing up the heads and articles concerning the juriſdiction of the Kirk. He was again choſen Moderator of the general Aſſembly held at Edinburgh in April 1577, in which there were many conferences and diſputes concerning the diſcipline of the Church [*E*]. That ſame year another Aſſembly met at Edinburgh, and a letter was preſented to them from Queen Elizabeth, acquainting them that a council of Proteſtants was to meet at Magdeburg, and deſiring them to ſend ſome of their members to it. Arbuthnot was one of thoſe whom they choſe, but the project having failed, none of them went. This ſhews however in what high eſteem he was, ſince ſo important a truſt was committed to him. The ſame Aſſembly having preſented the Regent with a copy of the Policy of the Church as approved by them, Arbuthnot was appointed, with ſeveral others, to wait upon the Regent, in order to ſolve his doubts, in caſe he ſhould have any concerning the new form of Policy. In a general Aſſembly held at Edinburgh April the 24th 1578 he was one of thoſe, who were appointed to wait upon the King and Council, and to reaſon with them concerning the ceremonies of the Church, and how far Miniſters may interpoſe in civil affairs, and whether they may vote in Council or Parliament. In the year 1582 Buchanan having committed the care of the reviſing and printing his hiſtory to Arbuthnot, he publiſhed it, which gave great offence, and expoſed not only the author, but even Arbuthnot to cenſure, at the ſame time that the latter was ordered by an act of the general Aſſembly to be removed from Aberdeen to St. Andrews. But the King prevented it [*F*]. Arbuthnot died ſoon after this in the forty ſixth year of his age, and was buried in the Collegiate Church of Aberdeen the 20th of October 1583. There is nothing extant of his compoſing, but ſome orations in praiſe of the law, and concerning its firſt riſe and origin; the Title is, *Orationes de Origine & Dignitate Juris*, printed at Edinburgh 1572, 4to. Upon which performance Mr. Thomas Maitland (*e*) has made an elegant encomium in Latin. Andrew Melvil compoſed his epitaph (*f*) in the ſame language. Both theſe pieces are to be found in the author, from whom we have borrowed this account (*g*). See the character of Arbuthnot in the remark [*G*].

(*g*) *The Lives and Characters of the moſt eminent Writers of the Scots Nation*, by George Mackenzie, vol. 3. pag. 186—194.

(*e*) Deliciæ *Poetar. Scot.* vol. 2. pag. 153.

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 120.

[*E*] *Conferences and diſputes concerning the diſcipline of the Church.*] The Aſſembly informed the Regent of their proceedings, and petitioned that proviſion might be made for viſitors; that perſons deprived of their office by the Church, might be deprived of their benefices; that he would take ſome courſe with thoſe, who ſell their benefices; and beſtow all vacant benefices upon perſons recommended by the Church. But the Brethren, who petitioned his Grace, having no written Commiſſion from the Aſſembly, after they had attended for ſome days, were diſmiſſed without any anſwer (12).

(12) Idem, ibid. pag. 191.

[*F*] *Arbuthnot — was ordered — to be removed — to St. Andrews; the King prevented it.*] In the beginning of the Aſſembly held in 1577, it was ordered that the Superintendant of Angus, and ſix other Miniſters ſhould attend Arbuthnot every morning from ſeven of the clock till the ſitting of the Aſſembly, for preparing ſuch things, as ſhould be brought before them. Upon which Mr. Petrie obſerves (13) that in all the following Aſſemblies theſe privy conferences, as they were called, were like that which in the Council of Trent was called the *Congregation*. For within ſome years all matters were debated and concluded in theſe privy Conferences, and the Aſſembly had little to do (14). Arbuthnot preſiding in theſe Conferences had no doubt a great influence in their reſolutions; we are not therefore to be ſurprized, if the King, ſuſpecting that the Aſſembly would have removed to St. Andrews, only to have his advice in their factious proceedings, St. Andrews being nearer the capital city, where they ordinarily met, than Aberdeen, forbad Arbuthnot to remove from the College of Aberdeen. The general Aſſembly, which met at Edinburgh in 1583, complained of this as of a grievance; but the King told them (15), that they had no reaſon, all things being well conſidered, to think, that this was either ſo proper for the Church, or ſo improper for the Civil State; for he and his Council had good reaſon to direct his Letters as he did (16).

(13) Calderwood, pag. 391.

(14) Mackenzie, ibid. p. 191.

(15) Petrie, Part 3. p. 441.

(16) Mackenzie, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 192.

[*G*] *The Character of Arbuthnot.*] He was, as we have obſerv'd, one of the great promoters of Reformation, and conſulted by all the general Aſſemblies of the Scots in the affairs of their Church. And tho' he was of the ſame principles with Buchanan and Andrew Melvil, yet he was much more moderate; and if he was not ſo good a Poet as Buchanan, or ſo great a maſter of the purity of the Roman Language, yet he was a more learned, and more univerſal Scholar. For Biſhop Spotſwood tells us (17), that "he was expert in all "Sciences; a good Poet, Mathematician, Philoſopher, "Theologue, Lawyer, and ſkilful in Medicine; ſo "that in every ſubject he could promptly diſcourſe, "and to good purpoſe." The ſame Prelate tells us, "that beſides theſe qualifications, by his diligent "teaching, and dextrous government, he not only "revived the ſtudy of good Letters, but gained many from the ſuperſtitions, to which they were "given. He was greatly loved of all men, hated of "none, and in ſuch account for his moderation with "the chief men of theſe parts, (*meaning the North*) "that without his advice they could almoſt do nothing, which put him to great fachery, whereof "he did often complain; yet he was very pleaſant "and jocund in converſation (18)."

(17) Lib. 6. pag. 335.

(18) *Apud* Mackenzie, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 192.

☞ARCADIUS, the Emperor of the Eaſt, was the eldeſt ſon to Theodoſius the Great by Flaccilla the Empreſs, and born in Spain about the year 377 (*a*). He was honoured with the Title of Auguſtus, the 16th or 19th of January 383 in the palace of Hebdomon, about ſeven miles from Conſtantinople (*b*). Themiſtius the Pagan Philoſopher had flattered himſelf, that he ſhould have the honour of educating this young Prince; but Theodoſius thought proper to place him under the care of Arſenius a Chriſtian Philoſopher, who had an abſolute authority over him, but retired from the Court about the year 390, or ſoon after (*c*). Upon the death of Theodoſius Arcadius ſucceeded in the Empire the 17th of January 395 (*d*). It appears from the general conſent of the Hiſtorians, that he was very much inferior to his father in the qualifications of his mind as

(*a*) Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Empereurs*, tom. 5. Part 2. pag. 446 and 827. edit. de Bruxelles 1710.

(*b*) Idem, pag. 492, 493, and 827.

(*c*) Idem, pag. 828.

(*d*) Idem, pag. 827.

as well as body [*A*]. Theodoſius left the Weſtern Empire to his ſon Honorius, as he had done that of the Eaſt to Arcadius, both of whom he recommended to Stilico, one of the greateſt Generals of his army, who had married Serena his niece. This was probably the ground of Stilico's pretence, that Theodoſius had upon his death-bed committed the care of theſe two Emperors and their dominions to him. But this was a point very difficult to execute; for though Arcadius had neither age nor capacity to govern himſelf, yet he was able enough to chooſe himſelf a Governor, or at leaſt to authorize ſome perſon, who could raiſe himſelf to that poſt by intereſt or intrigue (*e*). Oroſius tells us (*f*) that Theodoſius appointed Stilico to govern the Weſt, and Rufinus the Eaſt. It is agreed at leaſt, (*g*) that the affair was fixed in that manner (*g*). But this occaſioned a conteſt between Stilico and Rufinus [*B*], who being diſappointed in his deſign of marrying his daughter to Arcadius, involved the Eaſtern Empire in the utmoſt confuſion by bringing in the Barbarians [*C*], but

(*e*) Idem, pag. 830.
(*f*) Lib. 7.
(*g*) Tillem. pag. 830.

[*A*] *Very much inferior to his father in the qualifications of his mind as well as body.*] It is ſaid, that his perſon was very indifferent, and that he was of a low ſtature. He had a remarkable ſlowneſs of ſpeech; his eyes had no manner of livelineſs, and generally appeared ſhut. He was extremely indolent in his diſpoſition, and incapable of forming or executing any ſcheme. In ſhort, he had not the leaſt ſhare of genius imaginable; and he learned nothing, notwithſtanding all the pains, which Arſenius took of his education, but to write a good hand. And accordingly it will appear from the ſequel of his hiſtory, that he ſuffered himſelf to be governed, or rather commanded like a mere brute, without knowing the leaſt of the ſtate of his own affairs. However, he had ſome kind of zeal for the orthodox faith (1); and it was even pretended, that ſome extraordinary events were to be aſcribed to the efficacy of his prayers and piety (2). We do not find, that he ever was accuſed of cruelty or any other vice; on the contrary we are aſſured, that he was of a very mild, humane, and peaceable temper. And indeed, if we judge from his conduct, we ſhall find him ſo to exceſs. And therefore, there ſeems to be great reaſon to doubt, whether we ought to credit what is related in the *Chronicon* of Marcellinus under the year 390, when Arcadius was but thirteen years of age, that he forced the Empreſs Galla his mother in law, from the palace at Conſtantinople. With reſpect to the ſtory, which is told of him, that having been ſtruck by Arſenius his tutor, he reſolved to kill him, it is very improbable, and atteſted by no Author except Metaphraſtes. However, it is a very inconſiderable advantage for a Prince to be exempt from vices, if he has not likewiſe eminent virtues; and it is certain that the weak and ſtupid mildneſs of temper in Arcadius occaſioned the greateſt calamities imaginable in the Empire (3).

(1) Tillem. tom. 5. Part 2. pag. 828.
(2) *See* Socrat. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 6. cap. 23.
(3) Tillem. pag. 829, 830.

[*B*] *This occaſioned a conteſt between Stilico and Rufinus.*] The latter was a Gaul by nation, and had been in great favour with Theodoſius, who raiſed him to ſome of the higheſt poſts of the Empire. We have different characters of him according to the prejudices of different writers; but it is certain, that a violent ambition was the governing principle of his actions. Stilico's pretences to a right of governing the Eaſt as well as the Weſt raiſed the jealouſy of Rufinus, who had the ſame ambitious views, tho' they both agreed in felling decrees and ruining the moſt wealthy families, by injuſtice and ſuborn'd accuſations, in order to enrich themſelves with their ſpoils (4); in which reſpect however Rufinus is ſaid to have proceeded to the greateſt exceſs (5). As Stilico had married a niece of Theodoſius, Rufinus, who had a daughter ready for marriage, reſolved to engage Arcadius to marry her; and it is ſaid, that he was determined to gain this point, if poſſible, as a ſtep for himſelf to obtain the Empire. He took the moſt ſecret methods imaginable to have this marriage propoſed to the Emperor. However, the people got intelligence of it very ſoon, and were extremely provoked at his pride and inſolence. This intrigue of his was interrupted by a journey which he was obliged to take into the Eaſt, in order to ſatisfy Arcadius and Eucherius his uncle, who complained of Lucian, Count of the Eaſt. Rufinus had procured that poſt for Lucian, who was ſon to Florentius preſect of Gaul in the latter part of Conſtantius's reign. It was upon this account therefore, that Arcadius on his uncle's complaint caſt the blame on Rufinus; who immediately departed with a very ſmall retinue, and without acquainting any perſon with his deſign, and went to Antioch. He entered the city in the night, and ordered Lucian to be ſeized and brought before his tribunal, and beat in ſuch a manner upon the neck, that he died ſoon after. Rufinus upon his return to Conſtantinople, uſed his utmoſt efforts to promote the marriage of his daughter (6); but Eutropius the Eunuch, who afterwards became ſo famous, had engaged Arcadius to marry Eudoxia, which he accordingly did the 27th of April 395. This Lady was not a Roman, but born in Gaul, and daughter of Count Bauto, a celebrated General, who had been Conſul in the year 385 (7).

(4) Zoſim. lib. 5. *and* Suidas *apud* Tillem. p. 834.
(5) Suidas, *apud eundem*, ibid.
(6) Zoſim. lib. 5.
(7) Tillem. pag. 835.

[*C*] *Involved the Eaſtern Empire in the utmoſt confuſion, by bringing in the Barbarians.*] Failing in his deſign of marrying his daughter to Arcadius, and being apprehenſive of the power of Stilico, who pretended, that Theodoſius had made him guardian of two ſons, and who was coming into the Eaſt to deprive him of the authority, which he exerciſed there, he reſolved to raiſe ſuch a ſcene of confuſion as ſhould prevent any attempts of that kind againſt him (8). Oroſius likewiſe informs us (9), that he was in hopes that the exigence of the Empire would cover and promote the ambitious deſigns, which he had of ſeizing the ſovereign power; or at leaſt, as Claudian obſerves (10), that he might have the cruel conſolation of not periſhing alone. With theſe views he procured a deſcent of the Huns, who ravaged all the Eaſt as far as Antioch. We may refer to theſe incurſions the accounts which we read in ſome Homilies of that time, concerning Martyrs, who were put to death by the Barbarians, and Captives, who were carried to Antioch, where they were ſold or redeemed. St. Jerom mentions very frequently theſe ravages of the Huns, who ſtruck a terror upon all the nations as far as Paleſtine, while the Roman armies were engaged, as he obſerves, in civil war; that is, before the armies, which were conducted againſt Eugenius, were returned from the Weſt (11). Philoſtorgius (12) likewiſe mentions this deſcent of the Huns; but he places it after the death of Rufinus, and even that of Eutropius; which is a great error with regard to Chronology. At the ſame time, that Rufinus brought the Huns into Aſia, he abandoned Europe to the Goths (13). Their chief Captain was Alaric, who afterwards became ſo famous for taking the city of Rome. Theodoſius had given him the command of a body of Goths, and he complained ſo highly, that he was not advanced to ſome greater poſt, that he threatned to revolt (14). Rufinus made uſe of this diſpoſition of Alaric, and encouraged him privately by preſents (15) to collect the whole force of the Barbarians, and ravage the Provinces of the Empire, aſſuring him, that he might eaſily march into Greece, without any fear of meeting with oppoſition (16). It is ſaid, that Rufinus had deſignedly made Antiochus Proconſul of Achaia, and given the command of the Troops and the defence of the Straits of Thermopylæ and the Iſthmus of Corinth to Gerontius; which two men were both of his own faction, whom he choſe for this purpoſe, that they might not oppoſe Alaric, but open the paſſages to him. This they executed but too faithfully (17). The Goths being armed by the Romans againſt themſelves (18), and aſſiſted by the Huns, who had paſſed over the Danube upon the ice the winter before (19), ravaged Mœſia, Thrace, and Pannonia, and paſſed from thence into Macedonia and Theſſalia (20), ſacking all the towns between Dalmatia, the Adriatic Gulph, and the Euxin Sea. The city of Conſtantinople was likewiſe

(8) Zoſim. lib. 5.
(9) *Hiſt.* lib. 7.
(10) *In* Rufin. lib. 2.
(11) Tillem. pag. 638, 639.
(12) *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 2. c. 8.
(13) Claud. *in Rufin.* lib. 2.
(14) Zoſim. l. 5.
(15) Marcell. *Chronic. ad ann.* 395.
(16) Idem, ibid. *and* Zoſim. lib. 5.
(17) Zoſim. l. 5.
(18) Claudian. *in Rufin.* lib. 2.
(19) Philoſt. *Hiſt. Eccleſ. ubi ſupra.*
(20) Claud. *and* Zoſim. *ubi ſupra.*

but was at laſt killed at Conſtantinople [*D*]. His death was of great advantage to the Emperor, though it proved of little conſequence to his Empire, becauſe Eutropius the Eunuch was ſuffered to gain an abſolute aſcendant at the court of Arcadius [*E*]. However the Emperor, notwithſtanding all his defects, had a warm zeal for the Catholick faith, and was perſuaded, that God had granted his father the many illuſtrious victories which he had obtained on account of his piety. This induced him to confirm very readily thoſe Laws which Theodoſius had made in favour of the Church, and to appoint ſeveral new ones [*F*]. Stilico agreeably to Arcadius's orders had ſuffered Alaric and the Goths to continue iu Theſſalia; but they having ravaged that country paſſed the Straits of Thermopylæ, through the weakneſs or treachery of the General Gerontius, who had the command there, and the Proconſul Antiochus, and entered Achaia, and penetrated into Peloponneſus, where they made dreadful depredations. Stilico upon this reſolved

wiſe in a manner beſieged by the Barbarians, who came up to the gates of it. Rufinus went out in a Gothic dreſs, to treat with them, as he pretended, about making peace, and was received with great civility by the Goths, which very much increaſed the ſuſpicion of his treachery. Stilico, who had performed a journey into Gaul in fifteen days, if we credit Claudian (22), to ſecure a peace with the Germans and Gauls, alledged that it was neceſſary for him upon this exigence to give his aſſiſtance to the Eaſtern Empire; which he was undoubtedly determined to the more readily by the proſpect of ruining Rufinus. He departed therefore at the latter end of the ſpring with all the Troops of the Empire, which had attended Theodoſius againſt Eugenius, and even thoſe of Eugenius, which had ſurrendred themſelves to Theodoſius. The Barbarians hearing of his coming, collected themſelves in a body in Theſſalia; and Stilico was very near them, when Rufinus obtained an order from Arcadius to command him to ſend him the army of the Eaſt, which Theodoſius had conducted againſt Eugenius. He immediately obeyed, and ſent Arcadius not only the Troops, which he demanded, but likewiſe half of the treaſure of Theodoſius (23). Claudian tells us (24), that if Stilico had not been prevented by Rufinus from attacking the Barbarians, he would have ſecured Athens, Corinth, Lacedæmon, and many other famous cities of Greece, from the deſtruction, which they afterwards ſuffered.

(22) *De Stilic.* lib. 1.

(23) Tillem. p. 840, 841.

(24) *In* Rufin. lib. 2.

[*D*] *Was at laſt killed at Conſtantinople.*] When Stilico ſent back the Army to Arcadius, he gave the command of it to a General, who was a Goth, and named Gainas (25), to whom he diſcovered his deſign of killing Rufinus (26); and Eutropius the Eunuch readily concurred in that reſolution (27). When the Army came to Conſtantinople, Arcadius went out to ſalute it according to cuſtom, being attended by Rufinus, who was in hopes, that upon the ſight of his perſon, which was very noble, eſpecially in compariſon with Arcadius, and by means of the intereſt, which he had made with ſeveral officers of the Army, he ſhould be immediately proclaimed Emperor upon the ſpot. But it was already diſcovered, that he had impoſed upon the Troops, and been the means of Alaric's revolt. So that when the Army had paid their compliments to Arcadius, they inſenſibly ſurrounded Rufinus, and upon a ſignal given by Gainas, fell upon him, and cut him to pieces at the feet of Arcadius himſelf, while he was urging that Prince to declare him his collegue (28). Claudian (29) deſcribes the ſituation of the place, where this happened. It was at the palace called Hebdomon, and the tribunal where the Emperors uſed to be crowned. His head was cut off, and a ſtone thruſt into his mouth to keep it open; then his head was fixed upon the top of a lance, and carried thro' all the city of Conſtantinople, attended with a greater crowd than he had ever ſeen in his life-time. They cut off likewiſe his right hand, which they carried about every where to beg alms for this inſatiable man; and a great ſum of money was collected among thoſe, who hated his avaricious temper (30). His goods were confiſcated, and an Edict was publiſhed for that purpoſe, which was carried as far as Rome, every perſon exulting at the puniſhment of this old robber, who had plundered the whole world, as Symmachus expreſſes it (31).

(25) Zoſim. l. 5. *and* Marcellin. *Chron. ad ann.* 395.

(26) Zoſim. *ubi ſupra.* Philoſtorg. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 2. c. 3.

(27) Zoſim. *ubi ſupra.*

(28) Tillem. pag. 841, 842.

(29) *In* Rufin. lib. 2.

(30) Tillem. p. 842.

(31) Epiſt. 15.

[*E*] *Was ſuffered to gain an abſolute aſcendant at the Court of Arcadius.*] It is ſuppoſed, that he was an Armenian; but it is univerſally agreed, that he had been a ſlave. He was made an eunuch ſoon after he was born, that he might be ſold for an higher price, and, as Claudian obſerves (32), that he might afterwards caſt the greater diſgrace upon the Empire. He had many maſters, who ſold him to others, or gave him away, not knowing what uſe to make of him. At laſt he was brought to Court, where he raiſed himſelf from one degree to another, till he was appointed Grand Chamberlain to the Emperor, and gained an abſolute authority over him. The world was extremely ſurprized to ſee the Empire governed by an eunuch, whoſe intereſt multiplied prodigiouſly ſuch kind of perſons. Eunapius (33) has given us a deſcription of him in the moſt odious colours imaginable; and yet we are aſſured, that he has not reached the full extent of his guilt, ſince there was no crime, which he did not commit. Claudian has likewiſe written a Poem in two books againſt him. We are particularly informed, that he ſurpaſſed even Rufinus himſelf in avarice (34). He ſold publickly all the poſts of the Empire. He maintained whole troops of informers, in order to baniſh perſons of the greateſt merit, that he might ſeize their eſtates; and he diſcovered by their means all thoſe, who were rich, to prevent any thing from eſcaping his rapine (35). He took poſſeſſion of all the wealth of Rufinus, at leaſt, what he thought worth his deſire, leaving the reſt to be plundered by others (36). His ambition of governing alone made him hate the Senate and all perſons of authority and intereſt, whom he uſed his utmoſt efforts to remove from the Court (37). Claudian tells us in general, that all the priſons and places of baniſhment were filled with Men of eminent Quality. Eutropius imagined, that this was the means to raiſe himſelf, and ſecure his power. Suidas aſſerts, that he maintained a correſpondence with the Barbarians, with a view either to protect himſelf from Stilico, with whom he had an open conteſt ſoon after (38), or to raiſe himſelf to the Empire (39), tho' his character as an eunuch ſeemed to exclude him entirely from ſuch a pretenſion.

(32) *In Rufrcſt.* lib. 1.

(33) *In Excerpt. de Legation.*

(34) Marcell. *Chronic.*

(35) Zoſim. l. 5. Claud. *in Rufin.* *and* Suidas.

(36) Zoſim. *and* Marcellin. *Chron. ubi ſupra.*

(37) Zoſim. Suidas *and* Claudian, *ubi ſupra.*

(38) Zoſim. *ubi ſupra.*

(39) Suidas.

[*F*] *To confirm very readily thoſe laws which Theodoſius had made in favour of the Church, and to appoint ſeveral new ones.*] On the third of March 395, he confirmed all that his father had decreed againſt Hereticks, and abrogated every thing that was granted in hopes of reducing them by mildneſs. He made a law expreſly againſt the Eunomians, depriving them of their right to poſts of honour and profit, or to give or receive any thing whatever by will, tho' Theodoſius had allowed them the right of making wills by his law of the 21ſt of June 394. Arcadius's law of the 29th of March 395 prohibits all hereticks to hold any publick or private aſſembly, and to aſſume to themſelves the title of Biſhop or of any eccleſiaſtical office. That of the third of September declares, that a pretended Biſhop named Eureſius ſhould be ranked in the number of hereticks, as well as all thoſe, who receded from the Catholick doctrine, tho' the difference was ever ſo ſmall and inconſiderable. On the 24th of November Arcadius ordered Marcellus Maſter of the Offices to enquire ſtrictly whether there were any hereticks among the inferior officers of the Court, and not only to remove them, but even to baniſh them the city, together with thoſe, by whoſe means they gained their poſts. The law of the 7th of Auguſt renews all that had been decreed before againſt the Pagans, as well as againſt hereticks, and particularly prohibits all perſons from going into any place deſigned for the worſhip of idols, or to offer any ſacrifice in any place whatſoever (40).

(40) *See* Cod. Theodoſian. *ap.* Tillem. p. 848, 849, 850. *and* Millar's *Hiſtory of the Propagation of Chriſtianity*, Vol. 1. c. 4. p. 444. 3d edit.

ſolved to ſtop theſe ravages, and paſſed over his army thither. He killed a great number of the enemies, and obliged them to retire to a mountain called Phloe, near Piſa in Arcadia, where he might eaſily have deſtroyed them, but ſuffered them to eſcape [G]. Eutropius ſtill continued his tyranny at the Court of the Emperor, and forced ſeveral perſons of eminence, whom he was jealous of, into baniſhment, and engaged Arcadius to aboliſh the uſe of Sanctuaries [H]. In the year 396 the Emperor made ſeveral Laws, which were for the intereſt of the Church and Empire [I]. We are informed by Claudian the Poet (*b*), that Eutropius endeavoured about that time to make a treaty with the Barbarians;

(*b*) *In Eutrop.* lib. 1.

[G] *Where he might eaſily have deſtroyed them, but ſuffered them to eſcape.*] Claudian, who was entirely devoted to Stilico's intereſt, tells us (41), that he would have ſoon reduced Alaric and all his Goths to any terms, which he thought proper, as he had before killed a great number of them upon the mountains of Arcadia, if the Court of the Eaſtern Empire had not taken them into their protection under pretence of the laws; becauſe as Mr. Tillemont obſerves (42), Greece belonged to Arcadia; and perhaps at the time, that Stilico was amuſing himſelf, according to Zoſimus, in diverſions inſtead of attacking the Barbarians. Arcadius made a treaty with them. For it appears, that not long after Alaric was made Governor or General of the Troops of Eaſtern Illyricum, which included Greece (43); and Claudian expreſly affirms in another place (44), that the Romans had made him General of the armies of Illyricum. That Poet's words *in Eutrop. lib.* 2. are as follow:

(41) *De Bello Gothico.*

(42) Pag. 854.

(43) *Claud. in Eutrop.* lib. 2.

(44) *De Bello Gothico.*

——— *At nunc qui fœdera rumpit*
Ditatur; qui ſervat eget. Vaſtator Achivæ
Gentis, & Epirum nuper populatus inultam,
Præſidet Illyrico. Jam quos obſedit, amicus,
Ingreditur muros, illis reſponſa daturus,
Quorum conjugibus potitur, natoſque peremit.
Sic hoſtes punire ſolent, hæc præmia ſolvunt
Excidiis.

[H] *Engaged Arcadius to aboliſh the uſe of Sanctuaries.*] Sozomen tells us (45), that it was upon account of Pentadia, the wife of Timaſius, and ſeveral other perſons, whom he wanted to deſtroy, and in order to force them from the altars, to which they had fled, that Eutropius perſuaded the Emperor to make a law to prohibit any perſon from taking ſanctuary in the churches, to force thoſe away, who had fled thither, and to puniſh them with greater ſeverity. Mr. Tillemont obſerves (46) upon this occaſion, that it is very unreaſonable, that churches ſhould ſerve as ſanctuaries to protect the guilty; but that it is juſt on the other hand, that they ſhould be a refuge for the miſerable, till they are able to recollect themſelves, and the firſt fury of their enemies be calmed, and there be an opportunity of examining whether they have been guilty, or only unfortunate. *And it is ſtrange,* continues that author, that *Chriſtians ſhould preſume to uſe violence at the foot of the altars of Chriſt, and have leſs reſpect for his Churches, than the Pagans had for their Idols of wood and ſtone.* But the abuſes of thoſe ſanctuaries in Roman-Catholic countries are certainly the greateſt inconvenience imaginable, and an encouragement to the worſt of crimes. The law abovementioned render'd Eutropius extremely odious. And the Lawyers, tho' they had no very great zeal for the honour of the Church, conſidered it as one of the principal cauſes of the ruin of that Miniſter (47). They admired the juſtice of God, who a few years after reduced him to implore the aſſiſtance of the Church, which he endeavoured to deprive others of, and to confeſs, ſays St. Chryſoſtom, by his actions rather than by his words the injuſtice of his law (48). It was aboliſhed ſoon after his diſgrace, and torn out of all the public regiſters (49).

(45) *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 8. c. 7.

(46) Pag. 859.

(47) *See* Socrat. lib. 6. cap. 5. *and* Sozomen. lib. 8. cap. 7.

(48) Chryſoſt. *in Eutrop.* tom. 4. pag. 484. *apud* Tillem. pag. 859.

(49) Sozomen. *ubi ſupra.*

[I] *Made ſeveral laws, which were for the intereſt of the Church and Empire.*] That of the 3d of March addreſſed to Clearchus Prefect of Conſtantinople, ordains, that all the publick and private places held by the hereticks in that city, ſhould be confiſcated. This is ſuppoſed to ſignify thoſe places, where they kept their aſſemblies. That all their Clergy ſhould be baniſhed the city. That they ſhould not be permitted to aſſemble themſelves to perform their Litanies or proceſſions either in the night or day time. And that if the officers of the Pretorium ſuffered any of their aſſemblies, they ſhould be condemned in a body to pay a large fine. The two laws of the 21ſt and 22d of April are ſtill more ſevere againſt the Eunomians. They ordered Ceſarius Prefect of the Pretorium to make a ſtrict enquiry after their clergy, and to oblige them to quit the city. The law of the 23d of March againſt Apoſtates is more favourable to them than thoſe of the preceding Emperors. For it gives them the liberty at leaſt of beſtowing what they thought proper upon their children and grand-children, their parents, brothers and ſiſters. That of the 10th of December deprives thoſe, who have any concern in the Pagan idolatry, of the privileges, which had been granted them, ſince it was not reaſonable they ſhould enjoy thoſe privileges, whoſe very poſſeſſion was condemned by the laws. The law of the 5th of February addreſſed to Gennadius Prefect of Egypt decrees, according to the Code of Juſtinian, that none but Chriſtians ſhould be admitted into certain poſts at Alexandria. But in the Code of Theodoſius it has a quite different ſenſe, and makes no manner of mention of Chriſtians. The law of the 24th of March is a general Order to all Governors of Provinces to oblige the inhabitants of every city to repair their old walls, and to raiſe new ones, laying a tax upon private perſons for that purpoſe; and the Law gives ſeveral directions, that the tax might be levied in an equitable manner. It is ſuppoſed, that the late ravages of the Huns and Goths gave occaſion to this law. On the 26th of February, and 25th of April he made two laws in favour of the Jews. The latter prohibited any publick reproaches againſt the Patriarchs, who were the heads of their religion, and who had then the title of *illuſtrious* given them, as well as the principal officers of the Empire. The other law ordains, that the Jews themſelves ſhould commiſſion perſons to fix the price of the things, which they ſold, without the Governors interpoſing at all. It is ſuppoſed, that he granted them this favour, becauſe as they were univerſally hated, thoſe, who were not of their religion, rated their merchandize at too low a price. In a law of the 25th of April he gave leave for the celebration of a feaſt called *Majumas*, which was before prohibited, becauſe it was attended with great debauchery and licentiouſneſs, and a vaſt expence in banquets. He permitted it only on condition, that nothing ſhould be done contrary to decency and modeſty. But this being impoſſible to be reſtrained, he abſolutely forbad the celebration of it the 2d of October 399, and at the ſame time allowed other diverſions in the room of it, in order to relax the people's minds (50). Suidas tells us, that this feaſt of *Majumas* was originally obſerved at Rome upon the Tiber and the ſea ſhore; and that it took its name from the month of May, in which it was celebrated. Mr. Tillemont examines this conjecture in his 12th note upon the Emperor Arcadius (51). Others ſays that it was derived from water, which was called by that name in Syriac, becauſe it was performed at Daphne and other places, where there was plenty of water. The feaſt continued ſeven days. It is thought by ſome to have been that feaſt, which Libanius ſpeaks of with horror in ſeveral places of his writings; and againſt which St. Chryſoſtom preached frequently at Antioch; becauſe it was obſerved in a very licentious manner in the ſuburb of Daphne, from whence it introduced into the city an infinite deal of diſorder. Libanius tells us, that it had been prohibited by a wiſe Prince, whom ſome ſuppoſe to be Conſtantius, and was reſtored a long time after by others, who were fond of whatever bore an affinity with their own irregular manner of life. It is certain, that it was obſerved in the year 362 under Julian, and that after Libanius's time it was prohibited till this year;

(50) Tillem. p. 860, 861, 862, 863.

(51) Pag. 1041, 1042.

barians, but without ſucceſs. The ſame year Conſtantinople was threatened with immediate deſtruction by a cloud of fire which hung over it [K]. In 397 Arcadius made divers new laws [L], and in July went to Ancyra, from whence he returned at the latter end of September following, with the ſame pomp and magnificence, as if he had conquered the Perſians (*i*). Eutropius finding now that no perſon was capable of oppoſing him except Stilico, who pretended, according to Zoſimus (*k*), that he would come into the Eaſt and manage affairs there, he endeavoured to procure him to be aſſaſſinated; but this attempt being diſcovered, he engaged Arcadius to order the Senate of Conſtantinople to declare him a publick enemy, and to ſeize his poſſeſſions in the Eaſt (*l*). This was the means to raiſe a war between the two brothers Arcadius and Honorius. The ſame year the

(*i*) Tillem. pag. 871.
(*k*) Lib. 5.
(*l*) Tillem. pag. 871.

which was undoubtedly done by the Emperor Theodoſius. We find, that there were ſome remains of it in the time of Leo the ſon of the Emperor Conſtantine Copronymus in the 9th Century (52). But to return to Arcadius's laws, that of the 3d of Auguſt commanded all the Magiſtrates to try immediately the cauſes of thoſe, who were detained in priſon, without ſuffering them to languiſh there for a long time either out of negligence, or to gain the empty character of mildneſs by a real inſtance of cruelty in their conduct. The law of the 26th of November confirmed that of Theodoſius againſt the marriage of Couſin-Germans, but moderated the penalty of it. The law of the 3d of Auguſt ordained that the wives and relations of thoſe, who were proſcrib'd, ſhould not be involv'd in their puniſhments, if they had no concern in their guilt; and conſequently, that their wives ſhould enjoy all the eſtates, which they brought to their husbands, and even what had been ſettled on them by the marriage-contract (53).

(52) Idem, pag. 862, 863.

(53) Idem, pag. 864.

[K] *Conſtantinople was threatned with immediate deſtruction by a cloud of fire, which hung over it.*] St. Proſper and Marcellinus in their *Chronicles* tell us, that in the year 396 there were earthquakes for ſeveral days together, and that the ſky appeared all on fire. Tiro Proſperus in his *Chronicon* publiſhed with that of Euſebius by Scaliger in his *Theſaurus Temporum*, Amſterdam Edition 1658, gives a more particular account of this, and informs us, that Conſtantinople by a ſudden and thorough repentance averted the wrath of God, which it was threatned with by a cloud of fire, that appeared in a dreadful manner over the city. St. Auſtin deſcribes it more fully in his piece *De Urbis Romæ excidio. C.* 6. a few years after, and tells us, that there were ſeveral among his people, and perhaps even among thoſe, who heard him preach upon that ſubject, who were eye-witneſſes of this prodigious Phænomenon. His account of it is as follows. While Arcadius was Emperor at Conſtantinople, God, in order to ſtrike a terror upon that city, and by that means to reform it, appeared (*venit*) by a Revelation to one of his faithful ſervants, who was a military perſon, and declared to him that the city would be deſtroyed upon a certain day by fire from Heaven, and commanded him to go and acquaint the Biſhop with it. The Biſhop Nectarius did not neglect this warning; but addreſſed himſelf to the people; who having immediate recourſe to tears and repentance, as Niniveh did anciently, obtained a revocation of the ſentence, which had been pronounced againſt them. But that the perſon, who gave this warning, might not be conſidered as an impoſtor, or as one, who had been deceived himſelf, when the day came, which he had fixed, and every one waited under the moſt dreadful apprehenſions for the accompliſhment of his prediction, they ſaw at the beginning of the night a little cloud of fire, which aroſe from the Eaſt. It enlarged itſelf as it came nearer, till at laſt it extended itſelf over the whole city, where it occaſioned the moſt aſtoniſhing horror imaginable. Every one ſaw the flame hang over his head; and at the ſame time was ſenſible of the ſmell of ſulphur. All people crowded to the Churches, which were not large enough to contain thoſe, who took ſanctuary there. Thoſe, who had not received baptiſm before, deſired it with the utmoſt impatience, not only in the Churches, but likewiſe in the houſes, publick places, and ſtreets, *in order to eſcape*, ſays St. Auſtin, *not the fire, which they then ſaw themſelves threatned with, but that eternal one which they dreaded.* At laſt, after God had ſtruck an univerſal terror upon this great people, and convinc'd them of the truth of what his ſervant had declared from him, the cloud began to leſſen, and by degrees was diſſipated entirely. This fear ſcarce began to abate, before a rumour ſpread itſelf among them, that it was abſolutely neceſſary to abandon the city, ſince it would infallibly be deſtroyed the Saturday following; and even the particular hour was mentioned. All the people, and the Emperor himſelf left the city. Whatever regard any perſon might have for their houſes and goods, no body ſtay'd behind; and St. Auſtin aſſures us, that they did not even ſhut their doors, they were ſeized with ſo prodigious a dread. All the inhabitants retir'd together ſome miles out of the city, where they employed themſelves in imploring the divine Mercy, when of a ſudden at the hour foretold they perceived a great ſmoke, ariſing over the city. Upon this diſcovery they redoubled their prayers with loud lamentations, till the ſky became clear again. They ſent perſons then to ſee what had happened, and found to their great ſatisfaction, that the city ſtill remained entire; ſo that they returned with thankſgiving to God. Every perſon found his houſe in the ſame ſtate, in which he had left it, without looſing any thing, tho' the doors were open.

[L] *In* 397 *Arcadius made divers new laws.*] The law of the 16th of February was addreſſed to Cæſarius, in which the Emperor decrees, that thoſe perſons ſhould ſuffer the confiſcation of their eſtates and baniſhment, who had obtained or endeavoured to obtain by money, poſts of honour or profit at Court, or any other poſts, which ought only to be beſtowed upon thoſe of approved merit; there being no difference between committing a crime, and only being prevented by an impoſſibility from committing it. The law of the 6th of March confirms one of Valentinian againſt the receivers of taxes, who exacted more than they had a right to claim; and appoints, that their injuſtice ſhould be capitally puniſhed, ſince ſo many repeated prohibitions had not been able to reſtrain their exorbitance. By that of the 1ſt of April, Arcadius orders, that the Doctors and Teachers of the Apollinarians ſhould be baniſhed immediately from Conſtantinople, and that the houſes, where they held their private Aſſemblies, ſhould be confiſcated. As the Jews were the objects of univerſal hatred and contempt, he made a law the 17th of June, addreſſed to Anatolius Preſect of Illyricum, by which he appointed that the Governors ſhould take care to prevent them from being inſulted and diſturbed in their Synagogues. But he decreed at the ſame time, that thoſe among them, who being proſecuted for any crime or for debt, ſhould take ſanctuary in the Church, and promiſe to become Chriſtians, ſhould not be received till after they had cleared themſelves, or been acquitted of the crimes objected to them. In another law of the 1ſt of July, he exempts the Miniſters of their religion from offices in the Courts, putting them upon an equality in that reſpect with the Chriſtian Biſhops, Prieſts, and Deacons. He followed in this point the decrees of Conſtantine, Conſtantius, Valentinian, and Valens. But it is ſuppoſed, that he receded from thoſe of Gratian, the younger Valentinian, and his own father Theodoſius, who had not treated the Jews in ſo favourable a manner. The law of the 30th of December 399, ſeems to revoke this; for it ſubjects to the offices of the Courts all the Jews, who could be proved to be obliged to them by their birth, as Mr. Tillemont obſerves. The 4th of September Arcadius made a ſevere law againſt all thoſe, who formed any conſpiracy to kill any of his officers, or who engaged in any of thoſe which had been concerted by others. He condemns them all to the confiſcation

the Emperor had a daughter born, whom he named Flaccilla, by Eudoxia his Empreſs (*m*). In 398 he made ſeveral new laws [*M*], and in July the year following he ordered the temples in the country to be demoliſhed in ſuch a manner as would occaſion the leaſt confuſion, in order to deprive the Pagans of every thing which might afford matter for their ſuperſtition, their temples in the cities being probably deſtroyed before (*n*). Eutropius was now near his fall; which Zoſimus (*o*) aſcribes particularly to Gainas an Officer, who was a Goth and an Arian. He imagined, that he ſhould raiſe himſelf to the abſolute command of the Empire, if he could but deſtroy Eutropius. With this view he perſuaded Count Tarbigil or Tribigilde, a Goth, who commanded a great body of Oſtrogoths and Greuthonges at Nacolia in Phrygia, and was related to Gainas, according to Socrates (*p*), to revolt, and promiſed to ſupport him. Tribigilde accordingly took up arms, and ravaged Nacolia, and many other cities of Phrygia. Eutropius endeavoured to bribe him, but in vain, ſo that the Goth ſtruck a terror upon the whole Empire; and Gainas wrote to the Emperor, that it was abſolutely neceſſary to grant him his own terms, and particularly to give up Eutropius to him as the cauſe of all theſe misfortunes (*q*). This added to an inſult which he offered to the Empreſs Eudoxia, entirely ruined his intereſt with Arcadius [*N*], who baniſhed him to the Iſle of Cyprus, where he was beheaded (*r*). The deſtruction of Eutropius

(*m*) Idem, pag. 872.
(*n*) Idem, pag. 879.
(*o*) Lib. 5.
(*p*) Pag. 306. *apud* Tillem. p. 883.
(*q*) Tillem. p. 885.
(*r*) Idem, pag. 885-890.

confiſcation of their eſtates and death; and declares even their ſons to be infamous and incapable of ever poſſeſſing any eſtate, leaving but a very ſmall allowance to their daughters. Eutropius was undoubtedly the perſon, who procured this, in order to ſecure himſelf from the great number of enemies, whom he had raiſed himſelf by his injuſtice. This law is very famous; and Gothofredus has written a diſſertation upon it. Aſterius Count of the Eaſt having informed the Court, that he wanted materials to repair the roads, bridges, aqueducts, and walls of cities, Arcadius ordered him on the firſt of November to make uſe of thoſe, which were procured by the demoliſhing of divers Pagan Temples. The 8th of November Arcadius made a law to inflict death upon every domeſtic whether free or ſlave, who ſhould turn informer againſt his maſter. But he excepted the crime of *Læſa Majeſtas*, or high Treaſon; which render'd the law almoſt entirely uſeleſs (54).

(54) Tillem. p. 868-871.

[*M*] *In* 398 *he made ſeveral other laws.*] At the requeſt of St. Chryſoſtom he made a reſcript or order to ſhut up all the temples, which remained at Gaza, and to break the idols to pieces. Porphyrius, who was then Biſhop of Gaza, had deſired the Demolition of the Temples; but the Order which he had for that purpoſe, was defeated by the treachery of an officer named Hilarius, who was commiſſioned to execute it, but was bribed by the Pagans. The law of the 3d of February oblig'd the Jews to ſubmit to the Roman laws in thoſe things, which had no relation to their religion, permitting them only to make uſe of their Patriarchs or other perſons of their nation as arbitrators in their civil affairs, with an injunction to the Judges to ſee the execution of the ſentence of theſe arbitrators, as of thoſe whom they themſelves had authoriz'd. We find that the ſame conſtitution was made in favour of the Chriſtian Biſhops, in a law dated the 27th of July the ſame year. The law of the 4th of March was extremely rigorous againſt the Eunomians and Montaniſts. For it decrees, not only that they ſhould not only hold any Aſſembly even in the country, but that their clergy ſhould be baniſhed from the cities. That all thoſe, who ſhould be found there for the future, ſhould be puniſhed with death; and that all the houſes, in which they were entertained, ſhould be confiſcated, if they were not ſent away immediately. It ordains likewiſe, that a ſtrict ſearch ſhould be made after their Books in order to be burnt in the preſence of the Magiſtrates; and that if any perſon kept them, he ſhould be capitally puniſhed, in the ſame manner as if they were Books of Magic; becauſe in effect they taught all kinds of vice, and furniſhed matter for them. In the law of the 11th of the ſame month, the Emperor laid a large fine upon the officers of Simplicius, General of the army in the Eaſt, if their troops ſuffered their horſes to feed in the common paſtures of the city of Apamea in Syria, famous for its excellent paſturage, or in any of the lands near it, which belonged to private perſons in Antioch. There are ſeveral laws dated the 27th of July, addreſſed ſome of them to Cæſarius, and others to Eutychianus, but which are thought to be only fragments of one of thoſe laws, which Eutropius procured againſt ſanctuaries in Churches. It is decreed there, that if a ſlave, or any other perſon, who is accountable to, and dependent upon the publick or upon private perſons, takes refuge in a Church, the Eccleſiaſtics ſhall be obliged to ſurrender him up at the firſt ſummons, &c. That the Biſhops ſhall chooſe Monks to ordain them, as perſons of an approved virtue, rather than Laymen dependant upon others, the ordination of whom is very invidious. That the Clergy of the Churches in the country ſhould be obliged to the ſame tax, as formerly. That the Clergy and Monks may appeal to a ſuperior Judge in favour of criminals, but not take them out of the hands of the officers of juſtice; and that if they do ſo, an account ſhall be ſent to the Court, and the Biſhops ſhall be made reſponſible for them, ſince it is incumbent upon them to inſtruct others in their duty (55).

(55) Idem, pag. 873-876.

[*N*] *This added to an inſult which he offered to the Empreſs Eudoxia, entirely ruined his intereſt with Arcadius.*] He proceeded ſo far in his ill treatment of that Princeſs, that he threatned to baniſh her from the Palace. She ſeeing ſo favourable an opportunity upon this exigence of affairs to ruin him, took her two little daughters in her arms, and threw herſelf with tears at the feet of her husband to deſire juſtice of him. Arcadius being touched with the tears of his wife and children, and the neceſſity of affairs at that time, recollected at laſt that he was Emperor, and immediately ſending for Eutropius, reproached him in the ſevereſt terms imaginable, deprived him of all his offices and eſtate, and baniſhed him from the palace. Upon this all the imaginary grandeur of Eutropius vaniſhed in a moment. He ſaw every thing, which he had moſt lov'd and eſteemed, diſappear. All his adorers, friends, or rather flatterers, either abandoned him, or became his enemies. The Church, to which he had been before an enemy, was the only place, in which he found compaſſion or aſſiſtance. For perceiving, that even his life was in danger, he left the palace to take ſanctuary in the Church, with his head covered with duſt; and notwithſtanding the Law, which he had made to take away the right of aſſiſting the miſerable, he hung about the Altar for protection. Many perſons murmured againſt St. Chryſoſtom; but he repreſented to them, that nothing was more honourable to the Church, than to ſee the perſecutor of it obliged to have recourſe to its mercy; and that nothing was more worthy the Spouſe of Chriſt, than to forget every thing that he had done againſt her, and to aſſiſt him in his misfortunes. However there was an univerſal exclamation againſt Eutropius in the theatres, of which he had been ſo extremely fond. The City was all inraged againſt him. The ſoldiers demanded even his death; and Gainas urged very importunately, that he ſhould either be put to death or baniſhed, upon this pretence, that there was no other means to induce Tribigilde to lay down his arms. Some Perſons were ſent from the palace to force him from the Altar; and thoſe, who the evening before had kiſſed his hands with the utmoſt humility, took upon them this commiſſion. A body of ſoldiers came and ſurrounded the church with their ſwords drawn. Eutropius ſtruck with terror, hid himſelf in the ſacriſty, where the ſacred veſſels were repoſited. But St. Chryſoſtom went

tropius was of no very conſiderable advantage to the Empire, for the ſame diſorders ſtill continued. Arcadius having neither ſenſe nor conduct, the whole authority fell into the hands of Eudoxia the Empreſs, who abuſed her power [O]. Gainas had no other view in removing Eutropius, but to proſecute his own intereſts, and committed a thouſand diſorders in Aſia in conjunction with Tribigilde, ſo that Arcadius having no army to oppoſe them, ſent to the former, and conſented to whatever terms he thought proper. He demanded that Aurelian, Saturninus, and John, men of the greateſt eminence in the Senate, ſhould be delivered up to him, and then ordered them into baniſhment (*s*). He afterwards deſigned to ſeize Conſtantinople, but being prevented, went to Thrace, and was defeated by Fravitus, and at laſt killed by the Huns (*t*). In the year 400 Eudoxia received the title of Auguſta, and ordered her ſtatues to be honoured (*u*). The year following Arcadius's ſon and ſucceſſor Theodoſius, was born (*w*). In 404 the Empreſs baniſhed St. John Chryſoſtom, and died the 30th of September following (*x*). About the ſame time the Empire was ravaged by the Huns and Iſaurians (*y*). In 406 he publiſhed a ſevere Law againſt thoſe who publiſhed Libels againſt their enemies, and even againſt thoſe who read them without tearing them to pieces or burning them, or did not inform againſt thoſe

(*s*) Idem, pag. 895, 896, 897.

(*t*) Idem, pag. 900—904.

(*u*) Idem, pag. 904, 905.

(*w*) Idem, pag. 909.

(*x*) Idem, pag. 916, 917, 918.

(*y*) Idem, pag. 919, &c.

out to the ſoldiers, who carried him to the palace, and threatned him with death, becauſe he would not deliver up the criminal. Arcadius was eaſily perſuaded, that he ought to ſuffer him to enjoy the protection of the Sanctuary in the Church; but the ſoldiers inſiſted upon his death (56). St. Chryſoſtom tells us (57), that the Emperor made a long Speech to them, but could not make any impreſſion upon them at firſt, becauſe they were ſo highly provoked againſt the crimes of this Miniſter; and forgot even the reſpect due to the Imperial Majeſty. However at laſt he moved them by his tears to have regard to the Altar, to which Eutropius had fled. The day following there was a great concourſe of the people at the Church to ſee Eutropius, to view the man, who had juſt before made the world tremble under him, trembling himſelf for fear of death, and reduced to the moſt dreadful diſtreſs imaginable. St. Chryſoſtom upon this occaſion mounted the pulpit, and made a Diſcourſe, which is extremely celebrated in the Hiſtorians (58), in which he ſhewed the uncertainty and vanity of all human grandeur, and how little reaſon the rich and powerful have to be elated. He repreſented likewiſe ſome of the faults of Eutropius in order to enhance the charity, with which the Church aſſiſted him; and he expatiated upon the greatneſs of his fall, not with a deſign to inſult his misfortunes, but to move the people to have compaſſion upon him. In ſhort, having drawn tears from the eyes of his audience, how enraged ſoever they were againſt Eutropius, he concluded with exhorting them to go in a body, and caſt themſelves at the feet of the Emperor, and deſire of him pardon, or at leaſt life, for that unfortunate man, out of regard to the Church and its holy Altar (59). We have no account whether the people did as St. Chryſoſtom deſired of them; but we are told, that ſome days after Eutropius leaving the Church, in hopes to eſcape ſecretly, was taken and baniſhed into the Iſle of Cyprus. It appears, that ſome perſons imagined, that he was delivered up to his enemies by the Church (60). Others have aſſerted (61), that he was drag'd from the Church by force. But St. Chryſoſtom expreſly affirms in a Diſcourſe (62), which he wrote not long after, when Eutropius was in baniſhment, that all this was falſe; and that the Church would not have abandoned him, if he had not abandoned her firſt. Zoſimus (63) tells us, that when he was baniſhed to Cyprus, he was aſſured with an oath, that his life ſhould not be taken away. Claudian (64), who wrote about the ſame time that he was carried into baniſhment, promiſed him in his Poem, that his head ſhould not be cut off, tho' himſelf had ordered an eunuch to be ſerved in that manner. But, as Mr. Tillemont obſerves, he was a Poet, and not a Prophet. We have a Law ſtill extant, by which Arcadius confiſcates all his eſtate, deprives him of the office of Grand Chamberlain and Patrician, with all the other inferior poſts, which he held; and decrees that his name ſhould be eraſed out of all places, in which he had been mentioned as Conſul; and that all his images and ſtatues ſhould be removed from all the places either publick or private, where they had been fixed; and commands Aurelian Prefect of the Pretorian to ſee him conveyed to Cyprus under a ſtrong guard, and to take particular care to keep a watch upon him, for fear of any tumult. This Law is dated the 17th of January 399. Claudian (65) and Socrates the Hiſtorian (66) mention that article of it, which relates to effacing of all the marks of his Conſulſhip; and we find in ſome of the *Faſti*, only the name of Manlius Theodorus his Collegue; and ſome Writers affirm, that Theodorus was Conſul alone. However the name of Eutropius is ſtill extant in Marcellinus's *Chronicon* and other Authors (67). Gainas could not be eaſy while Eutropius was living, and urged ſeveral perſons to inform againſt him; ſo that he was ordered to be ſent for from Cyprus, and Commiſſioners appointed to try his cauſe, the chief of whom was Aurelian Prefect of the Pretorium (68). They met for this purpoſe at a place called Pantichium between Chalcedon and Nicomedia (69). He was at laſt condemned, and his head cut off, becauſe, as it was alledged, he had during his Conſulſhip made uſe of the ornaments, which belonged only to the Emperor (70); from whence they without doubt inferred that he had a deſign to uſurp the Empire. Zoſimus (71), who aſſerts that he had his life promiſed him with a ſolemn oath, tells us, that this breach of it was covered by a pretence, that this oath was reſtrained entirely to Conſtantinople, and upon that account he was executed at Chalcedon. He was put to death in the night time (72).

(56) Idem, pag. 885, 886, 887.

(57) *Apud* Tillem. p. 887.

(58) Socrat. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 6. c. 5. *and* Sozomen. lib. 8. cap. 7.

(59) Chryſoſtomi *in Eutropium Orat. Oper.* tom. 4. p. 482-487. *apud* Tillem. p. 888.

(60) Tillem. p. 889.

(61) Zoſim. lib. 5. Suidas *in Eutrop.*

(62) In Pſalm. xliv. p. 667. *ap.* Tillem. p. 889.

(63) Lib. 5.

(64) In Eutrop. lib. 2.

(65) *Ubi ſupra.*

(66) Lib. 6. c. 5

(67) Tillem. p. 890.

(68) Zoſim. l. 5. Philoſtorg. *Eccleſiaſt. Hiſt.* l. 2. c. 6.

(69) Philoſtorg. *ubi ſupra.* Sozom. lib. 7. c. 21.

(70) Philoſt. *ubi ſupra.*

(71) Lib. 5.

(72) Tillem. p. 891.

[O] *The whole authority fell into the hands of Eudoxia the Empreſs, who abuſed her power.*] We are informed by Zoſimus (73), that ſhe was a woman of a very bold and enterprizing diſpoſition, who was not aſhamed to take a ſhare of the money, which the Officers had raiſed by betraying their own honour and the intereſt of the Empire, and then to protect them from the purſuit of juſtice. She was likewiſe accuſed of a great many other inſtances of injuſtice and violence, of which her avarice was the ſource; and her perſecution of St. Chryſoſtom alone, as Mr. Tillemont obſerves (74), would be ſufficient to render every thing credible, which could be ſaid of her. Beſides her own perſonal faults, ſhe was perpetually ſurrounded by a ſett of women, who entirely governed her, and a company of eunuchs, whoſe avarice was always inſatiable. There was no body to be ſeen at Court but informers, who upon the death of a rich man were begging for his eſtate, under pretence that he had left no heirs; and they immediately obtained it without any other enquiry, merely by the intereſt of the eunuchs; ſo that the children loſt their father and their eſtate at the ſame time. Zoſimus aſſures us, that ſuch flagrant inſtances of injuſtice were to be ſeen every where, which made thoſe, who had the leaſt reſolution or honour, wiſh for death (75). Palladius in his *Dialogue concerning the Life of St. Chryſoſtom* (76) tells us, that among the inſtruments of the perſecution of that Father, beſides thoſe women, who were generally known, there were three widows, who abuſed to their own deſtruction the vaſt riches left them by their husbands, and which were the fruits of rapine and violence. Theſe widows were Marſa, the widow of Promotus, Caſtricia, the widow of Saturninus, and Eugraphia, a Lady of the moſt violent paſſions and outragious conduct. Γυναικῶν δὲ πρὸς ταῖς φημιζομέναις, τρεῖς χῆραι μὲν, ἀνδρόπλουτοι δὲ, ἐπ' ὀλέθρῳ τῆς ἑαυτῶν σωτηρίας τὰ ἐξ ἁρπαγῆς χρήματα κεκλημέναι, ταραξάνδριαι καὶ ἀνασείριαι· Μάρσα Προμότου γυνὴ, καὶ Καστρίκια ἡ Σατορνίνου, καὶ Εὐγραφία, ἀμφιμανής τις. T.

(73) Lib. 5.

(74) Pag. 895.

(75) Zoſim. *ubi ſupra.*

(76) Pag. 35. edit. Paris 1680.

thoſe who had read them. The puniſhment, which he appointed in theſe caſes, was capital (z). Arcadius died the firſt of May 408, being thirty one years of age, having reigned twelve years in conjunction with his father, and fourteen years after his deceaſe. He left but one ſon, Theodoſius, then eight years of age, who ſucceeded him in the Empire. He had four daughters, Flaccilla, Pulcheria, Arcadia, and Marina (*aa*).

(z) Idem, pag. 926.

(*aa*) Idem, pag. 931.

ARCERE (ANTHONY) one of the Fathers of the Oratory in the ſeventeenth Century, and celebrated for his attempt of compiling a Dictionary of the Turkiſh Language [*A*], was born at Marſeilles in the year 1664. He entered into the Congregation of the Oratory when he was eighteen years of age; and after he had ſtudied and taught polite Learning in that Society, he went to Paris, where he ſpent about a year in the *Maiſon de St. Honore*. He became acquainted there with ſeveral learned men who had a great eſteem for him, and particularly the Abbé Bignon; but his modeſty prevented him from ſhewing himſelf to advantage in publick, as his love of learning engaged him in a retired and ſtudious manner of life. He applied himſelf very early to the ſtudy of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew Tongues, and afterwards to the Arabic, Turkiſh and Perſian Languages; and he was well ſkilled in the chief of the European Tongues. Upon his return to Marſeilles, he prevailed with his parents to ſupply him with the neceſſary expences for travelling in the Eaſt, in order to perfect himſelf in the knowledge of the Languages and manners of thoſe countries, and to purchaſe books and manuſcripts proper for his deſign. He performed this voyage with great ſucceſs, and upon his return, reſolved not to enter himſelf again in the Oratory, but to live privately among his relations, that he might purſue his ſtudies without any interruption. His application to the compiling of his Dictionary was ſo very intenſe, that he did not allow himſelf the relaxation which was neceſſary to preſerve his health, ſo that he fell into a ſlow fever and conſumption, which put an end to his life the 22d of January 1699, when he was but thirty nine years of age. He left behind him in manuſcript, Grammars of moſt Languages, eſpecially of the Oriental, which were an inconteſtable proof of his great induſtry and application (*a*).

(*a*) See the Paris edition of Moreri 1732. p. 589.

[*A*] *Celebrated for his attempt of compiling a Dictionary of the Turkiſh language.*] He employ'd eight years in forming this Dictionary, in the French and Turkiſh tongues, which would undoubtedly have been of prodigious uſe with regard both to religion and trade. It was not deſigned as a mere Vocabulary, as moſt other Dictionaries are. It would have been much more extenſive and curious, as well as more eaſy for uſe than that of Meninſki, which begins with the Turkiſh, which that Author tranſlates into Latin or High-Dutch. The Dictionary of Monſr. Arcere began with the French, and ſhewed the conformity between the Turkiſh Proverbs and the French, Latin, and Greek tongues, and the Scriptures. He would have inſerted a great number of curious obſervations upon the Turkiſh Hiſtory, Religion, Ceremonies, Offices, military Diſcipline, Cuſtoms, Habits, Geography, &c. becauſe the different phraſes of the Turks under the ſame word alluding very often to theſe things, made ſuch an explanation of them abſolutely neceſſary. T.

ARCESILAUS, one of the moſt celebrated Philoſophers of Antiquity, was born at Pitane, in Æolis [*A*]. He was a diſciple of Autolycus the Mathematician his countryman, and followed him to Sardes. After that he came to Athens, and was there a diſciple of Xanthus, and afterwards of Theophraſtus, and laſtly of Crantor [*B*]. He alſo learnt

[*A*] *He was born at Pitane in Eolis.*] Diogenes Laertius is not the only authority we have for this (1): read the words of Pomponius Mela in that Chapter where he gives a deſcription of the country of the Æolians. *Caicus inter Elean decurrit & Pitanen illam quæ Arceſilam tulit, nihil affirmantis Academiæ clariſſimum Antiſtitem* (2). i. e. "Caicus runs betwixt "Elea and the city Pitane which gave birth to Arce-"ſilaus, that famous Preſident of an Academy which "never affirmed any thing." See alſo Strabo. Πιτάνη πόλις Αἰολικὴ. . . . ἐκ δὲ τῆς Πιτανῆς ἦν Ἀρκεσίλαος (3), i. e. "Pitane a city of Æolia. . . . Pitane was the "country of Arceſilaus." We are not to regard Solinus, who makes Pitane, a city of Laconia, this Philoſopher's native place (4); for this has been confuted by Salmaſius (5), and Mr. Menage (6). He is called in Mr. Gaſſendi (7) *Arceſilas Pritanæus*, whereas it ſhould have been Pitanæus; but whether this was occaſioned thro' the negligence of the Author or Corrector I cannot ſay.

(1) Diogen. Laertius lib. 4. num. 20.

(2) Pomp. Mela, lib. 1. cap. 18. num. 20.

(3) Strabo, lib. 13. pag. 422, *in fine*.

(4) Solin, cap. 7. pag. 22.

(5) Salmaſ. *Exercitat.* Plin. pag. 138.

(6) Menag. *in Diogen. Laert.* pag. 176.

(7) Gaſſendi, *Operum*, tom. 1. pag. 18.

[*B*] *He was a diſciple of Theophraſtus, and at laſt of Crantor* (8).] I am ſurprized that Diogenes Laertius, after having plainly inſinuated in other places that Arceſilaus was the Diſciple of Polemon, ſhould not make expreſs mention of this in the life of Arceſilaus. See the places wherein he intimates this. "Arceſilaus, "ſays he, having quitted the School of Theophra-"ſtus, in order to inliſt himſelf under Polemon and "Crates, declared that they were either Gods, or ſome "remains of the Golden Age." Ἔνθεν δ' Ἀρκεσίλαον μετελθόντα παρὰ Θεοφράστου πρὸς αὐλοὺς λέγειν, ὡς εἶεν θεοί τινες ἢ λείψανα τοῦ χρυσοῦ γένους (9). A little lower he obſerves that Crantor and Arceſilaus lodged together; and that Polemon and Crates, who had but one lodging betwixt them, in the houſe of one Lyſicles a citizen, often went to ſup with Crantor; and that Crates was the favourite of Polemon, as Arceſilaus was that of Crantor. The tranſlator of Diogenes Laertius has reverſed all this; for he makes Polemon to be the favourite of Crates, and Crantor that of Arceſilaus. Let us ſee how it ſtands in the Greek: Ἦν δὲ ἐρώμενος, Κράτης μὲν, ὡς προείρηται, Πολέμωνος. Ἀρκεσίλαος δὲ Κράντορος (10). The Latin verſion, which no commentator has found fault with, has *amator*, where it ſhould have been *amaſius*, the tranſlator having miſtaken the paſſive ſignification of the word ἐρώμενος; nor has he any better guarded againſt contradicting himſelf a little after, for, as the Greek directs, he has repreſented Arceſilaus as a paſſive character. Ἀρκεσίλαος θήλων ὑπ' αὐτῷ (Κράντορι) συσκιάζεται Πολέμωνι, καίπερ ἐρῶντος (11). "Arceſilaus being deſirous of being re-"commended by him, (Crantor) to Polemon, though "Crantor at the ſame time was a great lover of "him." Let us not here give way to thoſe filthy and obſcene ideas, which this author as well as ſeveral others would ſuggeſt from theſe expreſſions. It is common for them when they make mention of any great Philoſopher and his diſciples, to obſerve that he was a lover of ſuch or ſuch a one; which words I allow in ſome places are capable of being taken in an ill ſenſe; but it is alſo my opinion that upon a hundred different occaſions we ought to underſtand no more by them than a lawful tenderneſs and affection. Out of a great number of ſcholars there

(8) Diog. Laertius, lib. 4. num. 28, 29.

(9) Idem, *in Cratete*, lib. 4. pag. 240. num. 22.

(10) Idem, ibid.

(11) Idem, ibid.

learnt Geometry under Hipponicus (*a*). He had ſome inclination for Poetry, and was extreamly pleaſed with the reading of Homer [*C*]; but his deſire to be a Philoſopher was ſuperior to all the others. He ſucceeded Crates in the government of the Platonic School [*D*], and became an innovator there, for he founded a Sect, which they called the ſecond Academy, to diſtinguiſh it from that of Plato. He was very oppoſite to the Dogmatiſts; he affirmed nothing; he doubted of every thing; he diſcourſed for and againſt, and ſuſpended his judgment. *It is*, ſaid he, *becauſe nothing is certain.* He attacked very ſtrongly

(*a*) Diogen. Laert. lib. 4. num. 32.

there was always one who was the well-beloved and favourite of his maſter, and that upon account of his aptneſs at learning, his modeſty, or ſtrength of parts &c. and this was he whom he deſigned for his ſucceſſor, and diſtinguiſhed by the title of ἐράμενος. But let us come to the matter in hand. The laſt paſſage I quoted from Diogenes Laertius informs us that Arceſilaus deſired of Crantor a recommendation to Polemon. This Hiſtorian adds, that Crantor, who was at that time ſick, had no ill opinion of him, but on the contrary, when he was recovered, went himſelf to Polemon's lectures. Ἀλλὰ ἐ αὐτὸν ὑγιάναντα διακούειν Πολέμωνος (12). This is a proof that Arceſilaus was a hearer at leaſt, if not a Diſciple of this Philoſopher; but the latter is ſo plain that Cicero makes him to have had no other maſter. *Arceſilas tuus, etſi fuit in diſſerendo pertinacior, tamen noſter fuit, erat enim Polemonis* (13). i. e. "Your Arceſilaus, as "you call him, although he was ſomewhat poſitive "in diſputation, yet he was of our ſect, for he was "a Diſciple of Polemon." Numenius gives him ſeveral other maſters, and makes him ſucceſſively the ſcholar of Polemon, of Theophraſtus, of Diodorus, and laſt of all of Pyrrho (14). "Of Crantor he learned "eloquence, of Diodorus to be a Sophiſt, and of Pyr"rho to change to all ſides like a weather-cock, "and to be nothing at laſt. Ὧν ὑπὸ μὲν Κράντορος πιθανολόγικος, ὑπὸ Διοδώρου δὲ σοφιςὴς, ὑπὸ δὲ Πύρρωνος ἀγένητο παντοδαπὸς, καὶ ἴτης καὶ οὐδείς (15). He fixed at laſt in the uncertainty of Pyrrho, and was a Pyrrhonian in every thing but name: he retained indeed the name of an Academic, but this was only out of reſpect to the Philoſopher Crantor who was his maſter and lover. Πλὴν τῆς πρωτηγέτιδος ἐπέμεινε Πύρρωνι ὡς τῷ πάντων ἀναιρέσει. . . . αἰδεῖ τῷ ἐρωτὶ ὑπέμεινε λέγεσθαι Ἀκαδημαϊκὸς ἔτι. ἦν μὲν τοίνυν Πυρρώνειος πλὴν τοῦ ὀνόματος. Ἀκαδημαϊκὸς δ' οὐκ ἦν, πλὴν τοῦ λέγεσθαι (16). Numenius afterwards ſays that Arceſilaus being a handſome youth gained the love of Crantor the Academic, and gave himſelf up to him. Διὰ τὸ καλὸς εἶναι ἐπὶ ὧν ὡραῖος τυχὼν ἐράσθη Κράντορος τοῦ Ἀκαδημαϊκοῦ προσεχώρησε μὲν τούτῳ (17). He added that the lectures of Menedemus taught him to be a very warm diſputant, and for this he quotes Timon (18). Thus have I ſupplied the omiſſions in the liſt, which Diogenes Laertius has left us of the maſters of Arceſilaus.

(12) Diog. Laertius, lib. 4. num. 25.

(13) Cicero, *de Finibus*, lib. 4. cap. 31. See alſo his book *de Oratore*, lib. 3. c. 18.

(14) Numenius, *apud* Euſebium, *Præparat. Evangel.* lib. 14. cap. 5. pag. 729.

(15) Idem, ibid.

(16) Idem, *apud eundem*, cap. 6. pag. 731.

(17) Idem, ibid.

(18) The two verſes of Timon, which he quotes, are more correct than in Diogenes Laertius.

[*C*] *He took great delight in reading Homer.*] He preferred this author to all others, and read ſome part of him every night before he went to ſleep; and alſo when he aroſe in the morning he uſed to ſay, *I will go and make a viſit to my miſtreſs* (19) meaning this Poet. Ἀπεδέχετο δὲ πάντων μᾶλλον Ὁμήρου, οὗ ἐ εἷς ὕπνος ἦν παύσας τὶ ἀνεγίνωσκεν. ἀλλὰ καὶ ὄρθρου λέγων ἐπὶ τὸν ἐράμενον ἀπίεναι, ὁπόθ' ἂν βούλοιτο ἀναγνῶναι (20).

(19) To accommodate myſelf to the ſtile of our time, I have avoided a literal tranſlation.

(20) Diog. Laertius, lib. 4. num. 31.

[*D*] *He ſucceeded Crates in the government of the Platonick ſchool* (21). A great many authors, without making any mention of Crates, place Arceſilaus immediately after Polemon. See the note of Aldobrandinus on a paſſage of Diogenes Laertius (22), where you will find that this learned Commentator had no where diſcovered that Crates ſucceeded Polemon. You will there likewiſe ſee the words of St. Auſtin, *Moritur Polemo, ſuccedit ei Arceſilas, Zenonis quidem condiſcipulus, ſed ſub Polemonis magiſterio* (23). i. e. "Polemon dies "and is ſucceeded by Arceſilaus, who was ſchool-fel"low with Zeno, in the ſchool of Polemon." To this paſſage may alſo be added that out of the LVI Letter. *Idem quippe Academici qui Platonici, quod docet auditorum ipſa ſucceſſio. Arceſilas enim, qui primus occultata ſententia ſua nihil aliud iſtos quam refellere ſtatuit, quære cui ſucceſſerit; Polemonem invenies: quære cui Polemon; Xenocratem. Xenocrati autem diſcipulo Academiam ſcholam ſuam reliquit Plato* (24). i. e. "For "the Academics are the ſame with the Platoniſts, "which the ſucceſſion of ſcholars plainly ſhews: for "if you ask who Arceſilaus ſucceeded, who was the "firſt that diſputed with them by only confuting their "opinions, without offering his own, I anſwer, Po"lemon: if who Polemon ſucceeded, I anſwer, Xe"nocrates. Now Plato left the Academy, which was "his ſchool, to his ſcholar Xenocrates. We muſt not rely upon the authority of St. Auſtin in this, for he has not taken care to be ſtrictly exact; and as he has paſt over one ſucceſſion betwixt Plato and Xenocrates (25), he may have done the ſame betwixt Polemon and Arceſilaus. But I forbear to inſiſt any longer upon his ſilence with regard to that famous (26) Academic Crantor, who plainly appears to have been the immediate ſucceſſor to Polemon, and who died before him and Crates (27); but leſt the word ſucceſſor be objected to, read thus, that Crantor taught during Polemon's life time. We are alſo aſſured that Crates did the ſame, and hence it happens that ſometimes Crantor, ſometimes Crates is ſaid to have ſucceeded him, and ſometimes both, tho' generally Crates is ſet after Crantor (28). Once more I do not object the omiſſion of Crantor to St. Auſtin, for I am of opinion that this Philoſopher is falſly ſuppoſed to be the ſucceſſor of Polemon, ſeeing he died before his maſter; and I find that Lacydes, ſucceſſor to Arceſilaus, was the firſt that reſigned his chair to a ſucceſſor during his own life (29). Let us then conclude that no other than Crates ſucceeded Polemon, and not regard that paragraph in Father Rapin, *Crates and Crantor, who ſucceeded each other in the ſchool of Plato, made no alteration in his doctrine* (30). His error had been leſs if he had put Crantor firſt, ſeeing he died before Crates. A famous Critic (31) in his correction on a paſſage of Nonius Marcellus (32) has furniſhed us with an authority which ſtrongly ſupports this remark. According to this correction theſe are the words of Lucilius, *Polemon & amavit Cratem, & huic tranſmiſit ſuam ſcholam quam dicunt.* i. e. "Po"lemon greatly loved Crates, and tranſmitted to him "his ſchool as they call it." The Greek of Dio"genes Laertius is to the ſame ſenſe. Κράτης. . . . καὶ ἀκροατὴς ἅμα καὶ ἐράμενος Πολέμωνος. ἀλλὰ καὶ διεδέξατο τὴν σχολὴν αὐτῷ (33). i. e. "Crates was a "hearer and alſo the favourite (34) of Polemon, and "ſucceeded him in his ſchool." I do not think any great weight is to be given to thoſe words of Cicero, *Spenſippus autem & Xenocrates, qui primi Platonis rationem autoritatemque ſuſceperant, & poſt eos Polemo & Crates unaque Crantor, in Academiâ congregati diligenter eis, quæ à ſuperioribus acceperant, utebantur* (35). i. e. "Spenſippus and Xenocrates, who firſt followed "the method and example of Plato; and after them "Polemon and Crates together with Crantor, when aſ"ſembled in the Academy carefully adhered to thoſe "rules, which they had received from their prede"ceſſors." They are neither ſo exact nor plain as that paſſage of Diogenes Laertius. Πλάτων ὁ τὴν ἀρχαίαν Ἀκαδημίαν συνεστάμενος ᾗ Σπεύσιππος καὶ Ξενοκράτης, οὗ Πολέμων, οὗ Κράντωρ καὶ Κράτης, οὗ Ἀρκεσίλαος, ὁ τὴν μέσην Ἀκαδημίαν εἰσηγησάμενος (36). i. e. "Plato, "who firſt inſtituted the ancient Academy, was ſuc"ceeded by Spenſippus and Xenocrates; they were "ſucceeded by Polemon. Crantor and Crates ſucceed"ed him; they were followed by Arceſilaus, who in"troduced the middle Academy." Caſaubon in his note upon this place, quotes Galen, who ſays that the old Academy ended in Crantes, and that Arceſilaus the diſciple of Crantes founded the middle Academy (37). This Commentator is ignorant who is the Crantes of Galen (38), but it is eaſy to ſee either that the Copyiſts have put Crantes for Crates, or elſe that Galen himſelf did not write the name of Arceſilaus's predeceſſor according to its orthography; and indeed we have frequent inſtances amongſt the moſt learned men, of adding to or leaving out a letter from the

(21) Idem, ibid. num. 32.

(22) At the beginning of the *Life of Crates*, lib. 4. num. 21.

(23) S. Auguſtinus, lib. 3. *contra Academicos.*

(24) Auguſt. *Epiſt.* lvi. pag. 267. Euſebius, *Præpar. Evang.* lib. 14. pag. 726 tells us, *that Arceſilaus was ſaid to ſucceed Polemon.*

(25) Spenſippus, ſon of a ſiſter of Plato, governed the ſchool before Xenocrates.

(26) *Crantor ille, qui in noſtra Academia vel in primis fuit nobilis.* Cic. *Tuſc. Quæſt.* lib. 3. cap. 6.

(27) Diog. Laertius, lib. 4. num. 27.

(28) *See* Gaſſendi, *Operum* tom. 1. pag. 18. and Jonſius *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſoph.* pag. 52. or rather Diog. Laert. quoted underneath in quotation (36).

(29) Diog. Laert. *in Lacyde*, lib. 4. num. 60.

(30) Rapin, *Compar. de Platon & d'Ariſtote*, 4 Part, ch. 1. pag. 365.

(31) Petrus Victorius. See the Notes of Joſias Mercerus upon Nonius Marcellus, p. 193.

(32) Nonius Marcellus, *voce Tranſmittere*, pag. 414. He quotes the 28th book of Lucilius.

(33) Diog. Laertius, lib. 4. num. 21.

(34) And not *amator* (the Lover) as the printed Latin verſion has it.

(35) Cicero, *Academ. Quæſt.* lib. 1. cap. 9.

(36) Diog. Laert. *in Proœmio*, num. 14. p. 10.

(37) Galenus, *in Hiſt. Philoſophorum.*

(38) *Ego quiſnam ſit Crantes Galleni plane ignoro.* Caſaub. in Diog. Laertium, *Proœm.* num. 14.

ſtrongly all that the other Sects affirmed [*E*]; and it is for that reaſon they look upon him, in matters of Philoſophy, as a diſturber of the publick quiet (*b*). Some maintain, that finding no evidence to hinder him from floating equally between the affirmative and the negative, he would

(*b*) See the note [*E*] quotation (49).

the names of the authors they quote, tho' at the ſame time they mean the ſame perſon whom others write more properly. I could produce a hundred examples to this purpoſe, which makes me wonder that Caſaubon ſhould raiſe ſuch difficulties about this place. It is alſo to be remembered that he wonders that Galen ſhould omit mentioning Crantor: *Quis verò non miretur omiſſum a Galeno Crantorem* (39)?

(39) Idem, ibid.

[*E*] *He ſtrongly oppoſed every thing that the other Sects affirmed.*] It is not to be denied but that he was juſtly called an Innovator, though Diogenes Laertius is miſtaken when he takes him to be the firſt, who introduced the cuſtom of diſputing on both ſides of the queſtion. Πρῶτος δὲ καὶ εἰς ἑκάτερον ἐπιχεῖρησε (40). This was alſo the manner of Socrates, and Plato continued it. We ſhall quote a paſſage out of *Cicero*, which informs us that the method which Arceſilaus uſed of diſputing againſt every thing propoſed to him, was the ſame that Socrates uſed, and that Arceſilaus was inſtructed in Pyrrhoniſm (41) from the books of Plato, and thoſe diſcourſes which go under the name of Socrates. *Arceſilas primum, qui Polemonem audierat, ex variis Platonis libris, ſermonibuſque Socraticis hoc maximè arripuit, nihil eſſe certi, quod aut ſenſibus aut animo percipi poſſit: quem ferunt eximio quodam uſum lepore dicendi, aſpernatum eſſe omne animi ſenſuſque judicium, primumque inſtituiſſe (quanquam id fuit Socratium maximè) non quid ipſe ſentiret, oſtendere, ſed contra id quod quiſque ſe ſentire dixiſſet, diſputare* (42). i. e. "Arceſilaus, who was a "Diſciple of Polemon, firſt took this notion from the "books of Plato, and particularly from the diſcourſes "of Socrates, that there is no certainty either in the "perceptions of the ſenſes or of the underſtanding: "who, they ſay, did with a great deal of wit ar"gue againſt the judgment of both, and that he did "firſt inſtitute that way of diſputing (tho' it is chief"ly the Socratic) by confuting the opinions of others, "without advancing any of his own." He ſays in another book, that the method of Socrates, which had been neglected, was reſtored by Arceſilaus; in this conſiſts the innovation of the latter, and therefore the expreſſions of Diogenes Laertius are not exactly true; for it is plain that a Philoſopher, who profeſſes to attack every thing, that is offered in anſwer to his queſtions, muſt practiſe diſſenting *pro* and *con*. Let us attend to the following words: *Is* (Socrates) *percontando atque interrogando elicere ſolebat eorum opiniones quibuſcum differebat, ut ad ea quæ hi reſpondiſſent, ſi quid videretur, diceret. Qui mos quum à poſterioribus non eſſet retentus, Arceſilas eum revocavit, inſtituitque ut bi qui ſe audire vellent, non de ſe quærerent, ſed ipſi dicerent quid ſentirent. Quod quum dixiſſent, ille contra, ſed qui audiebant quoad poterant defendebant ſententiam ſuam: apud cæteros autem Philoſophos qui quæſivit aliquid tacet, quod quidem jam fit etiam in Academiâ* (43). i. e. "He (*Socrates*) uſed to ſift out "the opinions of thoſe whom he diſputed with, by "aſking them and interrogating them in order to op"poſe what they thought fit to anſwer: which cu"ſtom being laid aſide by his ſucceſſors was revived "by Arceſilaus, who made it a rule that thoſe who "had a mind to hear him ſhould propoſe their opi"nions without aſking him any queſtions; which "when they had done, he uſed to take the contrary "ſide, and they who propoſed defended their opi"nions as well as they could: but amongſt other "Philoſophers he who aſked any queſtion was after"wards ſilent, which is obſerved at this time in the "Academy." If this is not proof ſufficiently plain, the following however is undeniably ſo, which aſſures us that the Academy of Arceſilaus was the very ſame with that of Plato. *Hanc Academiam novam appellant, quæ mihi vetus videtur; ſiquidem Platonem ex illa vetere numeramus, cujus in libris nihil affirmatur, & in utramque partem multa diſſeruntur, de omnibus quæritur, nihil certi dicitur* (44). i. e. "They call this the new "Academy, though in my opinion it is the old, if "we reckon Plato of the latter, in whoſe books no"thing is aſſirmed, and many points are diſcuſſed on "both ſides the queſtion, where every thing is propo"ſed by way of queſtion, without aſſerting any thing "for certain." I have quoted elſewhere (45) another paſſage no leſs ſtrong than this. There are various Greek quotations which evince the truth of this. I have ſomewhere read, that Epicurus could not without indignation ſee the glory of Arceſilaus, who was the moſt renowned Philoſopher of that time, and that he reproached him for having raiſed himſelf a reputation among the ignorant without advancing any thing of his own. Τοῦ δ' Ἀρκεσιλάου τὸν Ἐπίκηρον οὐ μετρίως ἔοικεν ἡ δόξα παραλυπεῖν, ἐν τοῖς τότε χρόνοις μάλιστα τῶν Φιλοσόφων ἀγαπωμένου (46). i. e. "Epi"curus did not ſeem a little diſturbed at the glory of "Arceſilaus, who was the moſt eſteemed of the Phi"loſophers of that time." Though it is certain that Arceſilaus did not take to himſelf the glory of being the inventor, but aſcribed the credit of the *Epoche* and *Acatalepſy* to Socrates, Plato, Parmenides and Heraclitus. Ὁ δ' Ἀρκεσίλαος τοσοῦτον ἀπέδει τοῦ καινοτομίας τινὰ δόξαν ἀγαπᾶν ἢ ὑποποιεῖσθαι τῶν παλαιῶν, ὥστε ἐγκαμεῖν τοῖς τότε σοφιζομένοις ὅτι προσγράφεται Σωκράτει καὶ Πλάτωνι καὶ Παρμενίδῃ καὶ Ἡρακλείτῳ τὰ περὶ τῆς ἐποχῆς δόγματα καὶ τῆς ἀκαταληψίας, οὐδὲν διόμενος, ἀλλὰ οἷον ἀναγωγὴν καὶ βεβαίωσιν αὐτῶν εἰς ἄνδρας ἐνδόξους ποιούμενος (47). i. e. "Arceſilaus was ſo far from affecting any glory "of innovation, and from aſcribing to himſelf the "invention of antiquity, that the Sophiſts of that "time blame him for fathering his opinions, con"cerning withholding the aſſent, and denying the "certainty of knowledge, upon Socrates, Plato, Par"menides, and Heraclitus; not that he was obliged "by any neceſſity to do it, but only to give a credit "and ſanction to them by the authority of ſuch fa"mous men." Take notice that, by the very confeſſion of Diogenes, our Arceſilaus only made the Platonic method more contentious. This was the only alteration he made in it. Πρῶτος τὸν λόγον ἐκίνησε τὸν ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος παραδεδομένον, καὶ ἐποίησε δ' ἐρωτήσεως καὶ ἀποκρίσεως ἐριστικώτερον (48). i. e. "He was the "firſt who ſtarted that way of diſcourſe, which Plato "had delivered to his Scholars, and by queſtion and "anſwer rendered it more contentious." However we may venture to ſay that he was the firſt that diſturbed the publick repoſe of the Philoſophers; for not to mention his reviving a form which was almoſt forgot, he carried on the principles of Socrates with more heat than ever was done before, and proved a more fiery, obſtinate wrangler than the firſt inventers, which gave occaſion to his being ſpoken of in the following manner: *Nonne jam quum Philoſophorum diſciplinæ graviſſimæ conſtitiſſent, tum ut exortus eſt in optima Republica Tiberius Gracchus, qui otium perturbaret, ſic Arceſilas, qui conſtitutam Philoſophiam everteret, & in eorum autoritate deliteſceret, qui negaviſſent quicquam ſciri aut percipi poſſe* (49). i. e. "When the doctrines of "the Philoſophers were maturely ſettled, as Tiberius "Gracchus ſtarted up to diſturb the peace of the beſt "Republick, in the ſame manner came Arceſilaus to "overthrow the eſtabliſhed Philoſophy, and to take "ſhelter under the authority of thoſe, who denied "that any thing could be known or underſtood."

(45) In the note [*B*] of the article CARNEADES, quotation (6). This paſſage is in the 1ſt book of Cicero *de Natura Deorum*, ch. 5.

(46) Plutarch. *adv. Colotem*, pag. 1121. E.

(47) Idem, ibid.

(48) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 28.

People have enquired into the reaſon of this conduct of Arceſilaus, and it has been imputed to a violent emulation which ſubſiſted between him and his ſchool-fellow Zeno, who were both Scholars of Polemon (50) and competitors with each other in fame (51). Zeno ſided with the Dogmatiſts and laid down definitions and axioms, which Arceſilaus vigorouſly encountered, and in order to ſucceed the better was content to overturn the foundation of ſcience, and to reduce every thing to uncertainty. The following paſſage evidences the truth of this, and at the ſame time the little ſucceſs which this enterprize met with (52), tho' ſupported by all the powerful charms of eloquence. *Fuerint illa vetera, ſi vultis, incognita; nihilne eſt ergo actum quod inveſtigatum eſt poſteaquam Arceſilas Zenoni, ut putant, obtrectans, nihil novi reperienti, ſed emendanti ſuperiores immutatione verborum, dum hujus definitiones labefactare vult, conatus eſt clariſſimis rebus tenebras obducere? Cujus primum non admodum probata ratio, quanquam floruit, tum acumine ingenii, tum admirabili*

(49) Cicero, *Academ. Quæſtion.* lib. 4. cap. 5.

(50) Idem, ibid. lib. 1. cap. 9. Numenius, *apud* Euſeb. *Præp. Evangel.* lib. 14. cap. 6. pag. 729, 731.

(51) Numen. *apud eundem.* ibid.

(52) This does not agree with what will be related in the note [*G*].

(40) Diog. Laert. lib. 4 num. 28.

(41) I make uſe of this word without regarding the perſon of Pyrrho.

(42) Cicero *de Oratore*, lib. 3. cap. 18.

(43) Idem, *de Finibus*, lib. 2. cap. 1.

(44) Idem, *Academ. Quæſtion.* lib. 1. cap. *ult.*

would write no books (*c*); but others assure us that he wrote some, and afterwards they question whether he published any; for some affirm it, and others say that he threw what he had composed into the fire (*d*). They observe however that he dedicated some books to

(*c*) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 32.

(*d*) Idem, ibid.

rabili quodam lepore dicendi, proxime a Lacyde solo retenta est (53). i. e. "But granting, if you desire it, "that those old things were not known; does it "therefore follow that there have no improvements "been made by invention, since the time that Ar"cesilaus, thro' spite, as is thought, to Zeno, (who "made no new discoveries, but only improved upon "his predecessors by altering of the words) that "he might overthrow his definitions, attempted to "obscure and perplex truths, which were as clear as "light itself? Whose method was not at first much "approved of, tho' set off with all the advantage of "wit and eloquence, and afterwards it was only follow"ed by Lacydes." Others say, that the fear of being overpowered by the objections of some people, who took a pleasure in tormenting the Philosophers, constrained Arcesilaus to affirm nothing. He entrenched himself behind the Epoche as behind a rampart. This was to him a shelter by which he hoped to skreen himself from the pursuit of the Sophist Bion and of the followers of Theodorus, who were perpetually cavilling at the Philosophers. Numenius makes light of this conjecture, which he observes was first started by Diocles the Cnidian, and I think not without reason; for tho' in deciding neither on the one side nor the other, we may guard against a thousand insnaring difficulties, yet we are sure to bring upon ourselves a great many others; and if on one hand we have less to fear from grave and serious objections, retortions and arguments *ad hominem*, which is the ordinary and almost inevitable rock that the Dogmatists split upon, yet on the other hand we lay ourselves much more open to the raillery and insults of banterers: and it is certain that Bion, the greatest sneerer of his age, was less terrible when he reasoned than when he bantered. Generally speaking it is a very troublesome post when one is easily turned into ridicule. Nay Arcesilaus himself made use of raillery against those who rejected the evidence of the senses (54). However let us see the words of Numenius: Οὐ γὰρ πείθομαι τοῦ Κνιδίου Διοκλέους φάσκοντος ἐν ταῖς ἐπιγραφομέναις Διατριβαῖς, Ἀρκεσίλαον φόβῳ τῶν Θεοδωρείων τε καὶ Βίωνος τοῦ Σοφιστοῦ, ἐπεισιόντων τοῖς φιλοσοφοῦσι καὶ οὐδὲν ὀκνούντων ἀπὸ παντὸς ἐλέγχειν, αὐτὸν ἐξυλαβηθέντα, ἵνα μὴ πράγματα ἔχῃ, μηδέν γε δόγμα ὑπειπεῖν φαινόμενον. ὥσπερ γὰρ τὸ μέλαν τὰς σηπίας, προβάλλεσθαι πρὸ ἑαυτοῦ τὴν ἐποχήν. Τοῦτ' οὖν ἐγὼ οὐ πείθομαι (55). i. e. "Nor can I agree with Diocles the Cnidian, "who in his writings entitled *Diatribæ*, says that Ar"cesilaus thro' fear of the Disciples of Theodorus, "and Bion the Sophist, (who were continually at"tacking the Philosophers, and spared no pains to "catch them in an error) in order to disarm their "malice, took care to affirm nothing, that, as the "cuttle-fish makes his escape by shedding its ink, so "he might secure himself by advancing his Epoche." Let it be noted that one of the interlocutors in Cicero has maintained, that Arcesilaus did not give in to the Epoche out of pure contradiction to Zeno, but only from a desire of coming at the truth. *Arcesilam verò non obtrectandi causâ cum Zenone pugnavisse, sed verum invenire voluisse sic intelligitur* (56). He pretends, that Arcesilaus was the first who discovered and stuck by this proposition; *It is possible for a man neither to affirm nor deny in matters which are doubtful, and this a wise man ought to do. Nemo superiorum non modò expresserat, sed ne dixerat quidem posse hominem nihil opinari, nec solum posse, sed ita necesse esse sapienti, visa est Arcesilæ cum vera sententia, tum honesta & digna sapiente* (57). He tells us that this Philosopher put this question to Zeno, *What will be the case if the wise man should not be able to know any thing clearly, and if he must admit of any thing for true which is not clear and evident?* and that Zeno answered, *He will clearly comprehend some things, and therefore will admit of nothing which is obscure.* He should afterwards have laid down a rule whereby to judge what things are clearly comprehended. That which Zeno gave was opposed by Arcesilaus, who urged to him, that falsehood may appear under the shape of truth, and that therefore one would be at a loss to distinguish the one from the other. Zeno granted that nothing could be comprehended, if that which does not exist can appear under the same form with that which does exist; but he denied that there could be that conformity of ideas betwixt that which is and that which is not. Arcesilaus on the other hand insisted upon this conformity. *Incubuit in eas disputationes ut doceret nullum tale esse visum à vero, ut non ejusmodi etiam à falso possit* (58). i. e. "He laboured "earnestly in disputation to shew that there was no "appearance of truth which could not also be put "on by falsehood." This is the hinge upon which their dispute turns; and it is probable, as has been already observed from Cicero, that the obscurity of things, and not obstinacy or a desire of victory, engaged Arcesilaus in a dispute with Zeno (59).

I have already said, and that not without good grounds, that he carried the hypothesis of uncertainty farther than Socrates; for he would not allow what Socrates did, even that he knew that he knew nothing. He suspended his assent to every thing, and only disputed to convince himself, that the reasons for affirming were no stronger than the reasons for denying. *Arcesilas negabat esse quicquam quod sciri posset, ne illud quidem ipsum quod Socrates sibi reliquisset. Sic omnia latere censebant in occulto, neque esse quicquam quod cerni aut intelligi possit. Quibus de causis nihil oportere, neque profiteri neque affirmare quenquam, neque assertione approbare, cohibereque semper, & ab omni lapsu continere temeritatem, quæ tum esset insignis, quum aut falsa aut incognita res approbaretur, neque hoc quicquam esset turpius, quam cognitioni & perceptioni, assertionem approbationemque præcurrere. Huc (rationi quod erat consentaneum) faciebat, ut contra omnium sententias dies jam plerosque deduceret, ut quum in eadem re paria contrariis in partibus momenta rationum invenirentur, facilius ab utraque parte assertio sustineretur* (60). i. e. "Arcesilaus denied that any thing could be known, "and even that very proposition which Socrates ad"mitted; so dark and occult did they think every "thing, that they imagined nothing could be under"stood; for which reasons no one ought to allow or "affirm any thing, but to keep back his assent, and "to guard against all errors proceeding from rashness, "which is in nothing more conspicuous than in giv"ing our assent to a thing which is either false or "not understood, for there is nothing more unseem"ly than to assert or approve any thing before we "have a knowledge and perception of it. To this "end Arcesilaus (as was agreeable to reason) conti"nued disputing many days against all opinions, that "upon its appearing that the arguments on contrary "sides of the same questions were of equal force, he "might more easily evince the reasonableness of with"holding our assent from either." It was this Arcesilaus who taught the *acatalepsis* or incomprehensibility of things in a stricter sense than had ever been done before; which he carried to such an extreme, that Carneades who was better able to have maintained this doctrine than he, thought himself obliged to soften and qualify it (61), tho' it is certain that Arcesilaus only explained with some inlargements what had been said before by the greatest masters. *Cum Zenone . . . . . Arcesilas sibi omne certamen instituit . . . . . earum rerum obscuritate, quæ ad confessionem ignorationis adduxerant Socratem, & veluti amantes Socratem, Democritum, Anaxagoram, Empedoclem, omnes penè veteres, qui nihil cognosci, nihil percipi, nihil sciri posse dixerunt, angustos sensus, imbecillos animos, brevia curricula vitæ, & (ut Democritus) in profundo veritatem esse demersam, opinionibus & institutis omnia teneri, nihil teneri, nihil veritati relinqui, deinceps omnia tenebris circumfusa esse dixerunt* (62). i. e. "Arcesilaus grounded his dispute with Zeno on "the obscurity of those things which had brought "Socrates and the admirers of Socrates, as Democritus, "Anaxagoras, Empedocles, and almost all the anci"ents, to a confession of their ignorance, who said "that nothing could be known, perceived, or under"stood; that the senses were very imperfect, the un"derstanding weak, life but a span, and (as Demo"critus

(53) Cicero *Academic. Quæstion.* lib. 4. cap. 6.

(54) Diog. Laertius, lib. 4. num. 34.

(55) Numenius, *apud* Eusebium. *Præparat. Evangel.* lib. 14. cap. 6. pag. 731. C.

(56) Cicero, *Academic. Quæstion.* lib. 4. cap. 24.

(57) Idem, ibid.

(58) Idem, ibid.

(59) See hereunder the quotation (62).

(60) Cicero, *Academ. Quæstion.* lib. 1. cap. 12.

(61) See the article CARNEADES.

(62) Cicero, *Acad. Quæstion.* lib. 1. cap. 12.

(e) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 38.

to Eumenes Prince of Pergamus, and that he dedicated only to this Prince (e). We ſhall ſee how he has been combated by a Father of the Church [F]. As he had an eloquence that was very

" critus uſed to ſay) that truth was buried in a well ; " that every thing was known only by opinion and " hear-ſay, and not truly ; in ſhort that all things " were involved in obſcurity." It was by the authority of theſe great names that he attacked the Dogmatiſts (63), and indeed he might have confirmed it with a great many more, as may be ſeen in the ſecond book of *Academy Queſtions* (64). However Numenius, who handles him very ſeverely, expreſſes his greateſt indignation at his ſhifting and changing ſides, which he accuſes him of (65). His deſcription of this Philoſopher's inconſtancy affords us ſome marks of his reſentment. *He was a man*, ſays he, *who denied and affirmed the ſame things : he went off indifferently to the right or to the left, and even gloried in being ignorant of the difference betwixt good and evil. He gave into the firſt whims that his capricious fancy ſuggeſted to him, and then all on a ſudden would refute them with more arguments than he had eſtabliſhed them. He was a Hydra which preyed upon and tore itſelf in pieces.* The words of the original are ſtill more full and expreſſive. Ἐλεγε, καὶ ἀνήλιγε, καὶ μετεκυλινδεῖτο κ' ἀκινδύνως, κ' αὐτεῖθεν, ἐκατέρωθεν, ὁπόθεν τύχοι, παλιμπάγρητος, καὶ δύσκριτος, καὶ παλίμβολός τι ἄμμα, καὶ παμμαχικινδωνευμένος, ὁδόν τε εἰδὼς, ὡς αὐτὸς ἔφη, γενναῖος ὤν. . . . (66). Κατέχεσθαι τῷ ὀνείδει, καὶ ἠμφέσβητο θαυμαστῶς, ὅτι μήτε τὶ αἰσχρὸν ἢ καλὸν, μήτε ἀγαθὸν, μήτε αὖ κακόν ἐστι τὶ, ἤδει· ἀλλ' ὁπότερον εἰς τὰς ψυχὰς πίπτοι, τοῦτο εἰπὼν, αὖθις μεταβαλὼν, ἀντέτρεπεν ἂν πλειοναχῶς, ἢ δι' ὅσων κατεσκεύακεν. Ἦν οὖν ὕδρα τίμιων ἑαυτὸν, καὶ τεμνόμενος ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ, ἀμφότερα ἀλλήλων δυσκρίτως, καὶ τοῦ θείους ἀσυκόφαντος (67). Nay he thought he ſaw the finger of God in the ignorance of man, and was a great admirer of that verſe in Heſiod, where it is ſaid, that the Gods keep the human mind behind a curtain. Ἐπήνει γοῦν Ἡσιόδου τετὶ τὸ ἀπόφθεγμα,

(63) Idem, ibid. lib. 2. cap. 5. See above the quotation (49).
(64) Cap. 24.
(65) Numenius, *apud* Euſebium, *Præpar. Evang.* lib. 14. cap. 5. pag. 731.
(66) Idem, ibid. cap. 5. p. 730. A.
(67) Idem, ibid. cap. 6. p. 730. C.

Κρύψαντες γὰρ ἔχουσι θεοὶ νόον ἀνθρώποισι (68).

" The Gods in darkneſs keep the minds of men."

(68) Euſeb. ibid. cap. 4. pag. 726, D.

[F] *See how he has been attacked by a Father of the Church.*] I mean Lactantius, who undertakes to overthrow all Philoſophy by laying down with Socrates, that we know nothing, and with Zeno, that we are to believe nothing but what we know. His words are theſe : *Si neque ſciri* (69) *quicquam poteſt, ut Socrates docuit, nec opinari oportet, ut Zeno, tota Philoſophia ſublata eſt.* He founds this attempt on the great number of ſects, into which Philoſophy was divided. Each would confine truth and wiſdom to itſelf and charge all the reſt with error and folly. Therefore what particular ſect ſoever one ſhould condemn, one would have the Philoſophers of every other ſect on one's ſide ; and conſequently in condemning them all, one would have the ſuffrage of the majority, for each in particular would ſide with you againſt the others, and only oppoſe you in one vote for themſelves, which conſequently can have but little credit, as it is in favour of their own cauſe. See how Lactantius overthrows all the ſect of the ancient Philoſophy by the oppoſition they themſelves made againſt one another : *Pereunt igitur univerſi hoc modo, & tanquam Spartiatæ illi Poetarum* (70) *ſic ſe invicem jugulant, ut nemo ex omnibus reſtet. Quod eo fit, quia gladium habent, ſcutum non habent. Si ergo ſingulæ ſectæ multarum ſectarum judicio ſtultitiæ convincuntur, omnes igitur vanæ atque inanes reperiuntur. Ita ſeipſam Philoſophia conſumit & conficit* (71). i. e. " Thus are " they all deſtroyed, and like the Cadmeides of the " Poets cut one another's throats till they don't leave " one alive. The reaſon is this, they arm themſelves " with a ſword but not with a ſhield, and fight an of- " fenſive not a defenſive war. If therefore each par- " ticular ſect is proved guilty of abſurdity by the " judgment of many ſects, they will all equally be " found vain and fooliſh. Thus Philoſophy ſtabs it- " ſelf by its own weapons." " Arceſilaus, adds he, " who inſtituted an Academy, ſeeing this, armed " himſelf with their mutual accuſations, and the " confeſſion which the moſt famous Philoſophers had " made of their ignorance, and fought againſt them " all ; and ſo ſet up a new kind of Philoſophy, which " conſiſted in not philoſophizing at all." *Quod cum intelligeret Arceſilas, Academiæ conditor, reprehenſiones omnium inter ſe collegit, confeſſionemque ignorantiæ clarorum Philoſophorum, armavitque ſe adverſus omnes. Ita conſtituit novam non philoſophandi philoſophiam* (72). There ſubſiſted therefore from that time two parties ; the one ſtood up in defence of Science, the other to oppoſe it ; if the nature of things is not to be known, the former falls to the ground, if it is, the latter is ruined ; and if they both keep their ground, Philoſophy muſt inevitably periſh ſince it will be divided. " But if, as I have ſhewn, " through the weakneſs and infirmity of our na- " ture there is no ſcience in man properly ſo called, " Arceſilaus has won the day. But neither will he " ſtill be able to keep his ground long, becauſe it is " impoſſible but that ſomething muſt be known ; we " muſt of neceſſity periſh if we did not know what " is uſeful or deſtructive to life." *Si autem, ut docui, nulla poteſt eſſe in homine interna & propria ſcientia, ob fragilitatem conditionis humanæ, Arceſilæ manus vicit : ſed ne ipſa quidem ſtabit, quia non poteſt omnino nihil ſciri : ſunt enim multa, quæ natura ipſa nos ſcire, & uſus frequens, & vitæ neceſſitas cogit. Itaque pereundum eſt niſi ſcias quæ ad vitam ſunt utilia, ut appetas, quæ periculoſa, ut fugias & vites* (73). Afterwards Lactantius gives us a catalogue of ſeveral things, which are evidently known to men, and ridicules Arceſilaus, who expoſes his own ignorance at the ſame time that he reproaches others with it, and lays himſelf open to this anſwer, *If you prove, that we know nothing, and conſequently are not Philoſophers, it alſo follows that you are not one, ſeeing by your own confeſſion you yourſelf know nothing. They cut their own throats with the ſame weapons, which they employ to kill others. Quid ergo promovit Arceſilas, niſi quod confectis omnibus Philoſophis ſeipſum quoque eodem mucrone transfixit* (74) ? However, Lactantius does not blame him entirely, for he gives him the praiſe of having ſeen into the folly and arrogance of thoſe men, who thought to eſtabliſh ſcience upon mere conjectures. *Rectè vidit Arceſilas arrogantes vel potius ſtultos eſſe qui putent ſcientiam veritatis conjecturâ poſſe comprehendi* (75) ; but he is very moderate in his commendations of him, and goes on immediately to reproach him with that contradiction which the Pyrrhonians are ſo much charg'd with, " that by knowing that you know nothing, you know " one thing." *Arceſilas . . . . introduxit genus Philoſophiæ ἀσύστατον, quod Latinè inſtabile ſive inconſtans poſſumus dicere. Ut enim nihil ſciri poſſe ſciendum ſit, aliquid ſciri neceſſe eſt, nam ſi omnino nihil ſcias, id ipſum nihil ſciri poſſe tolletur. Itaque, qui velut ſententiæ loco pronunciat nihil ſciri, tanquam præceptam profitetur, & cognitum, ergo aliquid ſciri poteſt. Huic ſimile eſt illud quod in ſcholis proponi ſolet in aſyſtati generis exemplum, ſomniaſſe quendam ne ſomniis crederet : ſi enim crediderit, tum ſequitur, ut credendum non ſit ; ſi autem non crediderit, tum ſequitur, ut credendum ſit : ita ſi nihil ſciri poteſt, neceſſe eſt id ipſum ſciri, quod nihil ſciatur. Si autem ſcitur poſſe nihil ſciri, falſum eſt ergo quod dicitur, nihil ſciri poſſe. Sic inducitur dogma ſibi ipſi repugnans, ſeque diſſolvens* (76). i. e. " Ar- " ceſilaus introduced a contradictory kind of Philoſo- " phy : for in order to know that nothing can be " known, ſomething muſt neceſſarily be known, for " if we know nothing at all, the very maxim, that " nothing can be known, will be taken away. He " therefore that poſitively affirms that nothing is " known, profeſſes it as a maxim and known thing, " therefore ſomething can be known. Not unlike " to this is that example of the inconſiſtent kind, " which is often propoſed in the ſchools, that a cer- " tain perſon dreamed that he ought not to believe " dreams : for if he believes what he dreamed, then " it follows that his dream is not to be believed, " and if he does not believe it, then it follows that " it is not to be believed. So in like manner, if " nothing can be known, it neceſſarily follows, that " this very thing is known, that nothing is known ; " and if this is known, that nothing can be known, " then this propoſition, that nothing is to be known, " is falſe. So then a maxim is laid down, which " contradicts and deſtroys itſelf." Lactantius at laſt confeſſes

(69) Lactant. *Divin. Inſtitut.* lib. 3. cap. 4. pag. 153.
(70) The note of Thyſius upon this word is ridiculous. *Qui ſe invicem conficiunt*, ſays he, *ſicut Cleomedes & Socii apud Spartanos, teſte Plutarcho.* Does not he ſee that Lactantius ſpeaks not of the hiſtorical but of the mythological age, and of thoſe men that grew out of the teeth of a Serpent, ſown by Cadmus ?
(71) Lactant. *Divin. Inſtit.* lib. 3. cap. 4. p. 154.
(72) Idem, ibid.
(73) Lactant. *Divin. Inſtit.* lib. 3. cap. 4. p. 155.
(74) Idem, ibid. cap. 5. pag. 156.
(75) Idem, ibid. cap. 6. p. 157.
(76) Idem, ibid.

very perſuaſive, and returned always to his principal ſubject, and beſides anſwered objections ſubtilly and happily, he drew to his Auditory a great number of diſciples [G], although he was ſharp in his cenſures. At the bottom they were perſuaded of his goodneſs, and he filled his ſcholars with hopes, which kept them from being very angry with his reprimands, which were a little too ſevere (*f*). There are ſome who affirm, that he acted the Sceptic only to try his ſcholars, and after the proof he taught in another manner [H]. He was one of the moſt free men with his money in the world, and they relate many ſingular things of his liberality [I]. He was accuſed of being vain, and of labouring with too much earneſtneſs to pleaſe the people (*g*). The other Philoſophers delighted

(*f*) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 37.

(*g*) Idem, lib. 4. num. 41.

conſeſſes that with reſpect to Natural Philoſophy there is no ſuch thing as certain knowledge, and that we are not to ſearch after it there. *Quanto faceret ſapientiùs ac verius, ſi, exceptione facta, diceret cauſas, rationeſque duntaxat rerum cæleſtium, ſeu naturalium, quia ſunt abditæ, neſciri poſſe, quia nullus doceat, nec quæri oportère, quia inveniri quærendo non poſſunt* (77).

(77) Idem, ibid. pag. 158.

i. e. "How much more conſiſtent had he been both "with Philoſophy and truth, if he had only aſſerted "that the cauſes and effects of the heavenly and "other natural bodies were hid from our knowledge, "ſeeing there is none to inſtruct us in them, "and ſince they ought not to be enquired into, "being unſearchable."

Let us make ſome ſmall remarks on this diſpute. I. The argument which he makes uſe of to overthrow all the ſects of Philoſophy by oppoſing them to one another, proves too much. Were an Atheiſt to make uſe of the ſame at this day, to overturn all Chriſtianity, he would reaſon very ill: the different ſects of Chriſtians condemn one another, I confeſs, but were you to condemn any one in every point of its doctrine, you would not gain the approbation of all the reſt. II. Lactantius contradicts himſelf in a moſt ſhameful manner. He allows if there is no ſuch thing as knowledge amongſt men, that Arceſilaus gains the victory; and at the ſame time he pretends that he has proved that thro' the weakneſs of our nature we are not capable of attaining to knowledge. Why then does he preſently after add, that Arceſilaus cannot maintain his ground, ſeeing there are ſeveral things which men attain to the knowledge of? III. The examples which he brings prove nothing, for in the ſenſe, in which the word ſcience is taken in this diſpute to diſtinguiſh betwixt wholſome and hurtful food, is not a ſcience; this kind of knowledge having never been queſtioned by the Acataleptics. IV. The ſelf contradiction which he reproaches him with carries with it more of a ſpecious appearance than ſolidity and truth, and favours more of ſophiſtry than reaſon, which common ſenſe will eaſily make appear. If I dream that I am not to believe dreams, I am caught in a very odd dilemma; for if I do not believe my dream I ſhall believe it, and if I do believe my dream, I ſhall not believe it. Who does not ſee that in this caſe we are to except from all other dreams that particular one, which cautions us againſt the belief of dreams? See in Sextus Empiricus the anſwer which the Scepticks make to this objection. V. The confeſſion of Lactantius with regard to Natural Philoſophy was very improper, and might give an advantage to his adverſary over him in the diſpute.

[G] *He drew after him a great number of hearers.*] To encounter with all ſciences, and to reject both the teſtimony of the ſenſes and of reaſon too, is the very boldeſt enterprize that can be taken in hand in all the republic of letters. It is like that of the Alexanders and other Conquerors, who undertook to ſubdue all nations. It requires a great deal of wit, of eloquence, of reading and meditation. *Si ſingulas diſciplinas percipere magnum eſt, quanto majus omnes? quod facere iis neceſſe eſt quibus propoſitum eſt veri reperiendi cauſa, & contra omnes Philoſophos pro omnibus dicere* (78). "If to underſtand any one diſtinct branch "of learning is very difficult, how much more is it to "underſtand all? which they needs muſt do who make "it their buſineſs to find out truth, and to diſpute "on every ſubject againſt all the Philoſophers." Arceſilaus was as well qualified for ſuch an enterprize as any man could be, both nature and art having jointly concurred to arm him thoroughly for the combat. He had naturally a happy, ready and lively genius (79); his perſon was very agreeable, and he ſpoke with a good grace. The charms of his face heightened thoſe of his voice, and he had learned from the beſt maſters every thing that could contribute to improve his natural endowments, or increaſe their power by uniting to them ſeveral additional qualifications. You will find this particular deſcription of him in Numenius, though at the ſame time ſet in an ill-natured light, for Numenius did not love Arceſilaus, tho' he could not forbear ſpeaking of him in the following words: Πλὴν τοῖς ἀκούουσιν ἤρκεσεν, ὁμοῦ τῇ ἀκροάσει ἱστρόσωπον ὄντα διαμένοις· ἦν δὲ οὐκ ἀκούοντας καὶ βλέποντας ἥδιστος, ἐπεὶ τοι καὶ προσεπιθῶσαν ἀποδέχεσθαι αὐτὸν τῆς λόγου ἕνεκα καὶ καλῆς προσόψεως τε & τόνου, ὡς ἄνευ τῆς ἐν τοῖς ὄμμασι φιλοφροσύνης (80). i. e. "However, he delighted his hearers, who were greatly "taken with the comelineſs of his aſpect; for whe-"ther heard or ſeen he charmed, and therefore en-"gaged their attention the more agreeably to his "words, which were ſet off with the great advan-"tages of a good pronunciation, a comely counte-"nance, and a native ſweetneſs of the eyes." He alſo ſays that Arceſilaus amazed the Stoicks by his different ways of confuting his antagoniſts. It will not be amiſs to give you the whole paſſage, as it acquaints us with the addreſs of our Philoſopher, and the great credit he acquired. Οἱ Στωικοὶ δὲ ὑπῆκουον ἐκπεπληγμένοι. ἠ μοῦσα γὰρ αὐτοῖς ἠδὴ τότε ἦν φιλολόγος, οὐδ' ἐργάτις χαρίτων, ὑφ' ὧν ὁ Ἀρκεσίλαος, τὰ μὲν περιεῖρεν, τὰ δὲ ὑπετίμων, ἀλλὰ δ' ὑπεσκελίζετο, κατεγελᾶτό τε αὐτὸς, & πιθανὸς ἦν. Τοιγαροῦν πρὸς οὓς μὲν ἀντέλεγεν, ἐτέρπετο, ἐν οἷς δὲ λέγων ἦν, κατεπεπληγμένον διετέλουν πᾶς τοῖς τότε ἀνθρώποις ὑπῆρχε, μηδὲν ἴδιον μήτ' οὖν ἦθος, μήτε πάθος, μήτε ἔργον ἐν βραχὺ, μηδὲ ἄλογον τοιοῦτον ὀφθῆναι ποτ' ἂν, ἢ τι μὴ Ἀρκεσιλάῳ δοκεῖ τῷ Πιτανάτῃ (81). i. e. "The Stoicks heard him with aſtoniſhment, for "their learning was as yet in its infancy, and not "improved in thoſe graces of eloquence and per-"ſuaſion, with which Arceſilaus ſilenced his adver-"ſaries, ſometimes ridiculing, ſometimes taking to "pieces, and ſometimes overturning their arguments. "Thus bearing down all that oppoſed him, and ex-"citing the wonder of all that heard him, the men "of that time took it for granted, that there was no "word, no paſſion, no little work, nor any thing "that could ſeem frivolous, unleſs it appeared ſuch "to Arceſilaus of Pitane." The foregoing remarks have furniſhed us with good authorities for atteſting the merit of Arceſilaus, to which I will add one more. A certain perſon ſays in Tully, that no one would ever have come into this Philoſopher's way of thinking, ſo manifeſtly abſurd and falſe, if the inconſiſtency of his opinions had not vaniſhed before the flowing eloquence of the teacher. *Quis iſta tam apertè perſpicuèque & perverſa & falſa ſecutus eſſet, niſi tanta in Arceſila... & copia rerum & dicendi vis fuiſſet* (82).

(80) Numenius, *apud* Euſebium, *Præparat. Evangel.* lib. 14. cap. 6. p. 730, D.

(81) Ibid. pag. 733, C.

(82) Cicero, *Academ. Quæſtion.* lib. 4. cap. 18, *fin.*

[H] *Some ſay he only put on the Sceptick to try his ſcholars.*] Sextus Empiricus, after having told us that Arceſilaus does not ſeem to differ at all from the Pyrrhonians, adds, that if we are to believe certain reports, he was only a follower of Pyrrho in appearance, and that at the bottom he approved of the method of the Dogmatiſts. The doubts which he propoſed to his ſcholars, in order to diſcover if they had a ſufficient ſtrength of genius to comprehend the opinions of Plato, occaſioned his being looked upon as a Philoſopher who affirmed nothing; tho' he did not ſcruple to preach up ſtrongly the Platonic Philoſophy to thoſe, in whom he found a diſcerning judgment (83). It is a hard matter to decide whether or no this account is to be depended upon. See the diſſertations of Mr. Foucher upon the Academic Philoſophy (84), and the note of Thomas Aldobrandinus referred to in the margin (85).

(83) Sextus Empiricus, *Pyrrhon. Hypotypoſ.* lib. 1. cap. 33.

(84) Foucher, liv. 1, pag. 32; and liv. 3. pag. 154, *& ſuiv.*

(85) Th. Aldobrand. *in Diogen. Laertium*, lib. 4. num. 28.

[I] *There are ſome very remarkable ſtories told of his liberality.*] "He was very ready to confer a be-"nefit,

(78) Cicero, *de Nat. Deorum*, lib. 1. cap. 5.

(79) Τὸν Θεόφραστον κινζόμενον φασὶν εἰπεῖν ὡς ἐυφυὴς καὶ εὐπαρακολούθητος ἀπαλλαγὴς τῆς διατριβῆς ἐκ γεγένηται. i. e. "They ſay that "Theophraſtus "bore his depar-"ture very ill "and ſaid, how "ingenious and "ready a youth "is gone out of "the ſchool?" *Diog. Laert.* lib. 4. num. 30. *See alſo* num. 37.

lighted in carping at him (*b*); but did they equal him in modeſty, and in exemption from jealouſy? Did they exhort their Diſciples to hear the other Profeſſors? This is what he did (*i*). He even carried one of his pupils, who gave him to underſtand that the ſchool of a Peripatetic would be more agreeable to him; he carried him, I ſay, to this Profeſſor, and recommended him to him (*k*). Another time, he baniſhed from his ſchool one of his diſciples, who had offended Cleanthes in a verſe of a Comedy, and did not receive him into favour, till the perſon offended had received ſatisfaction (*l*). The merit of this proceeding will be better known, when it is underſtood that Cleanthes was the ſucceſſor of Zeno, who had been the great adverſary of Arceſilaus. He had not the fault of the Plagiaries: he declared that he taught nothing but what he had found in books (*m*). He only uſed them in all probability to give more authority to his ſentiments, and to appeaſe the hatred that the name of Innovator drew on him. He did not love to meddle with political affairs (*n*): nevertheleſs when they choſe him to go and negotiate ſome affair at Demetria, in favour of his country, with King Antigonus, he accepted the deputation, but returned without ſucceſs; and it was perhaps, becauſe he would never pay his court to this Prince, nor go to him, nor write any conſolatory letter to him, after the loſs of a ſea-fight (*o*), as many others did (*p*). He had a great ſhare in the friendſhip of the Governor of the Piræum (*q*), and he received many fine preſents from Eumenes, Prince of Pergamus (*r*). He had a very good thought upon death; for he ſaid that of all the evils this is the only one whoſe preſence never incommoded any body, and which only gives concern in its abſence (*s*). His doctrines tend to the deſtruction of all the precepts of morality; and yet it is remarked, that he practiſed it. The teſtimony which was given him upon that account by Cleanthes the Stoic, and his Anſwer, with the Reply to it, are very curious particulars [*K*]. He was never married (*t*), tho' he was of an amorous conſtitution, and too ready to follow the inclinations of nature, even to a ſcandalous exceſs [*L*]. He flouriſhed about the 120th Olympiad (*u*), and died of drinking too plentifully, and in a delirium, when he was 75 years old (*x*), in the fourth year of the 134th Olympiad (*y*). He boaſted of having ſhewn a prodigious ſtrength of reſolution in the midſt of the pains of the gout [*M*]. Diogenes Laertius does not repreſent Bion as his ſucceſſor, as Father Rapin imagined without any foundation [*N*]. I have but one error to reproach Moreri with; and that is, for telling

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

(*i*) Idem, ibid. num. 42.

(*k*) Idem, ibid.

(*l*) Plut. *de Diſcrim. Adulat. & Amici*, p. 55, C.

(*m*) See the paſſage of Plutarch above, quotation (47).

(*n*) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 40.

(*o*) Idem, ibid. num. 39.

(*p*) Idem, ibid.

(*q*) Idem, ibid.

(*r*) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 38.

(*s*) Plutarch. *de Conſolat. ad Apollonium*, p. 110. A.

(*t*) Diogen. Laert. lib. 4. num. 43.

(*u*) Apollodor. *apud* Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 45.

(*x*) Idem, ibid. num. 44.

(*y*) Diog. Laertius, num. 61, tells us, that *Lacydes, the ſucceſſor of Arceſilaus began that year to read Lectures to his diſciples.*

" nefit, and at the ſame time ſtudious to conceal " the obligation." Εὐεργετῆσαι προχειρος ἦν, καὶ λαθεῖν τὴν χάριν ἀτυφότατος (86). This was practiſing Chriſtianity before the promulgation of it. Paying a viſit to Cteſibius, who was ſick and wanted neceſſaries, he put privately under his pillow a purſe of gold (87). Seneca tells us the following ſtory of him. " Arceſilaus went " one day to ſee a friend, who was both ſick and " in diſtreſs, but withal ſo modeſt as to conceal his " wants tho' for the neceſſaries of life. Wherefore " that he might relieve his neceſſities, without of- " fending his modeſty, he privately ſlipt a purſe of " money under his pillow, that he might ſeem ra- " ther to find than receive the ſum he wanted." *Arceſilaus, ut aiunt, amico pauperi, & paupertatem ſuam diſſimulanti, ægro autem, & ne hoc quidem confitenti, deeſſe ſibi in ſumptum ad neceſſarios uſus, cum clam ſuccurrendum judicaſſet, pulvino ejus ignorantis ſacculum ſubjecit, ut homo inutiliter verecundus, quod deſiderabat, inveniret potius quam acciperet* (88). Plutarch relates the ſame fact more at large; but he ſuppoſes that the ſick perſon was not Cteſibius, but calls him Apelles of Chios (89). It is further reported, that Arceſilaus having lent ſome plate to a friend, who was going to make a feaſt, did not demand it again, looking upon it as a gift, not as a loan; and ſome ſay, that out of regard to his friend's neceſſities he refuſed it when it was brought him again (90).

(86) Diog. Laertius, lib. 4. num. 37.

(87) Idem, ibid.

(88) Seneca, *de Benef.* lib. 2. cap. 10. p. 25.

(89) Plut. *de Diſcrim. Amici & Adulator.* p. 63.

(90) Diog. Laertius, lib. 4. num. 38.

[*K*] *What Cleanthes reports in regard to the contrariety between his tenets and practice, is very curious.*] To declare that there is nothing certain, and that every thing is incomprehenſible, is to deny that there is any ſuch thing certain as vice and virtue: now ſuch an aſſertion ſeems calculated to inſtill an indifference to honeſty and all the duties of life: for which reaſon the enemies of Arceſilaus took occaſion to reproach him with the neglect of all moral duties, pretending that he lived according to his principles. But Cleanthes, although of a Sect very oppoſite to this Philoſopher, took his part. " Hold your peace, " ſays he, *to one that was cenſuring him*, for if he " deſtroys morality in his words, yet he confirms it " in his actions. Παῦσαι, ἔφη, καὶ μὴ ψέγε, εἰ γὰρ καὶ λόγῳ τὸ καθῆκον ἀναιρεῖ, τοῖς γοῦν ἔργοις αὐτὸ τιθεῖ (91). Arceſilaus made anſwer to him that he did not love to be flattered. *Is it flattering you*, replied Cleanthes, *to affirm you ſay one thing and do another* (92)? There is a great deal of ſmartneſs in this repartee; for it ſeems to have carried in it an alluſion to thoſe verſes in Homer which import, that thoſe impoſtors and hypocrites who ſay one thing and mean the contrary ought to be deteſted as diabolical (93). For all this, Cleanthes at the bottom commended the good life which Arceſilaus led. We are to take notice by the way that the doctrine of the moſt rigid Pyrrhonians, was in its theory favourable to the cauſe of virtue; for they did not ſcruple to teach that let the reality of things be as it would, yet in our practice we ought to conform to appearances. However this be, the true principle of morality has ſo little to do with ſpeculative notions on the nature of things, that nothing is more common than for orthodox Chriſtians to live ill, and for libertines in principle to be virtuous in practice.

(91) Diog. Laertius, *in Cleanthe*, lib. 7. num. 171.

(92) Idem, ibid.

(93) Homerus, *Iliad.* lib. 9. ver. 312.

[*L*] *He indulged his natural inclinations .... even to a ſcandalous exceſs.*] The good qualities which I have mentioned of his in the text of this article and in the foregoing remark were ſully'd by the moſt criminal violation of chaſtity; ſo true is it that vice and virtue may meet together in the ſame perſon. " He uſed to viſit in a publick manner Theodota " and Phileta, two lewd women of Elis." Καὶ Θεοδότῃ τε καὶ Φιλαίτῃ Ἠλιαίαις ἑταίραις συνῆν φανερῶς (94). But what was ſtill worſe, he gave himſelf up to unnatural uncleanneſs. Φιλομειρακιός τε ἦν καὶ καταφιλής. ὅθεν οἱ περὶ Ἀρίστωνα τὸν Χῖον Στωϊκοὶ ἐπικαλοῦσιν αὐτὸν φθορέα τῶν νέων, καὶ κιναιδολόγον καὶ θρασὺν ἀποκαλοῦντες (95). i. e. " He was given to the love of young boys, and " of an amorous diſpoſition; for which reaſon the " Stoic Ariſto of Chios uſed to call him a corrupter " of youth, and an impure and impudent fellow."

(94) Diog. Laertius, lib. 4. num. 40.

(95) Idem, ibid.

[*M*] *He gloried in ſhewing an invincible courage while afflicted with the gout.*] " Carneades who was " an intimate friend of Epicurus, came once to ſee him " when he was labouring under a violent fit of the " gout; upon which he was going out of the room " full of concern: Stay, (ſays he,) friend Carneades, " this ſuffers nothing from thoſe; pointing at the ſame "time to his breaſt and his feet." *Is quum arderet podagræ doloribus, viſitaſſetque hominem Carneades Epicuri perfamiliaris, & triſtis exiret, mane quæſo, (inquit,) Carneade noſter, nihil illinc huc pervenit, oſtendens pedes & pectus* (96). This was ſpeaking in the language of a Stoic, tho' Arceſilaus was the antagoniſt of the founder of that Sect.

(96) Cicero, *de Finibus*, lib. 5. cap. 31. *in fine.*

[*N*] *Diogenes Laertius does not repreſent Bion as his ſucceſſor, as Father Rapin imagines without reaſon.*] See his

telling us, that Arceſilaus ſtudied under Xanthus and Theophraſtus, before he came to Athens. I have remarked a very groſs miſtake in Sidonius Apollinaris [O].

his own words: "Cicero, who very well knew who "were the ſucceſſors of Plato, makes no mention of "this Bion, whom Diogenes Laertius repreſents as the "ſucceſſor of Arceſilaus, and who, according to Horace, "made himſelf famous by his ſevere Satyrs (97)." All the foundation that Father Rapin builds upon is, that the Life of Bion immediately follows that of Arceſilaus in the work of Diogenes Laertius; but this is no reaſon, ſince the Author expreſly ſays, that Lacydes was ſucceſſor to Arceſilaus (98); and that Bion, who was alſo a hearer of Crates, refuſed to embrace the principles of the Academy, and afterwards went over to another Sect (99).

(97) Rapin, *Compar. de Platon & d'Ariſtote*, Part 4. chap. 1. pag. 369.

(98) Diog. Laert. lib. 4. num. 59. *in Lacyde init.*

(99) Idem, ibid. num. 51, 52, *in Bione.*

[O] *I have diſcovered in Sidonius Apollinaris a very groſs fault with regard to him.*] He pretends that according to Arceſilaus, whom he places prior to Socrates, God is the efficient Cauſe of the world, and that atoms are the conſtituent parts of it.

Conjicit hanc molem, confectam partibus illis,
Quas Atomos vocat ipſe leves. Socratica poſt hunc
Secta micat, quæ de naturæ pondere migrans
Ad mores hominum limandos tranſtulit uſum (100).

(100) Sidon. Apollinaris, Carm. 15. ver. 94. pag. 152.

"Of atoms next Arceſilas ſuppos'd
"This world's great fabrick was at firſt compos'd,
"Not by the careleſs hand of chance combin'd,
"But form'd and faſhion'd by th' Almighty Mind.
"Next Socrates a nobler ſcheme began,
"To mend the morals and improve the man."

Savaro, without taking notice of this anachroniſm, contents himſelf with obſerving that all the world aſcribes to Epicurus and Democritus the doctrine which Sidonius Apollinaris fathers upon Arceſilaus (101). This obſervation is falſe; for no body ever pretended that Democritus and Epicurus taught that the world was made by God.

(101) Savaro *in hunc locum* Sidonii Apollinar.

Poſt hos Arceſilas divina mente patratam

☞ ARCESILAUS. Four Kings of that name reigned at Cyrene [A]. The firſt was the ſon of Battus, the Founder of that Kingdom, who having reigned forty years left the Crown to Arceſilaus, who enjoyed it ſixteen (a). We know nothing of the two following Kings, except that the next was called Battus, and his ſucceſſor Arceſilaus. The latter was ſucceeded by Battus the third, ſurnamed the *Fortunate*, under whoſe reign a great number of Greeks went into Africa, and ſettled at Cyrene, being induced to it by an Oracle [B]. Apries was at that time King of Egypt (b). After the death of Battus the third of that name, his ſon Arceſilaus III aſcended the throne, tho' before he could enjoy it peaceably, he had a violent conteſt with his brothers [C]. Yet after all he did not eſcape the ſnares of one of them called Aliarchus, who ſtrangled him in his bed one day, when being indiſpoſed he had taken Phyſic. But Aliarchus did not reap any benefit by this murther; for he was himſelf put to death by Erixo the wife of Arceſilaus. After this King reigned his ſon Battus IV, who was lame, and had not the right uſe of his feet. The Cyrenians having had ſome misfortunes under his reign, they conſulted the Oracle of Delphos, to know how they might beſt regulate their ſtate. The Oracle commanded them to ſend for a perſon from Mantinea, and eſtabliſh ſuch orders amongſt them as that perſon ſhould think proper. Accordingly the Mantineans ſent them one Demonax, a man highly eſteemed amongſt his fellow-citizens. Amongſt other regulations which he made, he deprived the King of the ſacred lands, and of the Prieſthood, and of all the revenues that the former Kings had been poſſeſſed of, and gave them to the people. This regulation continued during the reign of Battus. But Arceſilaus, his ſon (c) and ſucceſſor, declared that he would not ſubmit to the regulations of Demonax, and claimed all the honours and privileges, which his anceſtors had enjoyed. This ſoon occaſioned a ſedition, which obliged Arceſilaus to fly to Samos, and his mother to Salamine, in the iſland of Cyprus [D]. Whilſt Arceſilaus was at Samos, he ſollicited as many

(a) Herodotus, lib. 4. cap. 159. p. m. 272, 273. ed. Gronovii, Lugd. Batav. 1715. fol.

(b) Idem, ibid. p. 273.

(c) By Pheretima.

[A] *Cyrene.*] A city in Lybia, the Capital of the Cyrenaïc Country, which on account of the five celebrated cities which it contained, was called the Lybian Pentapolis (1). Theſe cities were, *Cyrene* the capital city, *Berenice*, *Arſinoe* or *Tenchira*, *Ptolemais* or *Barce*, and *Apollonia*. It is now the Weſtern part of the Kingdom of Barca, where the five ancient cities are ſtill ſeen, and known by the names of *Çairoan*, *Bernicho*, *Trocara*, *Barca* the capital city of the whole country, and *Bonandrea*, which is the ancient *Apollonia* (2).

(1) Uſher, *Index Geograp. in Voce* Cyrene.

(2) Baudrand, *in Cyrenaique.*

[B] *A great number of Greeks ſettled at Cyrene — induced to it by an Oracle.*] They were invited by the Cyrenians, who having land to ſpare, promiſed it to thoſe, who would come and ſettle amongſt them. The Oracle of Delphi was alſo an inducement to them. It declared that thoſe, who ſhould come too late into Lybia, and after the lands had been divided, would certainly repent it. The number of thoſe who came was ſo large, that the territories of Cyrene were not ſufficient for them. The Cyrenians therefore attacked their neighbours, and made themſelves maſters of part of their country. Whereupon theſe people with Adicra their King ſurrender'd themſelves to the Ægyptians, over whom Apries then reigned; who having raiſed a powerful army marched againſt the Cyrenians, and engaged in battle againſt them; but he found that the Greeks, whom he deſpiſed, were a brave people, ſince his Ægyptians were entirely routed by them (3).

(3) Herodot. lib. 4. cap. 159. p. m. 273.

[C] *He had a violent conteſt with his brothers.*] His brothers ſeeing that they could not get the Kingdom of Cyrene, went away and founded another city on the borders of the Cyrenaïc Country, and called it Barca. Whilſt they were building it, they invited the inhabitants of Cyrene to come over to them; which Arceſilaus ſo highly reſented, that he reſolved to attack them. Accordingly he marched againſt them with a powerful army; whereupon they fled, but he purſuing them they reſolved to try their fortune; and having engaged in battle againſt him, they were ſo fortunate as to gain the victory, having ſlain ſeven thouſand men of his army (4). Thus was eſtabliſhed the Kingdom of Barce, to the King of which one of this Arceſilaus's deſcendants and ſucceſſors fled for refuge (5).

(4) Idem, ibid. cap. 160. p. 173.

(5) See the text of this Article quotation (c).

[D] *His mother fled to Salamine in the Iſland of Cyprus.*] Euelthon was then King or Prince of that city. Pheretima the mother of Arceſilaus earneſtly deſired that Prince to reſtore her and her ſon to their Kingdom, or to give them an army, that they might themſelves recover it. Euelthon would have granted her any thing elſe but an army. He made her ſeveral preſents, at the receiving of which ſhe uſed to ſay, *This indeed is good, but it is an army I want.* This was the anſwer ſhe made at every gift ſhe received. Euelthon wearied at laſt with her importunities, ſent her a clew of golden thread, telling her, that was a proper preſent for a woman, and not an army (6).

(6) Ib. cap. 162.

By pag. 274.

many persons as he could, to assist him in the recovery of his Kingdom, and promised them lands, to persuade them to undertake it; and having by that means assembled a numerous army he sailed for Delphi to consult the Oracle. The answer he received was very clear, with regard to the time past, but with regard to what was to happen, the Oracle was so enigmatical, that it was impossible for Arcesilaus to understand it, before the event had put it out of his power to prevent the danger, that threatned him [*E*]. With such an answer he went to Cyrene, and recovered his Kingdom. He immediately resolved to revenge himself on those, who by their revolt had been, as he thought, the cause of his flight. Some of them went into a voluntary exile; others, who had been taken, he sent to Cyprus, in order that they might perish there; but they landing on the Island of Cnidus, were delivered by the inhabitants, and safely sent to Thera. Others had taken sanctuary in a large tower; those he burnt alive, having set fire to the tower. But then he began to understand the sense of the Oracle, which he had received at Delphi (*d*); whereupon he fled to Alazir, King of the Barcæi (*e*), his wife's father; but he was not safe there, for some of the Barcæi and some exiles of Cyrene having seen him in the market-place of Barce killed him there. In him ended the Kingdom of Cyrene; for he had given it to Cambyses King of Persia, and established a tribute to be paid to that King (*f*). We must not omit to observe, that this last Arcesilaus is celebrated by Pindar (*g*) for having carried a prize in the publick games of Greece, in the third year of the 79th Olympiad, according to Archbishop Usher (*b*), who also tells us (*i*) that the Kingdom of Cyrene lasted two hundred years. But that learned Author's assertion does not seem to be well grounded [*F*]. Moreri's account of Arcesilaus is proper only to lead the readers into a mistake [*G*].

(*d*) See the remark.

(*e*) They were a nation of Lybia; the country which they inhabited bordered upon that of the Cyrenians towards the North. Their capital city is by Ptolomy called Barce, and the inhabitants *Barcitæ*. Ptol. Geog. lib. 4. c. 4.

(*f*) Herodot. *ubi supra*. c. 160-164. pag. 173, 175.

(*g*) Ode 4 and 5.

(*b*) *Annal.* p. m. 113. *ad ann. Mund.* 3573.

(*i*) Ibid.

By which he seems to have shewn, that he had less generosity than that woman had courage, if she intended to head herself the army she desired; and if she desired him to assist her son by commanding his own army, his answer was a ridiculous expression without the least sense or reason, and in all probability Herodotus did not relate as a witty saying.

[*E*] *The answer he received was &c.*] The Priestess answered him, *The God grants you to reign at Cyrene the space of eight generations, till four Battus's and four Arcesilaus's have been Kings; but advises you not so much as to venture to go beyond that term.* Thus far the Oracle was very clear; Arcesilaus knew that he was the fourth of that name, and that four Battus's had reigned before him. And as to the prohibition not to extend the dominion of that family at Cyrene further, it related rather to Arcesilaus's children and descendants, than to himself. But the latter part of the Oracle was an absolute riddle. *If thou findest*, said the Oracle, *a furnace full of bottles, beware not to burn them, but let them go out into the air. Or if thou hast set fire to the furnace, do not enter into the atmosphere of it,* (or that which surrounds it,) *otherwise thou shalt perish, thou and the bull that works well* (7). The Greek words are (8) Ἢν δ᾽ τὴν καμίνου ἴδῃς πλέην ἀμφορέων, μὴ ἐξοπτήσῃς τοὺς ἀμφορέας, ἀλλ᾽ ἀσάμενος κατ᾽ ὄρεος· ἢν δὲ ἐξοπτήσῃς τὴν καμίνου, μὴ εἰσίλθῃς ἐς τὸν ἀμφίρυτον· εἰ δ᾽ μὴ, ἀποθανέεαι καὶ αὐτὸς, καὶ ταῦρος ὁ καλλιεύων. What man living could explain such an enigmatical and obscure sentence? Indeed Arcesilaus knew the meaning of it only by the event, and when he was ruined, for not having known it before. He understood then, that the tower, in which the Cyrenians took their refuge was the furnace, and the Cyrenians themselves the bottles meant by the Oracle. This made him think, that the atmosphere, or that which surrounded the furnace, must be the city which obliged him to fly out of it. If we consider the circumstances of this Oracle, it will not be difficult to conclude, that it was only an artifice of the Priestess, or of those under whose management she was. They express themselves plainly when the question is with regard to what they knew, the succession of the Kings of Cyrene; but are dark and enigmatical, when they come to futurity, in order that whatever the event should be, it might be in their power to explain their Oracle in what sense they please. It may also perhaps be thought, that this Oracle was framed after the event was passed; which is not at all improbable.

(7) Αμφίρυτον.

(8) Herodot. *ubi supra*, cap. 163, p. 274, 275.

[*F*] *Usher's assertion does not seem to be well grounded.*] He supposes that the Kingdom of Cyrene was founded the second year of the 37th Olympiad, that is, according to his account A. M. 3373, 631 before the Christian Æra, and ended A. M. 3573, 431 before Christ. He quotes Eusebius's *Chronicon*, and adds that under *the third King* of Cyrene, namely Battus the son of Arcesilaus, Apries reigned in Egypt (9). Now according to his account Apries began his reign A. M. 3410, and reigned twenty five years. His reign ended then A. M. 3435. Now if we add to the year of the world 3373, in which the Kingdom of Cyrene was founded, the forty years of Battus the first's reign, and the sixteen of Arcesilaus the first, the reign of the King, under whom the Greeks came to Cyrene, will fall between the years 3429, and 3435, in which Apries died. But this supposes, that the migration of the Greeks happened under Battus the second, whereas Herodotus expressly says that it was under Battus the third, ἐπὶ τρίτου Βάττου; and it appears by the sequel of his History that there was but one Battus, and two Arcesilaus's after the King, under whom the Greeks came to Cyrene. What then shall we do with Battus the second and Arcesilaus the second, whom Usher has omitted? If we say that they reigned in the interval between the death of Arcesilaus the first and that of Apries; we must ascribe but five years to them both, and suppose that the four last Kings of Cyrene reigned one hundred and thirty nine years, that is about thirty five years one with another; whereas the four first reigned but sixty one years. This, I own, is not impossible, but I think very improbable. I would therefore date the foundation of Cyrene somewhat sooner than Usher has done. Perhaps the whole story related by Herodotus will be called in question by those, who will imagine it to be improbable, that there should be eight Kings reigning successively, who were alternately called *Battus* and *Arcesilaus*.

(9) Usser. *Ann.* p. 64. *ad ann. Mundi* 3373, p. 113. *ad ann.* 4573.

[*G*] *Moreri's account is proper only to lead the readers into a mistake.*] The only thing he tells us, is that Arcesilaus the son of Battus the Founder of the Kingdom of Cyrene, succeeded his father in the year of the world 3414, and reigned sixteen years; whereupon he quotes Herodotus. Such a dry account does not in the least instruct the reader; but what is worse, such an inaccuracy will make the reader believe, that there was but one Battus, and one Arcesilaus Kings of Cyrene; whereas had Moreri, or his more modern continuators, looked into Herodotus, and not barely copied one passage of Usher, and that the only one referred to in the Index, they would have found four Arcesilaus's instead of one. But this instance and a thousand more shew, that Moreri's Dictionary was drawn up only by the help of Indexes, and that whatever was not found there, was left out of the work.

P.

ARCHELAUS. Diogenes Laertius mentions four persons of that name (*a*), who are as follows. ARCHELAUS the Philosopher (*b*), ARCHELAUS, the Author of a description of

(*b*) It is the same person who is the subject of the following article.

(*a*) Diog. Laertius, lib. 2. *in Archelao.*

of all the countries into which Alexander carried his arms, ARCHELAUS, who wrote a Poem upon the wonderful properties of certain things (c), and ARCHELAUS the Orator, who wrote a Syſtem of Rhetoric. Mr. Menage adds to theſe four, ARCHELAUS King of Cappadocia, ARCHELAUS King of SPARTA, ARCHELAUS a General of Mithridates, ARCHELAUS the Dancer, ARCHELAUS the Muſician, and ARCHELAUS the Comedian (d). He obſerves, that Lucian mentions the latter in his Treatiſe *de Conſcribendâ Hiſtoria*; that Athenæus in his firſt book ſpeaks of the Muſician (e); and Clemens Alexandrinus in the 7th book of his *Stromata*, mentions the Dancer [A]. He forgot ARCHELAUS the Aſtrologer (f), and ſeveral other perſons of that name, whom I ſhall treat of in the following Articles.

(c) See the note [C] of the following article.

(d) Menag. *in Diogen. Laert.* lib. 2. num. 17.

(e) See the note [H] of the article ABDERA.

(f) Cicero *de Divin.* lib. 2. c. 42.

[A] *Mr. Menage obſerves .... that Athenæus .... has ſpoken of Archelaus the Muſician, and that Clemens Alexandrinus .... ſpeaks of the Dancer.*] Mr. Menage underſtood the rules of a good and learned manner of quoting, but he does not obſerve them here. He had better have quoted the firſt book of Athenæus, with regard to Archelaus the Dancer, than the ſeventh book of the *Stromata* of Clemens Alexandrinus; for beſides that the right of ſeniority does not belong to this laſt, we find ſome particulars in Athenæus, and none in the *Stromata*. Athenæus relates, that King Antiochus had no greater favourite than Archelaus the Dancer (1). This Author had obſerved in the ſame page, that the inhabitants of Miletus, dedicated a brazen ſtatue to Archelaus the Fidler: if I may ſo tranſlate Ἀρχελάου τοῦ κιθαριστοῦ.

(1) Athen. l. 1. cap. 16. p. 19.

ARCHELAUS, a Grecian Philoſopher, a Diſciple of Anaxagoras, was of Athens, according to ſome writers, or of Miletus according to ſome others (a). What we are certain of is that he read Lectures in Athens. It is likewiſe ſaid that he was the firſt who transferred Philoſophy thither [A]. He made but little alteration in Anaxagoras's doctrine (b). He admitted, like him, *ſimilar* parts to be the principal matter of all things, and

(a) Diog. Laert. lib. 2. num. 16.

(b) See the note [C].

[A] *It is ſaid that he was the firſt who transferred Philoſophy thither.*] Several Critics have obſerved hereupon the diſagreement, which is betwixt Diogenes Laertius and Clemens Alexandrinus. The one attributes that firſt tranſlation to Archelaus, the other to Anaxagoras. Οὗτος (Ἀρχέλαος) πρῶτος ἐκ τῆς Ἰωνίας τὴν φυσικὴν φιλοσοφίαν μετήγαγεν Ἀθήναζε (1). i. e. "He (*Archelaus*) firſt brought Natural Philoſophy to Athens from Ionia." Theſe are the words of Diogenes Laertius, and the following of Clemens Alexandrinus. Οὗτος (Ἀναξαγόρας) μετήγαγε ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰωνίας Ἀθήναζε τὴν διατριβήν (2). i. e. "He (*Anaxagoras*) tranſlated the School from Ionia to Athens." No body that I know of, has ſought out the means of reconciling theſe two notions, nor the riſe of that diverſity of opinions. And yet it ſeems to me eaſy enough to apprehend it from what I am going to ſay thereupon. Anaxagoras came a very young Philoſopher to Athens, and dwelt there thirty years (3). It is not impoſſible that his Maſter Anaximenes continued teaching Philoſophy in Ionia, during part of that time (4). It may likewiſe be ſuppoſed that Diogenes, his other diſciple, ſucceeded him. But if the chair of Thales was not vacant in Ionia, whilſt Anaxagoras taught Philoſophy at Athens, it is not true that he transferred the ſchool of Thales to that city. Such a tranſlation ſuppoſes that the ſucceſſion was at an end by Anaxagoras's journey. It could only be true, that before this Philoſopher had read Lectures in Athens, no ſcholar of the Ionian Sect had ever been a Profeſſor amongſt the Athenians. Perhaps Clemens Alexandrinus and the Authors that followed him meant nothing elſe, and did not take the pains to expreſs themſelves more exactly. However that be, aſking Mr. Caſaubon's pardon (5), Diogenes Laertius ſeems to me to have ſpoken with more exactneſs; for we muſt know that when Anaxagoras went from Athens he retired to Lampſacus, where he read Lectures till his death. His chair was filled at Lampſacus, by his diſciple Archelaus (6), who went afterwards to teach Philoſophy at Athens (7). It was therefore properly Archelaus, who tranſported from Ionia to Athens the School of Thales. That was a true tranſplantation; but before, it was not a real one, ſince probably that School was not empty during all the time that paſſed betwixt Anaxagoras's journey to Athens, and his retreat to Lampſacus; or that if it did ſuffer ſome interruption, it was ſoon repaired by that Philoſopher's return into Ionia. It would ſignify nothing to object to me that we have no writer remaining, that has aſſured us that Diogenes was the ſucceſſor of Anaximenes; for I can anſwer, I, that we have no exact Hiſtory of the ancient Philoſophers, and conſequently, that this ſilence does not take away the right of ſuppoſing as I do: II, That Anaxagoras having been more eminent than Diogenes, and having had a diſciple that continued the ſucceſſion, having even, as is very probable, ſurvived Diogenes, it is by him, rather than by the latter, that the ſucceſſions of the Ionian Sect are diſtinguiſhed. There is great probability that Sidonius Apollinaris aſſociates the two diſciples of Anaximenes, as two collegues, who were the ſupport of that School,

Quartus Anaxagoras Thaletica Dogmata ſervat:
Sed divinum animum ſentit, qui fecerit orbem.
Junior huic junctus reſidet Collega, ſed idem
Materiam cunctis creaturis aera credens
Judicat inde Deum, faceret quo cuncta (8), *tuliſſe* (9).

That is,

" The fourth of thoſe, who in the Grecian ſchools
" Succeeded Thales, and maintain'd his rules,
" Was Anaxagoras: and he could find
" The world was form'd by an Almighty Mind.
" Next him his Collegue ſits, who held the air
" Does fit materials for all things prepare.
" And prov'd th' Almighty did from thence provide
" Such matter, as to form the world ſupply'd."

Here follow other conjectures. Our moſt learned men (10) take for the moſt certain rule to determine the age of Anaxagoras what Diogenes Laertius relates, that at the time of Xerxes's expedition, that Philoſopher was twenty years old. It is from thence that they take upon them to infer, that ſince he lived ſeventy two years he died in the 88th Olympiad. I do not care to raiſe a conteſt hereupon; but I have ſome difficulties to object againſt what this ſame Laertius ſays, that Anaxagoras took his journey to Athens at twenty years old, and that he dwelt there thirty years. It does not ſeem to me very probable, that he choſe for that journey the time of Xerxes's expedition, by which the People of Aſia did not doubt that the republic of Athens would be quite cruſhed to pieces. Let us not inſiſt upon that, but go on to ſome other and much ſtronger arguments. If Diogenes Laertius be in the right, it muſt be ſaid that Anaxagoras dwelt in Athens no longer than till the ſecond year of the 82d Olympiad; for the expedition of Xerxes fell out upon the laſt months of the 74th Olympiad, and on the firſt of the 75th; but does not Diodorus Siculus aſſure us that that Philoſopher was accuſed of impiety at Athens, in the ſecond year of the 87th Olympiad (11)? He therefore overturns the account of Diogenes Laertius: It is not without confounding himſelf on the other hand; for what will become of that which is related, that Socrates, after the condemnation of Anaxagoras, became the Diſciple of Archelaus (12)? What will become of that which others have told us, that Euripides quitted the ſtudy of Natural Philoſophy

(1) Diog. Laert. lib. 2. num. 16.

(2) Clem. Alexand. *Stromat.* lib. 2. p. 301.

(3) Diog. Laert. lib. 2. num. 7.

(4) That which Diogenes Laertius tells, book 2, num. 2. relating to the time of Anaximenes's death, is ridiculous.

(5) Caſaubon, upon this paſſage of D. Laertius, cenſures him, and declares himſelf for Clemens Alexandrinus. Mr. Menage does the ſame.

(6) Euſeb. *Præparat.* lib. 10. *ult.* p. 504.

(7) Idem, ibid.

(8) That compared with what Cicero *de Naturâ Deorum*, lib. 1. cap. 11, *& ſeq.* and St. Auguſtin *de Civit. Dei*, lib. 8. cap. 2. ſay of Diogenes of Apollonia, demonſtrates that he there treats of this Diogenes.

(9) Sidon. Apollinar. *Carm.* 15. ver. 89.

(10) Scalig. *in Euſeb.* num. 1554. p. 103; Petavius, *Rationar. Temporis*, Part 1. lib. 3. cap. 8. p. 140; Voſſius, *de Scientiis Mathem.* cap. 37. num. 4. pag. 148.

(11) Diod. Siculus, lib. 12. cap. 39. p. 433.

(12) Diog. Laertius, l. 2. num. 19.

and a Divine intellect for the cauſe of the orderly diſpoſal of bodies; and he taught, like him, that animals, men not excepted, were produced of a terreſtrial matter, hot and moiſt [B]. He made natural Philoſophy his chief ſtudy, as did his predeceſſors, but he engaged in moral Philoſophy a little more than they had done. He was not at all Orthodox, for he maintained that human Laws were the ſource of moral good and evil; that is to ſay, he did not admit ſuch a thing as the Law of Nature, but only poſitive Laws; and by conſequence he believed that all kinds of actions were indifferent in their nature, and that they became good or bad, according as it had pleaſed men to eſtabliſh certain

phy and applied himſelf wholly to the ſtage, by reaſon of the proceedings againſt Anaxagoras (13)? Could Socrates, who was near forty years old, at the time of that proceſs, according to the Chronology of Diodorus Siculus, have occaſion to ſtudy under another Maſter? And obſerve, that according to Porphyry, *he betook himſelf to the Philoſopher Archelaus* (14), at about ſeventeen years old. Did Euripides, who at the time of the ſame Proceſs was above fifty years of age, wait till then before he compoſed his tragedies? He was ſo far from delaying it ſo long, that he wrote one when he was but eighteen years old (15). To clear up this confuſion a little, and to find out ſome means to make theſe accounts agree, we muſt return to Diogenes Laertius, and lay aſide Diodorus Siculus; for by ſuppoſing that Anaxagoras was accuſed in the 82d Olympiad, we ſhall find the conſequence very poſſible, which it is ſaid that proceſs produced with regard to Euripides and Socrates. We ſhall be able to ſuppoſe that the Poet, having joined the ſtudy of Natural Philoſophy with the compoſing of tragedies, till he ſaw the danger of Anaxagoras, applied himſelf from that time only to the theatre. But what ſhall we do with Euſebius, who has told us that Archelaus was the ſucceſſor of Anaxagoras in Lampſacus before he came to teach Philoſophy at Athens? That cannot be true, if Anaxagoras lived till the 88th Olympiad; a time when Socrates, a much greater maſter than Archelaus, had no manner of occaſion to put himſelf under his diſcipline. It might perhaps be proper to ſuppoſe, I. that Archelaus, having ſtudied ſome years under Anaxagoras at Athens, took there the office of Profeſſor, when his maſter had retired: II. that after a while he rejoined him at Lampſacus, and was there made his ſucceſſor, from whence he afterwards returned to Athens, and tranſplanted thither entirely the chair of Thales. It might not perhaps be amiſs to ſuppoſe likewiſe, that Anaxagoras was accuſed more than once at Athens, and that having retired into Ionia at the time of the firſt proceſs, he was recalled ſome years after by Pericles, and underwent a freſh accuſation after he had been there ſome years. We have ſeen (16) that certain Authors have ſaid, that he was accuſed by Thucydides, the adverſary of Pericles, and condemned to death as an outlaw. But after the baniſhment of Thucydides, the authority was in the hands of Pericles for fifteen years (17): which imports that Thucydides was driven out fifteen years before the death of Pericles. It ſhould follow from thence that Anaxagoras had been outlawed fifteen or ſixteen years at leaſt before Pericles died: but according to Diodorus Siculus (18), and Plutarch (19), he was accuſed a little before the beginning of the Peloponneſian war, that is to ſay, two or three years before Pericles's death. One may therefore ſuppoſe, that he was accuſed twice, and place his return into Ionia and his ſecond return to Athens in the interval of the two accuſations; and by that means a great difficulty may be reſolved. Socrates was never a diſciple of Anaxagoras, although Diogenes Laertius affirms it (20). I have proved that (21) by a very ſtrong argument; and I can ſtrengthen it, not only by the ſilence of Plato and Xenophon, when the circumſtances of the ſubject could no ways oblige them to it; but likewiſe by the ſilence of Socrates's accuſers, and the anſwer that Socrates gave them. Would they have forborn to reproach him with being inſtructed by a Philoſopher that had been condemned for his impiety? Would not that have been the way to have rendered him more ſuſpected? Would they have forgot that aggravation? Would they have contented themſelves with reproaching him in general that his Philoſophy was of a piece with that impious man? And if he had had him for his maſter, would he have dared to anſwer as he did (22)? Let us conclude that he never was the Diſciple of Anaxagoras. But how ſhall we imagine that he was not, if we ſuppoſe that Anaxagoras did not go from Athens till the time that Diodorus Siculus and Plutarch have aſſigned? On that ſuppoſition did not Anaxagoras flouriſh in Athens, when Socrates had the moſt occaſion to chuſe him for his tutor? and allowing that, can one well believe that Socrates did not go to that Philoſopher's lectures, but to thoſe of Archelaus? It is probable that this latter ſet up a ſchool in Athens, during the time that Anaxagoras flouriſhed in the ſame city? or that if he did, his lectures were preferred by Socrates to thoſe of Anaxagoras? Theſe are difficulties which may be reſolved, by ſuppoſing that the latter was expelled, and that in the time that paſſed betwixt the two ſentences, Archelaus taught Philoſophy in Athens.

It remains for me to make an obſervation againſt Plutarch. We muſt not imagine that he believed that Anaxagoras died in the 88th Olympiad; for when he relates the prodigies that preceded the defeat of the Athenians at the river Ægos (23), he ſays that according to the prediction of that Philoſopher, there fell from Heaven a great ſtone. The overthrow of the Athenians fell out in the fourth year of the 93d Olympiad. It would be abſurd to ſuppoſe that Plutarch meant that Anaxagoras predicted that fall of the ſtone twenty years beforehand. He believed therefore that that Philoſopher lived to the 93d Olympiad. But that is a great miſtake. I ſuſpect him very much of falſe Chronology, in placing the fall of that ſtone under the 93d Olympiad. Pliny, Euſebius, and the Arundelian Marbles contradict it. They place that event under the 78th (24). In ſuch a lamentable ſtate as this, have the ancients, that are ſo much boaſted of, left the hiſtory of the Philoſophers. A thouſand contradictions throughout, a thouſand incompatible facts, a thouſand falſe dates. Obſerve that I have not ſeen any modern, who refutes thoſe which place the death of Anaxagoras in the 78th Olympiad (25); who refutes them, I ſay, by Diodorus Siculus and Plutarch, who aſſure us that that Philoſopher was accuſed a little before the firſt year of the Peloponneſian war (26).

[B] *He taught that animals, men not excepted, were produced of a material matter, hot and moiſt.*] What we have left of his ſentiments, in the Authors that relate them, is ſo ſhort, that a man cannot form a juſt notion thereof. Γινεσθαι δὲ φησι τὰ ζῶα ἐκ θερμῆς τῆς γῆς, ἓν ἰλὺν παραπλησίαν γάλακτι, εἶτα τροφὴν αὐτίσης. Οὕτω δὲ καὶ τοὺς ἀνθρώπους ποιῆσαι (27). i. e. "But "that animals are generated from the heat of the earth, "which hath melted down the mud into the form of "milk as food. So likewiſe are men produced." It is thus that Diogenes Laertius expreſſes himſelf. He had juſt been ſaying, that according to that Philoſopher, the cauſes of generation were heat and moiſture (28). He had likewiſe ſaid juſt before how that water, air, earth, and fire had their riſe from thoſe two principles; but I own that as I do not underſtand the meaning of his words, I will not take the pains to tranſcribe them. Mr. Menage, who has inſerted them in his commentary, without making any remark thereon, did not in all likelihood know what was their ſignification. The other commentators have not ſucceeded better. They have left them to their obſcurity; let us do the ſame, and have recourſe to Plutarch, who has ſaid that according to Archelaus, the unbounded air, the condenſation and rarefaction of the air, the one being fire, and the other water, were the principles of all things (29). Juſtin Martyr attributes very near the ſame opinion to him (30). The meaning of this, as I take it, is, that he admitted the air for the firſt matter, and fire and water for the elements. But that was not his opinion, if St. Auſtin's word may be taken on the occaſion; for that Father attributes to him the opinion of Anaxagoras with

(13) See the article of EURIPIDES, in the text.

(14) See the *Life of Socrates*, written by Mr. Charpentier, p. 5.

(15) Aulus Gellius, lib. 15. cap. 20.

(16) Above, citation (147) of the article of ANAXAGORAS.

(17) Plutarch. *in Pericle*, p. 161. E.

(18) Lib. 12. cap. 39. p. 433.

(19) Plutarch. *in Pericle*, p. 169.

(20) Diogen. Laert. *in Socrate*, lib. 2. num. 19, and 45.

(21) Above, at the end of the note [R] of the article of ANAXAGORAS.

(22) See the citation (29) of the article of ANAXAGORAS.

(23) See the citation (136) of the article of ANAXAGORAS.

(24) Pliny places it at the 2d year; ſee above citation (138) of the article of ANAXAGORAS; Euſebius at the 4th year; the *Marmora Arundeliana* at the 1ſt year. *See* Hardouin *on* Pliny, tom. 1. pag. 275.

(25) Diog. Laert. lib. 2. num. 7. does it; Euſebius places it at the 4th year of the 79th Olympiad.

(26) That is to ſay, at the 2d year of the 87th Olympiad.

(26) That is to ſay, at the 2d year of the 87th Olympiad.

(27) Diogen. Laertius, lib. 2. num. 17.

(28) Inſtead of ψυχρὸν *frigidum*, it ſhould be read ὑγρὸν, *humidum*. See Mr. Menage upon that paſſage. But note that Hermias *in Philoſophorum Deriſione*, pag. 177, aſſures us that Archelaus gave out as the principles of all things θερμὸν καὶ ψυχρὸν, *heat and cold*.

(29) Plutarch. *de Placit. Philoſ.* lib. 1. cap. 3. pag. 876.

(30) Juſt. Martyr. *Admonit. ad Græcos*, pag. 4.

(d) Plut. *in Cimone*, p. 481.
(e) Cicero, *Tusculan.* l. 5. Diog. Laert. l. 2. n. 16. Clem. Alexand. *Strom.* l. 1. pag. 301. Aug. *de Civit. Dei*, lib. 8. cap. 2.

certain Laws (*e*). He compoſed a work of natural Philoſophy, according to Suidas, and he was conſidered as the Author of certain *Elegies* which were deſigned for the conſolation of Cimon, who was very much grieved at the loſs of his wife (*d*). Socrates, the moſt illuſtrious of his diſciples, was his ſucceſſor (*e*). It will be proper to ſay ſomething of a Poet that was called ARCHELAUS [C]. Diogenes Laertius ſpeaks of

(*e*) Τὸ δίκαιον εἶναι, καὶ τὸ αἰσχρὸν οὐ φύσει ἀλλὰ νόμῳ. i. e. "That right and "wrong did not "conſiſt in na- "ture, but in "law." Diog. Laertius, lib. 2. num. 16.

with regard to ſimilar ſubſtances and touching the intellect, that united them together. *Anaxagoræ ſucceſſit auditor ejus Archelaus; etiam ipſe de particulis inter ſe diſſimilibus, quibus ſingula quæque fierent, ita omnia conſtare putavit, ut ineſſe etiam mentem diceret, quæ corpora diſſimilia, id eſt illas particulas conjungendo & diſſipando ageret omnia* (31). i. e. "To Anaxagoras ſuc-
(31) Auguſt. *de Civitate Dei*, lib. 8. cap. 2. *See alſo* Clem. Alexand. *in Protr.* p. 43.
"ceeded his Diſciple Archelaus: he likewiſe thought that "every thing conſiſted of particles diſagreeing amongſt "themſelves, of which all things were made, in ſuch "a manner that he ſaid there was in them a mind "which actuated the diſſimilar bodies, that is by "conjoining and ſeparating thoſe particles." I believe St. Auſtin is in the right; for Simplicius obſerves, that Archelaus, endeavouring to clear up ſomething that was particular to him, made no ſcruple to advance the ſame principles with Anaxagoras, namely,
(32) Simpl. *in Librum Phyſic. Ariſtot.* an infinity of ſimilar particles (32). There is great probability that with regard to the firſt formation of animals they followed the ſame Hypotheſis. We have ſeen what was the ſentiment of Archelaus, and this is the opinion of Anaxagoras: ζῶα γενέσθαι ἐξ ὑγροῦ καὶ θερμοῦ καὶ γαίας, ὕστερον δὲ ἐξ ἀλλήλων (33); i. e. "That
(53) Diog. Laert. lib. 2. num. 9.
"animals firſt aroſe from moiſture and heat and earth, "and that afterwards they were generated out of one "another." Since they admitted an intelligence, which drew theſe *Homœomeriæ* from the confuſion in which they were, we muſt believe that they made it preſide over the production of animals; for if there be any creature whoſe formation has need to be directed by a ſpirit, it is certainly the machine of an animal. If they did what I am ſuppoſing, they have advanced nothing on this head, which may not be reconciled with the Holy Scripture; but if they believed, as many others, that in the beginning men were born of the earth, by the ſole power of moiſture and heat, &c. they have advanced the moſt ridiculous piece of abſurdity in the world, and would be at a loſs how to get clear of this queſtion; how comes it to paſs that in ſucceeding times there have been no inſtances of men being born in the ſame manner? That queſtion would not embarraſs them at all in the other caſe, becauſe they might anſwer, as Chriſtians would do, that the intelligence having once formed animals, endowed with organs or parts neceſſary for propagation, would produce no more itſelf, the conſervation of the ſpecies being ſufficiently provided for by that deſire of coition, which is implanted both in the males and females.

[C] *It will be proper to ſay ſomething of a Poet that was called* ARCHELAUS.] He wrote a treatiſe on the particular Nature of things; that is to ſay, their particularities, or the properties which diſtinguiſh them. The quotation we have of it does not ſuffer us to doubt that this was the true character of that writing. Diogenes Laertius has deſcribed it in theſe words, ὁ τὰ ἰδιοφυῆ ποιήσας (34), *qui quæ cuique rei natura ſunt*
(34) Diog. Laertius, l. 2. n. 17.
propria, verſu prodidit; i. e. "who has explained in "verſe thoſe properties, that are naturally peculiar to "any thing." Caſaubon ſhould not have cenſured that Latin tranſlation, under a pretence, that according to the teſtimony of Antigonus Caryſtius, this book of Archelaus was a collection of Epigrams, wherein the extraordinary and marvellous qualities of things were
(35) Caſaub. *in Diogen. Laert.* lib. 2. num. 17.
related, τὰ παράδοξα, τὰ θαυμάσια (35); for that may agree with the title that is given by Diogenes Laertius; and upon the whole, the tranſlator ought not to have given that title a leſs general ſignification than what the Greek term imports. Voſſius was not of the ſame mind with Caſaubon, ſince he has tranſlated the words of Diogenes Laertius, by *qui carmen fecit*
(36) Voſſius, *de Hiſtoricis Græcis*, lib. 3. p. 329.
de propriâ cujuſque rei naturâ (36). The ſenſe which he gives theſe words ſeems to me very juſt: he underſtands thereby that Archelaus had made an enquiry into ſuch things as had ſome peculiarity in their nature, *quæ propriæ ac ſingularis naturæ ſunt*, as that Goats are never free from a fever, and that they breathe by the ears, and not by the noſtrils. *Auribus capras ſpirare, non naribus, nec unquam febri carere, Archelaus auctor eſt* (37). Athenæus has quoted one Archelaus ἐν τοῖς ἰδιοφύοις, and has given him the ſurname of the Cherſoneſian (38). Dalechampius has very ill tranſlated that Greek by *ſua propriaque ſtirpe genitis* (39); and I am ſurprized that Voſſius has not uſed in this paſſage the ſame words that he did in Diogenes Laertius: he makes uſe of theſe *de proprietate naturæ* (40); and yet he is of opinion that Athenæus and Diogenes Laertius ſpoke of the ſame Author. That is very probable, although Antigonus Caryſtius gives out Egypt to be the country of that Archelaus, who made the Epigrams upon the extraordinary properties of certain things, and who addreſſed them to Ptolemy. It is very poſſible that one Archelaus a native of Cherſoneſus paſſed for an Egyptian: It is ſufficient for it, that he reſided a long time in Egypt (41). Mr. Menage, who maintains that inſtead of ἰδιοφυῆ it ſhould be read in Diogenes Laertius διφυῆ (42) does not ſeem to me to be in the right. He builds upon this, that the Scholiaſt of Nicander cites Archelaus ἐν τοῖς Διφυέσι, that is to ſay, *in his book upon thoſe things, that are of a doubtful nature.* The foundation is not good; for as the work of Archelaus was not confined to that kind of ſingularities, which diſtinguiſh amphibious animals, or thoſe animals which are produced from the copulation of a male and female of different ſpecies, it would be unreaſonable to ſuppoſe that the Author made uſe of a title too determinate. It would be much better, either to correct the Scholiaſt by Diogenes Laertius, or to ſay that Archelaus, having divided his work into ſeveral treatiſes, gave a particular treatiſe; that of διφυῆ, for example, to the Epigrams where he ſpoke of amphibious creatures. Upon the ſame foot, one might believe, that they who quote Archelaus *lib.* 1. περὶ ποταμῶν, *of Rivers* (43), *lib.* 1. περὶ λίθων, *of Stones* (44), quote the parts of that work, whoſe general title was ἰδιοφυῆ; but I ſhould be more inclinable to ſay that it relates to quite another Archelaus. I do not paſs the ſame judgment upon the quotations of Artemidorus (45). I am perſuaded that they belong to the Author of ἰδιοφυῆ.

(37) Plin. lib. 8. cap. 50.
(38) Athen. l. 9. cap. *ult.* p. 409.
(39) Dalechamp, *Annot. in Athen.* p. 766. Father Hardouin in his *Index Auctor. Plinii*, p. 97. tranſlates the words of Athenæus by *de rebus quæ ſingulis in locis propria gignuntur.*
(40) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græcis*, lib. 3. pag. 319.
(41) There have been inſtances of ſuch things. *See* Strabo, book 14. pag. 451.
(42) Menag. *in Diogen. Laert.* lib. 2. num. 17.

Let us here admire the inconſtancy of the memory. Voſſius, in his work of the Greek Hiſtorians, ſpeaks learnedly of this Author: he tells us what he has found of him in Varro, in Pliny, in Athenæus, in Artemidorus, in Antigonus Caryſtius, &c. but he remembred no more of that when he afterward compoſed his treatiſe on the Greek Poets. One may there read thus: *Idem* (Archelaus Phyſicus) *aut ait Suidas, συνίταξε φυσιολογίαν* *. *Id ſic Lilius Gyraldus vertit in tertio Dialogo de Poetis* †: quæ naturæ propria ſunt, multis verſibus collegit. *Itaque & Archelaum inter Poetas recenſet. Sed addit Poetam Phyſicum eſſe alium ab Socratis magiſtro. At unde adſtruat non video. Nam Suidas clarè ait φυσιολογίαν conſcriptam ab Archelao Phyſico, Socratis magiſtro. Imò nec video, unde colligat, quempiam Archelaum carmine ſcripſiſſe de rerum natura. Saltem ex verbo συνέταξεν, quo Suidas utitur, id colligi nequit. Et Laertius cum dicat tres præterea Archelaos fuiſſe, non tamen Poetam in iis memorat* (46). i. e. "The ſame per-
(46) Voſſ. *de Poet. Græcis*, pag. 34.
"ſon (*Archelaus the Naturaliſt*) as Suidas ſays, συνέταξε φυσιολογίαν. Lilius Gyraldus tranſlates that "paſſage in the third Dialogue concerning the Poets "thus: *He comprized in a great many verſes, ſuch "things as are proper to nature.* He therefore reckons "Archelaus amongſt the Poets. But he adds, that "the philoſophical Poet was a different perſon from "him that was the maſter of Socrates. But I don't "ſee from whence he infers that. For Suidas plainly "ſays, that the φυσιολογία was written by Archelaus "the Naturaliſt, who was Socrates's maſter. Nor do "I ſee, from whence he gathers, that any Archelaus "wrote in verſe upon the Nature of things. At "leaſt it cannot be gathered from the word συνέτα-"ξεν, which Suidas makes uſe of. And tho' Laer-"tius ſays that there were beſides three Archelaus's, "yet he does not reckon a Poet among them."

(43) Stobæus does it Serm. I. *de Morbis, & moleſtiarum in eis Solutione.* Plut. *de Flumin.* pag. 1148, quotes the 13th book of Archelaus περὶ ποταμῶν.
(44) Plutarch does it, *de Flumin.* p. 1153.
(45) Artemidorus, *de Somn.* lib. 4. cap. 24.
* *Compoſuit Philoſophiam*; i. e. *Compoſed a Treatiſe of Philoſophy.*
† Pag. 108.

Obſerve

of him, but he contents himſelf with preſerving to us the title of a work of his compoſing.

(47) Giraldus has tranſlated them, *Quæ naturæ propria ſunt, multis verſibus collegit.* That verſion is not at all better than thoſe that have been above recited, citation (39).

(48) Colomeſius, *Not. in Gyrald. de Poetis*, pag. 147. edit. *Operum* Gyraldi, *ann.* 1696.

Obſerve here a very learned man, who imagines, I, that Giraldus had in his eye the Greek words of Suidas, and not thoſe of Diogenes Laertius, ὁ τὰ ἰδιοφυῆ ποιήσας (47): II, That there was no occaſion to acknowledge a Poet Archelaus, who was a different perſon from the Naturaliſt: III, nor to ſuppoſe that one Archelaus made verſes upon the Nature of things: IV, that Diogenes Laertius has made no mention of one Archelaus that did make verſes. All this is enough to ſurprize one, to conſider it ſimply; but it is ten times worſe when one compares it with page 329 of the book *de Hiſtoricis Græcis*. Colomeſius has ſet right the firſt of Voſſius's four miſtakes, and has ſaid ſeveral good things beſide (48); but he is miſtaken in ſuppoſing that the words of Plutarch in the Life of Cimon relate to Archelaus the Poet: they mean the Naturaliſt, whoſe diſciple Socrates was. He might have criticiſed Giraldus, who believed that Archelaus, Author of the ἰδιοφυῆ, was a Philoſopher. Moreri ſays ſo too. It is without foundation; for one that makes collections of the ſingular and wonderful properties of animals, or metals, &c. may well enough be called a Natural Hiſtorian; but not a Natural Philoſopher, at leaſt if he does not join to the facts the reaſon of thoſe facts, and the diſcuſſion of their cauſes. That is a thing that the Poet Archelaus is not found to have practiſed. Moreri tells us, that Diogenes Laertius quotes him often. We ought rather to ſay that he does not quote him at all.

ARCHELAUS I (*a*), King of Macedon, natural ſon of King Perdiccas, aſcended the throne, and maintained himſelf in it, by great crimes. His mother was ſervant to Alcetas, the brother of Perdiccas [*A*]; ſo that according to the Laws (*b*), he ought to have been a ſervant of Alcetas; but inſtead of the ſubmiſſion which he owed him, he cauſed him to be treacherouſly murdered. He enticed him to his houſe, and promiſed to reſtore to him the crown that Perdiccas had deprived him of; he gave him a great entertainment; and having made him drunk, he got him carried by night out of the city in a chariot, and gave orders to have him ſlain. Alexander, the ſon of Alcetas, was ſerved in the ſame manner; he was put into the ſame chariot drunk as his father, and killed with him. A little while after, Archelaus had his brother murdered, who was but ſeven years old, and was the legitimate ſon of Perdiccas and Cleopatra. He threw him into a well, and made Cleopatra believe that the child fell into it, as he was chaſing a gooſe (*c*). He applied himſelf carefully to ſuch things as might make Macedon formidable; for he fortified ſeveral places, he made great roads, he collected great ſtores of arms and horſes, and every thing neceſſary for war; and in all the preparations of that kind he ſurpaſs'd the Kings his predeceſſors (*d*). He bethought himſelf of one thing which they had never practiſed; which is that he equipped fleets, and fought ſea-fights (*e*). He was a lover of Letters and the polite Sciences [*B*]; and he had in his houſe the greateſt Poets, the moſt famous Painters, and the beſt Muſicians (*f*). He was at a great expence to have his houſe painted by Zeuxis [*C*]; and without doubt it vexed him that Socrates, whom he endeavoured to get to his court, would not go thither [*D*]. The latter could have taught him not to be afraid of Eclipſes; and he had great need to be ſet right upon that head (*g*). We have

(*a*) Note there are ſome people, who acknowledge but one Archelaus among the Kings of Macedon.

(*b*) See the note [*A*].

(*c*) Extracted from the *Gorgias* of Plato, p. 321.

(*d*) Thucydides, lib. 2. p. 142.

(*e*) Solinus, c. 9.

(*f*) See the note [*C*].

(*g*) See the note [*D*].

[*A*] *His mother was ſervant to Alcetas the brother of Perdiccas* (1).] Ælian calls her Simicha (2): but, ſince Archelaus was the ſon of the King of Macedon, it ſhould not be ſaid, that he was raiſed to the throne from the condition of a goat-herd. And yet Diogenes the Cynic tells us that in a ſpeech of Dion Chryſoſtom. Αἰτώλος ἦν Ἀρχέλαος (3). i. e. "Archelaus was a Goat-herd." Obſerve theſe words of Plato, which tell us what Archelaus ought to have been according to the Laws: Κατὰ μὲν τὸ δίκαιον δοῦλος ἦν Ἀλκέτᾳ, καὶ εἰ ἐβούλετο τὰ δίκαια ποιῶν ἐδούλευσεν ἂν Ἀλκέτᾳ (4). i. e. "By the courſe of law he was ſervant to Alcetas, and "on that ſcore if he had acted juſtly he would have "ſerved Alcetas.

(1) Plato, *in Gorgia*, p. 321.
(2) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 12. cap. 43.
(3) Dio Chryſoſt. Orat. 4. *de Regno.*
(4) Plato *in Gorgia*, p. 321.

[*B*] *He was a lover of Letters and polite Sciences.*] Solinus ſays ſo (5). I have cited his words in the note [*N*] on the article of EURIPIDES, at the beginning. Add to it this paſſage of Ælian. Ἦν δὲ ἅμα ὁ Ἀρχέλαος ἐρωτικὸς οὐχ ἧττον ἢ καὶ φιλόμουσος (6). i. e. "But Archelaus was not leſs ſtudious of Love "than he was of Letters."

(5) Solinus, c. 9.
(6) Ælian, *Var. Hiſt.* l. 2. c. 21.

[*C*] *He had his houſe painted by Zeuxis.*] Socrates took occaſion to cenſure that: he ſaid that the Prince, who had been at ſuch expences to embelliſh his palace, had taken no pains to adorn his mind. *We know well enough*, adds he, *what numbers of ſtrangers are fond of taking a journey into Macedonia, to ſee the Prince's houſe; but that no body goes thither to ſee him, except ſuch as he engages by preſents. But that is a thing that has no effect upon good men* (7). I believe that he did not take much pains to cure himſelf of his lewdneſs by cultivating the Muſes; but I am ſure that with regard to the ornaments of the mind, his progreſs was very conſiderable. It ſhould ſeem likewiſe, from a witty ſaying of his, that he may be concluded to have made ſome progreſs in practical Morality. He was one day inſtigated againſt a perſon, who had thrown ſome water upon him. *It is not me, that he has wetted*, anſwered Archelaus, *he has wetted the perſon that he took me for* (8). No Philoſopher reaſoning upon the allowances of a miſtaken conſcience, ever ſaid any thing more rational. All Princes ſhould thus treat involuntary faults, if themſelves were reaſonable, or if the publick intereſt could allow, that in practice things might be regulated according to the dictates of reaſon (9). Let us drop that, and return to Socrates. By the words, which I quoted, he declared ſeveral perſons of genius to be diſhoneſt men, who would not have gone to Macedonia but for the ſake of Archelaus. Did Euripides go thither for any other reaſon (10)? The famous Agathon, that illuſtrious Poet, and his admirer Pauſanias and ſo many others, did not they go thither merely on the ſame account? Οὗτος ὁ Ἀγάθων —— Ἀρχελάῳ τῷ βασιλεῖ μέχρι τελευτῆς μετὰ ἄλλων πολλῶν συνῆν ἐν Μακεδονίᾳ (11). i. e. "This "Agathon —— was with Archelaus King of Mace-"donia, as were ſeveral others, as long as he lived."

(7) *Ex* Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* l. 14. cap. 17.

(8) Plutarch. *in Apophthegmat.* p. 177.

(9) See in the *New Letters againſt the Hiſtory of Calviniſm by Maimbourg* thoſe which treat of a miſtaken conſcience.

(10) Ælian, *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 2. cap. 21.

(11) Schol. Ariſtoph. *in Ranas.*

[*D*] *Socrates, whom he endeavoured to get to his court, would not go thither.*] There were two other perſons whom that Philoſopher treated after the ſame manner: he would neither go to ſee them nor accept of their preſents. Ὑπερεφρόνησε δὲ καὶ Ἀρχελάου τοῦ Μακεδόνος, καὶ Σκόπα τοῦ Κρανωνίου καὶ Εὐρυλόχου τοῦ Λαρισσαίου μήτε χρήματα προσίμενος αὐτῶν, μήτε παρ' αὐτοὺς ἀπιὼν (12). i. e. "He moreover deſpiſed "Archelaus the Macedonian, and Scopas the Crannonian, and Eurylochus the Lariſſean, with great cou-"rage, ſince he neither accepted of the money, "which they ſent him, nor would go to them." Seneca has preſerved to us the excuſe that Socrates made uſe of to Archelaus: "I will not, ſays he, go "ſee a man from whom I might receive favours, with-"out being able to return the like." *Archelaus rex Socratem rogavit ut ad ſe veniret; dixiſſe Socrates traditur,*

(12) Diog. Laert. lib. 2. num. 25.

have elſewhere (*b*) taken notice of the regard he had for Euripides. His liberality to perſons of abilities was moderate; but that might be occaſioned by his finding them too forward in aſking [*E*]. He inſtituted ſacrifices and ſtage-plays in honour of Jupiter and the Muſes; the celebration of them laſted nine days, a day being allotted to each Muſe (*i*). He ſent chariots with four horſes, which bore away the prize at the Olympic and the Pythian Games (*k*). It is agreed that he was ſlain; but the circumſtances of his death, and the duration of his reign are not ſettled [*F*]. Scaliger himſelf has found ſo much obſcurity

(*b*) In the article of EURIPIDES, notes [*N*], [*O*], [*P*], &c.

(*i*) Diod. Siculus, lib. 17. cap. 16.

(*k*) Solin. cap. 9.

ditur, 'nolle ſe ad eum venire, à quo acciperet beneficia, cum reddere illi paria non poſſet (13). That anſwer of Socrates has been related by Marcus Aurelius, according to the ſame meaning (14); but Ariſtotle relates it in terms that are not at all philoſophical. He ſuppoſes that Socrates anſwered, that they, who cannot return a favour, receive as great an affront as they that cannot return an injury. Ὑβρει ἔφη εἶναι τὸ μὴ δύνασθαι ἀμύνασθαι ὁμοίως, ᾧ παθόντα ὥσπερ καὶ κακῶς (15). That maxim ſuppoſes that we ought to revenge our ſelves of thoſe that injure us: it therefore is not worthy the morality of a Philoſopher, eſpecially ſuch a Philoſopher as Socrates. Seneca has expatiated very much to demonſtrate that it was eaſy for that Philoſopher thoroughly to repay Archelaus. He has ſaid, amongſt other things, that the favours of that Monarch would not have been equal in value to the inſtruction he would have received about the cauſe of eclipſes, and which would have prevented his relapſing into that terror which was obſerved in him one day when the Sun was eclipſed. He had ſhut up his palace cloſe; he had cauſed his ſon to be ſhaved. *Quid tantum erat accepturus* (Socrates) *quantum dabat, ſi — regem in luce media errantem, ad rerum naturam admiſiſſet, uſque eo ejus ignarum, ut quo die ſolis defectio fuit regiam clauderet, & filium (quod in luctu ac rebus adverſis moris eſt) tonderet? Quantum fuiſſet beneficium, ſi timentem è latebris ſuis extraxiſſet, & bonam animum habere juſſiſſet, dicens:* "*Non eſt iſta* "*ſolis defectio, ſed deorum ſiderum coitus, cum luna hu-*" *miliore currens via, infra ipſum ſolem, orbem ſuum po-*" *ſuit, & illum objectu ſui abſcondit* (16)." i. e. "What "thing ſo great could he (*Socrates*) receive as he gave, "if he had unfolded the nature of things to the King, "who was wandring by day-light, and to that de-"gree ignorant, that on a certain day, when there "was an eclipſe of the Sun, he ſhut up the palace, "and (which is the cuſtom in times of great trouble "and adverſity) he ſhaved his ſon? How great a "benefit would it have been, if he had drawn him "frighted from his lurking place, and had bid him "be of good courage, ſaying: "That is no defect "of the Sun, but only the conjunction of the two "heavenly bodies, when the Moon, paſſing in a "lower ſphere, places her orb beneath the Sun, "and hides him by her interpoſition." Seneca pretends, that Socrates only made uſe of that excuſe by way of Irony (17), and that in reality he refuſed to go to the Macedonian court, only becauſe he was willing fully to preſerve his liberty. *Vis ſcire quid verè noluerit? Noluit ire ad voluntariam ſervitutem is, cujus libertatem civitas libera ferre non potuit* (18). i. e. "Would you know why he really "refuſed? He, whoſe liberty a free city could not "bear, refuſed to go into voluntary ſlavery." Some ſay that Ariſtophanes wrote his comedy of the Clouds, to gratify a pique that he had *againſt Socrates, becauſe Archelaus King of Macedon took more notice of that Philoſopher than of him* (19). Note that there is another turn given to the anſwer of Socrates. It is ſaid that he excuſed himſelf from going to the court of Archelaus, becauſe bread was ſo cheap in Athens, and there was plenty of water there (20).

(13) Senec. *de Benef.* lib. 5. cap. 6. pag. 96.

(14) Marcus Antoninus, τῶν εἰς ἑαυτὸν, lib. 11. Sect. 25. Note he ſuppoſes that it was made to Perdiccas.

(15) Ariſtoteles, *Rhetor.* lib. 2. cap. 23. p. 445, A.

(16) Senec. *de Benef.* lib. 5. cap. 6. pag. 96.

(17) Idem, ibid.

(18) Idem, ibid. p. 95.

(19) Charpentier's *Life of Socrates*, p. 57. He quotes the tranſlators of Ariſtophanes *in Argumento illius Comœdiæ.*

(20) *Vide* Stobæum, Serm. 237.

[*E*] *His liberality to perſons of abilities was moderate—perhaps becauſe they were too forward in aſking.*] "Archelaus the King of Macedon ſeemed to be a "little niggardly with regard to gifts and making "preſents, of which Timotheus the Muſician, as he "was ſinging to his lyre, gave him a hint, by re-"peating and dwelling upon this little ſneer, *That* "*paltry pelf too highly you commend:* But Archelaus "ſmartly and with a good grace inſtantly replied to "him, *But you of asking for it know no end.*" This ſtory is related by Plutarch (21). In another book he gives us likewiſe the following account. *There was formerly a certain perſon, who fancying that nothing was ſo honourable as to aſk and receive, aſked one day at ſupper, of Archelaus the King of Macedon, a golden cup out of which he was drinking. The King commanded his page to carry and give it to Euripides, who was at the table; and turning to the perſon that had asked it, ſaid to him,* "*For your part you deſerve to ask* "*and to be refuſed, becauſe you ask; but Euripides is* "*worthy of the preſent, becauſe he asks for nothing* (22)." Perhaps he ſet bounds to his liberality from a principle like that of Charles the ninth (23). But it is more probable that he had the ſame taſte which was remarked in Cardinal Richelieu, who *never did any thing* for the Poet Mainard, *and it was partly becauſe he did not love to be asked for any thing, but was deſirous that he might have the glory of giving from his own meer motion* (24).

(21) Plutarch. *de Fortunâ Alexandri*, lib. 2. pag. 334. I make uſe of Amiot's verſion.

(22) Plut. *de Vitioſo Pudore*, pag. 531. I make uſe of the ſame tranſlation.

(23) See the article DAURAT, note [*F*].

(24) Peliſſon, *Hiſt. de l'Academie Franc.* pag. 278.

[*F*] *The circumſtances of his death, and the duration of his reign are not ſettled.*] Some ſay that being a hunting he was wounded by his favourite Craterus, and that he died of that wound; and they add that Craterus did it innocently and by accident (25). Others ſay that he was ſlain by ſome conſpirators whom Decamnichus prompted to that parricide (26). Quintus Curtius favours the latter opinion. *Quis proavum hujus Alexandrum*, ſays he (27), *quis deinde Archelaum, quis Perdiccam, occiſos ultus eſt?* i. e. "Who hath re-"venged the death of his great grandfather Alex-"ander, or of Archelaus, or Perdiccas, that have been "ſlain?" I ſhall ſay ſomething further on this head in the following note. As to the duration of his reign, ſome writers make it twenty four years (28), others ſixteen (29), others fourteen (30), and ſome others but ſeven (31). The latter opinion ſeems to me to be right: it is that of Diodorus Siculus; and I am aſtoniſhed that Calviſius quotes that hiſtorian, after having ſaid that Archelaus reigned ſixteen years (32). A paſſage of Athenæus wrong underſtood has occaſioned a thouſand diſagreements. We read in the editions of that author, that Pericles and Perdiccas died in the third year of the Peloponneſian war, and that Archelaus immediately aſcended the throne (33). It is impoſſible for Athenæus to ſay ſo; for his deſign is to convict Plato of having committed a blunder; Plato, I ſay, who in the ſame dialogue where he ſuppoſes Archelaus to be King, aſſerts that Pericles had been dead but a little while. It is plain, that he who cenſures him makes himſelf ridiculous, and does not know what he ſays, if he advances what we read in his printed books. Caſaubon is not in the leaſt wrong to think it ſtrange that they who tranſlated Athenæus, did not obſerve ſo viſible an abſurdity, and that they were able to digeſt ſo hard a morſel. *Cum hæc clariſſime diſputentur ab Athenæo, quis interpretum ſtomacho non invideat, qui vulgatam loci hujus ſcripturam adeo ὐστομάχως tulerint* (34)? i. e. "As theſe things "are very clearly diſcuſſed by Athenæus, who can "help envying the goodneſs of the Tranſlators Sto-"machs, which could digeſt the common reading of "this place ſo eaſily?" For his own part he owns himſelf not able to do it; and notwithſtanding all the manuſcripts, he maintains the tranſcribers of Athenæus have left out a period. He ſeems to me to have hit very happily upon what the author did ſay; which is, that Alexander King of Macedon, who died about the ſame time with Pericles, was ſucceeded by Perdiccas, who reigned till the Archonſhip of Callias, and that Perdiccas dying under that Archonſhip, his throne was filled by Archelaus. Suppoſing that, Athenæus does not criticize Plato's diſcourſe without reaſon; for there was a conſiderable interval betwixt the death of Pericles, and the reign of Archelaus. Obſerve by the by, that Caſaubon has anſwered that cenſure (35); but above all take ſpecial notice that Diodorus Siculus, allowing ſeven years for the reign of Archelaus, places his death under the Archonſhip of Ariſtocrates, the ſecond year of the 95th

(25) Diod. Sicul. lib. 14. cap. 38. I ſhall quote his words in the laſt note.

(26) Ariſt. *de Repub.* lib. 5. cap. 10. I have quoted his words in the note [*N*] of the article of EURIPIDES.

(27) Quint. Curtius, lib. 6. cap. 11.

(28) Euſeb. *in Chron.* num. 1585. Helvicus embraces that opinion.

(29) Calviſius, *ad ann. Mundi* 3534.

(30) Petav. *Rationar. Tempor.* Part 2. lib. 2. *ſub finem ex Dexippo.*

(31) Diod. Sicul. lib. 14. cap. 38.

(32) Calviſ. *ad ann. Mundi* 3550 p. 156. col. 2.

(33) Athen. lib. 5. cap. 18. pag. 217.

(34) Caſaub. *in Athen.* pag. 384.

(35) Idem, ibid. pag. 385.

obſcurity thereupon as has led him into groſs errors (*l*). It is probable that Archelaus had led a laſcivious life, which occaſioned his deſtruction [*G*]. I ſhall

(*l*) See the note [*F*].

95th Olympiad. His reign therefore commenc'd the third year of the 93d Olympiad, when Callias was Archon. It muſt be allowed then that Perdiccas died in the time of the ſame Archon. But amongſt the various opinions, which had prevailed about the duration of Perdiccas's reign, that of Marſyas and Philocorus, which fixed it to three and twenty years, was made choice of by Athenæus in arguing againſt Plato. Therefore he muſt needs have ſuppoſed, that this Perdiccas aſcended the Throne the ſame year that Pericles died, that is to ſay, in the fourth year of the 87th Olympiad. All this ſo ſtrongly confirms the ſentiment of Caſaubon, that inſtead of ſaying his conjecture is probable, it ſhould be aſſerted without ſcruple, that the period which he reſtores was really written by Athenæus: and as it contains twice or thrice the ſame words at the end of a compleat ſentence, it is eaſy to imagine that the tranſcribers omitted it, and that the Readers did not perceive any thing to be wanting. The generality of people only read to be inſtructed without fatiguing themſelves: it is on that account that they are but little ſenſible of faults in reaſoning, when they require ſome attention, or taking a review of what preceded. Upon the whole they content themſelves with ſaying, *This is obſcure, I don't underſtand it*; but that does not mend the matter, the fault ſtill continues as it was. Critics, and eſpecially critical tranſlators, do not proceed after that faſhion. They take notice of faults in the ſenſe, and conſider how to correct them: they compare the manuſcripts together, they make the beſt uſe they can of their own conjectures. But in this paſſage of Athenæus, as Caſaubon lays it to their charge, they proved very dull.

Scaliger's Mistakes.

Here the great Scaliger will be an inſtance, that the penetration of the moſt learned perſons is ſometimes very much confined. He did not obſerve a viſible error of an author, whom he commented and critiſcized upon, and has uſed that very miſtake for the grounds of a cenſure againſt Diodorus Siculus, on whom he charges words which are only to be found in Athenæus. To make the matter clear; Euſebius has placed three things under the firſt year of the the 87th Olympiad; the death of Perdiccas, the beginning of the reign of Archelaus, and the commencement of the Peloponneſian war. Scaliger lets that paſs, and only obſerves that the firſt year of that war is generally ſuppoſed to be the ſecond year of the 87th Olympiad, becauſe that rupture happening towards the end of Pythodorus's Archonſhip, it had been thought beſt to date it from the Archonſhip of Euthydemus (36) who was Pythodorus's ſucceſſor (37). In obſervance of that method, he allows that the year in which Pericles died was the fourth of the 87th Olympiad, and the third of the Peloponneſian war; and quotes a Greek paſſage, which ſays, that in the ſame year that Pericles died, Perdiccas King of Macedon died, and Archelaus aſcended the throne. He aſcribes this paſſage to Diodorus Siculus; and, upon that foot, he cenſures him for an Anachroniſm of three years. That is by ſuppoſing that Euſebius was neither miſtaken with regard to the death of Perdiccas, nor to the coronation of Archelaus: ſo that he did not know that Thucydides has expreſly remarked, that King Perdiccas was alive in the ſixteenth year of the Peloponneſian war (38). But, further, he did not know that the words which he aſcribes to Diodorus Siculus, are Athenæus's: he did not know that thoſe words of Athenæus are corrupted; he was not aware that they are curtailed, and that they ought to be adjuſted after the manner that Caſaubon has ſettled them. It may be obſerved that Salmaſius took for good chronology, that which places the death of Perdiccas, and the beginning of Archelaus's reign, at the fourth year of the 87th Olympiad (39): he therefore was unacquainted with certain things that Caſaubon could have furniſhed him with; but it is worth the taking particular notice, that one might elude, or even confute, by a favourable interpretation, one point of my criticiſm upon Scaliger. I ſaid that he cenſured Diodorus Siculus, and the reaſon of my ſaying ſo is built upon theſe words of his: *Diodoro ergo prochroniſmus fuerit triennii* (40). i. e. "Diodorus therefore has made a miſtake of three "years." They follow the Greek paſſage, which is falſly attributed by Scaliger to that Author, and where it is to be found that Perdiccas dying in the third year of the Peloponneſian war, Archelaus ſucceeded him. But becauſe Euſebius aſſerts that Archelaus aſcended the throne the firſt year of the Peloponneſian war, it might be pretended that Scaliger would not ſay any thing elſe, only that the doctrine of Euſebius contains an anachroniſm of the anticipation of three years, according to Diodorus Siculus. If this be his true meaning, he has not blamed the latter hiſtorian; he has been content to keep himſelf in ſuſpence, determining nothing either in the favour of him or of Euſebius. I ſhall be glad to have this kind of recantation obſerved. A Critic who takes the advantage of a doubtful expreſſion, ought not to omit its favourable meaning. He ſhews by that means what can be ſaid for and againſt Authors. He ſupports ſucceſſively the character of an advocate, both for the Plantiff and Defendant.

(36) It anſwers to the 2d year of the 87th Olympiad.

(37) Scaliger, *Animadv. in Euſebium*, num. 1585, pag. 106.

(38) Thucydides, lib. 6. pag. 341.

(39) Salmaſius, *Exercitat. Plin.* pag. 156, 157.

(40) Scaliger, *Animadv. in Euſebium*, num. 1585. p. 106.

[*G*] *It is probable that Archelaus had led a laſcivious life, which occaſioned his deſtruction.*] Ariſtotle having ſaid that ſeveral conſpiracies had been formed againſt Kings, on account of their debaucheries, inſtances immediately in the attempt of Crateus (41). That man was not able to bear the diſhonour that Archelaus had done him, in ſatisfying his bruiſh luſt upon him. So that upon occaſion of another offence, which alone would not have been a juſt ground for a conſpiracy, he reſolved to deſtroy his maſter. That other offence was that the King having promiſed him one of his daughters, yet notwithſtanding married the elder to the King of Elimeus, and the younger to the ſon of Amyntas. A political conſideration occaſioned this breach of his word. Finding himſelf embarraſſed with a war that he had made upon Sirras and Arrhabæus, he was deſirous of gaining over the King of Elimeus. And being afraid that the ſon of Amyntas might create him ſome diſturbance, he made him his ſon in law, in hopes that that alliance would preſerve an union betwixt them, and have the ſame effect upon the ſon of Cleopatra. Crateus publickly ſhewed then his reſentment; but the ſource of his hatred aroſe from the injury he received in his perſon. Ἀλλὰ τῆς γὲ ἀλλοτριότητος ὑπῆρχεν ἀρχὴ τὸ βαρέως φέρειν πρὸς τὴν ἀφροδισιαστικὴν χάριν (42). i. e. "But the original "cauſe of his ill will was, that he took heinouſly his "being made ſubſervient to his luſt." Hellanocrates of Lariſſa joined him in this conſpiracy from the like motives; for having given up the flower of his youth to the paſſion of Archelaus, and not finding that it procured him to be recalled from his exile, as that Prince had given him room to hope, he concluded that his perſon had been made uſe of, not from any motives of love, but with deſign to diſgrace him. Διὶ ὕβριν καὶ οὐ δι' ἐρωτικὴν ἐπιθυμίαν φάντο εἶναι τὴν γεγενημένην ὁμιλίαν (43). Obſerve, that Plutarch tells us that Crateus the minion of Archelaus, ſlew that Prince (44). Plato tells us the ſame thing, but without naming that Aſſaſſin and Catamite; but he ſays that the murderer had not made the attempt but to poſſeſs himſelf of the crown, and that it was taken from him three or four days afterwards, by ſome other conſpirators (45). I wonder that Diodorus Siculus has related, in a manner ſo different from this, the death of the King of Macedon, and its conſequences. It is probable that Plato and Ariſtotle, who lived nearer the time and place, where thoſe things happened, knew more of them than he.

(41) Arist. *de Repub.* lib. 5. cap. 10. p. 305.

(42) Arist. *de Repub.* lib. 5. cap. 10. p. 305.

(43) Idem, ibid.

(44) Plutarch. *in Amatorio*, pag. 768, F.

(45) Plato, *in Alcibiade poſteriore*, p. 453, 454. Æliani *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 8. cap. 9.

I have obſerved ſome faults in Giſanius's commentary on this paſſage of Ariſtotle. I. That writer affirms that Suidas has related in the article of Euripides that Cratevas took away the life of King Archelaus his lover (46). That is not true: Suidas only ſpeaks of Cratevas as of a Poet, who, in concert with Arrideus, another Poet, contrived the death of Euripides. II. Inſtead of ſaying that Plutarch *in Alcibiade poſteriore*, & Plato *in Commentario de rebus amatoriis*, have ſpoken of the murder of Archelaus (47), he ſhould aſcribe to Plato the *Alcibiades poſterior*, and to Plutarch the Commentary *de rebus amatoriis*. III. It is not true,

(46) Obertus Giſan. in cap. 10. lib. 5. *Politic. Ariſtot.* p. 669.

(47) Idem, ibid.

ſhall have ſome obſervations to make againſt Moreri [*H*].

true, that Thucydides, in the IVth Book, mentions the war of Archelaus againſt *Sirras and Arrhibæus* (48): He only ſpeaks of a war which King Perdiccas and Braſidas made with Arrhibæus King of the Lynceſtian Macedonians. IV. It is falſe that Suidas has placed Arrhabæus in the number of the conſpirators againſt the life of Archelaus; he only ſays that the Poet Crateyas was ſeconded by another Poet called Arrideus to deſtroy Euripides. V. He ſhould not ſay the *King of Elibeus* (49), but the King of Elimeus, Archelaus's firſt ſon in law.

(48) *De hoc bello Archelai adverſum Sirram & Arribæum. videatur Thucyd.* lib. 4. i. e. "Concerning this "war of Archelaus againſt "Sirras and Arribæus" *ſee* Thucydides B. 4. Giſanius *in Politic. Ariſtot.* lib. 5. cap. 10. pag. 669.

(49) Idem, ibid.

[*H*] *Here are ſome obſervations againſt Moreri.*] I. It is falſe that Archelaus ſucceeded Perdiccas *in the year of the world* 3641; for, according to Moreri, that year of the world anſwers to the 351 year of Rome. But that year of Rome anſwers to the ſecond year of the 94th Olympiad; and we have ſeen above, that, according to Diodorus Siculus, Archelaus muſt have begun to reign the third year of the 93d Olympiad. II. It is not true that Juſtin ſpeaks of our Archelaus. He of whom he ſpeaks was the uncle of Alexander the Great, and had never been King. There is no occaſion therefore to be ſurprized, that he *ſays nothing about the time of his reign*. III. It is not true, that he places him *amongſt the ſons which Perdiccas had by Euridice:* he places him amongſt the ſons of Amyntas and Gygea; of Amyntas, I ſay, the father of Philip, and grandfather of Alexander the Great. IV. Neither what Juſtin has ſaid, nor what he has forgot, are ſigns that Archelaus the grandfather has been confounded with Archelaus, the grandſon; for he only ſpeaks of one Archelaus who was not the grandſon of ours. V. It is a ſtrange blunder, to place the death of our Archelaus under the 117th Olympiad, and to make that Olympiad agree with the 363d year of Rome. VI. He ſhould not have aſſerted that the Archelaus, who reigned after Oreſtes, was his ſon, and the grandſon of Archelaus; for beſides that Euſebius is but little followed with regard to that ſecond Archelaus, he does not ſet down any degree of kindred. What follows, concerns Moreri's ſupplement. It is there found that *Socrates would not come near Archelaus, becauſe of his tyranny and inhumanity.* Let us reckon that for a VIIth overſight; for we have ſeen before (50), that that was not the reaſon which prevented that Philoſopher from going to the Macedonian Court. The VIII fault is the charging Thucydides, and Diodorus Siculus, with having ſaid, that *Euripides* being deſired *to compoſe a tragedy upon the ſubject* of Archelaus, *excuſed himſelf from it, that he might not repreſent the cruelties of that tyrant.* It is very certain that neither Thucydides, nor Diodorus Siculus ſay any thing like it; and I am of opinion that no good Author amongſt the Ancients has mentioned it. Does a Prince deſire to be the ſubject of tragedies *himſelf?* Cannot a Court Poet write ſuch tragedies as are agreeable to his maſter, by paſſing over the cruelties of that maſter? IX. The favourite, who ſlew Archelaus, is called Craterus in Diodorus Siculus (51): he ought therefore to call him by that name, and not by *Crateus* or *Cratevas*, ſince no body but Diodorus Siculus is quoted for it. X. The ſame reaſon makes me maintain that it ſhould not be declared that he *formed a conſpiracy againſt Archelaus, and ſlew him*, to be revenged of him for the breach of his word. The continuator of Moreri ſays, that Archelaus promiſed his daughter to that favourite, and gave her to another. Since he only quotes Thucydides, and Diodorus Siculus, the former of whom has not ſaid a word about that, and the latter has related that the favourite wounded his maſter by miſchance (52), he deſerves a little cenſure; for I agree that if he had quoted Ariſtotle, he had been right enough. See the preceding note. XI. Diodorus, whom he quotes, calls him, who reign'd after Archelaus, Oreſtes (53): Why then are we juſt now told that this Prince *had a ſon of the ſame name who ſucceeded him?* XII. This Hiſtorian adds, that Oreſtes was ſtill a child, and that he was ſlain by his tutor Æropes, who reigned afterwards ſix years. Why then is he made to ſay that Archelaus the ſecond, ſon of Archelaus the firſt, ſucceeded his father, *and reigned but four years, and was ſlain in hunting by Craterus one of his confidents, who afterwards ſeized upon the crown, but enjoyed it but three days?* As many faults as words.

(50) In the note [*G*].

(51) Lib. 14. cap. 38.

(52) Ἀρχέλαος ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν τινι κυνηγίᾳ ἀκουσίως ὑπὸ Κρατεροῦ τοῦ ἡρωμένου. i. e. "King Archelaus being a "hunting was "undeſignedly "wounded by "Craterus, "whom he "highly eſteem-"ed." Diod. Siculus, lib. 14. cap. 38.

(53) Idem, ibid.

ARCHELAUS King of Cappadocia, in the time of Auguſtus, was the great grandſon of ARCHELAUS, a Cappadocian by country (*a*), General of Mithridates's army in Greece againſt Sylla. That General, who had ſo much ſignalized himſelf at the defence of the Pireum (*b*), in the ſecond war left Mithridates's party, and took that of the Romans. He left a ſon called as well as himſelf ARCHELAUS, who, upon the news that the Romans were going to attack the Parthians, joined Gabinius Governor of Syria, to take part in that expedition (*c*). The Senate altered their reſolution: Gabinius's army was deſtined to the reſtoration of the King of Egypt (*d*), who had implored the aſſiſtance of the Romans, to recover his crown from his own daughter Berenice. Archelaus accompanied Gabinius in that war, but left him to go into Alexandria, where he married Berenice [*A*]. He did not long poſſeſs the crown which he got by that marriage; for he loſt his life ſix months after (*e*), in a battle againſt the forces of Gabinius, in the year of Rome 698 [*B*]. He had obtained of Pompey a very honourable poſt [*C*]; it was the Pontificate of Comana in Cappadocia (*f*). His ſon Archelaus poſſeſſed it after him (*g*), till Cæſar took it from him in the year of Rome 707, to give it to another [*D*]. We

(*a*) Plutarch. *in Sylla*, p. 466. C.

(*b*) Appian *in Mithridat.* See the laſt note.

(*c*) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 384; and lib. 17. pag. 547. Dion, l. 39.

(*d*) His name was Ptolomæus Auletes.

(*e*) Strabo, l. 17. p. 547.

(*f*) Idem, lib. 12. pag. 384.

(*g*) Idem, ibid.

[*A*] *He married Berenice.*] We ſhall make an article of this Princeſs, where we ſhall examine whether Father Noris ought to have ſaid that ſhe drew in Archelaus by promiſing him marriage.

[*B*] *He loſt his life in a battle againſt the forces of Gabinius, in the year of Rome* 698.] This does not agree with the 17th book of Strabo, where we read, that Ptolemy having been reſettled in his Kingdom, put to death his daughter and ſon-in-law Archelaus. I ſhall demonſtrate in the article of BERENICE, that Strabo is miſtaken there, and that he has even contradicted himſelf. We may take it for a certainty, that theſe words of Moreri are a miſtake: *Ptolemy having been re-eſtabliſhed in* 699, *put to death Archelaus and Berenice.*

[*C*] *He obtained of Pompey a very honourable poſt.*] Father Noris pretends that the Pontiff of Comana was Sovereign of the place. *Hunc Archelaum*, ſays he (1), *Pompeius ſacerdotem Bellonæ ac Comanorum Principem (utraque enim dignitas unà eidemque conferebatur) conſtituerat*, cuivis Dynaſtæ parem opibus, *ex Appione in Mithridat. p.* 252. i. e. "Pompey conſtituted this "Archelaus, who *was equal in wealth to any Prince*, "Prieſt of Bellona and Prince of the Comani; for both "the dignities were conferred together upon the ſame "perſon." Appian. *Mithr.* p. 252. We ſhall examine in another place if he be in the right.

(1) Noris, *Cenotaph. Piſana*, pag. 255.

(2) In the article COMANA.

[*D*] *Cæſar took that dignity from the ſon of Archelaus, to give it to another.*] Hirtius relates that Cæſar diſpoſed of this benefice in favour of Nicomedes, who alledged very juſt pretenſions. *Id homini nobiliſſimo Nicomedi Bithynio adjudicavit, qui regio Cappadocum genere ortus, propter adverſam fortunam majorum ſuorum mutationemque generis jure minimè dubio, vetuſtate tamen intermiſſo, ſacerdotium id repetebat* (3). i. e. "He adjudged it to Nicomedes a noble Bythinian, "who being ſprung from the royal family of Cappadocia, endeavoured to recover that Prieſthood, "having

(3) Hirtius, *de Bello Alexandrino*, p. 416.

We are in the dark as to the reſt of his adventures; but it appears that he married a very fine woman, named Glaphyra, and that he had by her two ſons, whereof one was called Siſinna, and the other Archelaus. The former diſputed the Kingdom of Cappadocia with Ariarathes, who was in poſſeſſion of it. Mark Anthony was the arbitrator of this difference, in the year of Rome 713, and decided it agreeably to the wiſhes of Siſinna (*b*). The fair ſex had too ſo much power over him, and Glaphyra was ſo very fine a woman, that the proceſs could not but take ſuch a turn. There are ſome Hiſtorians who treat her as a courtezan (*i*); that is a way to give us a good notion why Mark Anthony paſſed ſo favourable a judgment for Siſinna; but whatever probability there may be in this ſcandal, it might not be impoſſible but that the friendſhip of Mark Anthony for this Archelaus, who married Berenice (*k*), was his motive. It is not known what became of Siſinna; we only know that Ariarathes reaſcended the throne of Cappadocia; for Mark Anthony was obliged to drive him thence in the 718th year of Rome, and then he conferred that Kingdom upon Archelaus the other ſon of Glaphyra (*l*). This is he who appears at the head of this article. He became very powerful (*m*), and he teſtified his gratitude to Mark Anthony his benefactor, by furniſhing him with good troops during the war at Actium (*n*). He was ſo happy, that it occaſioned no reſentment from Auguſtus againſt him; he was left in the poſſeſſion of Cappadocia, and he was almoſt the only one that received the like favour (*o*). He aſſiſted Tiberius in the year 734, to reeſtabliſh Tigranes in Armenia (*p*), and he obtained of Auguſtus the Leſſer Armenia, and good part of Cilicia (*q*). He fixed his reſidence in the Iſland of Eleuſa [*E*], near the coaſt of Cilicia; and having married Pythodoris, the widow of Polemon King of Pontus, he conſiderably encreaſed his power; for the ſons of Polemon being but children, he had undoubtedly the adminiſtration of their Kingdom jointly with their mother [*F*]. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf in a ſignal manner in making his court to Caius Cæſar, who was ſent into the Eaſt by his grandfather Auguſtus (*r*). That proved very fatal to him in the conſequence [*G*]; for Tiberius remembring that he had received no civility from him during his ſtay at Rhodes, and that on the contrary Caius Cæſar had received a great many honours from him, was reſolved to be revenged as ſoon as he ſaw himſelf maſter of Rome;

(*b*) Appian. lib. 5. *Belli Civilis*, pag. 675.

(*i*) See the article GLAPHYRA.

(*k*) Plutarchus, *in Antonio*, pag. 917.

(*l*) Dio, lib. 49. p. 469.

(*m*) See the note [*L*] towards the end.

(*n*) Plutarch. *in Antonio*, p. 944.

(*o*) Dio, lib. 51. *initio*.

(*p*) Joſeph. *Ant.* lib. 15. cap. 5.

(*q*) Dio, lib. 54. *ad annum* 734. *See alſo* Strabo, lib. 12. p. 368, and 382; and lib. 14. p. 461.

(*r*) In the year of Rome 753.

" having a title no ways dubious, tho' on account " of the ill fortune of his anceſtors and his change of " country, it had been a conſiderable time diſconti- " nued." Father Noris aſſerts, that Cæſar conferred that dignity upon Lycomedes, after having vanquiſhed Pharnaces; but all who ſhall conſult Hirtius will eaſily ſee that it was before the battle. As to the name of Lycomedes, it may be ſeen in the editions of Strabo (4). It is likewiſe certain that we find in Dion, that one Lycomedes was ſtript of his poſſeſſions by Auguſtus after the defeat of Mark Anthony (5), and that he might very well be the perſon whom Cæſar raiſed to the Pontificate of Comana; for he reigned in part of Cappadocia. Every one muſt do as he pleaſes in this caſe. The epithet of Bithynian, which Hirtius has made uſe of, favours rather the reading of Nicomedes (6), than that of Lycomedes.

(4) Lib. 12. pag. 384.

(5) Dion, lib. 51. *init.*

(6) It is that of the editions of Appian *in Mithridat.* towards the end.

[*E*] *He fixed his reſidence in the Iſland of Eleuſa.*] That is what Strabo and Joſephus tells. *Poſt Corycum Eleuſa inſula eſt continenti propinqua. Eam Archelaus condidit, ac regiam ſibi fecit, cum totam aſperam Ciliciam excepta Seleucia eſſet nactus.* i. e. " Beyond " Corycus lies Eleuſa, an iſland near the continent. " Archelaus built it and made himſelf a palace, when " he had got all the rocky Cilicia except Seleucia (7)." Joſephus remarks that Herod, having arrived at Eleuſa in Cilicia, found there Archelaus King of Cappadocia (8). It was thither that the Meſſengers of Herod were ordered to carry the letter, which he wrote to Archelaus (9). That Hiſtorian obſerves that Eleuſa was called Sebaſte (10). Might it not be Archelaus, who, to make his court to Auguſtus, had made that alteration of the name?

(7) Strabo, lib. 14. p. 461.

(8) Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. 16. c. 8.

(9) Idem, ibid. cap. 16.

(10) Idem, ibid. cap 8.

[*F*] *He had undoubtedly the adminiſtration of the Kingdom of Pontus.*] Father Noris poſitively affirms it (11). I chuſe rather to make uſe of an expreſſion, that ſignified, not that it was found to have been ſo in ancient books; but that it was agreeable to reaſon to ſuppoſe it probable. What inclined me to make uſe of this little caution was, that I obſerve that Strabo ſays nothing farther about it than that Pithodoris dwelt with her huſband Archelaus as long as he lived. Αὐτὴ δὲ συνώκησεν Ἀρχελάῳ, καὶ συνέμεινεν ἐκείνῳ μέχρι τέλους (12). She underſtood the art of government: therefore it might not be impoſſible that ſhe determined to rule alone the Dominions of her children. Γύνη σώφρων καὶ δυναμένη προϊσασθαι πραγμάτων (13). i. e. " A prudent woman and one that " knew how to preſide over affairs."

(11) Noris, *Cenotaph. Piſana*, p. 227. He quotes no body.

(12) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 383.

(13) Idem, ibid. pag. 388.

[*G*] *The pains he took about C. Cæſar became very fatal to him in the conſequence.*] I have already remarked more than once, that ſuch a perſon as we deſpiſe is deſtined by Providence to great fortune (14). Unhappy thoſe then, who formerly have deſpiſed him. There are few perſons ſo equitable as Lewis XII, who uſed to ſay that the King of France ought not to revenge the injuries done to the Duke of Orleans. Our Archelaus acted ſuitably to the rules of Politicks; he knew that Auguſtus tenderly loved his grandſon, and that in all likelihood that young Prince was to ſucceed his grandfather. Tiberius, in the Iſland of Rhodes, was in a kind of diſgrace, which no ways promiſed him the Empire. Archelaus thought that he ſhould run no riſque in neglecting him, and it was even hinted to him that he would expoſe himſelf by cultivating his acquaintance. He believed that all the honours which he paid to Caius Cæſar, would be a certain baſis for rewards and kindneſſes during his whole life. He was miſtaken: he was not ſufficiently aware of the ability of Livia to clear the way for her ſon to the throne. Caius and his brother did not live long; of which in all appearance ſhe knew the reaſon. After all, it is the beſt politicks generally to be complaiſant, even when they are in diſgrace, to all ſuch as one ſees in a way of coming to great power (15). Let us produce our authorities, which tell us of Tiberius's reſentment. *Rex Archelaus*, ſays Tacitus (16), *quinquageſimum annum Cappadocia potiebatur, inviſus Tiberio, quod eum Rhodi agentem nullo officio coluiſſet: nec id Archelaus per ſuperbiam omiſerat, ſed ab intimis Auguſti monitus, quia florente Caio Cæſare, miſſoque ad res Orientis intuta Tiberii amicitia credebatur.* i. e. " King Archelaus enjoyed Cappadocia fifty years, hated by Ti- " berius, becauſe he had taken no notice of him " during his reſidence at Rhodes: nor had Archelaus " omitted it through pride, but by the admonition " of Auguſtus's particular friends, becauſe Caius Cæ- " ſar flouriſhing at that time, and being ſent to take " care of the affairs of the Eaſt, the friendſhip of " Tiberius was deemed unſafe." Dio ſays almoſt the ſame thing: *Tiberius Cappadociæ Regem Archelaum, infenſus ei, quia cum olim ſibi is ſupplicâſſet, ſuoque patrocinio uſus, cum at incolis apud Auguſtum accuſaretur, fuiſſet, Rhodi ſe neglexiſſet, at Caium in Aſiam venientem officioſe coluiſſet; inſimulatum quaſi novis rebus ſtuderet, evocavit Romam* (17). i. e. " Tiberius " being offended at Archelaus King of Cappadocia, " becauſe

(14) See the end of the text, and the note [*B*] of the article of APOLLODORUS the Architect.

(15) POMPONIUS ATTICUS found great advantage by ſuch a conduct. See the note [*A*] on his Article.

(16) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 2. cap. 42.

(17) Dio, l. 57.

Rome; and to that purpoſe he ſummoned him, and gave him up to the judgment of the Senate [*H*] on ſuch accuſations as ſhould be brought againſt him. Old age, the gout, and above all the indignity of his treatment ſoon brought him to his end [*I*], although the Senate had pronounced nothing againſt him. It is thought that he avoided the ſentence of the Senate by counterfeiting madneſs [*K*]. He died in the year of Rome 770, the 52d of his reign, after which Cappadocia was reduced into a Province [*L*]. His

" becauſe though he himſelf had formerly been a " ſupplicant to him, and had uſed his good offices, " when he was accuſed by the inhabitants to Augu- " ſtus, yet he had neglected him at Rhodes, and paid an " extraordinary deference to Caius, when he came " into Aſia, ſummoned him to Rome as a perſon " who aimed at innovations." We learn from this paſſage, that Tiberius not only complained of the incivility of Archelaus, but likewiſe of his ingratitude. The circumſtance of the place might farther provoke the Emperor; for the Iſland of Eleuſa, where Archelaus reſided, was but 15 miles diſtant from Rhodes (18).

(18) Strabo, lib. 14. pag. 448.

[*H*] *Tiberius ſummoned him, and gave him up to the judgment of the Senate.*] Dio relates, *Inſimulatum quaſi novis rebus ſtuderet, evocavit Romam, ac Senatus judicio tradidit* (19). i. e. " He cited him to Rome " as a perſon who aimed at innovations, and deliver- " ed him up to the judgment of the Senate." It was therefore a ſtate crime of which he was accuſed. Tacitus does not ſeem to grant that; he inſinuates very plainly, that Tiberius had the ſincerity to complain of nothing, but the incivility of Archelaus, and that he gave him room to hope that by his preſence and entreaties he might obtain pardon. *Ut verſa Cæſarum ſobole imperium adeptus eſt, elicit Archelaum matris literis, quæ non diſſimulatis offenſionibus clementiam offerebat, ſi ad precandum veniret* (20). i. e. " As " ſoon as the Cæſarean race being removed, he had " got poſſeſſion of the Empire, he engaged Archelaus " to come to him by his mother's letters, who offered " mercy, tho' he did not diſſemble his offences, if he " would come to beg it." That ſincerity about the article of perſonal offences concealed a very dangerous trap. The King of Cappadocia did not perceive it, or dared not act as one that did perceive it. He ſet out forthwith to make his appearance at Rome, was very ill received by Tiberius, and ſoon found himſelf delivered over to juſtice. *Ille ignarus doli, vel ſi intelligere crederetur vim metuens, in urbem properat, exceptuſque immiti à principe, & mox accuſatus in Senatu* (21). Suetonius only mentions in a general manner this action of Tiberius. *Reges infeſtos ſuſpectoſque comminationibus magis & querelis quam vi repreſſit; quoſdam per blanditias atque promiſſa extractos ad ſe non remiſit, ut . . . . . Archelaum Cappadocem* (22). i. e. " He repreſſed troubleſome and ſuſpected Kings more " by threatnings and complaints than force; ſome " whom he had drawn out by good words and pro- " miſes, he never ſent back again as . . . . Archelaus " the Cappadocian." I don't know whether Archelaus, notwithſtanding his age, was not engaged in ſome attempt after the death of Auguſtus; for there is mention of one of his plots (23), which can relate to no time but that.

(19) Dio, lib. 57.

(20) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 42.

(21) Idem, ibid.

(22) Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. 37. *See alſo* Eutropii lib. 7.

(23) Philoſt. *in Vitâ Apoll.* lib. 2. cap. 7.

[*I*] *Old age, the gout . . . . brought him to his end.*] Let us go on to conſult Tacitus. *Mox accuſatus in Senatu non ob crimina quæ fingebantur, ſed angore, ſimul feſſus ſenio, & quia regibus æqua nedum infima inſolita ſunt, finem vitæ ſponte an fato implevit.* i. e. " Be- " ing afterwards accuſed in the Senate, either his own " choice, or fate put an end to his life, not on " account of the crimes which were found againſt " him, but becauſe he was worn out by pain attended " with old age, and by reaſon that forms of judica- " ture, much leſs thoſe of a low kind are unuſual to " Princes." This Hiſtorian does not know whether Archelaus ſlew himſelf, or whether he ſunk under the weight of his misfortunes; but one may infer from his account, that this Prince was not condemned, much leſs puniſhed with death. Dio will furniſh us with more circumſtances.

(24) Mr. Tillemont, *Hiſtoire des Empereurs*, tom. 1. p. 107, falſly charges Dio with having ſaid that Archelaus was acquitted by the Senate by pretending to be mad.

[*K*] *It is thought that he avoided the ſentence of the Senate by counterfeiting madneſs.*] Dio aſſures us that Archelaus overburdened with age was looked upon as one who doated; that he nevertheleſs had his perfect ſenſes, but counterfeited madneſs, becauſe he ſaw no other way to ſave his life (24); that after all, he would have ſuffered death, if he had not been accuſed by a falſe witneſs of having uttered threatning expreſſions, and of having ſaid, that when ſhe ſhould be got back to his Kingdom, he would ſhew Tiberius that he did not want ſtrength. That occaſioned a laughter, and diverted Tiberius's deſign of putting him to death. He was ſo weak and feeble, that he was obliged to be carried to the Senate in a litter. Dio adds, that at that juncture, Archelaus eſcaped death; but that he died ſoon after. The text of my remark is not contradicted by Dio; for if the falſe witneſs ſaved the life of Archelaus, it was only becauſe it was judged that the threats of a man ſo reduced as he, were a certain proof of his being diſtracted, of doating, of being relapſed into a ſtate of childhood, &c. From this one may be ſatisfied, that Xiphilinus had no great judgment. He has ſuppreſſed the pretended madneſs of Archelaus. But that is a fact which he ought to have kept, whatever brevity he aimed to obſerve. David, Brutus and ſome others have made an excellent uſe of that contrivance. I agree to it; but theſe are however remarkable adventures, and which ought to be retained by an abbreviator. Let us not forget that Dio obſerves that at another time Archelaus had been really mad, which appeared by ſuch marks, that Auguſtus had appointed him a Governor, who was Regent of the Kingdom. I do not know whether it might not be upon that occaſion that he had recourſe to the protection of Tiberius. He had recourſe thither finding himſelf accuſed by his ſubjects; but might he not have been accuſed of madneſs, at a time when he had reaſon enough left to wiſh not to be put under guardianſhip, and to maintain that his ſubjects through mere malice wanted to have him thought incapable of the government? It would be difficult to clear that up. The ancient Hiſtorians kept ſo to their maxim of relating only the main ſubſtance of things, that they have given us no light with regard to certain little particulars. Their maxim is a very good one; but there is an art of ſpecifying facts in few words as one goes along, that would be of great uſe, if people either would, or knew how to practiſe it. An Hiſtory *in folio*, by means of that art, might remove a thouſand diſputes, and clear up a variety of particulars, without being for all this above fifty pages longer.

[*L*] *After his death Cappadocia was reduced into a province.*] Velleius Paterculus, Tacitus, Dio, and ſeveral others expreſly aſſert it (25). Here are the very words of the three firſt. *Tib. Cæſar . . . . ut has armis, ita auctoritate Cappadociam populo R. fecit ſtipendiariam* (26). *Regnum in provinciam redactum eſt* (27). *Paulo poſt obiit* (Archelaus) *ac inde Cappadocia quoque Romanorum juris effecta, equitique regenda data* (28). i. e. " As Tiberius Cæſar rendered theſe tribu- " tary to the people of Rome by his arms, ſo did " he Cappadocia by his authority . . . . The King- " dom was reduced into a Province . . . . A little af- " ter he (*Archelaus*) died, and from that time Cappa- " docia likewiſe was made a Province of the Romans, " and the government of it given to a Knight." It was Germanicus, who executed that order (29). Appian therefore is highly miſtaken, in ſaying that the Kingdom of Cappadocia was reduced to a Province under Auguſtus (30). Father Noris, who has obſerved that fault of Appian, has found two very conſiderable ones in Riccioli, the one relating to Genealogy, and the other to Chronology (31). The words which he produces of that Author are theſe: *Summoto Mithridate, creatus eſt Cappadocum conſenſu à Romanis Ariobarzanes; tandem Archelao pronepote mortuo Romæ Conſulibus C. Cælio Ruſo & L. Pompeio, ut ait Tacitus, id eſt anno 84 ante Chriſtum, deſiit regnare in Cappadocia* *. i. e. " Mithridates being removed, Ario- " barzanes was created by the Romans with the con- " ſent of the Cappadocians; at length Archelaus his " great grandchild being dead at Rome when C. Cæ- " lius

(25) Strabo, lib. 12. p. 368. Sueton. *in Tiber.* cap. 37. Eutrop. lib. 7. cap. 6.

(26) Paterc. lib. 2. cap. 39.

(27) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 2. cap. 42.

(28) Dio, lib. 57. p. 614.

(29) Suet. *in Calig.* cap. 1. Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 56.

(30) Appianus, *in Mithridaticis*, pag. 244. *apud* Noris, *Cenot. Piſan.* pag. 241.

(31) Noris, *Cenot. Piſan.* pag. 226.

* Riccioli, *Chron. Reformat.* tom. 1. lib. 5. cap. 9. num. 5.

His family boasted of a very ancient and illustrious descent [*M*]. We shall say some thing of his descendants in the Article of GLAPHYRA. There is a probability that he wrote some books [*N*]. The address which he made use of to appease the fierce indignation of Herod against his son Alexander, testifies, that he knew how to give things a masterly turn (*s*). Some people have confounded him with Archelaus the son of Herod [*O*]. I have never found that Eutropius says what a modern author imputes to him; viz. that Archelaus bequeathed his Kingdom at his death to the people of Rome, and that it was upon that title that Cappadocia became a Province (*t*). Mr. de Tillemont might be very well assured of a thing of which he is in doubt (*u*); which is that the same Archelaus, who was King of Cappadocia, obtained by the favour of Augustus a part of Cilicia, and the lesser Armenia. Moreri has committed several faults of omission in this Article. His Continuator has been guilty only of one fault of commission; but it is such an enormous one that it is as bad as four [*P*]. We shall see what it is in the last note on this Article.

(s) Joseph. *Antiquit.* lib. 16. cap. 12; and *de Bello Judaico.* lib. 1. cap. 17.

(t) Noldius, *de Vitâ & Gestis Herodum*, pag. 194.

(u) *Histoire des Empereurs*, tom. 1. pag. 33.

ARCHELAUS

"lius Rufus and L. Pomponius were Consuls, as Ta-
"citus says, that is, in the year 84 before Christ, he
"ceased to reign in Cappadocia." These words have perfectly the air of a mutilated passage: it is not an uncommon thing for Printers to skip over whole lines. However, Archelaus did not descend from Ariobarzanes; which is the genealogical error of Ricciolus; and the Consulship of C. Cælius Rufus and L. Pomponius, under which he died at Rome, fell out on the 17th year of Jesus Christ; which is the chronological error. Strabo declares in express terms, that Archelaus was not a relation of Ariobarzanes. *Ita Rex ab iis factus est Ariobarzanes, cujus in tertia stirpe genus defecit. Exinde Archelaus ab Antonio Rex est constitutus* NULLA AFFINITATE *ipsis conjunctus* (32). i. e. "Thus was
"Ariobarzanes made King by them, whose race was
"extinct in the third generation. Then Archelaus
"was appointed King by Anthony, being not in the
"least allied to them." The error which Noldius imputes to Jornandes is very different from that of Appian. He will have it that Cappadocia became a Province under the Emperor Claudius, and that, by Archelaus's will (33). The revenues of Cappadocia were so considerable when Archelaus died, that Tiberius thought himself able, by the acquisition thereof, to support himself without the moiety of a tax, which he had caused to be levied. *Regnum* (Archelai) *in provinciam redactum est, fructibusque ejus levari posse centesimæ vectigal professus Cæsar, ducentesimam in posterum statuit* (34). i. e. "The Kingdom (*of Archelaus*) was
"reduced into a Province; and Cæsar professed that
"by the product thereof the tax of the hundredth part
"might be mitigated, and ordered that for the fu-
"ture it should be only of the two hundredth part."
He eased even that Province, and would not draw from thence so much as it had furnished to the last King (35).

(32) Sttabo, lib. 12. p. 273.

(33) Jornand. *de Regnor. & Tempor. Successione.* p. 645. *apud* Noldium *de Vitâ Herod.* p. 194.

(43) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. c. 42.

(35) Idem, ibid. cap. 56.

[*M*] *His family boasted of a very ancient and illustrious descent.*] Glaphyra, daughter of the last Archelaus, and wife of Alexander the son of Herod, often talked of the nobility of her family, and boasted that she was descended from Temenus, by the father's side, and from Darius the son of Hystaspes, by the mother's side (36).

(36) Joseph. *de Bello Jud.* lib. 1. cap. 17.

[*N*] *There is some probability that he wrote some books.*] Pliny furnishes all that probability. He several times quotes Archelaus, and it is judged that in two places he means Archelaus King of Cappadocia. He gives him that title in one of the two citations, *Archelaus qui regnavit in Cappadocia*, says he (37); and as he treats there of certain particulars relating to Amber, Father Hardouin does not doubt but that he ought to understand the same Archelaus in the 7th chapter of the 37th book of Pliny, where one Archelaus is quoted about the properties of a kind of precious stones (38). He no more doubts, that it was extracted from the book *de Lapidibus* cited by Plutarch (39). I shall leave that undetermined; and to say something more certain, I shall point out a passage of Pliny, where Archelaus is reckoned amongst the Kings that have written on Agriculture (40). I have spoken above (41) of another Archelaus, whom Pliny often quotes.

(37) Plinius, lib. 37. cap. 3. pag. 371.

(38) Hardouin. *in Indice Autor. Plinii. See also* Malincrot, *Paralipom.* p. 60.

(39) Plut. *de Fluviis*, p. 1153.

(40) Plinius, lib. 18. cap. 3. pag. 440.

(41) In the note [*C*] of the article of ARCHELAUS the Philosopher.

[*O*] *He has been confounded with Archelaus the son of Herod.*] Father Noris has convicted Ricciolus of that fault (42). The last named Author has pretended, that Tiberius pleaded for Archelaus before Augustus, in the process which Archelaus had with his brothers, relating to the succession of Herod, and he pretends to prove it by this passage of Suetonius: *Civilium officiorum rudimentis Archelaum Trallianos, & Thessalos, varia quosque de causa, Augusto cognoscente defendit* (43). i. e. "At his first engaging in civil
"offices he defended Archelaus, the Trallians, and
"Thessalians, each having different causes, before Au-
"gustus." And as Velleius Paterculus tells him, that Tiberius quitted Rhodes, to return to Rome, in the year 755, he concludes that in that very year, and not in 751 or sooner, Archelaus was made Ethnarch. Father Noris shews him from the passage of Dio above cited (44), that the words of Suetonius ought to be understood of Archelaus King of Cappadocia. He might have added a circumstance, which overturns Ricciolí's hypothesis; viz. that Tiberius defended the cause of Archelaus before he went to Rhodes. That is plain from the words of Dio, and may evidently be inferred from those of Suetonius, who ranks the defence of Archelaus in the front of all the causes undertaken by Tiberius, when he made, if I may be allowed the expression, his first campaign of the long Robe, *civilium officiorum rudimenta*. Torrrentius understood the thing like Ricciolus, that Suetonius meant to speak of the great process of Archelaus the son of Herod, and he refers us to Josephus (45). How came he not to see that Josephus could not have been ignorant of that good office of Tiberius, and that he would have spoke of it if he had known it? I have been surprized, that Father Noris, who has made such frequent and so vigorous sallies upon the Jesuit Salian, has spared him on this occasion. That Jesuit has fallen into the same mistake as Riccioli: he has censured Casaubon for having applied (46) the passage of Suetonius to Archelaus King of Cappadocia; he has represented to him that that Prince's cause was transacted under the reign of Tiberius; he has maintained, that therefore we should understand here Archelaus the son of Herod; and he has proved it by this supposition that Jesus Christ dwelt two years in Egypt: *for*, says he, *Tiberius was not yet returned to Rome in the second year of Jesus Christ: nevertheless he was at Rome, when Archelaus disputed with his brethren about the succession of Herod, since he honoured him with his protection* (47). See how a man heaps one fault upon another, when he lays a wrong foundation. It is as clear as the noon-day, that the King of Cappadocia had a process before Augustus, before Tiberius retired into the Island of Rhodes (48).

(42) Noris, *Cen. Pisan.* pag. 148.

(43) Suet. *in Tiberio*, cap. 8.

(44) Citation (17).

(45) Torrent. *in Sueton. Tiber.* cap. 8. he refers us to Euseb. *in Chron. & Eccles. Hist.* lib. 1. *and to* Joseph. *Antiq.* lib. 17. cap. 11.

(46) *Comment. in Sueton.*

(47) Saliani *Annales, in Scholiis, ad ann.* 3. *Christi*, num. 7.

(48) *See* Noldius *de Vitâ & Gestis Herodum*, p 194, *& seq.*

[*P*] *The continuator of Moreri has made an enormous blunder about Archelaus.*] He says, that *Scylla* (as he spells it) after having taken the city of Athens, *with his own hand slew Archelaus* General of Mithridates's forces, *at the foot of the altar, where he had taken sanctuary*. Then quotes *Aulus Gellius*, l. 14. It is certain, that Aulus Gellius in chap. 1, of the 15th book, speaks of a thing, which the continuator has mentioned, I mean of an expedient made use of by Archelaus to prevent the Romans from burning a wooden tower, which defended the Piræum. We shall see below how that is; but it is utterly false that he says, that Archelaus took refuge in a temple, and that Sylla himself slew him at the foot of the altar. I do not think any Author of credit has said that; for it is a notorious fact, that Archelaus, having forced Sylla to give over the attacks of the Piræum, and only to attack

ARCHELAUS the ſon of Herod the Great, King of Judea, was by his father's will declared his ſucceſſor [*A*], and immediately after Herod's death (*a*) took upon him the power and authority, tho' not the name of a King, becauſe it was neceſſary for him to be confirmed by the Emperor (*b*). Having performed the funeral of his father, and mourned over him ſeven days, according to the cuſtom of the Jews, he went into the Temple dreſſed in a white garment, and ſeated himſelf upon a high Throne of Gold. In his march to the Temple he was attended with a multitude of people, who gave him a thouſand bleſſings, and wiſhed him a proſperous reign; he in return gave them great hopes that they ſhould be much happier under his government, than they had been under that of his father [*B*]. The people, who generally believe that Princes are very ſincere in the promiſes they make at their acceſſion to the crown, received with great acclamations the aſſurance which Archelaus gave them; and took that opportunity to beg ſeveral favours of him. Archelaus, whoſe only deſign was to ſecure the crown to himſelf, did not think proper in this conjuncture to refuſe any thing to the people. He made them the faireſt promiſes, but he ſoon ſhewed that he would be as great a tyrant as his father had been. For even before he had been confirmed by Auguſtus, he gave a terrible inſtance of his cruel and tyrannical temper. He put to death three thouſand perſons, who had formed a deſign to revenge the death of ſome perſons, who as they thought had been unjuſtly puniſhed by Herod [*C*] (*c*). Archelaus went afterwards

(*a*) He died about the 25th of November in the firſt year of Chriſt, the fourth before our vulgar Æra. Clericus, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* Sæc. 1. p. 215.

(*b*) Joſeph. *de Bello Judaic.* lib. 1. cap. 21. and *Antiquit.* lib. 17. cap. 10.

(*c*) Idem, *De Bello Judaic.* lib. 2. cap. 2. and *Antiq.* lib. 17. cap. 11.

tack the city, had time to retire when he knew that it was taken by ſtorm (49). Sylla purſued him, and gained great victories over him, and obliged him to make peace upon diſadvantageous terms. Archelaus finding himſelf ſuſpected of ill practices (50), durſt not truſt himſelf with Mithridates, and went to find out Murena, who commanded the Romans. He was received honourably, as Strabo has obſerved in more places than one. Ἦν ὁ οὗτος Ἀρχέλαος υἱὸς μὲν τοῦ ὑπὸ Σύλλᾳ καὶ τῆς συγκλήτου τιμηθέντος (51). i. e. "This "Archelaus was the ſon of him, who received honour "from Sylla and the Senate." The ſecret of preſerving the wooden tower conſiſted in rubbing it well over with allum. I fancy Quadrigarius is the only Hiſtorian who has mentioned it. The others ſay that the towers and machines were deſtroyed by the beſiegers. It is very certain that allum has not the quality, that Quadrigarius ſpeaks of. Theſe are his words: *Tum Sulla conatus eſt & tempore magno eduxit copias, ut Archelai turrim unam, quam ille interpoſuit, ligneam incenderet. Venit, acceſſit, ligna ſubdidit, ſubmovit Græcos, ignem admovit, ſatis ſunt diu conati, nunquam quiverunt incendere: ita Archelaus omnem materiam obleverat alumine, quod Sulla atque milites mirabantur: & poſtquam non ſuccendit, reduxit copias* (52). i. e. "Then Sylla endeavoured, and for a great while "drew out his forces, to burn one of Archelaus's "wooden towers, which he placed betwixt them. "He came, he drew near, he put billets under it, "he drove away the Greeks, he put fire to it, they "laboured a long while, but could not make it "kindle. Archelaus had ſo ſmeared over the whole "ſubſtance thereof with allum, that Sylla and his ſol-"diers were aſtoniſhed, and after that it did not burn, "he withdrew his forces." If Mr. l'Abbé de la Roque had known of this paſſage of Aulus Gellius, he would not have ſaid, that "Hiſtory remarks that "Sylla ſeveral times attempted to burn a wooden "tower, which one of Mithridates's Lieutenants de-"fended, and that he could never accompliſh his de-"ſign, becauſe it was ſmeared over with a certain "drug, WHOSE NAME WE HAVE NOT COME TO "THE KNOWLEDGE OF, which had a property of "repreſſing the activity of fire (53)." Two things aſtoniſh me: the one, that ſince Quadrigarius has mentioned ſo extraordinary an accident, all the other Hiſtorians have taken no notice of it; the other, that ſince ſo many Hiſtorians have not ſaid a word about it, Quadrigarius has deſcribed it in ſo particular a manner. Theſe kinds of facts ſtrike the imagination ſo forcibly, that an incombuſtible wooden tower muſt have been the laſt thing that their accounts could have omitted. Sylla would have infallibly inſerted it in his Memoirs. Plutarch, who quotes them ſo often (54), would have ſeen it there, and would not have failed to mention it. Let us conclude from his ſilence and that of the other Hiſtorians, that the fact is not true. But from whence has Quadrigarius taken it? I believe it is not poſſible to determine the origin of his error. It is true enough that the feathered allum does reſiſt fire, and cannot be conſumed; but to rub a wooden tower over therewith, and by that means to render it incombuſtible, is, as I take it, a thing impracticable.

(49) *Vide* Appian. *in Mithridat.*

(50) The *Epitome* of Titus Livius obſerves, that Archelaus delivered up the fleet of Mithridates to the Romans. Aurelius Victor ſays that Sylla *Claſſem Mithridatis proditione Archelai intercepit.* i. e. "In-"tercepted Mi-"thridates's "fleet through "the treachery "of Archelaus.

(51) Strabo, lib. 12. p. 384. *See alſo* lib. 17. pag. 547.

WHETHER Archelaus knew how to make wood incombuſtible.

(52) *Apud* Aul. Gell. lib. 15. cap. 1.

(53) *Journal des Savans* of the 15th of Feb. 1677. p. 54.

(54) Plutarch. *in vit. Syllæ.*

[*A*] *He was by his father's will declared his ſucceſſor.*] He had made another will before, by which he left the Kingdom to his ſon Antipas (1); but he altered his mind, and leaving now the Kingdom to Archelaus, he gave Antipas only the Tetrarchate of Galilee and Perea; and to Philip his brother the Provinces of Traconitis, Gaulonitis, and Bathanea, which he erected into a Tetrarchate; to Salome his ſiſter the cities of Jamnia, Azot, and Phazaelis, with fifty thouſand pieces of ſilver; beſides ſeveral other legacies to his friends, and to the Emperor (2), to whom he left entirely the diſpoſal of this Teſtament, declaring expreſly that it ſhould have no force, till it was confirmed by Auguſtus (3). We may obſerve here, that Archelaus was older than Antipas, but the reaſon why Herod did not mention him was, that Antipater another ſon of Herod, had rendered Archelaus ſuſpected to his father (4), who when he diſcovered the traiterous deſigns of Antipater, found that he had been miſinformed concerning Archelaus, and accordingly declared him his ſucceſſor.

(1) By the ſame wife as Archelaus.

(2) Joſeph. *Ant.* lib. 17. cap. 10.

(3) Idem, ibid.

(4) Idem, *de Bello Judaico*, lib. 1. cap. 20.

[*B*] *He gave them great hopes, that they ſhould be much happier under his government, than they had been under that of his father.*] He told the people that he was very thankful for the loyalty and affection they ſhewed him, and ſo much the more as he perceived that the tyranny of the King his father, and the hardſhips they had ſuffered under his government, had not diminiſhed their love for him. He promiſed that he would ſoon give them proofs of his gratitude; but that he could not yet take upon him the title of King, till his father's Teſtament had been approved and confirmed by the Emperor: but that as ſoon as he ſhould have received the crown from the hands of his Sovereign, he would ſhew by his actions, and by the whole courſe of his life, that they had good reaſons to love him (5). Theſe promiſes of Archelaus would afford us ſeveral reflections, if it were proper to inſert them here; but, not to give offence, we muſt leave the ingenious reader to make them himſelf.

(5) Idem, *Antiq.* lib. 18. cap. 10.

[*C*] *To revenge the death of ſome perſons, who had been unjuſtly puniſhed by Herod.*] The fact as related by Joſephus (6) is as follows. Herod had cauſed a golden eagle of an extraordinary bulk and very great price to be placed over the porch of the Temple, tho' the Jewiſh laws expreſly forbid the making of any images of animals. There were at that time in Jeruſalem two men called Judas and Matthias, who were extremely beloved by the people, not only for their eloquence, and becauſe they were perfectly well skilled in the law, but alſo becauſe they inſtructed the youth, and endeavoured to perſuade them to be virtuous. Theſe men hearing that King could not recover of his illneſs, exhorted all young people, who revered them as their maſters, to deſtroy whatever had been raiſed againſt the laws and cuſtoms of their anceſtors. They repreſented to them, that nothing could

(6) Ibid. cap. 8.

wards to Rome, leaving the care of his family, and the government of his Kingdom to Philip his brother. In his voyage he was attended by his mother (*d*) and by ſeveral of his friends. Salome his aunt did alſo accompany him with all her family, under pretence of uſing her intereſt with Auguſtus in his favour; but in reality to obſtruct his meaſures, and particularly to accuſe him before the Emperor, for having cauſed ſo many perſons to be killed in the Temple. Antipas, whom Herod in a former will had made his ſucceſſor, went alſo to Rome by Salome's advice, and pretended that Herod's laſt will was not to be regarded, as having been made at a time when Herod was not in ſound health. This cauſe was pleaded before Auguſtus [*D*]. Antipater the ſon of Salome, a very eloquent man, who hated Archelaus, ſpoke for Antipas; and one Nicholas, who had been employed by Herod in ſeveral affairs, defended the cauſe of Archelaus

(*d*) She was a Samaritan woman, named *Malthace*. Joſeph. *Antiquit.* lib. 17, cap. 1. and 12.

could be more glorious, than to declare themſelves the reſtorers and defenders of religion; and tho' the undertaking was full of dangers, yet thoſe very dangers ought to inſpire them with zeal and ardour, ſince an honourable death is preferable to a life, how eaſy ſoever, when a man dies to maintain the laws of his country, which procures him an immortal glory. Such a diſcourſe fired the breaſt of thoſe to whom it was addreſſed, and a falſe report being then ſpread, that Herod was dead, they went immediately to the Temple, pulled down the Eagle, and with hammers and axes broke it to pieces before a multitude of people, who were at that time aſſembled in the Temple. The Officer, who commanded the King's garriſon at Jeruſalem, went immediately with a great number of ſoldiers to the Temple, where finding no reſiſtance, he ſoon diſſipated the multitude. Four only of the young men, who had broken down the Eagle, made ſome reſiſtance; but they were ſoon taken priſoners and carried before the King, with Judas and Matthias, their leaders, who thought it would be a ſhame for them to run away. Herod asked them, how they came to be ſo bold, as to pull down an image that was conſecrated. They anſwered, "It is a long time ſince "we have taken this reſolution; and it would have "been baſe for us not to have put it in execution. "We have avenged the injury done to God, and "maintained the honour of his law. What! do you "imagine it ſtrange, that we, who have received that "law from Moſes, to whom God himſelf gave it, "ſhould prefer it before your orders and commands? "Or, do you think we are afraid of death? No; "Whatever torments you will make us ſuffer, death "will not be to us the puniſhment for a crime, but "the reward of our virtue and piety." Theſe words they pronounced with ſo much courage, that there was no reaſon to doubt but their hearts agreed with their mouth, and that they would not be leſs conſtant in their ſufferings, than they had been bold in their enterprize. They had ſoon an opportunity to ſhew whether they were ſincere; for Herod condemned Matthias, and all thoſe who were taken with him, to be burnt alive. Another Matthias, who was then High-Prieſt, and who was thought to have been concerned in this affair, was deprived of his office, which was conferred on Soazar his brother in-law. This was highly reſented by a great number of Jews. They kept quiet during Herod's life, being awed by him; but as ſoon as they heard that he was dead, they began to aſſemble in a tumultuous manner, and to deplore the cruel condemnation of Matthias, and of thoſe who had been put to death with him. They preſſed Archelaus to revenge ſo great an injuſtice, by the death of ſome of Herod's friends and counſellors, who, they ſaid had prompted him to that unjuſt condemnation. Archelaus thought at firſt, that gentle meaſures were the moſt proper to appeaſe this tumult. He ſent one of the principal Officers of his army to repreſent to the rioters, as Joſephus calls them, "That they ſhould "not indulge themſelves in this deſire of revenge; "but conſider, that the puniſhment they complained "of, had been inflicted according to law. That their "petition was an high offence againſt his authority. "That this was not a proper time to make ſuch "complaints. That for the preſent they ſhould en"deavour only to maintain the publick peace and tran"quillity, till Archelaus being confirmed on the throne "by Auguſtus, ſhould return from Rome. That then "he would endeavour to regulate every thing after a "mature deliberation with a general conſent, but "till then they ſhould be quiet, without involving "themſelves in the guilt of rebellion." This was not capable of aſſwaging the fury of the rebels; they ſhewed by their repeated clamours, that it was impoſſible for any perſon to endeavour to bring them back to their duty and allegiance, without running the hazard of his life. They thought it was inſufferable, that even after Herod's death, the blood of their friends, which had been ſo unjuſtly ſpilt, ſhould not be revenged. They became more and more enraged, and as the feaſt of the Paſſover drew near, at which a vaſt number of people uſed to reſort to Jeruſalem, there was reaſon to fear, that the ſedition would become more terrible. And indeed, during the feaſt, thoſe rebels, who lamented the death of Judas and Matthias, did not ſtir out of the Temple, and choſe rather to beg for their daily ſuſtenance, than to depart from the Temple. Archelaus fearing, leſt they ſhould carry their revolt ſtill farther, ſent an Officer with ſome ſoldiers to them, in order to ſuppreſs the tumult, before they had inſpired the reſt of the people with the ſame ſpirit of rebellion. But the ſeditious having notice of it, did by their clamours and exhortations inflame the people to ſuch a degree, that they fell upon the ſoldiers, and killed almoſt all of them; and the Officer himſelf who commanded them, hardly eſcaped with his life. The King judging it would be of a very dangerous conſequence, to ſuffer ſuch a rebellion to continue unpuniſhed, ſent his whole army againſt them, with orders for the cavalry to kill all thoſe, who ſhould endeavour to eſcape out of the Temple; and not to ſuffer thoſe from without to aſſiſt them. Upon this occaſion Archelaus's army killed three thouſand of thoſe rebels; the reſt eſcaped into the mountains. This is Joſephus's account (7), who, tho' a Jew, does not ſcruple to call them rebels, and to condemn thoſe who ſtood up in defence of their religion and their laws. But we leave our readers to judge whether Archelaus, who had but lately promiſed, that his government ſhould be milder and juſter than that of his father, ought not to have prevented the rebellion, not by the ſword, but by bringing to condign puniſhment thoſe, who had been concerned in the death of Matthias and his unfortunate companions, and even thoſe, who had adviſed Herod to do an action ſo very contrary to the law of Moſes, as was the erecting an image in the entrance of a Temple conſecrated to God alone.

(7) Ibid. cap. 12.

[*D*] *This cauſe was pleaded before Auguſtus*] Antipater, who pleaded againſt Archelaus, opened the cauſe; and ſaid, that "It was only out of formality that Ar"chelaus asked the Emperor's conſent, ſince without "waiting till he knew what would be the Emperor's "pleaſure, he had taken poſſeſſion of the Kingdom "in a very terrible manner, by putting to death on "a ſacred day a vaſt number of Jews. That indeed they "deſerved it, but he ought not to have puniſhed them, "till he had been lawfully empower'd to do it. That "if he had done it as a King, without waiting for the "Emperor's confirmation, it was an high offence againſt "him; but if he had acted in his private character, it "was ſtill a greater crime. How then could he ex"pect, that the Emperor would confer upon him a "crown, which he thought, as he had ſhewed by "his conduct, the Emperor had no right to diſpoſe "of?" Antipater afterwards accuſed Archelaus of having by his own private authority removed ſeveral Officers of the army; of having ſeated himſelf on the throne; of having heard cauſes pleaded before him; of having granted to the people the favours they had asked; in a word, of having done whatever he could have done, if he had been already confirmed by the Emperor. He laid ſeveral other things

Archelaus. The Emperor did not determine this affair immediately (e); and whilſt the cauſe was ſtill depending, there aroſe another obſtacle againſt Archelaus's ambition: The Jews ſent a ſolemn Embaſſy to Auguſtus [E], praying him to alter the form of their government, and not to ſubject them any longer to Kings, but to unite their country to Syria, that they might be ſubject only to the governor of that Province. Notwithſtanding this petition of the Jews, Auguſtus granted to Archelaus, not indeed the whole Kingdom of Judea, but half of it [F] under the title of Ethnarchate, and promiſed to make him King, when by his wiſdom and virtue he ſhould deſerve it (f). Archelaus returned then into Judea, and having taken poſſeſſion of his Ethnarchate, began to exert his authority by depriving Joazar the ſon of Boethus of the High-Prieſthood, pretending that he had favoured and ſupported the party of thoſe, who had raiſed a ſedition in revenge for the perſons, who had been put to death by Herod. He repaired afterwards in a very ſumptuous manner the Palace of Jericho; he built a town, which from his own name he called *Archelais*; and what very much exaſperated the Jews againſt him, was, that he did not ſcruple to tranſgreſs the laws of Moſes, by marrying Glaphyra, the daughter of Archelaus King of Cappadocia, tho' ſhe was the widow of Alexander, his brother, and had children by him. In the tenth year of Archelaus's reign, the Jews not being able to bear any longer his tyrannical government, accuſed him before the Emperor. What encouraged them the more to it, was, that they knew, that Auguſtus had expreſly recommended to him, to govern his ſubjects with moderation and juſtice. Theſe complaints provoked the Emperor againſt him to ſuch a degree, that he did not condeſcend to write to him, but only ſent the agent he had at Rome, to conduct him thither. Archelaus accordingly went to Rome, where Auguſtus having heard his charge and his defence, confiſcated all the money he had, and ſent him into baniſhment to Vienne (g) in Gaul. He and his wife had ſome warning of this misfortune in a dream [G]. The countries, over which Archelaus had reigned, were united to

(e) Idem, ibid. cap. 11.

(f) Ibid. cap. 12 and 13.

(g) The chief town of the Viennois, a county in the Lower Dauphiné, which is a Province of France.

things to his charge, ſome of which were true, and ſome very probable, conſidering the ambition, which muſt be natural to a man ſtill young, and lately raiſed to the ſovereign power. He afterwards inſiſted very ſtrongly upon that horrid and impious murther, committed in the temple, where in one ſolemn day had been ſeen ſo many innocent victims ſlain, of citizens as well as of ſtrangers, who had been cruelly butchered, not by a foreign Prince, or by an enemy, but by one, who made uſe of the venerable name of a lawful King, to ſatisfy his tyrannical paſſions and ſanguinary temper. Antipater added, that Herod, who knew the ill inclinations of that man, had, when in health, ſo little thoughts of leaving him the Kingdom, that by his former Will, which was much more authentick than the latter, he had choſenfor his ſucceſſor Antipas, whoſe manners were intirely the reverſe of thoſe of Archelaus. This Will was made at a time, when it could not yet be ſaid, as it had been afterwards, that Herod's mind was dead before his body, but when the ſtrength of both were ſtill full and entire. Laſtly, ſaid Antipater, ſuppoſe that Herod was in health when he made his laſt will, yet he did not know what manner of King Archelaus would be, who ſhewed himſelf unworthy of the crown, by diſdaining to receive it from the Emperor's hands, and by putting to death ſo many citizens when he himſelf was ſtill but a private man. Nicholas, who pleaded Archelaus's cauſe, anſwered, that the blood ſpilt about the temple muſt be aſcribed only to the inſolence and obſtinacy of the rebels, who had obliged Archelaus againſt his will to have recourſe to arms in order to repreſs their inſolence; and that though they ſeemed to revolt againſt Archelaus only, yet it was evident, that they intended to rebel even againſt the Emperor himſelf. Antipater, added he, ſhould be aſhamed to be carried ſo far by his hatred againſt Archelaus, as to excuſe the rebels; whereas he ought to own, that they only were guilty, who had been killed, ſince they were the aggreſſors, and had forced the ſoldiers to uſe againſt them thoſe arms, which they had carried with them to defend themſelves. With regard to Herod's laſt Will, he maintained that the King had perfectly the uſe of his ſenſes when he made it; and added, that this Teſtament was ſo much the more to be looked upon as authentick, as Herod left the execution of it entirely to the diſpoſal of the Emperor. The plea concluded with ſome compliments beſtowed both upon Auguſtus and Archelaus (8). We ſhall only obſerve here, that Archelaus's cruelty with regard to the perſons killed in or about the temple, would not have been a proper motive to Auguſtus to refuſe him the crown; ſince that Emperor did not eſtabliſh himſelf on the throne, but by ſhedding a prodigious quantity of blood.

(8) Idem, ibid.

[E] *The Jews ſent a ſolemn Embaſſy to Auguſtus.*] The Embaſſy conſiſted of fifty perſons, who upon their arrival at Rome were joined by above two thouſand Jews, all inhabitants of that city. They were admitted to the Emperor's audience, and there, in preſence of Archelaus, the firſt made very great complaints againſt the government of Herod their late King. Then they added, that "they hoped his ſon would "take a quite different courſe; that for this reaſon "they had not ſcrupled to acknowledge him for their "King: But that he, as tho' he had been afraid of "not being thought Herod's ſon, had ſoon diſcovered "his real character." They then enlarged upon what happened near the temple, and added, "We leave "you to judge, whether after ſo abominable an ac"tion, we are not in the right to hate that man, "who tho' guilty himſelf of ſuch a crime, dares to re"preſent us as rebels and traitors." Nicholas under took the defence of Archelaus (9), of which it is ſuperfluous to give an account here, ſince it is almoſt the ſame with that he ſpoke before, and which the reader has ſeen in the preceding remark.

(9) Ibid. cap. 12.

[F] *Auguſtus granted to Archelaus half the Kingdom of Judea.*] By Judea muſt here be underſtood the whole country inhabited by the Jews, and over which Herod had been King. For Joſephus tells us afterwards, that Auguſtus gave Archelaus Judea, Idumea, and Samaria (10); where by Judea can be meant only Judea properly ſo called, that is, the country of which Jeruſalem was the capital city. Antipas had for his ſhare Galilee with the country beyond the river. This produced him a yearly revenue of two hundred talents. But the revenue of Archelaus was ſix hundred talents; which I ſuppoſe muſt be underſtood of Alexandrian talents, one of which made 450 pounds ſterling money (11).

(10) Ibid. cap. 13.

(11) Prideaux, Preface to his *Connex.* p. xxi.

[G] *He and his wife had ſome warning of this misfortune in a dream.*] Archelaus dreamt that he ſaw ten ears of corn, very ripe and extremely full, and that ſome oxen came and devoured them. Being awaked out of his ſleep, he thought ſuch a dream was not to be neglected, and ſent for thoſe perſons, who were eſteemed the beſt interpreters; but as they did not agree amongſt themſelves concerning the meaning of this dream, an Eſſene called Simon ſtood up, and begged the King's leave to interpret his dream. "It "ſignifies, ſaid he, a change in your affairs, which "will be no ways happy for you; becauſe oxen are "animals, which paſs their lives in an uninterrupted "labour,

to Syria by Auguſtus, who charged Cyrenius or Quirinus, who had been Conſul, to take an exact account of the inhabitants, and to ſell the Palace of Archelaus (*b*), who in all probability died in his baniſhment.

(*b*) Joſeph. *Antiquit.* lib. 17. cap. 15.

" labour, and which by tilling the ground turn up " the earth, and alter its place and ſituation. The " ten ears of corn ſignify ten years, becauſe the earth " produces ſome every year. Therefore, ſaid he to " Archelaus, the tenth year of your reign will be alſo " the laſt." Glaphyra his wife, who was the daughter of Archelaus King of Cappadocia, had been firſt married to Alexander the ſon of King Herod, and after his death to Juba King of Mauritania; who alſo dying, ſhe returned to her father. Archelaus the Ethnarch having ſeen her, fell ſo paſſionately in love with her, that he divorced Mariamne his wife to marry Glaphyra. The dream ſhe had was as follows; ſhe thought that ſhe ſaw Alexander her firſt huſband, and being overjoyed ſhe ran to embrace him; but he received her with a reproachful air, telling her, " You " have ſhewn by your behaviour, that thoſe are in " the right, who believe, that women are never to " be truſted; ſince having been married to me, when " you was a pure virgin, and having children by me, " the deſire of marrying a ſecond time, made you " forget the love, which you owed to me, and ought " to have kept inviolably: and not contented to have " done that firſt injury to me, you have not been " aſhamed to take a third huſband, and to enter a- " gain into my family by marrying my own bro- " ther. But I will not forget you, as you have for- " gotten me, I will take you to me again, as my " own property, and thus deliver you from the infa- " my in which you live." Glaphyra related this dream to ſome of her friends, and died a few days after (12). Joſephus tells us, that he mentioned thoſe dreams, becauſe they ſerved as a proof of the Immortality of the Soul and a Divine Providence. *If any man*, ſays he, *thinks theſe facts incredible, let him enjoy his opinion to himſelf; but let him not endeavour to diſturb the belief of others, who by inſtances of this nature are excited to the ſtudy of virtue.* This is related in the *Spectator* (13), *not ſo much for the ſake of the ſtory itſelf*, as the ingenious writer obſerves, *as for the moral reflections, with which the Author concludes it.* But with regard to dreams in general, no regard is to be paid to them; ſince if one of them happens to be prophetical, there are ten thouſand that have no meaning at all. So that whatever dream we have, we cannot conclude, that it ſignifies ſomething real, till the event has ſhewed it; which renders a dream, if conſidered as a warning, entirely uſeleſs; ſince like the Oracles of Delphi, it is enigmatical, and capable of being explained in ſeveral different, nay oppoſite ſenſes. But it will be ſaid, that ſometimes what we have dreamt comes to paſs. But is there any man, how unſkilful ſoever, who, if he ſhoots all day long, will not once or twice hit the mark? We dream almoſt every night. Why then ſhould we be ſurprized, that what we dream ſometimes happens to be true. *Quid eſt*, ſays Cicero (14), *qui totum diem jaculans non aliquando tollineet* (15)? *Totâs noctes dormimus, neque ulla fere eſt, quâ non ſomniemus, & miramur, aliquando id, quod ſomniamus, evadere?* I would not aſcribe to mere chance thoſe dreams, which happen to be true. Chance is a word invented to conceal our ignorance, when we cannot explain the cauſes of ſome *phænomena*. Dreams, like all other events, have natural cauſes; they are generally occaſioned by what moſt employs our thoughts in the day-time; and as what we hope or fear makes very deep impreſſions upon our minds, and comes ſometimes to paſs, we are not to be ſurprized, if our dreams happen now and then to be confirmed by the event. P.

(12) Idem, ibid. cap. 15.

(13) Num. 110. Vol. 2.

(14) *De Divinat.* lib. 2.

(15) I follow Lambinus's correction, who reads *collineet* inſtead of *collimet*.

(*a*) Socrat. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 1. cap. 22.

☞ARCHELAUS, a Biſhop of Caſchara (*a*), or Carrhæ (*b*) in Meſapotamia, was famous for his two diſputes with the Hereſiarch Manes [*A*], who having eſcaped out of priſon, fled to Meſopotamia, where he propagated his doctrine; to prevent the progreſs of which, Archelaus invited him to a conference before a great number of Pagans, and appointed the Philoſophers to be judges of the cauſe. Manes being confounded, retired

(*b*) *See* Zacagnius in his *Collectanea Monumentor. Veterum Eccleſ. Græc. & Latin.* edit. Rom. 1698, in 4to; *apud* Bernard, *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres, Fevrier* 1700, Article 1. p. 127.

[*A*] *Famous for his two diſputes with the Hereſiarch Manes.*] The Acts of theſe two Diſputes were publiſhed by Laurence Alexander Zacagni, Keeper of the Vatican Library at Rome in his *Collectanea Monumentorum Veterum Eccleſiæ Græcæ ac Latinæ* under the title of *Archelai Epiſcopi Acta Diſputationis cum Manete Hæreſiarcha Latine ex antiquâ verſione.* Epiphanius (1), St. Jerom (2), and Heraclianus Biſhop of Chalcedon (3) mention theſe Acts; but they do not agree in the name of the perſon, who reduced them into writing. The two firſt are of opinion, that it was Archelaus himſelf; but Heraclianus aſcribes them to one Hegemonius. Zacagni thinks, that theſe two opinions may be reconciled by ſuppoſing, that Archelaus wrote at firſt in Syriac what he had ſaid in the conference, which he had with Manes before the Judges, who were expreſly choſen for that purpoſe; and that Hegemonius afterwards put in order what Archelaus had written, and added a Preface, and a Concluſion, and every thing neceſſary to make the work compleat. St. Jerom (4) informs us, that this account of the Diſpute was written at firſt by Archelaus in Syriac: *Librum diſputationis ſuæ, quam habuit adverſum Manichæum, exeuntem de Perſide, Syro ſermone compoſuit.* Zacagni confirms this by an argument drawn from the work itſelf. We cannot learn who it was, that tranſlated it into Greek; but it is ſuppoſed to have been Hegemonius abovementioned. With regard to the Latin Tranſlator, all that can be affirmed is, that he lived after the time of St. Jerom, and before the ſeventh Century. It is extremely probable, that his verſion was made from the Greek, and not from the Syriac. Zacagni having examined with great accuracy into the time, when Manes began to publiſh his hereſies, and conſidered what the Ancients and Epiphanius in particular have ſaid upon this ſubject, concludes, that the conference of Archelaus with that Hereſiarch was held between the months of July and December 277. He ſhews then, that no manner of doubt can be raiſed againſt the antiquity and truth of theſe Acts. However he acknowledges, that they have not come down entire to us; but that ſome ancient copier has retrenched ſeveral paſſages; ſince Cyrill of Jeruſalem in his *ſixth Catechefis* mentions divers arguments of Manes, with Archelaus's anſwers to them, which are not to be found in theſe Acts. Henry Valeſius at the end of his Notes upon Socrates's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* has publiſhed a conſiderable Fragment of theſe Acts, with an entire Epiſtle of Archelaus to Diodorus from a MS. which had been communicated to him by Emeric Bigot, who at the end of his Preface to Palladius's Life of St. Chryſoſtom tells us, that by comparing the Greek paſſages, which Epiphanius has given us from Archelaus, he had corrected many places in the Greek, and more in the Latin verſion, and that he had deſigned to publiſh theſe Acts in Greek and Latin, that it might appear from the compariſon, how much the ancient verſions are to be eſteemed, and what advantage may be gained from them; but that he afterwards thought proper to leave this taſk to thoſe, who ſhall undertake a new edition of Epiphanius or Socrates. The MS. from whence Bigot communicated the Fragments above mentioned to Valeſius was afterwards preſerved in the Ambroſian Library at Milan (5). Zacagni collated theſe Fragments with the MS. he made uſe of, and has accurately mark'd the various readings in his Critical Notes. This MS. was procured from the Abbey of Mount Caſſino, and it is above ſix hundred years old; but there are ſeveral errors in it, which exerciſed the critical ſkill of Zacagni; who intimated, that he deſigned to publiſh that work more correct at the end of his *Hiſtory of Manicheiſm*, in which he was then engaged, if he could find any other MS. of it in the other Libraries of Europe. He reſolved likewiſe to join to it the other works, which the Ancients wrote againſt

(1) Hæreſ. 66.
(2) *De Viris Illuſtrib.* cap. 72.
(3) *Apud* Bernard, *Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lett. Fevrier* 1700, pag. 127. *and* Photii *Biblieth.* Cod. 85.

(4) *Ubi ſupra.*

(5) J. Albert. Fabricii *Not. in S. Hieron. de Viris Illuſt.* c. 72.

tired to an obſcure village, where he challenged the Prieſt of that place, whom Epiphanius calls Trypho, to a diſputation, but was followed thither by our Biſhop, who again ſilenced him; and as Manes was preparing to fly from hence, he was ſeized by the King's guards and committed to priſon (c). Dr. Cave gives Archelaus the character of a man of quick and lively genius, and tells us that he flouriſhed about the year 278. Socrates in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (d) has given us an account of this diſpute of his with Manes. He was eminent for his piety and learning, and his name is inſerted in the Roman Martyrology under the 26th of December.

(c) Cave, *Hiſt. Literaria*, p. 93. edit. Colon. Allobrog. 1720.

(d) *Ubi ſupra.*

againſt that Sect. The learned John Albert Fabricius of Hamburgh publiſhed theſe Acts from Zacagni's edition in his *Spicilegium* of the Fathers of the third Century, which he ſubjoined to the ſecond volume of the works of St. Hippolytus, printed at Hamburgh in 1718 in fol. But, as he obſerves (6), tho' this edition is much more perfect than that of Valeſius, yet theſe Acts ſeem to be mutilated at the end, and retrenched in many other places by the tranſcriber or epitomizer of them. *Quanquam verò longe, ut dixi, integriara hæc Acta ſunt quam Valeſius ediderat, tamen & ipſa in fine mutila, & vel librarii vel epitomatoris faſtidio ſubinde decurtata eſſe videntur.* It appears from this conference, that the reaſons, upon which Manes defended his opinions, had much more ſubtilty than ſolidity in them. They are ſometimes ſo very abſtruſe, that they are ſcarce intelligible, and it is probable, that this Hereſiarch hardly underſtood himſelf. Archelaus ſoon ſilenced him; and then uſed the ſevereſt terms of reproach to him. Manes's opinions irritated his auditors ſo highly againſt him, that they would have torn him to pieces, if the authority of the Biſhop, who had ſufficient advantage over him in the argument, had not prevented them from this outrage. We ſhall not enter particularly into an account of this Diſpute, but only obſerve, that Archelaus affirms there, that it was not the Iſraelites, who made the golden calf in the wilderneſs, but the Egyptians, who mixed themſelves among them, and were companions in their flight (7). T.

(6) Idem, ibid.

(7) *See* Bernard, *Nouvelles &c.* pag. 130.

ARCHILOCHUS a Greek Poet, native of the Iſle of Paros (a), ſon of Teleſicles [A], flouriſhed in the 29th Olympiad [B]. The character of his Poetry was an extraordinary overflowing of ſlander [C]. The terrible effects of it may be ſeen by Lycambes hanging himſelf, after the violent Satyr that Archilochus had made againſt him. The indignation

(a) Herod. l. 1. cap. 12. Lucianus, *in Pſeudol.*

[A] *He was the ſon of Teleſicles.*] We find this not only in Suidas, but alſo in Oenomaus, quoted by Euſebius (1).

(1) Euſeb. lib. 6. cap. 7. *Præparat. Evangel.* p. 256. *item* lib. 5. cap. 33. p. 227.

[B] *He flouriſhed in the 29th Olympiad.*] Authors differ about this. Tatian and St. Cyril have placed Archilochus under the 23d Olympiad (2). Clemens Alexandrinus has placed him under the 20th: another under the 15th, the 18th, and the 19th (3). Cicero makes him to have lived under the reign of Romulus (4). Cornelius Nepos places him in the time of Tullus Hoſtilius (5). Herodotus does not only aſſert that he made verſes on the adventure of Gyges and Candaules, but alſo that he lived at that time (6). Euſebius makes him flouriſh in the 29th Olympiad. It is eaſy to reconcile ſome of theſe Authors: but one cannot do ſo with them all; for the revolution that was made in Lydia, by the death of Candaules, and the inſtallation of Gyges, falls under the 17th Olympiad (7). The death of Romulus belongs to the foregoing Olympiad. The reign of Tullus Hoſtilius is contained between the firſt years of the 27th and 25th Olympiads. Salmaſius who was very happy in correcting a groſs blunder of Solinus has however fallen into a miſtake himſelf. Solinus was ſo negligent as to place in the ſame Age the three Orators of the family of Curio, and Archilochus and Sophocles. *Plurimi*, ſays he (8), *inter Romanos eloquentiâ floruerunt, ſed hoc bonum hereditarium nunquam fuit niſi in familia Curionum, in qua tres ſerie continua oratores fuere: magnum hoc habitum eſt ſanè eo ſæculo quo facundiam præcipue & humana & divina mirata ſunt: quippe tunc percuſſores Archilochi poetæ Apollo prodidit, & latronum facinus Deo coarguente detectum; cumque Lyſander Lacedæmonius Athenas obſideret, ubi Sophoclis tragici inhumatum corpus jacebat; identidem Liber Pater ducem monuit per quietem ſepeliri delicias ſuas ſineret, nec prius deſtitit, &c.* i. e. "Many have excelled in "eloquence amongſt the Romans, but this excellence was never hereditary except in the family "of the Curio's, in which there were three Orators "ſucceſſively. This was accounted a great thing in "that Age, when eloquence was admired both by "Gods and men; for at that time Apollo diſcovered "the aſſaſſins of the Poet Archilochus, and the fact "of the villains was revealed by a God; and when "Lyſander the Lacedæmonian beſieged Athens, "where the body of Sophocles the Tragedian lay "unburied, Bacchus admoniſhed the General in "a dream to ſuffer his favourite to be buried." Salmaſius obſerves, that one of theſe Curio's lived in the reign of Julius Cæſar, that Archilochus lived in the time of Tarquinius Superbus, and that Sophocles lived above two Ages after Archilochus (9). He is in the right then to laugh at Solinus; but he is in the wrong to place Archilochus in the time of Tarquinius Superbus, who reigned from the third year of the 61ſt Olympiad, to the laſt year of the 67th. He is in the wrong, I ſay, to place him there, ſince in another place he fixes him about the 29th Olympiad. *Circiter vigeſimam nonam Olympiadem inclaruit Archilochus* (10). Having committed the fault of making Archilochus and the laſt King of Rome contemporary, he ought not to have imagined that there were 200 years between Archilochus and Sophocles; for the death of the laſt happened about the 92d Olympiad. Another great man (11) ſuffered himſelf to be carried too far with the deſire of cenſuring, when he imputed to Herodotus, the having made uſe of a pitiful reaſon to prove that Archilochus lived under Gyges, namely, that Archilochus has made mention of this King. I confeſs this reaſoning would be abſurd; but it is not true that Herodotus has made uſe of it: he has only ſuppoſed it, he has drawn no conſequence from it. Τοῦ δ' Ἀρχίλοχος ὁ Πάριος κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον γενόμενος ἐν ἰάμβοισι τριμέτρου ἐπεμνήσθη (12). i. e. "Of which "Archilochus the Parian, who lived at the ſame time, "has made mention in his Iambicks."

(2) *See* Voſſius, *de Poët. Græcis*, pag. 14.

(3) Anonymus *in Deſcrip. Olymp. apud* Voſſium, *de Poet. Græcis*, pag. 14.

(4) Cicero, *Tuſculan.* 1. cap. 1.

(5) Cornel. Nepos, *apud* Gellium, lib. 17. cap. 21.

(6) Herod. lib. 1. cap. 13.

(7) *See* Sethus Calviſius, *ad ann. Mundi* 3239, p. 65.

(8) Solinus, cap. 2. *ſub fin.*

(9) Salmaſ. Plin. *Exerc.* p. 52.

(10) Idem, ibid. pag. 854.

(11) Scaliger *in Euſeb.* p. 57, 58, edit. ann. 1658.

(12) Herod. lib. 1. cap. 12.

[C] *The character of his Poetry was an extraordinary overflowing of ſlander.*] Hence it comes that Horace has conſidered Archilochus as a man full of rage,

Archilochum proprio rabies armavit iambo (13).

That is,

"Rage with Iambicks arm'd Archilochus."
Ld. Roſcommon.

(13) Horat. *de Arte Poetica*, ver. 79.

And when any one had a mind to give an idea of a Satyr ſuperlatively ſevere, he ſaid it reſembled thoſe of Archilochus:

In malos aſperrimos
Parata tollo cornua,
Qualis Lycambe ſpretus infido gener (14).

That is,

"I'm ſtill prepar'd to ſtrike the blow,
"As ſharp as fierce Archilochus's ſong." Creech.

(14) Idem, Epod. 6, ver. 13.

Ovid, in the ſame ſpirit, has uſed this menace:

Poſtmodo ſi pergas, in te mihi liber iambus
Tincta Lycambeo ſanguine tela dabit.

That is,

"Stain'd with Lycambes blood my arrows fly,
"Which free Iambics to my rage ſupply.

It

indignation of this Poet aroſe from his not keeping his word. Lycambes had promiſed him his daughter, and had afterwards refuſed her to him. Archilochus took the thing ſo to heart, whether he loved the Fair one, or whether ſome particular contempt had been added to the refuſal, ſo that he collected all the fury of his ſpleen to defame Lycambes. It is probable that he involved all the family under theſe paſquinades; for they pretend that the daughter followed the example of her father; and there are ſome who affirm that three of Lycambes's daughters died of deſpair at the ſame time [D]. He publiſhed adventures perhaps equally defaming and diſtant from the knowledge of the publick. At leaſt there ſeem to have been very ſmutty paſſages in this Poem; for it was on account of this Satyr that the Lacedæmonians prohibited the verſes of Archilochus [E], after having conſidered that ſuch reading was very little agreeable to modeſty. Some have ſaid that he himſelf was baniſhed from Lacedæmon (b); but the maxim that he had inſerted in his verſes, is aſſigned for the reaſon of it, *that it was better to fling down one's arms, than to loſe one's life.* He had written that for his juſtification (c). His abuſiveneſs, which ſometimes injured him in his own circumſtances [F], and extended even to his own perſon [G],

(b) Plutarch. *Inſtit. Lacon.* p. 239.

(c) See the note [C].

It is in his Poem *in Ibin*, *Verſ.* 51. a work ſo full of railing, that thoſe who have thought it was made in imitation of Archilochus (15), would be excuſable, if it was not eaſy to know by theſe two verſes, *Verſ.* 53.

Nunc quo Battiades inimicum devovet Ibin,
Hoc ego devovco teque tuoſque modo,

That is,

"What fate Battiades on Ibis ſends,
"The ſame ſhall fall on thee and all thy friends,"

that Ovid propoſed to himſelf the imitation of the Poet Callimachus. There are I know not how many proverbs, that eterniſe the railing humour of our Poet: *Archilochia edicta*, Ἀρχίλοχοι πατεῖν, *Archilochum teris*, &c. We find the firſt in Cicero, who intends by it the Edicts that the Conſul Bibulus publiſhed. This poor Conſul, not daring to go out of his houſe, retained no other ſhadow of authority, than the revenging himſelf by ſome Paſquinades, wherein he diſplayed the moſt infamous debauches of Cæſar, and abuſed his enemies. *In eam coëgit deſperationem, ut quoad poteſtate abiret, domo abditus, nihil aliud quam per edicta nunciaret* (16). This is what Cicero called *Archilochia edicta*, which pleaſed the people ſo much, that there was no getting thro' the crowds in the ſtreets, where they were fixt up; for they thronged ſo to read them, that Pompey was ready to burſt with vexation. *Archilochia in illum Bibuli edicta ita populo ſunt jucunda, ut eum locum ubi proponuntur præ multitudine eorum qui legunt præterire nequeamus, ita ipſi acerba ut tabeſcat dolore, mihi mehercule moleſta, quod & eum quem ſemper dilexi nimis excruciant* (17). Plutarch ſpeaks thus of theſe Edicts of Bibulus: Βίβλος μὲν εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν κατακλεισάμενος οὐδὲν μηνῶν ὃ προῆλθεν ὑπατεύων, ἀλλ' ἐξέπεμψε διαγράμματα βλασφημίας ἐμφορῆ ἔχοντα καὶ κατηγορίας (18). i. e. "Bibulus being "ſhut up in his houſe did not go out for eight months "during his Conſulſhip, but only put forth Edicts "full of reproaches and accuſations againſt both of "them," (Pompey and Cæſar). As for the proverb *Archilochum teris*, I do not believe it ſignifies, as Eraſmus has imagined, a Railer that treads in the ſteps of Archilochus, or that ſtudies his books; but a man, that having offended an Archilochus, ought to fear the fate of him that treads on a ſerpent, and immediately receives a mortal wound. See what Lucian puts in the mouth of Archilochus againſt one that had ſlandered him, *Alis cicadam comprehendiſti* (19), and you will not queſtion but Eraſmus's explication, how conformable ſo ever it may be to Suidas, is wrong. I do not deny however, that πατεῖν is ſometimes taken as *terere* for *lectitare*: ὁδ' Αἴσωπος πεπάτηκας, ſays Ariſtophanes in his *Birds* (20). There are ſome Epigrams in the *Anthologia*, which give us a ſtrong idea of the abuſive temper of this man. Cerberus is adviſed to be more watchful than ever, and to take care that he is not bitten, becauſe Archilochus is gone down to hell (21). We ſhall ſee in the note [G], that he ſlandered himſelf.

(15) Johannes Tortellius Aretinus, *in Commentariis de Ortbographid*, *and* Jacobus Lannius, *Subſecivar. Lect.* lib. 2. cap. 4. *apud* Dionyſ. Salvagnium Boeſſium, *Comment. in Ibin*, p. 25.

(16) Sueton. *in Cæſar.* cap. 20. *Vide etiam* cap. 49.

(17) Cicer. *ad Attic.* Epiſt. 21. lib. 2.

(18) Plut. *in Pomp.* p. 644.

(19) Lucian. *in Pſeudol.* tom. 2. pag. 548. See the Article of TETTIX.

(20) This was communicated to me by Mr. de la Monnoie.

(21) Anth. lib. 3. cap. 25. *See alſo* Salmaſ. *Exercitat. Plinian.* p. 394, 395.

[D] *It is probable, ... that the three daughters of Lycambes died of deſpair at the ſame time.*] I have ſaid, that Archilochus took the thing much to heart; but that was nothing in compariſon of his father-in-law, and his miſtreſs. He contented himſelf with a cruel Satyr; but Lycambes and his daughters found their conſolation only at the end of a halter. Horace ſpeaks of the hanging only of the father and of the daughter, who had been promiſed to Archilochus:

. . . . . *Non res & agentia verba Lycamben.*
. . . . . .
Nec ſocerum quærit, quem verſibus obliuat atris;
Nec ſponſæ laqueum famoſo carmine nectit (22).

That is,

"My muſe denounces not Lycambes fate,
"I with black lines aſperſe not thoſe I hate,
"No ſpouſe or father's death I meditate.

(22) Horat. Ep. 19. lib. 1. ver. 25, 30, 31.

It is in the *Athologia*, that the two and even the three daughters of Lycambes are ſaid to have hanged themſelves (23). See in the article of HIPPONAX (24) ſome inſtances of the fatal effects of Satyr. Let us not forget what one of the Scholiaſts of Horace has obſerved; that Neobule (ſo he names Archelaus's ſpouſe) did not hang herſelf becauſe of the Satyrs of her gallant, but for the regret ſhe conceived for the deplorable end of her father (25). Moſt readers will join with the *Anthologia*, where Archilochus is repreſented as the immediate cauſe.

(23) Anth. l. 3. cap. 25.

(24) Note [F].

(25) Scholiaſt. *in Horatii*, Epod. 6.

[E] *It was on account of this Satyr, that the Lacedæmonians interdicted the verſes of Archilochus.*] Valerius Maximus affirms this in expreſs terms. *Lacedæmonii libros Archilochi è civitate ſua exportari juſſerunt, quod eorum parum verecundam ac pudicam lectionem arbitrabantur. Noluerunt enim ea liberorum ſuorum animos imbui, ne plus moribus noceret quam ingeniis prodeſſet. Itaque maximum poetam, aut certè ſummo proximum, quia domum ſibi inviſam obſcœnis maledictis laceraverat, carminum exilio multarunt* (26). i. e. "The Lacedæmonians commanded the books of "Archilochus to be carried out of their city, becauſe "they thought the reading of them not to be very mo-"deſt or chaſte. For they were unwilling the minds "of their children ſhould be tinctured with them, "for fear they ſhould do more harm to their manners "than ſervice to their genius. And ſo they baniſhed "the verſes of the greateſt or at leaſt next to the "greateſt Poet, becauſe he had fallen upon a family "that was odious to him with obſcene abuſes.

(26) Val. Max. lib. 6. cap. 3.

[F] *His abuſiveneſs ſometimes injured him in his own circumſtances.*] I learn this particular from Pindar, for he affirms that Archilochus, tho' fattened with ſlander, yet was often reduced to great ſtraits.

Εἶδεν μὲν ἐκεῖνος ἐὼν τὰ πολλ'
ἐν ἀμαχανίᾳ
Φεύγοντ' Ἀρχίλοχον, βαιτυλόγοις ἔκθυσιν πιαινόμενον (27).

(27) Pindar. *Pythior.* Od. 2.

Aretius did not underſtand this paſſage, when he found this meaning in it, that Archilochus gained conſiderably by his ſlanders, and that they had raiſed him from a low condition to eminence and riches (28). The word πιαίνω, *to fatten*, was the cauſe of his miſtake: he ſhould have known that to fatten upon any thing, ſignifies literally to take a great delight in it. No doubt Ovid had his eye upon this paſſage of Pindar, when he ſaid in his Poem againſt Ibis, ver. 521.

Utque repertori nocuit pugnacis Iambi,
Sic ſit in exitium lingua proterva tuum.

(28) *See* Benedictus *in Pindar.* Od. 2. *Pythior.*

That

perſon [G], did not deprive him of the favour of Apollo, for when he had been killed in a combat, the Oracle of Delphi drove the murderer out of the temple [H], and was not appeaſed without a multitude of excuſes and prayers; and even after that he ordered him to go to a certain houſe, there to pacify the ghoſt of Archilochus (d). However he was fairly killed [I]. It was in Iambic verſes that this Poet excelled; he was the inventor of them [K], and one of the three Poets whom Ariſtarchus approved

(d) See the article TETTIX.

That is,

" May thy vile tongue in the ſame trap be caught
" With his, who firſt the keen Iambic taught.

We ſhall ſee in the note [H] that thoſe who ſay Archilochus's abuſiveneſs coſt him his life are miſtaken (29).

(29) Leſcalopier *in Ciceron. de Nat. Deor.* lib. 3. p. 703. Boeſſius, *in Indice Comment. in Ibin.*

[G] *He extended his ſlanders even to his own perſon.*] This Poet was ſo delighted with ſlander, that not content with reviling his neighbour, he ſpoke evil of himſelf too (30). This is what Critias blames him for (31): *We ſhould not have known if it had not been for him*, ſays Critias, *that his mother Enipone was a ſlave; that he was forced by his miſerable condition to quit the iſle of Paros, and go from thence to Thaſus; that he made himſelf hated there, that he abuſed both friends and enemies; that he was extremely given to the debauching of women, and very inſolent; and, what is worſe than all* (32) *that he had thrown away his ſhield.* The ſcholiaſt of Ariſtophanes informs us, that it was in the war againſt the Saïans, a people of Thrace, that Archilochus, to ſave his life, threw away his arms and fled (33). Ariſtophanes had made two verſes upon this Poet, on occaſion of this adventure (34), and upon this it is that his Scholiaſt has given us this information. Plutarch relates the ſame verſes, and ſomething more.

(30) See the paſſage of Plutarch, quoted in the note [M], citation (55).

(31) *Apud* Ælianum, *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 10. cap. 13.

(32) It is Critas that ſpeaks.

(33) Schol. Ariſtoph. *in Comœd. de Pace. See alſo* Strabo lib. 12. pag. 378.

(34) *In Comœd. de Pace, circa fin.*

Ἀσπὶδι μὲν Σαίων τις ἀγαλλεται ἣν παρὰ θάμνῳ
Ἔμπης ἀμώμητον κάλλιπον οὐκ ἐθέλων.
——————— Ἀσπὶς ἐκείνη
Ἐρρέτω· ἐξαῦθις κτήσομαι οὐ κακίω (35).

That is,

" Rejoice ſome Saïan, who my ſhield may find,
" Which in ſome hedge unhurt, I left behind.
" Farewell my ſhield: Now I my ſelf am free,
" I'll buy another full as good as thee.

(35) Plutarch. *in Inſtitut. Lacon.* pag. 239.

Notwithſtanding this, our run-away valued himſelf more as a ſoldier than as a Poet.

Εἰμὶ δ' ἐγὼ θεράπων μὲν Ἐνυαλίοιο ἄνακτος
Καὶ μουσέων ἐρατὸν δῶρον ἐπιστάμενος (36).

That is,

" I bow to royal Mars's mighty reign,
" And the ſweet doctrines of the muſe obtain.

(36) Athen. lib. 14. cap. 6. pag. 627, C.

Alcæus placed his qualifications after the ſame manner: he gave the firſt place to arms; and when he deſcribes his houſe (37), he does not ſpeak of books, but of helmets and bucklers: the whole ſavours of the arſenal, and not at all of the library. It is known however that he eſcaped out of a battle, not by means of his arms, but of his heels. See the note [B] of his Article.

(37) *Ap.* Athen. lib. 14. cap. 5.

[H] *Apollo drove the murderer of Archilochus out of the temple of Delphi* (38).] The name of him, who ſlew Archilochus, was *Callondas Corax* (39), and he was of the iſland Naxos. The Prieſteſs of Delphi drove him out of the temple, becauſe he had killed a man conſecrated to the muſes. Ἐκβλητὶς ὑπὸ τῆς Πυθίας ὡς ἱερὸν ἄνδρα τῶν μουσῶν ἀνηκόν (40). He had killed him however in the war, and fairly too, as we learn from Suidas more clearly than from Plutarch. Hence we muſt not be too fond of thinking Pliny very exact, when he tells us in the plural number, *Archilochi Poetæ interfectores Apollo arguit Delphis* (41). i. e. " Apollo called the murderers of Archilochus to ac-
" count at Delphi." Solinus his copyiſt, having a mind to paraphraſe, put himſelf quite out of reach of being excuſed: he has had the aſſurance to ſpecify that this Poet was killed by robbers. *Percuſſores Archilochi Poëtæ Apollo prodidit, & latronum facinus Deo coarguente detectum* (42). Euſebius quotes a Greek author, named Oenomaüs, who gives the name of Archias to the murderer of Archilochus. *Quare*, ſays he (43), *qui Archilochum occidit Archias à templo quaſi ſceleſtus exire ab Apolline juſſus eſt: Muſarum enim ami-*

(38) Plut. *de iis qui ſerò a Numine puniuntur*, p. 560; and *fuſe* Suidas *in* Ἀρχίλοχος.

(39) Iidem, ibid. *vide etiam* Plutarch. *in Numa*, pag. 62.

(40) Plutarch. *de iis qui ſerò puniuntur*, p. 560.

(41) Plin. lib. 7. cap. 29.

(42) Solin. cap. 1. pag. 11.

(43) Euſeb. *Præpar. Evangel.* lib. 5. cap. 23. quoted by F. Hardouin upon Pliny, tom. 2. pag. 124. *Theſe are not the very words of Oenomaüs, it is only his thought.*

cum occiderat: i. e. " Wherefore Archias, who ſlew
" Archilochus, was commanded by Apollo, to go out
" of the temple: for he had killed a friend of the
" Muſes." Galen has related the words of the oracle.

Μυσάων θεράποντα κατίκτανες· ἔξιθι νηοῦ (44).

That is,

" Thou murderer of the Muſes ſervant get thee out of
" the Temple.

(44) Galen. *in Suaſoria*, tom. 2. cap. 9. pag. 10. *apud* Hardouin, ibid.

Apollo has been very much blamed for acknowledging him as a client of the Muſes, and for having highly praiſed a Poet who had written ſo many ſmutty things. Oenomaüs reproaches this God (45). Origen and Euſebius made uſe of it as a ſcandal to the Heathens. Τούτοις προσθῶμεν, ſays Euſebius (46), ὅσῳ δὲ ἂν ἄνδρα ὁ Ἀπόλλων θαυμαζοι τὸν Ἀρχίλοχον, ἀνδρα παντοίαις κατὰ γυναικῶν αἰσχρορρημοσύναις καὶ ἀῤῥητολογίαις ἀς οὐδ' ἀκοῦσαι τὶς σώφρων ἀνὴρ ὑπομείνειεν, ἐν τοῖς οἰκείοις ποιήμασι κεχρημένον. i. e. " Let us add to this how great-
" ly Apollo admires Archilochus, a man that has uſed
" ſuch ſhameful and obſcene expreſſions in his works
" againſt women, as a modeſt man cannot bear to
" hear." I do not tranſcribe the paſſage of Origen; it may be found in the third Book againſt Celſus, in the 125 page of the Cambridge Edition, in 1677.

(45) Oenomaüs, *apud* Origen. & Euſebium, *Præpar. Evangel.* lib. 5. c. 33.

(46) Ibid. cap. 32. p. 227.

[I] *Archilochus was fairly killed in battle.*] I have already ſaid that Suidas relates this more clearly than Plutarch; but I have ſomething more to ſay that is worth relating. There is a little treatiſe of Commonwealths, aſcribed to Heraclides: wherein is the order of the Prieſteſs of Delphi to the murderer of Archilochus, to go out of the Temple, with the anſwer of the murderer. This anſwer is an impenetrable Enigma in the Latin tranſlation. The tranſlator ſuppoſes this murderer to anſwer, *I am innocent; for I killed him at a diſtance, as the law commands.* I will ſet down the Greek and the Latin (47). Ἀρχίλοχον τὸν ποιητὴν Κόραξ ὄνομα ἔκτεινε, πρὸς ὃν φασιν εἶπειν τὴν Πυθίαν, ἔξιθι νηοῦ. τοῦτον δὲ εἶπειν, ἀλλὰ καθαρός εἰμι ἄναξ. ἐκ χειρῶν γὰρ νόμῳ ἔκτεινα. *Quidam Corax dictus Archilochum Poetam interfecit. Itaque Pithi ad eum aiebat, exi Templo. Cui is reſpondit, at purus ſum,* Rex, *eminus enim, ut lex* jubet, *interfeci* (Archilochum). One of my friends who is greatly skilled in polite literature (48), confeſſed to me, that he never heard any more than my ſelf, of an edict that excuſed murderers who killed at a diſtance, and that he did not think any more than my ſelf, that ἐκ χειρῶν ſignified *eminus.* As he is an intimate friend of Gronovius, he conſulted him upon this difficulty, and this is the anſwer of that learned profeſſor: ἐκ χειρῶν νόμῳ, *locutio eſt propria in prælis occiſorum & occidentium. Quem in illo fervore vel gladius, vel alia machina, vel bellua deprehendens ad Orcum mittit, is trucidatur* ἐκ χειρῶν νόμῳ. *Ita omnes Græci & præſertim Polybius, ut libro* 1. *cap.* 34. Καταπατήσωσι σαφῶς ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ διαφθείροντο. Ὁ πάνυ (49) *illic pugnantes: quod quidem non ſufficit, nam & in prælio multi poſſunt non pugnantes occidi, & tamen* ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ. *Rurſus eodem libro cap.* 57. Τοῦτους γὰρ αὐτοὺς ἄλλοι συνέκαιον διαφθείρειαν κατὰ τὰς συμπλοκὰς τοὺς ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ πεπτωκότας. There remains no difficulty, after this learned anſwer: we ſay that Corax meant only that Archilochus was killed in fight, according to the laws of war.

(47) *Juxta editionem Nicolai Cragii ad calcem Tractatus de Republica Lacedæmonior.* pag. 19.

(48) Mr. Henricius, whoſe elogium may be ſeen in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the Treatiſe that Mr. Gronovius publiſhed at Leyden in 1693, under the title of *Diſquiſitio de Icuncula Smetiana, quam Harpocraten indigitarunt.* I am glad of this opportunity of making a publick acknowledgment of Mr. Henricius's ſingular goodneſs in lending me the books of his excellent Library.

(49) That is Caſaubon.

[K] *He excelled in Iambic verſes, of which he was the inventor.*] This appears from theſe verſes of Horace in the XIXth Epiſtle of the 1ſt Book, ver. 23.

Parios ego primus Iambos
Oſtendi Latio, numeros animoſque ſecutus
Archilochi:

That is,

" I firſt the Romans keen Iambics taught,
" In numerous ſmoothneſs, and in height of thought,
" I match'd Archilochus." Creech.

But

proved in this kind of Poetry (e). Quintilian puts him in ſome reſpect below the other two. Ariſtophanes the Grammarian, thought that the longer the Iambic Poems of Archilochus were, the finer they were [L]. The Hymn that he made upon Hercules and Iolaüs had this advantage, that they uſed to ſing it three times to the honour of thoſe, who had gained the victory at the Olympick games (f). There are very few of his works preſerved; which is rather a gain than a loſs, with regard to morality [M]. Thoſe who ſpeak of ſeveral Archilochus's, multiply beings without neceſſity [N]. If we had the dialogue compoſed by Heraclides upon the life of this Poet (g) we ſhould probably learn many particulars, and without doubt we ſhould find there how he led into the iſle of Thaſus a Colony of Parians (h). It was an honour to be choſen for ſuch an employment.

(e) See the note [K].

(f) Pindar *Olympic.* Od. 9. & *ibi* Joh. Benedictus. See alſo in the *Chiliads of Eraſmus*, Archilochi melos.

(g) Diogen. Laert. *in Heraclid.*

(h) Oenomaüs, *apud* Euſeb. *Præpar. Evang.* l. 6. c. 7. *Vide etiam* Perizon. *in Ælian.* lib. 10. c. 13.

But ſtill more clearly from this paſſage of Paterculus, *Neque quemquam alium, cujus operis primus Auctor fuerit, in eo perfectiſſimum præter Homerum & Archilochum reperiemus* (50). i. e. "Nor ſhall we find any one "to be abſolutely perfect in that ſort of work, of "which he is the Author, except Homer and Archi-"lochus." It is manifeſt that this Poet's ſtrength lay in Iambics. *Ex tribus receptis Ariſtarchi judicio ſcriptoribus Iamborum ad illa maxime pertinebit unus Archilochus. Summa in hoc vis elocutionis, cum validæ tum breves vibranteſque ſententiæ, plurimum ſanguinis atque nervorum, adeò ut videatur quibuſdam quod quoquam minor eſt, materiæ eſſe non ingenii vitium* (51). i. e. "Of the three received writers of Iambics in Ari-"ſtarchus's judgment the chief is Archilochus. He "has the greateſt force of elocution, his ſentences are "ſtrong, ſhort, piercing and nervous, ſo that in the opi-"nion of ſome, when he falls below any other, it is the "fault of the ſubject not of his genius." It is of this then that Paterculus has made him the inventor. He would have been the inventor alſo of Epick Poeſy, if what has been imputed to Terentianus was true: *Doctrinæ laudem ei Terentianus tribuit, ut & Epicorum verſuum inventionem, lib. de metris pag.* 86. i. e. "Te-"rentianus aſcribes the praiſe of learning to him, "and alſo the invention of Epic verſe." It is thus that Faber ſpeaks in his *Theſaurus*, in the Article of Archilochus; but it is eaſy to ſee, when one conſults the paſſage of Terentianus Maurus, that he ſpeaks of the Epode and not of Epick verſes. Beſides, it would not be certain that the place which concerns Archilochus made him the inventor of the Epode, if we did not learn this truth elſewhere (52). This place might appear a quotation, alledged as an example of the Epode ſpoken of in this place, which is an Hexameter verſe, followed with a half Pentameter;

Hoc doctum Archilochum tradunt genuiſſe Magiſtri
Tu mihi Flacce ſat es.

Lorenzo Fabri obſerves, that *the Greeks had been ſix hundred years without any other verſes than Hexameters, till Archilochus produced others with ſo much ſucceſs, that every one attempted a different meaſure, whence the Greek Poeſy became ſo beautiful by this variety of verſification* (53).

(50) Paterc. lib. 1. cap. 5.

(51) Cicero, *Epiſt.* 11. lib. 16. *ad Attic.*

(52) Of Marius Victorinus, *Art. Grammat.* lib. 3.

(53) Menetrier, *Repreſentat. en Muſique*, p. 245.

[L] *The longer his Iambic Poems were, the better they were eſteemed.*] Cicero informs us of this particular, by ſaying the very ſame thing of his friend Atticus's Epiſtles; *Ut Ariſtophani Archilochi Iambus, ſic Epiſtola longiſſima quæque optima videtur* (54). i. e. "The "longeſt of your Epiſtles ſeems to me the beſt, as "the Iambics of Archilochus did to Ariſtophanes." The ſame judgment has been made of the orations of Demoſthenes.

(54) Cicero, Epiſt. 11. lib. 16. *ad Attic.*

[M] *There are very few of his works preſerved; which is rather a gain than a loſs, with regard to morality.*] We ſhould find but very ill examples in the verſes of Archilochus. He had expreſſed a very violent concern for the loſs of his ſiſter's husband, who died at ſea. Here was a tenderneſs, that might have been rendred uſeful; but he made it degenerate into a pernicious maxim, namely, that he would ſeek for conſolation in wine, and other ſenſual pleaſures, ſeeing his tears could do no good to his brother-in-law, and his diverſions could not injure him.

Οὔτε τι τὸν κλαίων ἱκέσθαι, οὔτε κλαύσω
Θάψω, τέρπωλας δ' ἄλλοις ἰφθίμοις (55):

That is,

"For my dead brother tears would flow in vain;
"Nor can my pleaſures give him any pain."

(55) Plutarch. *de audiend. Poetis*, p. 33.

The worſt of all is that he made no difficulty of diſgracing himſelf, by ſtuffing his Poems with a thouſand filthy reflections upon the fair ſex. Τῶν ὑπ' Ἀρχιλόχῳ πρὸς τὰς γυναῖκας ἀκρήτως & ἀκολάστως ἰαμβίων, ἑαυτὸν παραδειγματίζοντος (56). See the uſe that Theodore Beza has made of this laſt word in his notes on the 1ſt Chapter of St. Matthew.

(56) Plut. *de Curioſit.* p. 520.

[N] *Thoſe who ſpeak of ſeveral Archilochus's, multiply beings without neceſſity.*] A paſſage of Euſebius wrong underſtood is the cauſe of mention being made of one Archilochus an Hiſtorian and Chronologer, to whom the impoſtor of Viterbo has had the aſſurance falſly to aſcribe a little book. Thus it ſtands in Euſebius, according to the Latin verſion, *Licet Archilochus viceſimam tertiam Olympiadem . . . . . ſupputet* (57). It is pretended by this means, that Archilochus computed time ſo as to place Homer in the 23d Olympiad. But Scaliger has ſhewn that Euſebius's Greek means only that there are ſome Authors who have made Homer and Archilochus flouriſh at the ſame time. Goropius Becanus had already cleared this up in the large and curious collection he had made upon Archilochus, in order to give a full confutation of the forgeries of Annius of Viterbo (58). Here then is Archilochus the pretended Chronologer reduced to nothing. Voſſius had better have followed this correction, than have put Archilochus among the Greek Hiſtorians (59). He adds that Scaliger places him under the reign of Darius the ſon of Hyſtaſpes (60), without mentioning any further proof. I have not been able to find this in Scaliger's notes, which are quoted by Voſſius, and I believe it is not there. Voſſius, in another Book (61), having ſpoken of our Poet Archilochus under the 29th Olympiad, promiſes another under the 94th; but when we go to look for him, we only find one Antilochus. Charles Stephens, and Lloyd, and Hofman have given us an Archilochus a Lacedæmonian Poet, flouriſhing at Rome under Tullus Hoſtilius, and another Antilochus ſon of Neſtor, ſlain at the ſiege of Troy by Memnon. Theſe are all chimæra's: the laſt was named Archilochus: and a ſmall degree of attention would make one recollect that the court of the firſt Kings of Rome was no proper Theatre for Greek Poets. The greateſt part of theſe laſt faults are in Calepin.

(57) Euſeb. *in Chron. ad ann.* 908.

(58) Corop. Becanus, *Origin. Antwerp.* lib. 4. What he ſays thereupon, is to be found in the *Biblioth. Hiſpanica* of Schottus, pag. 375, &c.

(59) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Græcis*, pag. 5.

(60) He mounted the throne in the 3d year of the 64th Olympiad. Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græcis*, pag. 6.

(61) Voſſius, *de Poetis Græcis*, pag. 14.

☞ ARCHIMEDES, a celebrated Geometrician, was born at Syracuſe, a city of great note in the iſland of Sicily. He was a relation and friend of Hiero, the King of that city (a). His ſkill in mechanicks has rendered him famous in hiſtory: for, by the engines he invented, Syracuſe was a long time defended when it was beſieged by Marcellus (b). At the taking of that city, this noble General commanded his ſoldiers to have a particular regard to the ſafety of Archimedes. But this care was in vain, for he was ſlain by a ſoldier, who did not know him [A]. He is ſaid to have formed

(a) Plutarch. *in Marcello.*

(b) *See* Livy, lib. 24. cap. 34. *and* Plutarch, *in Marcello.*

[A] *He was ſlain by a ſoldier, who did not know him.*] Plutarch (1) is very particular in the relation of this circumſtance. "What gave Marcellus, *ſays* "*he* (2), the greateſt concern, was the unhappy fate "of

(1) *In Marcello.*

(2) We make uſe of the tranſlation printed at London in 3 vol. 8vo 1727. vol. 3. pag. 227.

formed a glaſs ſphere, with a ſurprizing workmanſhip, wherein the motions of the heavenly bodies were ſhewn [*B*]. He was remarkable for an extraordinary cloſe attention to Mathematical ſtudies, and a ſingular delight in them [*C*]. We have ſeveral of his works preſerved, though many are loſt [*D*]. His monument

" of Archimedes, who was at that time in his Muſæ-
" um, and his mind, as well as eyes, ſo fixed and
" intent upon ſome geometrical figures, that he nei-
" ther heard the noiſe and hurry of the Romans, nor
" perceived that the city was taken. In this tranſport
" of ſtudy and contemplation, a ſoldier came ſudden-
" ly upon him, and commanded him to follow him
" to Marcellus; which he refuſing to do till he had
" finiſhed his Problem, and fitted it for demonſtration;
" the ſoldier, in a rage, drew his ſword and ran him
" through. Others write, that Archimedes ſeeing a
" ſoldier come with a drawn ſword to kill him, en-
" treated him to hold his hand one moment, that he
" might not die with the regret of having left his
" Problem unfiniſhed, and the demonſtration imper-
" fect; but that the ſoldier, without any regard, either
" to his Problem or Demonſtration, killed him im-
" mediately. Others again write, that as Archime-
" des was carrying ſome mathematical inſtruments in
" a box to Marcellus, as ſun-dials, ſpheres, and an-
" gles, with which the eye might meaſure the mag-
" nitude of the Sun's body, ſome ſoldiers met him,
" and believing there was gold in it, ſlew him. But
" what is moſt certain, and wherein all Hiſtorians
" agree, is, that Marcellus was extremely concerned
" at his death; that he would not ſo much as look
" upon his murderer, deteſting him as an execrable
" villain; and that having made a diligent enquiry
" after his relations, he granted them his protection,
" and ſhewed them many ſignal favours upon his ac-
" count." Livy (2) ſays he was ſlain by a ſoldier, who did not know who he was, whilſt he was draw-
ing ſchemes in the duſt; that Marcellus was griev-
ed at his death, and took care of his funeral; making
his name at the ſame time a protection and honour
to thoſe who could claim being related to him. *Archimedem memoriæ proditum eſt, in tanto tumultu, quantum capta urbs in diſcurſu diripientium militum ciere poterat, intentum formis quas in pulvere deſcripſerat, ab ignaro milite, quis eſſet, interfectum. Ægre ia Marcellum tuliſſe, ſepulturæque curam habitam: & propinquis etiam inquiſitis honori præſidioque nomen ac memoriam ejus fuiſſe.*

(2) Lib. 25. cap. 31.

[*B*] *He is ſaid to have formed a glaſs ſphere &c.*] Claudian has an Epigram on this invention:

Jupiter in parvo cum cerneret æthera vitro,
Riſit, & ad ſuperos talia dicta dedit;
Huccine mortalis progreſſa potentia curæ?
Jam meus in fragili luditur orbe labor.
Jura poli, rerumque fidem, legeſque deorum,
Ecce Syracuſius tranſtulit arte ſenex.
Incluſus variis famulatur ſpiritus aſtris,
Et vivum certis motibus urget opus.
Percurrit proprium mentitus ſignifer annum,
Et ſimulata novo Cynthia menſe redit.
Jamque ſuum volvens audax induſtria mundum
Gaudet & humana ſidera mente regit.
Quid falſo inſontem tonitru Salmonea miror?
Æmula naturæ parva reperta manus.

That is,

" When in a glaſs's narrow ſpace confin'd
" Jove ſaw the fabrick of th' Almighty Mind,
" He ſmil'd and ſaid, can mortal's art alone
" Our heav'nly labours mimick with their own?
" The Syracuſian's brittle world contains
" Th' eternal law, which thro' all nature reigns.
" Fram'd by his art ſee Stars unnumber'd burn,
" And in their courſes rolling orbs return.
" His Sun thro' various ſigns deſcribes the year,
" And ev'ry month his mimick Moons appear.
" Our rival's laws his little Planets bind,
" And rule their motions with a human mind.
" Salmoneus could our thunder imitate,
" But Archimedes can a world create.

(3) *In Commentario, Ne ſuaviter quidem vivi poſſe ſecundum Epicuri decreta, decente*, p. 1094.

[*C*] *He was remarkable for an extraordinary cloſe attention to mathematical ſtudies, and a ſingular delight in them.*] Plutarch (3) tells us " he uſed to be carried " to the baths by force, and whilſt the ſervants were " anointing him, he would be drawing lines upon his " body. It is ſaid that having one day diſcovered, " by the effuſion of the water on his going into the " bath, a method of finding out the quantity of gold " in a crown (4), he leaped out, and as if inſpired on " a ſudden by ſome divine fury, he ran about cry- " ing, *I have found it.* Ἀρχιμήδω ϗ βία τῶν διαγραμμάτων ἀποσπᾶσης σωήλειφεν οἱ θεράποντες. ὁ ϗ ἐπὶ τῆς κοιλίας ἔγραφε τὰ σχήματα τῷ σληγίδι, ϗ λιπόμενος, ὡς φάσιν, ἐκ τῆς ὑπερχύσεως εὑρήσας τὸν τοῦ στεφάνου μετρήσιν εἶτα ἐκ τίνος κατοχῆς ἢ ἐπιπνοίας ἐξήλατο βοῶν, Εὕρηκα.

(4) See the note [*D*].

[*D*] *We have ſeveral of his works preſerved, tho' many are loſt.*] Thoſe which remain are, περὶ τῆς σφαίρας ϗ κυλίνδρου βιβλία β, *two books of the Sphere and Cylinder:* κύκλου μέτρησις, *the Dimenſion of a Circle:* ἐπιπέδων ἰσορροπιῶν ἢ κέντρα βαρῶν ἐπιπέδων, *of Centres of gravity or æquiponderants:* περὶ κωνοειδέων καὶ σφαιροειδέων, *of Sphæroids and Conoids:* περὶ ἑλίκων, *of Spiral Lines:* τετραγωνισμὸς παραβολῆς, *the Quadrature of a Parabola:* ψαμμίτης, *of the Number of the Sand:* περὶ τῶν ὀχουμένων, *of Bodies that float on fluids.* Amongſt thoſe works of Archimedes which are loſt, we may reckon the deſcriptions of ſuch inventions as we can gather from himſelf, and other ancient Authors, theſe are 1, περὶ τῆς στέφανης, *a Method to diſcover the mixture of gold and ſilver in a crown:* Vitruvius (5) tells us, that " Hiero King of Syracuſe having a mind " to make an offering to the Gods of a golden crown, " agreed to have one made of great price, and weigh- " ed out the gold to the maker, who brought one " home of the full weight. It was afterwards diſco- " vered, that a quantity of the gold was ſtolen and made " up with a like weight of ſilver. Hiero being very " angry at this impoſition, deſired Archimedes to take " into conſideration, by what method ſuch a fraud " might be diſcovered for the future. Whilſt he " was engaged in the ſolution of this difficulty, he " happened to go into the bath, where obſerving that " a quantity of water overflowed, equal to the bulk " of his body, it immediately occurred to him, that " Hiero's queſtion might be anſwered by a like me- " thod, on which he leaped out and ran homewards, " crying εὕρηκα, εὕρηκα. He then made two maſſes, " each of equal weight with the crown, one of gold " and the other of ſilver. When he had done this, " he filled a large veſſel to the brim with water, and " put the ſilver maſs into it; upon which a quantity " of water overflowed, equal to the bulk of the maſs. " Then taking the maſs out, he filled up the veſſel " again, meaſuring the water exactly, which he put " in. This ſhewed him what meaſure of water an- " ſwered to a certain weight of ſilver. Then he " tried the gold in like manner, and found that it " cauſed a leſs quantity of water to overflow, the " gold being leſs in bulk than the ſilver, tho' of the " ſame weight. Then he filled the veſſel a third time, " and putting in the crown itſelf, he found that it " cauſed more water to overflow, than the golden " maſs of the ſame weight; whence he computed the " mixture of ſilver with the gold, and ſo manifeſtly " diſcovered the fraud." *Hiero Syracuſii auctus regia poteſtate, rebus bene geſtis, cum auream coronam votivam, diis immortalibus in quodam fano conſtituiſſet ponendam, immani pretio locavit faciendam, & aurum ad ſacoma appendit redemptori. Is ad tempus, opus manufactum ſubtiliter, regi approbavit, & ad ſacoma pondus coronæ viſus eſt præſtitiſſe. Poſteaquam indicium eſt factum, dempto auro tantundem argenti in id coronarium opus admixtum eſſe, indignatus Hiero ſe contemptum, neque inveniens qua ratione id furtum deprehenderet, rogavit Archimedem, uti in ſe ſumeret ſibi de eo cogitationem. Tunc is cum haberet ejus rei curam, caſu venit in balneum ibique cum in ſolium deſcenderet, animadvertit quantum corporis ſui in eo infidret, tantum aquæ extra ſolium effluere. Itaque cum ejus rei rationem explicationis offendiſſet, non eſt moratus, ſed exiluit gaudio motus de ſolio, & nudus vadens domum verſus, ſignificabat clara voce inveniſſe quod quæreret.*

(5) Vitruv. l. 9. cap. 3.

Nam

monument had a ſphere and a cylinder carved on it [*E*].

Nam currens identidem Græcè clamabat ἵυρηκα, ἵυρηκα. Tum verò ex eo inventionis ingreſſu duas dicitur feciſſe maſſas æquo pondere, quo etiam fuerat corona, unam ex auro, alteram ex argento. Cum ita feciſſet, vas amplum ad ſumma labra implevit aqua, in quo demiſit argenteam maſſam. Cujus quanta magnitudo in vaſe depreſſa eſt, tantum aquæ effluxit. Ita exempta maſſa, quanto minus factum fuerat refudit, ſextario menſus; ut eodem modo quo prius fuerat ad labra æquaretur. Ita ex eo invenit, quantum ad certum pondus argenti certa aquæ menſura reſponderet. Cum id expertus eſſet, tum auream maſſam ſimiliter pleno vaſe dimiſit, & ea exempta, eadem ratione menſura addita, invenit ex aqua non tantum defluxiſſe, ſed tantum minus, quantum minus magno corpore eodem pondere auri maſſa eſſet quam argenti. Poſtea verò repleto vaſe in eadem aqua ipſa corona demiſſa, invenit plus aquæ defluxiſſe in coronam, quam in auream eodem pondere maſſam, & ita ex eo quod plus defluxerat aquæ in corona quam in maſſa, ratiocinatus, deprehendit argenti in auro mixtionem, & manifeſtum furtum redemptoris.

2. The Κόχλια or Κόχλιον was an engine to drain water out of places where it ſtagnated. Athenæus (6) ſpeaking of the prodigious ſhip that was built by the order of Hiero, tells us that "Archimedes invented "an engine called *Cochlion*, by means of which the "hold, notwithſtanding its depth, could be drained "by one man. Diodorus Siculus (7) informs us, that Archimedes invented the Cochlea, to drain Egypt, which by a wonderful mechaniſm would empty the water from any depth. Ἀποφύσιοι γὰρ τὰς ῥύσεις τῶν ὑδάτων τοῖς Αἰγυπτιακοῖς λεγομένοις Κοχλίαις, οὓς Ἀρχιμήδης ὁ Συρακούσιος εὗρεν, ὅτε παρέβαλεν εἰς Αἴγυπτον. Διὰ δὲ τούτων συνεχῶς ἐκ διαδοχῆς παραδιδόντες μοχλὸν τοῦ καμόντος τῶν μετάλλων τόπον ἀναξηραίνουσι, ὃ κατασκευάζουσιν ἔντεχνον πρὸς τὴν τῆς ἐργασίας πραγματοῖαν. Φιλοτέχνου δ' ὄντος τοῦ ὀργάνου καθ' ὑπερβολὴν, διὰ τῆς τυχούσης ἐργασίας ἄπλετον ὕδωρ ἀναῤῥιπίζεται παραδόξως, ὃ πᾶν τὸ ποτάμιον ῥεῦμα ῥαδίως ἐκ βυθοῦ πρὸς τὴν ἐπιφάνειαν ἐκχύται Θαυμάσαι δ' ἄν τις εἰκότως τοῦ τεχνίτου τὴν ἐπίνοιαν, οὐ μόνον ἐν τούτοις, ἄλλα καὶ ἐν ἄλλοις πολλοῖς κ) μείζοσι, διαπρεπομένους κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην.

3. The Ἕλιξ, by means of which (according to Athenæus (8) he launched Hiero's great ſhip. Κατασκευάσας ἕλικα, τὸ τηλικοῦτον σκάφος εἰς τὴν θάλασσαν κατήγαγε. πρῶτος δ' Ἀρχιμήδης εὗρε τὴν τῆς ἕλικος κατασκευήν.

4. The Τρίσπαστον or Τρίσπαστος, of the power of which Tzetzes (9) gives a hyperbolical relation.

Καὶ τῇ τρισπάστῳ μηχανῇ χειρὶ λαιᾷ κ' μόνῃ,
Πεντηκοντορίσμυρίμνιον καθεῖλκυσεν ὁλκάδα.

5. The Machines he uſed in the defence of Syracuſe againſt Marcellus. Of theſe we have a large account in Polybius, Livy and Plutarch.

6. His Burning-Glaſſes, with which he is ſaid to have ſet fire to the Roman gallies (10).

7. His Pneumatic and Hydraulic Engines, of which he wrote books, according to Tzetzes (11).

—— Πνευματικὴν, τὰς ὑδροσκοπικάς τε
Καὶ τούτῳ ὃ ἔγραψε τῶν βιβλων Ἀρχιμήδες.

8. The Sphere. See the note [*B*].

[*E*] *His monument had a ſphere and a cylinder carved on it.*] This remarkable monument, Tully informs us, was quite unknown at Syracuſe in his time, being overgrown with buſhes. But when he was Quæſtor there, he found it out and cauſed the palace to be cleared. There was an inſcription upon it, but the latter part of all the verſes was conſumed. *Cujus ego Quæſtor*, ſays he (12), *ignoratum ab Syracuſanis, cum eſſe omnino negarent, ſeptum undique, & veſtitum vepribus, & dumetis indagavi ſepulchrum. Tenebam enim quoſdam ſenariolos, quos in ejus monumento eſſe inſcriptos acceperam; qui declarabant, in ſummo ſepulchro ſphæram eſſe poſitam cum cylindro. Ego autem, cum omnia colluſtrarem oculis (eſt enim ad portas Agragianas magna frequentia ſepulchrorum) animadverti columellam non multum è dumis eminentem, in qua inerat ſphæræ figura, & cylindri. Atque ego ſtatim Syracuſanis (erant autem principes mecum) dixi, me illud ipſum arbitrari eſſe, quod quærerem. Immiſſi cum falcibus multi purgarunt & apparuerunt locum. Quo cum patefactus eſſet aditus, ad adverſam baſim acceſſimus, apparebat epigramma exeſis poſterioribus partibus verſiculorum, dimidiatis fere. Ita nobiliſſima Græciæ civitas, quondam verò etiam doctiſſima, ſui civis unius acutiſſimi monumentum ignoraſſet, niſi ab homine Arpinate didiciſſet.*

(6) Athen. Δειπνοσοφιστῶν, lib. 5.

(7) Diod. Sicul. lib. 5.

(8) Athen. Δειπνοσ. lib. 5.

(9) Tzetzes, *Chil.* 2. *Hiſt.* 35.

(10) Idem, ibid. Galen. περὶ κράσεων, lib. 3.

(11) Tzetzes, *Chil.* 2. *Hiſt.* 35.

(12) Cic. *Tuſc.* lib. 5.

ARCHIMELUS, a Greek Poet, flouriſhed in the time of Hiero King of Syracuſe [*A*]: which appears by the preſent he received from this Monarch. He had made an Epigram in praiſe of a ſhip of a prodigious bulk, that Hiero had built (*a*). This Epigram was worth a thouſand buſhels of corn to him, which this Prince ſent to him to the *Piræum* (*b*). Here then is a Poet to be ranked with thoſe few, who have found men of the humour of the Admiral *de Joieuſe* (*c*).

(*c*) The Admiral of this name gave an Abbey for a Sonnet. Balzac, *Entret.* 8.

(*a*) See the deſcription of it in *Athenæus*, book 5, pag. 206.

(*b*) Athen. pag. 209.

[*A*] *He flouriſhed in the time of Hiero King of Syracuſe.*] That is, about the year of Rome 520, and the 136th Olympiad. It is probable that he lived at Athens, ſince the corn that was given him for a preſent was carried to Piræum. I am ſurpriſed that Voſſius ſhould forget that there was ſuch Poet as this: the reward for his Epigram made him remarkable. Athenæus has preſerved the 18 verſes for which he was ſo largely paid (1). Monſieur Catherinot has not related faithfully the reward. *Archimelus*, ſays he (2), *was regaled by King Hiero with ſix thouſand buſhels of corn, for an Epigram of* 20 *verſes upon his ſhip.*

(1) Athen. lib. 5. pag. 209.

(2) Cather. *Traité de la Marine*, pag. 6.

ARCHIROTA (ALEXANDER) [*A*], Abbot of Olivet (*a*), was of Naples; he compoſed among other Books, a *Collection of the Actions of the Kings mentioned in* ſcripture [*B*], and dedicated it to the Queen of Poland, Bonna Sforza, who was then at Bari. She rewarded him with a penſion for life of 300 crowns a year. He lived a hundred and twenty years (*b*): M. Konig makes him to flouriſh in 1636, and attributes to him a *Commentary upon the Books of Samuel, and of the Kings*, and a *treatiſe upon the vow of Poverty.*

(*a*) A ſort of Monks in Italy.

(*b*) Lancelot de Perouſe, p. 987 of the book intitled, *Chi l'indovina è ſavio.*

[*A*] *ALEXANDER.*] Lancelot de Perouſe ſays in the body of his work intitled *Chi l'indovina è ſavio*, that this Author's name was Alexander: but in the margin and table of contents he calls him *Agoſtino.*

[*B*] *A Collection of the Actions of the Kings mentioned in Scripture.*] This work was compoſed in Italian. I do not know whether it is the ſame with that which is intitled *Diſcorſi ſopra diverſi Luoghi della ſacra Scrittura.* The Oxford Catalogue expreſſes its being divided into two parts, the firſt of which was printed at Florence, in 1581, in 8vo; and the ſecond, at the ſame place, in 1583, in 8vo. In the ſame Catalogue we ſee that the treatiſe *de Voto Paupertatis* appeared at Florence in 1580 in 8vo, and that the Author of theſe three books was named *Alexander Archirola.* I believe it ought to be *Archirota.*

☞ARCHYTAS of Tarentum, was the ſon of Mneſagoras, or according to Ariſtoxenus, of Heſtiæus (*a*). He was a Philoſopher of the Pythagoræan ſect, and a famous Aſtronomer and Geometrician. His doubling the cube is mentioned by Eutocius, and he was almoſt the firſt that brought down the Mathematicks to human uſes (*b*). He commanded the army ſeven times, and was never defeated. There are two Epiſtles preſerved in Diogenes Laertius, one from Achytas to Plato, and another from Plato to Archytas. He is ſaid to have made a wooden Pigeon that could fly (*c*). He was caſt away in the Adriatic Sea, and thrown on the ſhore of Apulia [*A*]. Diogenes Laertius mentions three of this name, beſides our Archytas; one of Mitylene, a Muſician; another a Writer on Agriculture (*d*); a third, an Epigrammatiſt.

(*a*) Diog. Laert. *in Archyta.*

(*b*) Whiſton, *Introduction to Euclid's Elements*, edit. Lond. 8vo, 1719.

(*c*) Aulus Gellius, lib. 10. cap. 12.

(*d*) He is mentioned by Varro and Columella.

[*A*] *He was caſt away in the Adriatic Sea, and thrown on the ſhore of Apulia.*] We find this in Horace (1): for that Poet being an Epicurean takes occaſion to ridicule Archytas, on his knowledge in Aſtrology, Geometry, and the Pythagorean Philoſophy:

(1) Horat. Od. 28. lib. 1.

Te maris & terræ numeroque carentis arenæ
Menſorem cohibet, Archyta,
Pulveris exigui prope littus parva Matinum
Munera: nec quidquam tibi prodeſt
Aërias tentaſſe domos, animoque rotundum
Percurriſſe polum, morituro.

That is;

"A narrow grave by the Matinian ſhore
"Confines thee now, and thou canſt have no more.
"Ah learn'd Archytas, ah how ſmall for thee,
"Whoſe wond'rous mind could meaſure Earth and Sea?
"What ſands make up the ſhore minutely teach,
"And count as far as number's ſelf could reach!
"What did it profit that thy nimble ſoul
"Had travell'd Heav'n, and oft ran round the Pole,
"Purſu'd the motions of the rowling light,
"When death came on, and ſpread a gloomy night."
Creech.

And a little after,

Me quoque devexi rapidus comes Orionis
Illyricis Notus obruit undis.

That is,

"A boiſterous ſtorm my feeble tackling tore,
"And left me naked on th' Illyrian ſhore:
Creech.

☞ARDSHIR ſurnamed Dirâz deſt, [Artaxerxes Longimanus,] King of Perſia. See BAHMAN.

☞ARDSHIR [or ARTAXERXES,] ſurnamed Babegân, King of Perſia, was the Prince who put an end to the Parthian monarchy, and reſtored the empire to the Perſians; or, as the Oriental Hiſtorians expreſs it, wreſted the crown from the race of Aſhghân, and founded a fourth royal family, named Sâſânians, who held the throne of Perſia till that country was conquered by the Arabs. He was the ſon of a private perſon, though deſcended, as is generally ſuppoſed, from a King of Perſia of the ſecond race [*A*], by the daughter of Bâbec, Governor of the Province of Farſiſtân, or Proper Perſia, under Ardawân, the reigning Prince at that time; and had the ſurname of Babegân from his maternal grandfather (*a*). Young Ardſhir being of an excellent natural diſpoſition, and educated with the utmoſt care, made ſo extraordinary a proficiency in all the exerciſes becoming a perſon of his birth, that the King hearing of it, would needs ſee him; and being greatly pleaſed with his behaviour, ordered him for the future to be brought up with his own children. One day, as Ardſhir accompanied the Princes to a hunting match, the King followed them to ſee what paſſed, and finding Ardſhir far ſurpaſſed his own ſons in grace and dexterity, as well in uſing the bow as in managing his horſe, conceived a jealouſy of him, and reſolved to ſend him from court, and accordingly gave him the command of ſome troops in a diſtant Province. There he continued till he received the news of his grandfather Bâbec's death, upon which he returned to court to beg his government, but could not obtain it; Ardawân having deſigned it for his eldeſt ſon. About this time the King had a dream, which, as he was told by thoſe whom he conſulted thereon, portended that ſome fugitive from his court ſhould deprive him of his crown. A young woman in the King's ſeraglio gave notice to Ardſhir, with whom ſhe held a private correſpondence, of this dream and its interpretation, and perſuaded him to make his eſcape with her, building great hopes on what was thereby foretold. Ardawân was acquainted with their flight, and began to fear the accompliſhment of his dream. Ardſhir, on the other hand, being arrived at Iſtakhr, the capital of Farſiſtân, was extremely well received by his grandfather's friends [*B*], who waited on him in great numbers, and offered to riſk their lives and fortunes in his ſervice; ſo that in a little time he was in a condition to make open war againſt the King's ſon, who bore the ſame name with his father, and was then Governor of the Province. Several battles were fought between them, but the laſt was deciſive, young Ardawân being ſlain therein. On the news of this defeat, the King himſelf

(*a*) Khondemir, e Tarik Gozideh, & Binakiti.

[*A*] *He was the ſon of a private perſon, tho' deſcended, as is generally ſuppoſed, from a King of Perſia of the ſecond race.*] Some (1) call Ardſhir's father Sâſân; but others (2) ſay Sâſân was the name of his grandfather, who was lineally deſcended from another of the ſame name, ſon to Bahman the ſixth King of the race of the Cayanians. Hiſtorians add, that this Sâſân, having either voluntarily reſigned his right of ſucceſſion, to lead a religious and contemplative life, or being diſinherited by Bahman in favour of his daughter Khamâni (3), left Perſia, and retired into a foreign country, whence one of his poſterity returning, entred into the ſervice of Babec, and, as ſome ſay (4), kept his ſheep; but his maſter ſoon diſcovered ſuch good qualities in him, that he gave him his only daughter in marriage (5).

(1) Lobb al tawarikh.
(2) Tarik Gozideh, & Binakiti, *apud* Khondemir.
(3) Al Beidawi, *in Nodhâm al tawarikh*, MS. See the Articles of BAHMAN and KHAMANI.
(4) Lobb al tawarikh, Khondemir.
(5) *Supra citati hiſtorici, &* Hezârſen.

[*B*] *Ardſhir was extremely well received by his grandfather's friends.*] The reaſon of this favourable reception, and the people's ſo readily embracing Ardſhir's party, was the great reſpect they had for the memory of Babec, who had governed them with great juſtice and humanity, and exerciſed none of thoſe violences and tyrannical acts for which the Princes of the race of Aſhghân were ſo infamous (6).

(6) Al Beidawi, *ubi ſupra.*

ſelf marched againſt Ardſhir with all his forces, but had no better fortune than his ſon, loſing the battle and his life at the ſame time. Ardſhir after this victory, which reſtored him the throne of his anceſtors, took the title of *Shâhinſhâh*, i. e. *King of Kings*, or *Emperor*, and extended his conqueſts on every ſide. This Prince is ſaid to have poſſeſſed all military and civil virtues in ſo high a degree, that he became the model of ſuch of his ſucceſſors as had the good of their people at heart: and in reality, his great atchievements in war, tho' hiſtory ſpeaks of them in general only, the number of magnificent cities which he built, the prudent laws and regulations which he made in the ſtate (*b*), and the writings which he left behind him [*C*], give us an idea of a moſt accompliſhed Prince. To ſecure to himſelf the poſſeſſion of the crown, he married the daughter of Ardawân, his predeceſſor; but that Princeſs not being able to put off the affection ſhe bore to her own family, and having a ſecret averſion for the King her husband, laid a deſign to poiſon him, and to ſet one of her brothers on the throne: her plot, however, was diſcovered, and ſhe was found guilty, and delivered to one of the chief miniſters to be put to death. The miniſter, going to execute his orders, found the Queen to be with child, and conſidering that the King his maſter had no iſſue, reſolved to ſpare her life, to preſerve him an heir; and ſhe being delivered of a ſon, he brought the child up privately, and took great care of his education, till he at laſt preſented him to the King, as he was exerciſing himſelf at mall on horſeback according to the Perſian cuſtom, and diſcovered the ſecret to him. The King received his ſon with much pleaſure, and having commended the miniſter's prudence, and rewarded him proportionably to his ſervice, ordered the young Prince, who was named Shâbûr, or Sapores, to be treated in all reſpects according to his quality, and declared him his ſucceſſor (*c*). Ardſhir reigned thirty years (*d*) [*D*], as the beſt Hiſtorians agree; for the fourteen laſt of which he had been ſovereign of all Aſia, or, as the Perſians expreſs it, of the fourth part of the world (*e*).

(*b*) As to the reformation made by this Prince in religion, ſee the Article of ERDAVIRAF.

(*c*) Idem, *apud* D'Herbel. *Bib. Orient.* pag. 125. Al Beidawi, *in Nodhâm al tawarikh*, MS.

(*d*) Iidem, Hezarſen, MS.

(*e*) Al Beidawi, *ubi ſupra.*

[*C*] *The writings which he left behind him.*] He wrote a *Gâr nâmeh*, or Journal of his life, in which he ſet down his expeditions, conqueſts, private actions, and even his diſcourſe, without any diſguiſe; for he had ſo great an abhorrence to flattery, that he appointed one of his court to examine him every morning, and make him give an account of all he had ſaid or done the preceding day.

Beſides theſe Commentaries, he alſo left another work, entitled *Adab al aiſh*, or *Rules of life*, for the uſe of his ſucceſſors and ſubjects. This book Nuſhirwâu, one of his ſucceſſors, ordered to be copied and publiſhed, to re-eſtabliſh good order and policy in his dominions (7).

(7) Khondemir, *apud* D'Herbel. *Biblioth. Orient.* p. 125.

[*D*] *Ardſhir reigned thirty years.*] Eutychius places this Prince's reign too early, making him contemporary with the Emperor Commodus; whereas he obtained not the crown of Perſia, at the ſooneſt, before the reign of Caracalla, in the beginning of the third Century. Y.

☞ARETÆUS of Cappadocia was a Phyſician of the Sect of the Pneumatiſts (*a*). Authors differ very much about the age in which he lived. Some place him in the time of Auguſtus Cæſar [*A*], others after Galen [*B*]. Voſſius (*b*) is one of thoſe who make him very antient, and founds his conjecture on our Author's uſing the Ionic dialect, which, as this learned Critic obſerves, was out of uſe long before the time of the Cæſars. But he is evidently miſtaken [*C*]. It is more probable that he lived under Trajan or Adrian [*D*]. We

(*a*) This was firſt diſcovered by Mr. Le Clerc, *Hiſt. de la Medicine*, Part 2. liv. 4. Sect. 2. chap. 3. See an account of this Sect, under the Article of ATHENÆUS.

(*b*) Voſſius, *de Philoſophia*, cap. 13.

[*A*] *Some place him in the time of Auguſtus Cæſar.*] Mercklin (1) ſays he lived under the reign of Auguſtus, and at the ſame time, by a moſt unaccountable blunder, makes him contemporary with Strabo, who flouriſhed under Tiberius, and with Gregory Nazianzen, who flouriſhed under Valens and Theodoſius.

(1) Linden. renovat. p. 87.

[*B*] *Others place him after Galen.*] Thoſe who hold this opinion, found it chiefly on Galen's not having mentioned Aretæus. They think he would hardly have paſſed him over in ſilence, if he had written before his time, becauſe he is ſo frequent in the mention of other Pneumatiſts. To this it is anſwered (2), that we have not all the works of Galen, and beſides that it is not poſſible he ſhould quote all the Phyſicians that wrote before him. It was enough for him to ſpeak of the chief of each ſect, and ſo to quote only Athenæus and Archigenes, who were the moſt famous, and held the firſt place among the Pneumatiſts. They might alſo have been contemporaries, and ſo Galen could not have quoted him. It is farther obſerved (3), that the fragments of Archigenes, preſerved in Aëtius, are ſo like the writings of Aretæus, that we find in them not only the ſame method of cure, but alſo the ſame deſcriptions and obſervations, expreſſed almoſt in the very ſame words. Hence it is no wonder, if the fame of Archigenes, who practiſed Phyſick at Rome itſelf, exſtinguiſhed that of Aretæus, who was a more obſcure perſon, and wrote in a leſs faſhionable ſtyle.

(2) Le Clerc, *Hiſt. de la Medicine*, Part 2. liv. 4. Sect. 2. ch. 3.

(3) Wigan, *de Aretæi ætate*, pag. 15.

[*C*] *Voſſius is miſtaken.*] Mr. Menage (4) has ſhewn that the Ionic Dialect was uſed long after the time ſuppoſed by this Author. For Arrian wrote in it, as alſo one Cephalo, who, as well as Arrian, lived under Adrian, and is quoted by Suidas: it was uſed alſo by Dionyſius Mileſius, a contemporary of Philoſtratus, who lived under Severus. But what puts this out of diſpute, is that it appears from Aretæus himſelf, that he did not live before the time of Nero: for he mentions the *Antidote of Vipers*, which was the invention of Andromachus, Nero's Phyſician (5).

(4) *In Amœnitat. Juris.*

(5) See the Article of ANDROMACHUS.

[*D*] *It is more probable that he lived under Trajan or Adrian.*] The knowledge of his ſect proves, that he muſt have lived after Athenæus the founder of it, who is thought to be contemporary with Pliny, who flouriſhed under Veſpaſian. He is quoted by that Dioſcorides, who was Author of the *Euporiſta*, and dedicated his book to Andromachus. There were three Authors who bore the name of Dioſcorides. The firſt was ſurnamed Phacas, and lived in the time of Anthony and Cleopatra, with whom he was acquainted. The ſecond was the famous Author of the books on the *Materia Medica*; he was ſurnamed Anazarbæus, and wrote his books, in all probability, under the reign of Veſpaſian. The third, ſurnamed Alexandrinus and Junior, is ſaid by Galen to have lived a little before his time. The firſt can by no means be ſuppoſed to have lived till the time of Nero, whoſe Phyſician Andromachus was. And the ſtyle and manner of writing is ſo unlike what we find in the books on the *Materia Medica*, that we can hardly ſuppoſe them to be the compoſition of the ſecond Dioſcorides. It muſt then be the third, that wrote theſe *Euporiſta*, and lived a little before the time of Galen, who was born about the 15th year of Adrian. Andromachus the *Archiater* had a ſon of the ſame name, who might be the perſon to whom the *Euporiſta* were dedicated. Thus I think it is certain that our Aretæus muſt have lived between the reign of Veſpaſian and the latter

We have had but few editions of this valuable writer [*E*].

end of the reign of Adrian: and it ſeems to me very probable that it was under Trajan, in whoſe reign Archigenes alſo flouriſhed, who was probably contemporary with Aretæus.

[*E*] *We have had but few editions of this valuable Writer.*] The firſt was a Latin Tranſlation by Junius Paulus Craſſus, Profeſſor at Padua; printed at Venice in 1552, in 4to. In this edition the ſecond, third, fifth, ſixth and ſeventh chapters of the ſecond book περὶ χρονίων παθῶν θεραπείας are wanting. The firſt edition in Greek was that of Jacobus Goupylus, printed at Paris by Turnebus, in 1554, in 8vo. The ſame year a new edition of the tranſlation of Craſſus was publiſhed, with Annotations by G. M. T. (6): to this edition there was added alſo a verſion of the five books, omitted in the former edition by Craſſus. It was printed at Paris, in 8vo (7). This edition was reprinted by H. Stephens, in his *Medicæ Artis Principes* (8), but without the Annotations. After this, a new edition of the verſion of Craſſus came out, reviſed by himſelf, with a tranſlation alſo of the five books, which he had omitted in his firſt edition (9). It was publiſhed after his death by his ſon. In the year 1603, there came out a Greek and Latin edition (10), in folio, by Heniſchius, who pretends to have collated three Manuſcripts, the Venetian, the Bavarian and the Auguſtan: but, as Dr. Wigan (11) obſerves, tho' he had inſpected theſe three Manuſcripts, yet he does not ſeem to have amended the text in any one place, and has even tranſcribed the typographical errors in the edition of Goupylus, and ſuffered ſeveral new ones to creep in, and at the ſame time has left the Latin verſion without the leaſt emendation. Mercklin (12) mentions an edition in Greek and Latin at Paris in 4to, without aſſigning any date, and ſays it is illuſtrated with the annotations of Peter Petit: but there is good reaſon to believe this edition never was printed, and that Mercklin took it upon truſt from Mr. Menage, who mentions ſuch a book, as being ſoon to be publiſhed (13). Beſides theſe, we have an elegant and correct edition of Aretæus, publiſhed at Oxford, in 1723, in folio, by Dr. Wigan, who collated a manuſcript in the Library of the preſent Earl of Oxford, and procured the collation of that in the Vatican Library, and made a new tranſlation. In his Preface he gives an account of the ſeveral editions of this Author, which we have followed in this note. To this are ſubjoined Diſſertations on the age of Aretæus, his ſect, his ſkill in Anatomy, and his method of cure. At the end is a large collection of various Readings, with Notes on them; a treatiſe on the Author's Ionic Dialect, and a Greek Index, by the learned Mr. Mattaire: to which are added an Appendix to the Greek Index, containing chiefly the phyſical terms, made uſe of by Aretæus, and a Latin Index. There has been alſo lately publiſhed another edition by the learned Profeſſor Boerhaave (14). In this the Greek text is the ſame with that in the edition of Goupylus: and the Latin verſion is that of the anonymous Author mentioned above. In the Notes we have about fifty emendations which Joſeph Scaliger had written in the margin of a copy of Heniſchius's edition, now in the Library of the Univerſity of Leyden, and the emendations and various readings of Goupylus, Heniſchius and Petit. After the text of Aretæus our learned Editor has added the whole Comment of the famous M. Petit (15), which had been long lamented by the learned, being ſuppoſed to be loſt; the ſeveral improvements of Dr. Wigan, for which he had the leave of that learned Editor; the Conjectures and Emendations of the learned Triller, publiſhed by him in the *Acta Lipſienſia*; and a copious Index by the diligent Pellerinus.

(6) Dr. Wigan thinks this anonymous author was Goupylus, *Præf. Aret.* pag. 3. but M. Petit affirms it was Celſus Craſſus, the ſon of Junius.

(7) *Apud Guliel-mum Morelium, & Jacobum Puteanum.*

(8) *Anno* 1567, in folio.

(9) Baſileæ, *ap.* Petrum Pernam, 1581, in 4to. His Epiſtle to the Reader is dated in 1555.

(10) *Auguſtæ Vindelicorum, ap.* Georgium Willerum.

(11) *Præfat.* pag. 4.

(12) Linden. renovat. p. 87.

(13) Menagius *ad Laert.* edit. 1692, p. 253.

(14) Printed at Leyden in 1731, by Peter Vander Aa.

(15) The emendations made by this author are founded on the authority of three manuſcripts, as he himſelf tells us in his Preface.

☞ ARETAPHILA, a Lady of diſtinguiſhed fortitude in the time of the Mithridatic War. She was daughter of Æglator, and wife of Phædimus. Her beauty and knowledge in the management of civil affairs were very remarkable; and the calamities, in which her country was involved, rendered her merit more conſpicuous. For Nicocrates having ſeized the government of Cyrene in Libya, among many other acts of cruelty [*A*], killed Menalippus the Prieſt of Apollo with his own hand, and took poſſeſſion of the Prieſthood, and put Phædimus the huſband of Aretaphila to death, and obliged her to marry him. Aretaphila, regardleſs of her own intereſt [*B*], reſolved to revenge the injuries done to her country, and to diſpatch the Tyrant; for which purpoſe ſhe prepared poiſon, but being diſcovered, her huſband, at the inſtigation of his mother Calbia, a woman of an implacable diſpoſition, ordered that ſhe ſhould be put to the torture. Upon this ſhe confeſſed, that ſhe had indeed prepared poiſon, but inſiſted that it was not of a deadly nature, and only a mere love potion [*C*]; and bore the torture with ſuch reſolution, that ſhe was acquitted of the crime. This however did not prevent her from trying another method

[*A*] *Among many other acts of cruelty.*] In order to ſecure himſelf in the poſſeſſion of his government, he deſtroyed a great number of the citizens. He introduced a great many things, which were contrary to the laws; and in particular appointed centinels to ſtand at the gates of the city, to examine whether thoſe, who were carried out, were really dead, by wounding their bodies with ſwords, and burning them with fire, in order to prevent any of the citizens from eſcaping, under ſuch a diſguiſe (1).

(1) Plutarch. *de Virtut. Mulierum.*

[*B*] *Regardleſs of her own intereſt.*] Nicocrates had ſo great an affection for her, that tho' he was ſtern and inexorable to every other perſon, yet he behaved with the utmoſt humanity to her, and ſuffered her to enjoy a very large ſhare in his power. But this did not abate of her regard for her country, or the pain ſhe felt in viewing the diſtreſſes, which it laboured under. She obſerved, that the citizens were deſtroyed one after another without any proſpect of revenge; and very little aſſiſtance could be expected from the exiles, who were diſperſed in ſeveral parts, and could not unite in ſuch a manner as to be able to attempt any thing of importance. Aretaphila therefore being deſtitute of all other methods, determined upon poiſon as the moſt effectual, and ſacrificed all conſiderations of her own ſafety to the generous regard, which ſhe had for her country.

[*C*] *She confeſſed that ſhe had prepared poiſon, but inſiſted, that . . . . it was only a love potion.*] When her deſign was detected, and Calbia urged Nicocrates to put her to death immediately, his great love for Aretaphila occaſioned him to defer the execution of her as long as poſſible; and he was the more inclined to ſpare her, becauſe ſhe reſolutely denied the crime. But when ſhe ſaw that there was ſtrong evidence againſt her, ſhe told him, that as ſhe had enjoyed a great ſhare in his favour, and by that means had a very conſiderable authority, this had expoſed her to the hatred of ſeveral Ladies; and therefore being apprehenſive of their arts to draw over his affection to them, ſhe had determined to prepare a love potion to ſecure him to herſelf. This ſhe owned might be conſidered as a piece of very weak conduct in her; however ſhe hoped, that her too violent love for him would not ſubject her to the puniſhment of death. Nicocrates thought proper to put her to the torture, to ſee whether ſhe would perſiſt in this defence, and Calbia was appointed to preſide at the tryal. But Aretaphila bore the torments with ſuch undaunted reſolution, that Calbia notwithſtanding her cruel temper, was abſolutely tired out with viewing the torture, and Nicocrates being convinced of her innocence, acquitted her, and repented of his ſeverity; and after ſome time came to her, and endeavoured by all the gentle methods imaginable to regain her affections.

method of deſtroying Nicocrates, which was by engaging Leander his brother in her intereſt [*D*], to whom ſhe promiſed her daughter in marriage. He was prevailed upon to procure his brother to be aſſaſſinated by a ſervant, whoſe name was Daphnis. But when he began to act like his predeceſſor in an imperious and tyrannical manner, ſhe took meaſures to deſtroy him likewiſe, which ſhe at laſt effected by means of Anabus, a Prince of Libya [*E*]. The people of Cyrene being thus reſcued from tyranny offered to give Aretaphila a ſhare in their government in conjunction with their Magiſtrates. But ſhe rejected this offer, and having had the ſatisfaction of ſeeing the city reſtored to its former liberty, ſhe retired from all publick affairs, and ſpent the remainder of her life after a private manner in the converſation of her friends, and the management of her domeſtick employments (*a*).

(*a*) Plutarch. *de Virtutibus Mulierum.*

[*D*] *By engaging Leander his brother in her intereſt.*] She had a daughter who was extremely beautiful, whom ſhe ſent to Leander, in order that by the force of her charms, ſhe might prevail upon the youth to enter into her deſign. It was reported, that Aretaphila had made uſe of magical methods, that ſhe might engage his affections to the young Lady. After Leander had obtained with great difficulty his brother's conſent for the marriage, he was induced to reſolve upon the deſtruction of Nicocrates, partly by the ſollicitations of his wife, who had inſtructions from her mother how to act, and who urged him to reſtore liberty to the city, ſince under ſuch a tyranny he could not poſſibly enjoy ſufficient freedom; and partly by the perſuaſions of Aretaphila's friends, who were perpetually ſuggeſting to him all the diſadvantageous things imaginable againſt his brother, and raiſing ſuſpicions in his mind of the danger, which he might apprehend from him.

[*E*] *Which ſhe at laſt affected by means of Anabus, a Prince of Libya.*] Aretaphila enjoyed a great ſhare of power under the government of Leander, whom ſhe did not oppoſe openly, but took all the ſecret methods imaginable to procure his ruin. She firſt raiſed a war in Africa againſt him, having engaged Anabus to make an incurſion into his country, and to come even to the city in an hoſtile manner. She then complained to her ſon-in-law of his friends and Generals, as men of no reſolution or conduct in the war, but more inclined to peace, which ſhe acknowledged indeed was neceſſary for his intereſt, if he propoſed to maintain his authority in the city, firm and unſhaken. She promiſed therefore, that ſhe would procure a pacification if he thought proper, and engage Anabus to treat with him, ſince there might be very great danger from continuing the war. Leander conſented immediately, that ſhe ſhould undertake this negotiation; upon which ſhe had firſt a conference with Anabus, whom ſhe prevailed upon by a great many conſiderable preſents and promiſes to engage, that he would ſieze upon Leander, when he came to treat with him. Leander was very unwilling to go, and yet he could not avoid it out of regard to Aretaphila, who had promiſed that ſhe would be preſent at the conference; and accordingly he went without arms or guards. But when he came in ſight of Anabus, he ſtop'd, and ſeem'd to wait for his guards; upon which Aretaphila went to him, and urged him to go on to the conference; and when he ſtill delayed, ſhe took him by the hand, and forced him thither, and delivered him to Anabus. Leander was immediately ſeized by the Africans, and kept in chains, till Aretaphila's friends with the reſt of the citizens brought the money, which ſhe had promiſed. For moſt of the citizens, when they heard of this affair, came out to the place deſign'd for the conference. In the evening they returned with Leander into the city; and having paid the higheſt honours to Aretaphila for reſtoring their liberties, they ordered Calbia to be burnt alive, and the Tyrant to be put into a ſack, and thrown into the ſea. In the Edition of Moreri publiſhed at Paris in 1732, we are told that it was Anabus, who order'd him to be puniſhed in this manner, which is one of the infinite number of miſtakes, with which that book abounds. T.

ARETIN (CHARLES) was of Arezzo in Tuſcany, as his ſurname ſhews; (which may be ſaid for all the others who have been named Aretin.) He held a conſiderable rank among the learned men of the fifteenth Century. Poggius gives him great praiſes (*a*); but they ought to be ſuſpected, becauſe Charles Aretin was a great enemy of Philelphus, and Poggius mortally hated Philelphus. This laſt complains bitterly of our Aretin, and repreſents him as a wicked man, full of fraud and malicious cunning (*b*). That alſo ought to be ſuſpected, coming from ſuch an enemy as Philelphus, who being naturally abuſive, was become more ſo by the quarrels he had with ſome other learned men. There are ſome diſintereſted people however, who ſay that Charles Aretin underſtood Latin and Greek perfectly, and that he has ſhewn this by ſome tranſlations out of the Greek (*c*). He was alſo a pretty good Poet [*A*], and has written ſome Comedies in proſe, of which Albert de Eyb has inſerted ſome fragments in his *Margarita Poetica* (*d*). But what is the moſt evident proof of his ability is, that after the death of Leonard Aretin in 1443, he was choſen to ſucceed him in the office of Secretary of the Republick of Florence [*B*]. We do not know the year of his death; but it is certain that Moreri is

(*a*) Poggius, *init. Hiſt. Diſcept.* and 11 *Invect. in Philelph.*

(*b*) Philelphi, *Epiſt. ad Carol. Aretin. an.* 1433, & Epiſt. *ſeq.*

(*c*) Leand. Albert. *Deſcript. Ital.* p. 96.

(*d*) Geſneri *Bibliothec.*

[*A*] *He was a pretty good Poet.*] We muſt underſtand this with regard to that time: And I am afraid that even with this reſtriction, I ſhall not be able to make my text generally appear well grounded; for Mr. de la Monnoie has written to me as follows: *Lilius Gyraldus, who ſaw the Poems of Charles Aretin, did not approve of them, and in truth by the quotations we ſee of them in Tortellius's Dictionary, we may judge there is but little in them.* Note that Tortellius *quotes only ſome Elegiac Verſes; but F. Labbe* * *quotes in two or three places a verſion of the* Batrachomyomachia *in hexameter verſe by Charles Aretin.*

* Labbe, *Nova Bibliotheca MSS.*

[*B*] *He was choſen to ſucceed Leonard Aretin in the office of Secretary of the Republick of Florence.*] We learn this from Leander Albertus, *Diem functus eſt* (Leonardus Aretinus) *anno poſt C. N. MCCCCXL, ætatis ſuæ LXXIV, Florentiæ, cum illi Reipublicæ diu à ſecretis fuiſſet, & ſucceſſorem in eo munere habuit Carolum item Aretinum, & Græcis Latiniſque literis eruditiſſimum, qui etiam ipſe quædam de Græcis Latina fecit* (3). i. e. "Leonard Aretin died in 1440, in the "74th year of his age, at Florence, having been a "long time Secretary to that Republick. He was "ſucceeded in that office by Charles Aretin, who was "very learned in Greek and Latin, and tranſlated "ſome things out of Greek into Latin." Let us add to this teſtimony that of Æneas Silvius, tho' it be ſomething long; for it ſerves us as a proof of more than one thing. *Commendanda eſt*, ſays he (4), *multis in rebus Florentinorum prudentia, tum maxime quod in legendis Cancellariis non juris ſcientiam ut pleræque civitates, ſed oratoriam ſpectant, & quæ vocant humanitatis ſtudia. Norunt enim rectè ſcribendi dicendique artem non Bartolum aut Innocentium, ſed Tullium Quintilianumque tradere. Nos tres ex ea urbe cognovimus, Græcis & Latinis & conditorum operum famâ illuſtres, qui*

(3) Leand. Albert. *Deſcript. Ital.* p. 96.

(4) Æn. Silvius, *Hiſt. de Europâ*, cap. 54.

is miſtaken when he ſays it was in 1443 [C]. The Authors whom he quotes do not ſay that our Aretin left a volume of Letters. Some are of opinion that he was brother to John Aretin (e), of whom we ſhall ſpeak in his proper place; but they are miſtaken. He envied very much the glory of Leonard Aretin his predeceſſor (f).

(e) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Latinis*, p. 579.

(f) See the note [H] of the Article of (LEONARD) ARETIN.

qui Cancellarium alius poſt alium tenuere, Leonardum & Carolum Aretinos, & Poggium ejuſdem Reipublicæ civem, qui Secretarius Apoſtolicus tribus quondam Romanis Pontificibus dictârat epiſtolas. i. e. "The diſcretion of the Florentines is in many things to be "commended, but above all becauſe in the choice of "their Chancellors they do not regard the knowledge "of Law, like other cities, but of Oratory and polite "Learning. For they know, that the art of ſpeaking and writing well is delivered not by a Bartolus "or an Innocent, but by a Tully and a Quintilian. "We have known three out of that city famous for the "Greek and Latin tongues and works of their own compoſing, who have been Chancellors ſucceſſively, Leonard and Charles Aretin, and Poggius a citizen of the "ſame Republic, who was Secretary to three Popes." We muſt correct by this paſſage the obſcurity or miſtake of another paſſage of Æneas Silvius, which has given Voſſius ſome trouble. This is the other paſſage: *Leonardum Aretinum ex te primum ſenſi obiiſſe, qui Latium ornavit literis, quo nemo poſt Lactantium Ciceroni proximior fuit. Gaudeo Poggium ejus locum apud Florentinos tenere. Sed maluiſſem potius locum non vacaſſe, ne tanto ſplendore caruiſſet Hetruria* (5). i. e. "I firſt underſtood from you, that Leonard Aretin "was dead, who adorned Italy with learning, than "whom none came nearer Cicero after Lactantius. "I am glad that Poggius has ſucceeded him at "Florence. But I had rather the place had not been "vacant, that Tuſcany might not have wanted ſo "great an honour." See the note [A] of the article of (Leonard) ARETIN.

(5) Æn. Silvius, *Hiſt. de Europâ*, cap. 51.

[C] *Moreri was miſtaken when he ſaid that he died in* 1443.] It is certain that Poggius ſucceeded our Aretin in the Secretaryſhip of Florence; and it appears by the Oration, wherein he congratulates Nicholas V on his promotion to the Papacy, that he had no employment at Florence in 1447 (6). We muſt ſay then, that in 1447, Charles Aretin was Secretary of Florence; for Leonard Aretin his predeceſſor was dead in 1443. But here follows a more demonſtrative proof of Moreri's miſtake. Poggius, in a letter written under the Pontificate of Nicholas V, mentions that Charles Aretin was come to ſee him. *Quo primum anno*, ſays he (7), *Nicolaus Pontifex quintus peſtis cauſa, Fabrianum, Piceni oppidum ſeceſſit, cum me ad Terram novam natalem patriam cum familiâ contuliſſem; venit eò poſtmodum rogatus à me, qui Florentiam ob negotia publica adibat, Carolus Aretinus.* What led Moreri into his miſtake is, that Voſſius (8) does not refute the German Author whom he quotes, and who has ſaid in his Collection of Births and Deaths, that Charles Aretin, an Orator and Hiſtorian, died in 1443, at the age of ſeventy four years. All this agrees ſo well with Leonard Aretin, that in all probability the German Author has confounded Charles with Leonard. However, Voſſius ought to have ſhewed him his miſtake, concerning the year of the death of our Aretin.

(6) That is the year of the election of Nicolas V.

(7) Poggius, *init. Diſceptat.* 1.

(8) Voſſius, *de Hiſtoricis Latinis*, pag. 578.

ARETIN (FRANCIS) lived in the fifteenth Century. He was a man of great reading, and a good Grecian. He tranſlated into Latin the *Commentaries of St. Chryſoſtom upon St. John*, and about twenty of the ſame Father's *Homilies*. He alſo tranſlated the Letters of Phalaris into Latin [A]. We have beſides of his compoſition a treatiſe *de Balneis Puteolanis*. John Anthony Campanus, who was a favourite of Pius III and of Sixtus IV, was one of his moſt intimate friends (a). Eraſmus did not eſteem the performance of our Aretin upon St. Chryſoſtom [B]. Some think that our Francis Aretin was the ſame perſon with the famous Civilian FRANCISCUS ARETINUS, who was of the family of the Accolti. But others can hardly be perſuaded to believe that the tranſlator of ſome works of St. Chryſoſtom, &c. is the ſame with Francis Accolti, whoſe Law works are filled with the groſſeſt barbariſms, without any ſhadow of the knowledge of Greek. I have ſome obſervations to produce thereupon, which may convince many perſons that there was but one Francis Aretin [C]. However, let us ſpeak of Aretin the Lawyer. He ſtudied at Sienna about the year 1443 (b), and afterwards

(a) Taken from Aubert le Mire, *Auctar. de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.* pag. 268.

(b) Panzirol *de Clar. Legum Interpretib.* lib. 2. cap. 103. p. 249, & *ſeq.*

[A] *He tranſlated the Letters of Phalaris into Latin.*] I have ſeen in a book printed in Germany in 1689 (1), ſeveral curious inquiries concerning theſe Letters; but I cannot forbear ſaying that the Author aſcribes to Leonard Aretin, what is due only to Francis. *Latinè emiſit Leonhardus Aretinus Florentiæ* 1480. We ſhall ſee in its proper place (2), that Leonard was not alive when this edition was publiſhed.

(1) *Decas Decadum* Joh. Alberti Fabricii, num. 8.

(2) In the note [G] of the article of (LEONARD) ARETIN.

[B] *Eraſmus did not eſteem the performance of our Aretin upon St. Chryſoſtom.*] He takes notice in two places of the miſtake, which this Author has committed about the word οἴησις *, in the verſion of the Comment on the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians. *Quod attinet ad fidem bene reddendi Græca, magis peccatum eſt ab Aniano, Aretino, & cæteris, quam ab Oecolampadio, qui magis peccat feſtinatione quam imperitiâ. Verſionem Franciſci Aretini in priorem ad Corinthios habemus uſque ad cap.* 30. *Cepi guſtum quam ſcitè tractaſſet rem, & ecce in ipſo ſtatim limine, quod eſt* τὸ τυφοῦσθαι καὶ χαυνοῦσθαι ἔρριψε πᾶσιν αὐτῶν, *οἴησιν, ὄιησιν* opinionem *vertit pro* arrogantia (3). He obſerves in another place (4), that Aretin had finiſhed the tranſlation of the Commentaries on the firſt Epiſtle to the Corinthians, to the 20th Homily.

* He tranſlates οἴησις *Opinion* inſtead of *Arrogance.*

(3) Eraſm. Epiſt. 59. lib. 26. pag. 1478. *See alſo* Epiſt. 4. lib. 28. p. 1591.

(4) Pag. 1591.

[C] *I have ſome obſervations to produce . . . . which may convince a good many . . . . that there is only one Francis Aretin.*] Let us propoſe in the firſt place the doubt of Panzirolus. *Liberalibus artibus imbutus non ſolum Latinis, ſed etiam Græcis literis operam dediſſe creditur, & Joannis Chryſoſtomi in D. Joannem & Epiſtolam primam Pauli ad Corinthios Commentaria Latina feciſſe, vereor tamen ne is ſit Accoltus, cum quæ in jure ſcripſit, illum ſtylum non oleant, neque ullum ſervent linguæ Græcæ veſtigium* (5). i. e. "Being inſtructed in the liberal arts, he is thought to have "applied himſelf to the learning not only of Latin "but alſo of Greek, and to have tranſlated into Latin Chryſoſtom's Comments on St. John and the firſt "of St. Paul to the Corinthians; but I am afraid it "was not Accoltus, ſince what he wrote in Law "has nothing of that ſtyle, neither does it ſhew any "trace of the Greek tongue." Now let us ſee what Mr. de la Monnoie has written to me upon that doubt (6). "Francis Accolti of Arezzo, having written his "Counſels, and other works in Law, in a ſtyle "which ſhews not only an intire ignorance of Greek, "but alſo of Latin, I have queſtioned, as well as "Panzirolus, his being the ſame Francis d'Arezzo, "who has given us ſome Greek tranſlations, the ſtyle "of which is not inferior to that of moſt of the other "humaniſts of his time. I ſaw that the Lawyer "took the name of Accolti and the titles of Doctor "and Knight; whereas the Humaniſt was called ſimply Franciſcus Aretinus. However, having lately "ſeen a copy of the Epiſtles of Francis Philelphus, "printed at Venice, *in fol.* in 1502, which is a "very ſcarce edition, and larger than the others of "21 books, I have found in it wherewithal to clear "up my doubt, by reading ſeveral of theſe Epiſtles, "wherein the Author ſpeaks of one Francis d'Arezzo "his diſciple, equally ſkilled in the Law and the "*Belles Lettres.* The time and circumſtances ſhew "evidently

(5) Panzirol. *de claris Legum Interpret.* lib. 2. cap. 103. p. 249.

(6) Mr. de la Monnoie's manuſcript notes.

wards he taught Law there with ſuch a vivacity of genius, that they ſurnamed him the Prince of Subtilties, and Aretin's wit became a proverb. This talent of his principally ſhone in diſputes, for no body could withſtand him. He gave his advice with ſo much confidence, as to aſſure the clients they ſhould gain their cauſe; and experience did not contradict him; for it was a common ſaying at the bar, ſuch a cauſe has been condemned by Aretin, and therefore it muſt be loſt. He taught alſo in the Univerſity of Piſa, and in that of Ferrara. He was at Rome under the Pontificate of Sixtus the Fourth, and did not ſtay there long, for he ſoon ſaw that the great hopes that he had built upon his reputation would come to nothing. This Pope declared that he would willingly have given him the dignity of Cardinal, if he had not been afraid of injuring the publick by taking from the youth ſuch an excellent Profeſſor. When old age would not permit him to perform all the functions of his office any longer, they diſpenſed with his reading of Lectures, and continued his ſalary. But he did not quite give over going into the chair, and although his Lectures had no great ſpirit in them, yet he had many Auditors on account of his reputation. One day when the Students ran to ſome publick ſhews, he perceived that there

" evidently that it is he of whom Volaterranus, a " writer about the ſame time, makes mention at the " end of his 21ſt book. Beſides his Law Compoſi- " tions, his tranſlations of St. Chryſoſtom, of the Epi- " ſtles of Phalaris, and of thoſe of Diogenes the Cy- " nick, there is a treatiſe aſcribed to him of the " Baths of Puzzoli, which however he is not the Au- " thor of, but only dedicated them to Pope Pius II, " in an ill written Epiſtle. He had alſo compoſed a " book of the Life and Manners of St. Anthony " Archbiſhop of Florence. Philelphus in the 12th " Letter of the 17th book, ſpeaks of this work with " commendation. In the 28th book of the Letters " of the ſame Philelphus there are ſix addreſſed *Fran-* " *ciſco Arretino, Equiti aurato ac Jureconſulto*, at that " time Profeſſor of Law in the Univerſity of Sienna. " In moſt of his Letters he gives him great praiſes, " upon which may be made large abatements. *Quaſi* " *dubitandum ſit*, ſays he to him in the firſt, *minus tibi* " *eſſe apud florentiſſimam iſtam Rempublicam ſecunda* " *omnia, qui vir in omni eruditionis ac ſapientiæ ge-* " *nere præſtantiſſimus ſis, atque ea virtute præditus,* " *quâ non modo ex hominibus hujuſce tempeſtatis nemini* " *cedis, ſed potes jure cum univerſa antiquitate de laude* " *contendere.* i. e. " As if it were to be doubted that " all things ſucceed with you in that moſt flouriſh- " ing Republick, who are a man of the greateſt ex- " cellence in all kinds of learning and knowledge, " and of ſuch virtue, that you not only do not yield " to any men of the preſent age, but may alſo juſtly " diſpute the praiſe with all antiquity." " By the " third, dated the 8th of March 1468, it appears " that Francis d'Arezzo was at that time a little above " fifty years of age; which was the reaſon he made " uſe of to diſpenſe with being married. Upon " which Philelphus ſays to him very merrily: *Nam* " *quod ais ſentire te debilitatas tibi eſſe corporis vires,* " *cum ſis quinquagenarius, aut paulo amplius, id nulla* " *tibi cauſa accidit alia, quam quod ætatis robur re-* " *miſeris ut quo tempore tendendus erat arcus, tum eum* " *tu maximè relaxaveris. Quod ſi eam ſervaſſes me-* " *diocritatem, quam & Philoſophi probant, & ego ſe-* " *cutus ſum, conſuluiſſes tu ſanè & poſteritati & tibi.* i. e. " For as to what you ſay, that you perceive the " ſtrength of your body to be weakened, being fifty " years old or a little more, that happens only be- " cauſe you have abated a little of your ſtrength, ſo " that when the bow ought to be bent, you have " ſlackened it moſt. But if you had obſerved that " mediocrity, which even the Philoſophers approve, " and I have followed, you would have ſerved poſte- " rity and yourſelf." " In the 4th of the 28th, he " aſks him for ſome news about his ſtudies: *Cæterum* " *cupio ex te noſſe quid rerum agas? Non enim ſatis* " *tuo præſtanti ingenio, ſingularique doctrinæ eſſe duco,* " *quod doceas leges, & jus civile, nam hæc jam tibi* " *nullius ſunt induſtriæ, cujus memoria divinâ eſt potius* " *quam humana. Majora quædam te arbitror medi-* " *tari, nec enim in eodem ſemper verſaris ludo, itaque* " *fieri non poteſt, quin aliquid novi ſemper cudas ex-* " *cudaſque.* i. e. " But I deſire to know of you what " you are about; for I do not think it equal to your " excellent genius and ſingular learning, to teach the " common and civil Law; for theſe ſhew nothing " of induſtry in you, whoſe memory is rather divine " than human. I am of opinion that you have " greater things in your thoughts; for you are not " always upon the ſame thing, and ſo you muſt always " be ſtriking out ſomething new." " In the 5th, he de- " ſires him to get him copied upon parchment the " Hiſtory of Ammianus Marcellinus. In a Letter of " the 19th book, he propoſes to him to receive De- " metrius Caſtrenus of Conſtantinople at Sienna, at " the expence of the Republick, to teach the young " people Greek. In another Letter of the 31ſt book, " he gives him advice of the deſign the Senate of " Venice had of drawing him to Sienna, and offering " him a chair at Padua. *Ad hæc ego*, adds he, *con-* " *tra locutus ſum, & quæ vera eſſe novi, & quibus te* " *delectari exiſtimavi, quippe qui non eſſem oblitus quæ* " *mecum nuper cum ad Octobrem Senæ fuiſſem, & de* " *temperamento corporis tui, & de iſtius cœli quantum* " *ad te attinet, intemperie locutus fueras.* i. e. " To " this I anſwered what I knew to be true, and what " I thought would pleaſe you, not having forgotten " what you had ſaid when I was with you at Sienna " in October, about your conſtitution and the badneſs " of that air for it." " It is very ſurprizing that he " ſhould ſay in the ſame Letter, that Francis d'Arezzo " is an enemy to a barbarous ſtyle: *Nec illud ſanè* " *prætereundum cenſui; Appianum Alexandrinum eſſe* " *jam ab me magna ex parte Latinum factum, quo-* " *niam tu nullâ barbariæ linguâ delectaris.* i. e. " Nor did I think this was to be omitted, that Appia- " nus Alexandrinus has been in great part rendered " by me into purer Latin, becauſe I know you can- " not be pleaſed with any barbarity of ſtyle." Is it " then to the cuſtom of that time, that we muſt " aſcribe the barbarous expreſſions of Francis d'Arezzo " in his writings on the Law? There is methinks " room to believe that he expreſly affected them, for " fear of being eſteemed a leſs able Lawyer, on ac- " count of his deſire to paſs for a polite writer. I have " run thro' ſome of his Counſels, which are barbarity it- " ſelf. His 42d has been much laughed at, where, " in conſequence of the agreement made between " Francis Sforza Duke of Milan, and Louïs de Gon- " zaga Marquis of Mantua, that in caſe Dorothy " the daughter of the Marquis ſhould be found with- " out any deformity or defect at the age of fourteen " years, ſhe ſhould be married to Galeazzo the Duke's " ſon, he maintains that the Duke had a right to " demand that the Phyſicians ſhould viſit the Princeſs, " to examine her naked, according as circumſtances " ſhould require. It appears however that this viſit, " how uneaſy ſoever it might be in the execution, " might be required by Law: ſo it was demanded " by the Duke, but refuſed by the Marquis."

After having examined theſe obſervations of Mr. de la Monnoie; I propoſed to him yet another doubt, and this is the manner in which he confirmed his opinion anew. *You have no reaſon to queſtion* that Francis d' Arezzo, the tranſlator of ſome Greek works, and Francis d' Arezzo the Civilian, whoſe Comments we have upon the law, with his counſels, " was one " and the ſame author. Volaterranus, who might " have ſeen the Civilian, aſcribes to him, beſides his " skill in the law, a great knowledge of polite lite- " rature (7). Philelphus, who wrote ſome years be- " fore, ſays the ſame thing. You may ſee by the " teſtimonies of the Epiſtles, that I have quoted to " you, that there was in his time one Francis Areti- " nus,

(7) Theſe are Volaterranus's words, at the end of the 21ſt book, p. 782. *Alexander Imolenſis & Franciſcus Aretinus, ambo ſcriptis excellentibus nuper relictis in memoria poſteritatis vivent. Franciſcus, præter jura, ceteras etiam liberales artes eſt adeptus, princeps ſæculi hujus habebatur. Xiſti tempore magna expectatione in hanc urbem venit, pauloque poſt ſpe fruſtratus remigravit impari doctrinæ ſapientia vitæque inſtituto, cum in cælibatu vixerit, ac opibus inhiaverit, quas cumulatiſſimas cognatis demum reliquit.* i. e. " Alexan- " der Imolenſis " and Francis A- " retinus will " both of them " live in their " excellent writ- " ings which " they have left " to poſterity. " Francis, be- " ſides the Law, " was acquainted " with the other " liberal arts. He " came into this " city in the time " of Xiſtus with " great expecta- " tions, and be- " ing diſappoint- " ed, he went " back a little " afterwards, " with an une- " qual learning " and way of life, " as he lived in " celibacy, and " hunted after " riches, which " he left at laſt " in great plenty " to his relations.

there were but forty perſons in his Auditory, he was ſo angry that he flung away his book, and cried out, *Aretin will never explain Law to a few perſons.* He retired in a paſſion, and would teach no more. He was of a ſevere temper, and he never kept the ſame ſervant longer than a month or two. *New brooms ſweep clean*, ſaid he. He was honoured with the title of Knight, and ſpent all his life in celibacy, and a parſimony, which gave him an opportunity of amaſſing a great deal of wealth. He was no leſs honoured on account of his continence than of his learning. It will be pleaſing to know what art he uſed in order to teach his diſciples of what conſequence it is to paſs for an honeſt man [*D*]. Though he had deſigned his wealth for the maintenance of a College, he left it to his relations (*c*).

" nus, or Arretinus (as he and others always write) " his Diſciple, a Knight, a Civilian, and Profeſſor " of Law in the Univerſity of Sienna, a man excel- " lent in all ſorts of literature. I add this paſſage to " thoſe which I have ſent you already. It is in the " 1ſt Epiſtle of the XXVIth Book, which is an in- " vective againſt Leodriſio Crivello. *At laudas Fran- " ciſcum Arretinum, & jure quidem, ſed, ut arbitror, dor- " mitans. Egiſti enim præter ingenium, & conſuetudinem tuam. At meretur Franciſcus Arretinus, cum ſit tum Jureconſultorum omnium præſtantiſſimus, tum nullius præclaræ diſciplinæ ignarus. Tamen laudari à te flagitiorum omnium ſcelerumque ſentinâ, dedecoroſum eſt. Jubes ab illo ut diſcam: recte mones, nam non ab iſto ſolum, ſed etiam abs te ipſo, ſi quid boni afferre poſſes, non invitus diſcerem. Sed cur quem tantopere laudas, non item imitaris. Illud prædicat apud omnes diſcipulum ſe meum extitiſſe, mihique tribuit tantas laudes, quantis vellem me non carere. At eſt te, inquis, omni doctrina præſtantior. Non eo inficias, neque fero graviter me à multis etiam diſcipulis meis ſuperari, id quod ſine aliqua mea laude fieri non potuerit, ſiquidam hi grati eſſe voluere.* i. e. " But you commend Francis Arreti- " nus, and juſtly; but, I believe, in your ſleep. For " you have acted contrary to your diſpoſition and " manner. But Francis Arretinus deſerves it, as he " is both the moſt excellent of all Lawyers, and alſo " acquainted with all excellent parts of learning. Yet " it is a diſgrace to be commended by you, who are " the ſink of all crimes and wickedneſs. You bid " me learn of him: and you give me good advice, " for I would willingly learn not only of him, but " even of you too, if I could not get any benefit by " you. But why did you not imitate him whom you " commend ſo much? He declares every where, that " he was my diſciple, and gives me ſuch praiſes " as I would not willingly be without. But he is, " you ſay, my ſuperior in every part of learning. I " do not deny it, nor am I offended at being ex- " celled by many of my diſciples, which cannot hap- " pen without ſome praiſe to my ſelf, if they have " a mind to be grateful." *This letter is dated Auguſt* 1, 1465. *Much about the ſame time, Janus Pannonius, who ſtudied at that time in Italy, addreſſed an Epigram to our Francis d' Arezzo,* of which theſe are the two firſt verſes:

Franciſce, interpres legum, ô Aretine, ſacrarum,
Nec minus Aonia nobilis in citharâ.

That is,

" Thou learn'd Expounder of the Sacred Laws,
" Whoſe tuneful Lyre deſerves no leſs applauſe."

It is certain then, that this Profeſſor of Law at Sienna, named Francis d' Arezzo or Aretin, was converſant in polite learning: It is no leſs certain that the family name of this Profeſſor was Accolti. You may believe himſelf. *Ego Franciſcus de Accoltis de Aretio,* ſays he at the bottom of his XVIIIth Counſel, *Decretorum Doctor, ſenis ordinariè legens, & illuſtris D. Marchionis Eſtenſis Conſiliarius, & ad fidem me ſubſcripſi, & meo ſolito ſigno ſignari juſſi.* " The times agree. Volaterranus ſays " that Francis Aretin, a Humaniſt and Civilian, was " at Rome under Sixtus IV. It was againſt the ſame " Sixtus that Francis Accolti wrote his CLXIIId Coun- " ſel in favour of Laurence de Medicis and the Flo- " rentines, whom this Pope had excommunicated be- " cauſe of the murther of the Archbiſhop of Piſa, " and the impriſonment of the Cardinal his great ne- " phew. Volaterranus ſays, that Francis Aretin be- " ing gone to Rome full of great hopes, ſoon went " away again, ſeeing that the ſucceſs did not anſwer " his expectation. Whence I draw the conſequence, " that Francis Accolti, who is the ſame with the Fran- " cis Arretin of Volaterranus, took upon himſelf the " more willingly to write for the Florentines againſt " Sixtus, becauſe he remembred that this Pope had " ſuffered him to depart from Rome without acknow- " ledging his merit. Perhaps alſo it was upon the " view of ſome eccleſiaſtical dignity, with which he " flattered himſelf (as has been ſaid of the Lawyer " Jaſon) that he would not marry. There remains " the ſcruple relating to the difference between the " ſtyle of Aretin the Profeſſor of Law, and that of " Aretin the Tranſlator. It is true that this diffe- " rence is enormous. And tho' the Verſions which " he has given us are not exquiſite in their Latinity, " one may ſay however, that in compariſon of his " law works, it is more than Ciceronian. If he had " intended, like ſome other authors, to write in a " Macaronic ſtyle on purpoſe, he could not have ſuc- " ceeded better. *Sunt etiam multi teſtes,* ſays he, in his LXXXIIId Counſel, *qui viderunt aquam bene ire ad molendinum, & ipſum benè molere, & Stecbariam lignaminis benè in puncto.* And in the XIIIth Counſel. *Probatur per duos teſtes noſtros, quod iſta mulier geſſit portaturam capitis ſecundum habitum nuptarum à ſex annis citra.* " The whole Book is full of theſe flowers. " The Orthography of the words taken from the Greek " is ſtrangely diſfigured in it. We find there *Eco- " nomus, Emologatio, Cyrothecæ, Griſogonus, Emphithe- " ota.* I have hinted at the reaſon why this Civilian " did ſo; which was that his brethren wrote after " the ſame manner. His language, if it had been " better, would not have been underſtood by the reſt " of his Profeſſion. Francis Aretin, or Accolti, call " him which you pleaſe, could have ſpoken better; " but he loved money, and if he had thought fit to " have uſed the ſtyle of a Papinian, he might have " ruſted in his ſtudy, and been univerſally abandoned. " The ſame barbarity reigned at that time amongſt " the Divines and the Phyſicians. Thoſe amongſt " them who were the firſt to introduce politeneſs, " were accounted neither Divines nor Phyſicians, but " only Grammarians. The world was not quite clear " of this prejudice in the time of Ludovicus Vives. " His words are worth relating:" *Quæ Lyranus & Hugo ſcribunt* (ſays he, in the firſt Book *de Cauſis corruptar. Art.*) *Theologia eſt: quæ Eraſmus, Grammatica. Idem de Hieronymo, Ambroſio, Auguſtino, Hilario dicturi, niſi nomen obſtaret, tametſi hîc etiam neſcio quid muſſant. Quod ſi Johannes Picus Apologiam ſuam corrupto illo non ſcripſiſſet ſermone, haud quaquam haberetur Theologus, ſed Grammaticus. Alciatus, Zaſius, Cantiuncula, Grammatici ſunt, cum de jure diſputant: Accurſius eſt Juriſconſultus, vel cum interpretatur* que *id eſt* et; ait *id eſt* dixit; ſeu *id eſt* aut; &c. i. e. " What Lyra- " nus and Hugo write is Divinity; what Eraſmus " writes is Grammar. The ſame might be ſaid of " Jerom, Ambroſe, Auguſtin, Hilary, if it was not " for their name, and yet there is ſome murmuring " againſt them too. But if Joannes Picus had not " written his apology in that corrupt ſtyle, he would " not have been accounted a Divine, but a Gram- " marian. Alciatus, Zazius, Cantiuncula, are Gram- " marians, when they diſpute about Law: Accurſius " is a Lawyer, even when he interprets *que*, that is, " *&*; *ait*, that is, *dixit*; *ſeu*, that is, *aut*." *It was then a ſort of neceſſity, Sir, that Francis Aretin the Lawyer, ſhould accommodate himſelf to the cuſtom of his time; and I am of opinion, that theſe reflections added to the preceding, will be ſufficient to perſuade you that he differs from the Humaniſt only in elocution.*

[*D*] *It will be pleaſing to know what art he uſed*

to

lations (c). He had a brother who became very famous under the name of BENEDICTUS ACCOLTUS ARETINUS [E]. I shall speak of him in a note.

(c) Taken from Panzirolus, *de claris Legum Interpretibus*, lib. 2. cap. 10, p. 249, & *seq.*

to teach his disciples of what consequence it is to pass for an honest man.] He made use of this stratagem, after having seen that frequent exhortations to preserve a good character signified nothing. *Ubi* (Ferrariæ) *studiosos ad famam boni nominis conservandam sæpe hortatus, cum nihil proficeret, ridiculum commentum excogitavit, ut quam vim maximam habeat existimatio, ostenderet* (8). The Butchers of Ferrara left their meat in the shambles all night. He went thither with his servant, before day; and having broke open their shops took away all the meat. Two scholars, who were looked upon as more mischievous than all the rest, were accused of this action, and imprisoned. Aretin went to Duke Hercules, and desired their liberty, taking the whole fault upon himself. But the more he insisted upon his having done it, the more the prisoners were suspected to be guilty; for no body dared to suspect a professor of such a thing, whose gravity and wisdom were so well known. The affair being at last brought to a conclusion, he declared what had been his drift. This was shewing the weight and authority of a good reputation. *Quo constantiùs se facti autorem fatebatur, eo magis qui in vinculis erant rei credebantur, cum ob viri gravitatem nemo id de eo suspicari auderet. Re demum compositâ, id se Aretinus ad demonstrandam hominis bonæ opinionis auctoritatem feciſſe dixit* (9). Every body knows, that those who pass for great liars are not believed, even when they speak truth. It happens quite otherwise to those who have the reputation of being very sincere: they are believed even when they tell a lye. See in Valerius Maximus, what is the effect of the good opinion one has conceived of a man (10).

(8) Panzirol. *de claris Legum Interpret.* p. 250.

(9) Idem, ibid. p. 251.

(10) Val. Max. lib. 3. cap. 7. num. 8.

[E] *His brother became very famous under the name of* BENEDICTUS ACCOLTUS ARETINUS.] He was born in 1415; and after having made a good progress in polite learning, he applied himself to the study of the law, with so much ardour, that he was not long before he reached the degree of Doctor: after which, both by publick lectures and consultations (11), he raised himself to the rank of the most famous Lawyers. He did not renounce the *Belles Lettres*, and it appears by some of his Treatises, that he was not indifferent about them. His Dialogue *de Præstantia Virorum sui ævi* was printed at Parma, in 1692, from a manuscript of Monsieur Magliabecchis. He was principal Secretary of the Republic of Florence, the seven last years of his life. He died at Florence, in 1466, at the age of fifty one. His son Peter, a great Lawyer, being Auditor of the *Rota*, for twenty five years, was honoured with a Cardinal's hat by Pope Julius II. He had another son, named Michael, who was the father of Benedict Accoltus. This last was Secretary to Clement VII, and afterwards Cardinal (12). See Moreri's Dictionary under the word ACCOLTI.

(11) Some of them are printed.

(12) Taken from the *Life of Benedictus Accoltus* at the beginning of the Dialogue *de Præstantiâ Virorum sui ævi*.

ARETIN (GUY) a Benedictin Monk lived in the eleventh Century. He became famous for discovering a new method of learning Music. He published a book upon that subject, which he intitled *Micrologus*, and a *Letter*, which has been inserted by Cardinal Baronius in his *Annals*, under the year 1022. He was four and thirty years old when he published the *Micrologus*, under the Pontificate of John XX, and he had been already invited three times to Rome by Pope Benedict VIII. This Pope had examined the *Antiphonaire* of Aretin, and admired several things he had learnt from this Author. This is what Possevin tells us in his *Apparatus* (a). To say something concerning this invention of Guy Aretin, I ought to take notice that it was he who found the six notes, *ut*, *re*, *mi*, *fa*, *sol*, *la*. They will have it that the names of these six notes were borrowed from a Hymn, which contains these saphick verses.

(a) Pag. 694.

UT queant laxis
MI ra gestorum
SOL ve pollutis
RE sonare fibris
FA muli tuorum
LA biis reatum (b).

(b) See Vossius, *de Musice*, p. 40.

For that purpose you need but take the first and sixth syllable of each verse. Some pretend that the word *Gammut*, so frequent in Music, came from Guy Aretin's having made use of the first letters of the alphabet to design or mark his notes, and using therein the letter G, which the Greeks call *Gamma*; and that he did it to shew that Music came from Greece (c). Those who ascribe to him a book against Berengarius are mistaken [A].

(c) Furetiere, at the word *Gammut*.

[A] *Those who ascribe to him a Book against Berengarius are mistaken.*] Vossius has fallen into this mistake, and so has made him flourish under the Emperor Conrad the younger, and accused those of being mistaken who have placed him a hundred years after (1). The mistake which I speak of here, arose from confounding Guy Aretin with another Monk named Guitmond, who was of the Convent of Saint Leufred, of the order of Saint Bennet, in the diocese of Evreux, and became Cardinal, and Bishop of Aversa in Italy. They were almost contemporaries; for Guitmond died in 1080. It is he that has written three Books *de Veritate corporis & sanguinis Christi in Eucharistiâ, adversus Berengarium*, which were printed separately, and in the *Bibliotheca Patrum* (2). The cause which I assign of this error is so true, that the same Vossius says expressly in another place, that in 1070, under the Pontificate of Gregory VII, flourished Guido, or Guidmond, a native of Arezzo, *Patriâ Aretinus*, at first a Monk in the Monastery of Saint Leufred in the diocese of Evreux in Normandy, and afterwards Cardinal and Bishop of Aversa; that he composed, whilst he was a Monk, two treatises of Musick, one in verse, the other in prose; and that he is the same, who wrote three Books against Berengarius (3).

(1) Vossius, *de Musice*, p. 40.

(2) *Vide* Labbeum, *de Script. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. 1. pag. 402.

(3) Vossius, *de Scient. Mathem.* pag. 95.

ARETIN (JOHN) surnamed *Tortellius*, is considered as one of the most learned men of the fifteenth Century. He composed a Life of St. Athanasius [A], at the desire of Pope Eugenius IV. He was admitted to the confidence of Nicholas V, whose Chamberlain

[A] *He composed a life* of Saint Athanasius.] Paulus Jovius insinuates plainly enough that he did but turn it into Latin: *Divi Athanasii Vitam Eugenio expetenti Latinam fecit* (1). Gesner says it much more expressly: *Athanasii Alexandrini Vitam ad Eugenium Pontificem in Latinum transtulit* (2). But Vossius ascribes to him much more than the part of a translator: *Athanasii Vitam ex variis, Eugenii postulato, consarcinavit*; and he quotes Paulus Jovius, and Volaterranus (3). The quotation of Paulus Jovius cannot be very exact, as any one may see by comparing the words. That of Volaterranus is not more exact; for he has said thus: *Joannes*

(1) Jovius, *Elogiorum*, cap. 108. pag. 251.
(2) Gesneri *Bibliotb.* fol. 458.

(3) Vossius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 579.

berlain he was (*a*). He was agreeable in converſation, and diſtinguiſhed himſelf glorioufly from the other learned men his contemporaries, in not diſhonouring, as they did, the profeſſion of the *belles Lettres* by violent and reproachful diſputes. He was principally ſkilled in the knowledge of Grammar, as he ſhewed by his book *de Poteſtate Literarum* [*B*]. Geſner's *Bibliotheca* relates the title of many other works of Tortellius; but his *Lexicon* is forgotten, which is quoted by Magius (*b*). Laurentius Valla was one of his great friends, and has dedicated to him his books *de Latina Elegantia* [*C*]. Voſſius, who affirms that he was brother of Charles Aretin (*c*), muſt be very much deceived, if he has no other proof than the words of Volaterranus, to whom he ſeems to refer us; Volaterranus ſays nothing of this pretended relation between them [*D*].

(*a*) Jovius, *Elogior.* cap. 108.

(*b*) Magius, *Miſcellan.* lib. 2. cap. 14.

(*c*) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 579.

(*d*) See in one of the notes on the Article NICOLAS V, the paſſage of the firſt Letter of the 26th book of Philelphus.

There are Connoiſſeurs who believe that Tortellius had but a moderate ſhare of learning, even for the time he lived in; but as he was very ready to do ſervices, and held a conſiderable poſt near the Pope, the wits of that time gave him great praiſes, which ſome of them afterwards retracted. Philelphus was of this number [*E*]. I ſhall elſewhere take notice (*d*) that Tortellius was Librarian to Nicholas V.

Joannes (Aretinus) *cognomento Tortellius, Romanæ Eccleſiæ ſubdiaconus apud Eugenium quartum fuit. Orthographiam, Vitamque Athanaſii ac nonnulla alia conſcripſit* (4). Voſſius affirms, that Wicelius has put this life of Saint Athanaſius into his *Hagiologia*. He conjectures, that Tortellius is the author of the life of St. Zenobius, Biſhop of Florence, inſerted in the compilation of Surius under the 25th of May. The reaſon of his conjecture is taken from the circumſtances of the time, and from the author of this life, being named *Joannes Archipreſbyter Aretinus*.

(4) Volater. lib. 21. p. 773.

[*B*] *He has ſhewn his skill in Grammar, by his Book* de Poteſtate Literarum.] "What Volaterranus calls "*Orthographia*, Paulus Jovius a Book *de Poteſtate Literarum*, Geſner *Commentarii Linguæ Latinæ*, and "Magius *Lexicon*, is but one and the ſame volume of "Tortellius, in two parts, of which the firſt, which "is very ſhort, contains ſome chapters upon the invention, the number, the figure, the pronunciation, "and the aſſemblage of the letters of the alphabet. "The ſecond which is very long, contains an alphabetical catalogue of the Latin words, moſt of which "are taken from the Greek, whereof he ſhews or "endeavours to ſhew the orthography (5)."

(5) Mr. de la Monnoie's manuſcript notes.

[*C*] *Laurentius Valla has dedicated to him his Books,* de Latinâ Elegantiâ.] As Geſner has expreſſed himſelf, there is no body but muſt imagine that it is Tortellius, who has dedicated this work to Laurentius Valla. Theſe are Geſner's words: *Joannes Tortellius, natione Aretinus, Laurentiæ Vallæ amiciſſimus, ad quem Elegantiarum linguæ Latinæ ſex libros perſcripſit, Nicolai poſtmodum Pontificis contubernalis, & ſtudiorum ejus intimus comes* (6). Compilers, who, being inclined to make a great Book in a little time, or for other reaſons, never look beyond the page before them for the neceſſary inſtructions, would eaſily commit three groſs faults, if they join their own conjectures never ſo little to this text of Geſner. I. They would ſay that Tortellius wrote ſix Books of the elegancies of the Latin Tongue, which he dedicated to Laurentius Valla. II. That after that he had entered into the ſervice of Pope Nicholas V, and was his companion in his ſtudies; and that it was the great ſucceſs of his Book, which procured him this honour. III. That Nicolas V, was Pope in 1420; for ſeeing Geſner places at that time the flouriſhing ſtate of Tortellius, and common ſenſe declares that this flouriſhing ſtate muſt be placed in the time when Tortellius was in favour with Nicholas V, it follows that according to Geſner, he was Pope at the time that I have ſaid. The truth is, he was elected in 1447, and he was his chamberfellow and companion in his ſtudies, when Laurentius Valla dedicated his *Elegantiæ* to him. I do not know what Moreri means upon this article, with his vague quotation of Valerius Andreas. Why did he not conſult Voſſius and Paulus Jovius, who would have furniſhed him with ſome remedy for dryneſs in this Article?

(6) Geſneri *Bibliotheca*, fol. 458, *ex Tritbemio.*

[*D*] *Voſſius makes him the brother of Charles Aretin. Volaterranus ſays nothing of this pretended relation between them.*] I have reaſon to ſpeak as I do, ſeeing Tortellius, ſpeaking of Charles and Leonard d'Arezzo, makes them only his countrymen: *A doctiſſimis viris noſtræ ætatis*, ſays he (†), *& conterraneis meis Leonardo & Carolo Aretinis*; and when he makes mention of Charles, he ſays always, either *Carolus Aretinus conterraneus meus*, or *Carolus noſter Aretinus* (‡). This was communicated to me by Mr. de la Monnoie. Let us relate the words of Volaterranus, and thoſe of Voſſius. We ſhall ſee whether the latter could build upon the former. *Carolus & Johannes Aretini nobilia temporis illius ingenia, quorum alter ſcriba Florentinorum Leonardo ſucceſſit, alter Joannes cognomento Tortellius Romanæ Eccleſiæ Subdiaconus apud Eugenium quartum fuit* (7). i. e. "Charles and John Aretin, the "noble Genius's of that time, of whom the one "ſucceeded Leonard as Secretary of Florence; the "other, John, ſurnamed Tortellius, was Subdeacon "of the Roman Church under Eugenius the fourth." Here follows what Voſſius relates: *Joannes Aretinus cognomento Tortellius Caroli Aretini, qui poſt Leonardum Aretinum ſcriba Florentinorum fuit, frater, Romanæ Eccleſiæ Subdiaconus apud Eugenium IV. . . . . præter grande de Orthographiâ volumen, etiam Athanaſii Vitam . . . . conſarcinavit, ut præter Jovium auctor eſt Volaterranus lib. xxi. Anthropol. ubi & hoſce Aretinos fratres* nobilia illius temporis ingenia *appellat* (8). i. e. "John Aretin ſurnamed Tortellius, the brother of "Charles Aretin, who was Secretary of Florence af"ter Leonard Aretin, Sub-deacon of the Roman "Church under Eugenius IV. . . . . beſides a great "volume of Orthography, he compiled alſo the Life of "Athanaſius, as not only Jovius but Volaterranus "alſo relates *lib. xxi. Anthropol.* where he alſo calls "theſe Aretins, two brothers, *the noble Genius's of "that time.*" If he had contented himſelf with ſaying they were relations, that might have been founded upon theſe words of Philelphus: *Putabam Carolum Aretinum rediiſſe mecum in gratiam. Ita enim Joannes Aretinus ejus* NECESSARIUS *tuis verbis mihi renunciaret* (9); for tho' *Neceſſarius* is ſometimes taken for an *intimate friend*, yet Philelphus, and moſt of the writers of that time, never uſe it but in the ſenſe of a *relation*. This obſervation is Mr. de la Monnoie's.

(†) In the 1ſt Part of his work, in the chapter of the Greek T.

(‡) In the 2d Part, which contains the words in the order of the alphabet.

(7) Volaterranus, lib. 21. p. 773.

(9) Philelphus, Epiſt. lib. 9.

[*E*] *Philelphus was one of thoſe who retracted the praiſes they had given to J. Aretin.*] In the article of Nicholas V I ſhall quote a Letter of Philelphus, dated Aug. 1, 1465, where the Latin and Greek learning of Tortellius is much commended. But ſee what the ſame Philelphus wrote May 29, 1473. *Video quoſdam noſtræ tempeſtatis homines, qui cum magnum de ſe quiddam voluerunt in arte Grammatica profiteri, in maximos errores devenerunt. E quorum numero principatum mihi tenere viſus eſt Joannes Tortellius Aretinus, qui cum & Græcam & Latinam literaturam noviſſe videri vult, utramque ignoraviſſe apertiſſimè declarat* (10). i. e. "I ſee ſome men of our time, who hav"ing a mind to be thought great Grammarians have "fallen into the greateſt errors. Of whom John "Tortellius Aretinus ſeems to me the principal, who "being deſirous to ſeem to underſtand both Greek "and Latin, moſt evidently declares his ignorance "of both.

(10) Monſ. de la Monnoie has furniſhed me with this.

ARETIN (LEONARD) is better known under this name, which was given him becauſe he was of Arezzo, then under that of Brunus or Bruni, which was his family name.

name. He was one of the moſt able men of the XVth Century [*A*]. He learned Greek under Emanuel Chryſoloras, as he himſelf ſays (*a*); and having made his merit known to Pope Innocent VII, he obtained of him, altho' young, the office of Secretary of the Briefs, of which he acquitted himſelf worthily under this Pope, and under the four following ones (*b*). He was afterwards Secretary to the republick of Florence (*c*) and amaſſed a great deal of riches (*d*) as well by his living in Celibacy (*e*), as by his being very frugal. He tranſlated out of Greek into Latin ſome *lives of Plutarch* [*B*], and the *Ethics of Ariſtotle*; he compoſed three *Books of the Punic War*, which may ſerve as a ſupplement to ſome of thoſe which are wanting of Livy [*C*]. He alſo compoſed the Hiſtory of the things which were done in his time in Italy [*D*], that *of the Republic of Florence*, that *of the ancient Greece* [*E*], and that *of the Goths*: but this laſt, which did him a great deal of honour, whilſt it was not known that he had only tranſlated it from the Greek of Procopius, drew upon his memory ſome kind of infamy (*f*), as ſoon as it was known after his death, by the care of Chriſtopher Perſona, that Procopius whoſe name he had ſuppreſſed, by appropriating his work to himſelf, was the Author of this Hiſtory of the Goths [*F*]. He compoſed many other Books of which the Catalogue may be ſeen in Geſner's *Bibliotheca*. He died in the year 1443, being ſeventy four years old [*G*], at Florence, where there is his marble monument to be ſeen in the church of the Holy Croſs (*g*). Poggius was one of thoſe who criticiſed him [*H*]. M. de la Mare, Counſellor of the Parliament of Dijon, publiſhed in 1653 a Catalogue of the Books of Leonard Aretin, which he deſigned to have printed. I believe the thing was never executed. I have heard, that there is lately found, among the Manuſcripts of the Library of Oxford, a copy of the letters of Leonard Aretin, where there are forty

(a) Leon. Aretinus, *Hiſt. Rer. Italicarum. Vide etiam* Jovium, *Elogior.* cap. 23.
(b) Jovius, *Elogior.* cap. 9.
(c) Leand. Alberti *Deſcrip. Italiæ.*
(d) Jovius, *Elogior.* cap. 9.
(e) Volaterranus, lib. 21. pag. 772.
(f) Jovius, *Elogior.* cap. 9. and 116.
(g) Idem, ibid. cap. 9.

[*A*] *He was one of the moſt able men of the fifteenth Century.*] According to Paulus Jovius, it was Leonard Aretin, who was the firſt reſtorer of the Greek tongue in Italy (1). Philelphus aſcribes to him a great deal of eloquence and a large fund of genius and erudition (2), Poggius (3), and Laurentius Valla (4) have ſet him above all his contemporaries, in point of eloquence and ſcience: but Floridus Sabinus is a little more moderate in his praiſes, and gives no advantageous idea of his Latin (5): from whom Eraſmus does not ſeem greatly to differ (6). Æneas Silvius praiſes our Aretin very much in his 51ſt Letter, and informs us that the Florentines had conferred his place on Poggius. Upon this, Voſſius obſerves that Æneas Silvius and Leander Albertus do not agree, the latter ſaying in his Deſcription of Italy, that Charles Aretin ſucceeded Leonard in the Secretaryſhip of the Republick of Florence. See the article of (Charles) ARETIN (7), where we prove from Æneas Silvius himſelf, that Leander Albertus was in the right.

(1) Jovius, *Elogior.* cap. 9. pag. 27.
(2) Philelphus, *Conviviorum*, lib. 1. & Epiſt. *ad eum ſcripta.*
(3) Poggius, *in Philelph.* Invect. 2.
(4) *Apud* Philelph. Invect. 1. *in Vallam.*
(5) Flor. Sabin. *adverſ. Calumniat. Ling. Lat.*
(6) Eraſm. *in Ciceron.*
(7) In the note [*B*].

[*B*] *He tranſlated ſome of Plutarch's Lives.*] Namely that of Paulus Æmilius, that of the two Gracchi, that of Pyrrhus, that of Sertorius, that of Demoſthenes, that of Mark Anthony, and that of Cato of Utica (8). The Printers have made a ſtrange blunder in Moreri's Dictionary, by putting *Vers de Plutarque* (*Verſes of Plutarch*) inſtead of *Vies de Plutarque* (*Lives of Plutarch.*)

(8) Geſner. *in Biblioth.*

[*C*] *He compoſed three books* of the Punick War, *which may ſerve as a Supplement . . . . to Livy.*] The two firſt treat of the firſt Punick War, which is wanting in Livy: the third treats of the diſorders into which the Carthaginians fell, by the mutiny of the ſoldiers, and the revolt of the people; as alſo of the war againſt the Gauls, and againſt thoſe of Illyria; all of them things that are wanting in the Roman Hiſtory (9). Aretin has done nothing but tranſlate the Greek of Polybius, tho' he has denied it in his Preface; and from thence it comes that Badius Aſcenſius has put the name of Polybius at the beginning of this work in his edition of Paris (10).

(9) Ibid.
(10) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Latin.* pag. 557.

[*D*] *. . . that of the things that were done in his time in Italy.*] This work begins with the ſchiſm that aroſe againſt Pope Urban VI, in 1378, and reaches to the victory obtained by the Florentines before Anglara, in 1440.

[*E*] *. . . that of the ancient Greece.*] This work reaches from the command of Theramenes and Thraſybulus amongſt the Athenians, to the death of Epaminondas. This contains forty five or fifty years.

[*F*] *It was known by the care of Chriſtopher Perſona, that Procopius, and not our Aretin, was the Author of the* Hiſtory of the Goths.] Perſona determined with himſelf, according to Voſſius, to tranſlate Agathias, when he had obſerved our Aretin's want of fidelity (11). Voſſius alledges Paulus Jovius thereupon; but it is certain that Paulus Jovius ſays nothing of Agathias, either in the place that is quoted (12), or in any other that can be quoted (13), and that he ſpeaks there expreſly of Procopius. I acknowledge that Perſona has alſo tranſlated Agathias; but it is of the verſion of Procopius that Voſſius muſt have ſpoken in the place where he was treating of the *Plagiat* of Aretin. It is thus, I think, we muſt ſay, and not *Plagiariſm*, as a modern Author has done, whoſe whole paſſage I am going to relate, becauſe it is full of errors. *We owe*, ſays he (14), *the Hiſtory of Procopius in Greek to David Hæſchelius. Leonard Aretin had already given it in the Gothick tongue; but he had ſuppreſſed the name of the Author: ſo that, when this Aretin was dead, Chriſtopher Perſona accuſed him of theft, becauſe having found himſelf another copy of this Hiſtory in the ſame language, he publiſhed it under the name of its Author, and ſo convicted Aretin of Plagiariſm.* Of what monſter is he ſpeaking here? Procopius, in the Gothick tongue, publiſhed firſt by Aretin, and afterwards by Perſona, is a chimera that never was nor will be ſeen. Beſides, it is ſpeaking without any exactneſs, to ſay that Leonard Aretin and Perſona have given the Hiſtory of Procopius, for they have tranſlated only a part of that Hiſtory. The Printers of Moreri's Dictionary have made a groſs blunder, when they put it, that *the Hiſtory of the Goths was properly nothing but a tranſlation of Plutarch.*

(11) Idem, pag. 558.
(12) It is in the 116th chapter of the *Elogia.*
(13) It is in the 9th chapter of the *Elogia.*
(14) Le Gallois, *Traité des plus belles Bibliotheq.* pag. 169. (wrong marked 163) Paris edit. in 1680.

[*G*] *He died in* 1443, *at the age of ſeventy four* (15).] Leander Albertus is in the right, when he ſays he died at the age of ſeventy four; but he places his death in the year 1440. His computation does not agree with Matthæus Palmerius, who puts the year of the birth of Leonard Aretin in 1370 (16): and as I ſee beſides in Volaterranus, that our Aretin died in 1443 (17), (on the 9th of March according to Bucholcer) I have been unwilling to follow Leander Albertus. I have obſerved already (18) the miſtake of a modern Author, who thought Leonard Aretin was alive in 1480.

(15) Varillas, in the *Anecdot. de Florence*, p. 162, is miſtaken when he makes him live to above 80.
(16) Palm. *in Chronic. ad ann.* 1370. The Printers of Voſſius *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 557. have put thro' miſtake CIↃCCCCLXX.
(17) Volat. lib. 21. pag. 772.
(18) In the note [*A*] of the article of (FRANCIS) ARETIN.

[*H*] *Poggius was one of thoſe who criticiſed him.*] The following words of Philelphus ſhew this. They are in a Letter which he wrote to Laurentius de Medicis the 29th of May 1473. *Quod eo feci accuratius, quoniam & Leonardus Aretinus familiaris noſter, vir ſane facundiſſimus, adverſus Blondum Flavium multa diſſeruit, & poſt Leonardi obitum Poggius Carolo gratificatus Aretino, quem diſſertiſſimi concivis gloria offenderet, libellum etiam contra illius ſcripta contexuit, cum neuter ſuo ſit functus officio* (19). i. e. "Which I did "the more accurately, becauſe Leonard Aretinus alſo, "our acquaintance, a very eloquent man, has written "much againſt Blondus Flavius, and after the death "of Leonard, Poggius to gratify Charles Aretin, "who was offended at the glory of his moſt excel-"lent fellow-citizen, drew up a piece againſt his "writings, when neither of them had done his duty." This paſſage was communicated to me by Monſr. de la Monnoie.

(19) Philelphus, *Epiſtolar.* lib. 37.

forty letters which were never printed; and which perhaps may give somebody an inclination to set to work about a new Edition.

ARETIN (LEONARD). We presume the reader will not be displeased to find here a supplement to Mr. Bayle's Article of this famous man, since we have borrowed the following particulars from a very eminent Author (*a*). Leonard Aretin was born about the year 1370 [*A*]; he applied himself to the study of law during four years (*b*) before he learned Greek under Emanuel Chrysoloras. In the year 1434, he was made Secretary to Pope Innocent VII [*B*]; whence it appears that he was not then very young as Mr. Bayle insinuates, since he was about thirty years old. In the year 1413 he was Secretary to Pope John XXIII, and accompanied him to the Council of Constance. He was the same year employed in a very difficult negotiation [*C*]. He was in the neighbourhood of that city, when Poggius wrote to him a famous letter concerning the death of Jerom of Prague (*c*), which Leonardus thought a little too free (*d*) [*D*], wishing his friend had been more cautious and politic. When the council was ended, Aretin returned to Florence, where he was made Chancellor [*E*] of the Republic, which high Post he enjoyed till the year 1444, when he died aged seventy four years (*e*). The inscription

(*a*) The late Reverend Mr. LENFANT.
(*b*) Lenfant, in his *Poggiana*, tom. 1. Part 1. pag. 11.
(*c*) Idem, ibid.
(*d*) Idem, p. 20.
(*e*) Lenfant, *Preface de l'Hist. du Concile de Pise*, pag. xx.

[*A*] *Leonard Aretin was born about the year* 1370.] This is clear, if it be true that he died in 1444, being then seventy four years of age. But Mr. Bayle places his death in 1443, with Volaterranus, tho' at the same time he does not take notice of the contradiction of Matteo Palmieri, according to whom Aretin was born in 1370. This may perhaps seem trifling; but we remark it only, to shew, that the most accurate Authors may sometimes be guilty of an oversight. This happened to Mr. Lenfant. He tells us in his *Poggiana* (1), that Aretin was seventy (2) years old when he died, and in his Preface (3) to his History to the Council of Pisa he makes him seventy four years old when he died. But in that same place he has committed another mistake; he says that Aretin might be about twelve years old when the great schism began, since he died in 1444, being then seventy four. But according to Mr. Lenfant himself, the schism began in 1378 (4) by the election of Robert Cardinal of the twelve Apostles, who was chosen Pope the 20th of September 1378, and took the name of Clement VII. Now Aretin could be then but eight years old. We observe this mistake only, because Mr. Lenfant supposes that Aretin being twelve years old at the beginning of the schism, might be considered as an eye-witness of what passed at that time; which indeed may be true of a child of twelve years old. At that age he may take notice of several things, and remember them very well afterwards; but I doubt whether the same could be expected from a child of eight years only.

(1) Tom. 1. Part 1. p. 11.
(2) It is perhaps an error of the press.
(3) Pag. xx.
(4) *Hist. du Concile de Pise*, tom. 1. liv. 1. p. 29.

[*B*] *He was made Secretary to Pope Innocent VII.*] Mr. Recanati pretended (5), that Leonard Aretin was Secretary to Pope Boniface IX, when Poggius came to Rome. But Mr. Lenfant shews (6) by Poggius's own words, that it was he himself, who engaged Aretin to go to Rome, and procured him the place of Secretary to Pope Innocent VII. The words of Poggius are as follows; *Innocent VII*, says he (7), *having succeeded to Boniface, Leonard Aretin entreated me by word of mouth and by letters, to endeavour to procure him at the court of Rome some employment, by which he might live in an honourable manner. As I was very intimate with all those, who had the greatest access to the Pope, I was continually extolling the great qualities of Leonard; and to support what I used to say of the elegance and politeness of his style, I sometimes communicated to them his letters. At last I procured by my recommendations, that tho' he was unknown to them and to the Pope, yet he was chosen to be Innocent the seventh's Secretary.* It is plain therefore, that Mr. Recanati must be mistaken; yet we are not to be surprized at it, adds Mr. Lenfant (8), since this may happen to the most learned men.

(5) *Ap.* Lenfant, *Pogg.* tom. 1. Part 1. pag. 21.
(6) Ibid.
(7) Baluz. *Misc.* tom. 3. p. 254, 255.
(8) Ibid. p. 22.

[*C*] *He accompanied him* (the Pope) *to the Council of Constance, where he was the same year employed in a very difficult negotiation.*] This is what Mr. Lenfant says in the *Poggiana* (9); but in the preface to the second edition of his *History of the Council of Constance* (10), he says that he doubts of Leonard's attending the Pope. It is very certain, says he, that Leonardus was at Constance, since amongst his letters, there is one dated from that place, in which he gives his friend Nicolas Nicolo a very diverting account of his journey. But he cannot have accompanied the Pope to Constance, since the latter arrived there the 28th of October 1414; whereas it appears by this letter of Aretin, that he stayed at Verona till the latter end of November (*quinto Kalendas Decembris*). Nay he must have continued but one year at Constance; for on the first of January 1415 (11) he received at Arezzo a Letter from Poggius dated December the 13th of the foregoing year. With regard to Leonard's negotiation, Mr. Lenfant refers us to his *History of the Council of Constance*; but there we find only that Emanuel Chrysoloras was employed in a negotiation by the Pope, and Leonard is only mentioned for having said, that Chrysoloras contributed to the restoration of learning in Italy.

(9) Tom. 1. Part 1. pag. 1.
(10) Pag. xv.
(11) The year began then in March, as it still does with us in England.

[*D*] *Poggius wrote to him a letter concerning the death of Jerom of Prague, which Leonard found a little too free.*] Mr. Lenfant's judgment of that letter was as follows; *Poggius's account of the fact*, says he (12), *agrees exactly with the Acts of the Council, and with History. But it is also wrote with such a moderation, and with such sentiments of admiration and love, as would not have been expected from a Secretary of the Pope towards so odious an heretick, as Jerom of Prague was with regard to the court of Rome. That Letter of Poggius may be considered as a funeral Oration, and as an Elogium of Jerom, so much the less suspected as it comes from a person otherwise a zealous Roman Catholick. It is a pretty curious contrast to see Poggius on one hand declare that Laurentius Valla deserved to be committed to the flames, on account of some subtle and trite speculations, and on the other lament the death of a man, who had overthrown the foundations of the Church of Rome, and make his apology as much as he could safely do, without running the same danger with his Heroe.* Leonard Aretin very well understood, that his friend had gone too far, and spoke too much in praise of an heretick. He censures him gently for it in a letter which he wrote to him on that subject. *I have received*, says he (13), *your letter concerning the death of Jerom of Prague, and greatly admire the style and elegance of it; but you speak more in his behalf, than I wished you had done. It is true, that sometimes you add a few words, which serve to qualify the judgment you pass upon him, but after all there runs thro' your whole letter too visible an affectation. I think, that we are to write on such subjects with more caution.* The consequence that may be drawn from Poggius's and Aretin's Letters, is that the former was open and sincere, and the latter more reserved and politic in his sentiments.

(12) Ibid. p. 239.
(13) Aret. *Epist.* lib. 4. Ep. 9.

[*E*] *He was made Chancellor of the Republick.*] Mr. Bayle says only Secretary. If this was not the same post with that of Chancellor, we may rely the more upon Mr. Lenfant, who seems to have made a more particular study of the History of these times, than on Mr. Bayle, who does not seem to have been so well acquainted with what passed then in Italy. It is true Leander Albertus seems to call him Secretary, *à Secretis* (14), but Æneas Silvius calls him (15) *Cancellarius*, Chancellor, and seems to hint that in his post he had occasion for eloquence and polite Literature rather than for the knowledge of the Law, which is very true of a Chancellor, who is in a manner the mouth of the Commonwealth.

(14) See the passage in the article of CHARLES ARETIN, remark [*B*], quotation (1).
(15) Ibid. quotation (2).

inſcription on his tomb is very honourable to him [F]. Poggius made his funeral oration, which according to Mr. Lenfant (f), is a very elaborate piece, in which amongſt other curious particulars we find, that Poggius and Leonard Aretin lived forty years in ſo conſtant a friendſhip, that it never ſuffered the leaſt interruption or indifference. Mr. Bayle ſays, that Aretin was exceſſively frugal; yet we find that when Poggius, who was not very rich, was travelling to diſcover ancient Manuſcripts, ſeveral of his friends, and amongſt them Leonard Aretin and Franciſco Barbaro furniſhed him with all the money he wanted for his deſign (g). Aretin's hiſtories of Florence and of Italy, as well as his letters contain ſeveral particulars, which can hardly be found in any other authors, and which have been of great uſe to Mr. Lenfant, in his hiſtory of the council of Piſa, as he tells us himſelf in the place referred to in the margin (h). Though Aretin had been Secretary to ſeveral Popes during the grand Schiſm, and tho' his maſters were men of very ill characters, yet it appears by his letters, that he did not approve their conduct [G], and that he was a man of great virtue and probity.

(f) Poggiana, tom. 1. Part 1. pag. 12.

(g) Ibid. p. 24.

(h) Preface de l'Hiſt. du Conc. de Piſe, p. 21.

[F] *The inſcription on his tomb is very honourable to him.*] It was as follows: "Since the death of Leonard hiſtory is in mourning, eloquence is become "mute, the Greek and Latin Muſes cannot forbear "ſhedding tears (16)."

(16) Mabill. *It. Ital.* p. 165. *ap.* Lenfant, *Poggiana*, tom. 1. p. 11.

[G] *It appears by his letters that he did not approve the Pope's conduct, and that he was a man of virtue and probity.*] Here follow the proofs of theſe aſſertions. Firſt with regard to his diſapproving the conduct of Pope Gregory XII, whoſe Secretary he was, he writes to Petrillo his friend in the following manner: *Since you left this city* (17), ſays he (18), *the Pope went from Rome, and retired for ſome months to Sienna. The time to go to Savona* (19) *was now come; but the Pope did not think fit to perform his promiſe, which ſcandalized all well-meaning perſons. His competitor had been there at the time appointed, and was continually reproaching Gregory with his affected delays. O ſhame to us and to our poſterity! that having freely and after a mature deliberation accepted a place, where we were to reſtore the union amongſt the Chriſtians, we ſhould now be backward, and refuſe to go thither. Yes, I am extremely grieved at what paſſes, both as a Chriſtian, and as an Italian. I cannot comfort myſelf, when I conſider, that the Chriſtians are diſappointed in the hopes they had conceived of ſeeing the Church united again; and when I think that the Italians* (20) *my countrymen, will be looked upon as falſe and perfidious men, without ſincerity or honour. When I ſpeak after this manner, I ſhew myſelf more ſollicitous about the true glory and the reputation of the Pope, than thoſe who by their flatteries and deceitful Councils diſſuade him from a deſign, which would raiſe him an immortal glory.* Leonard, who was in Gregory's ſervice, thought he could not in honour abandon him; but at the ſame time he abhorred his maſter's conduct, and was heartily afflicted at the approaching ruin of the Church, thro' the ambition and obſtinacy of the Antipopes. *It grieves me in the moſt terrible manner,* ſays he (21), *to be here. There is no deſart, no cavern, tho' ever ſo dreadful, where I ſhould not chooſe to live, rather than be here. Any place would be agreeable to me, where I might not ſee the conflagration and aſhes of the church, which I am forced to behold here.* Such expreſſions and ſentiments certainly ſhew the benevolent and virtuous diſpoſition of our Aretin. His conduct had been agreeable to his words; for the Conclave, in which Gregory XII was choſen, being met, Aretin was admitted to ſpeak to the Cardinals, and exhorted them with the utmoſt ſtrength and vigour, to ſuſpend the election, becauſe he was of opinion, that this was the only method to put an end to the ſchiſm (22). This is a ſtrong proof that Aretin was a man of virtue and probity. We may add to it what he ſays of John Dominic, who before he was made a Biſhop ſeemed very zealous to promote the union of the Church, but was thought to oppoſe it after he had obtained a Biſhoprick. Aretin had a great eſteem for him, yet read what he ſays of him. *They complain,* ſays he (23), *that this man, who was one of the moſt zealous promoters of the union, did not ſpeak a word of it, as ſoon as he had got a Biſhoprick, nay that he even ſeems to oppoſe it by his advice. The manner in which he uſed to ſpeak before his promotion, made every one believe that he would refuſe that preferment; yet he has accepted it with all his heart, and it is pretended, that ſince that he has betrayed the cauſe, which he ſo warmly eſpouſed. He aſpires to a ſtill higher rank* (24). *We are not to judge of his heart, but we cannot but blame thoſe intrigues, which ſeem to be ſo inconſiſtent with his former conduct. Ambition, I fear, has a much greater ſhare in his actions, than wiſdom and real prudence. I love the man for his great abilities; and I am ſorry that by his conduct he ſhould deſtroy the good opinion, which the world had of him. As he cannot be thought to act out of ignorance, it is eaſily judged, that he is blinded by covetouſneſs or ambition.* A man who writes after this manner, concerning a perſon for whom he had a great eſteem, muſt certainly have the true principles of virtue in himſelf.

P.

(17) Rome.

(18) *Apud* Lenfant, *Hiſt. du Conc. de Piſe*, tom. 1. liv. 2. pag. 192, &c.

(19) Where Gregory was to meet Benedict XIII the other Pope, in order to conſult how to put an end to the ſchiſm.

(20) Gregory was an Italian.

(21) Lenfant, *Conc. de Piſe, ubi ſupra*, p. 195.

(22) Leon. Aret. *Epiſt.* lib. 2. Ep. 3. *apud eund.* ibid. p. 161.

(23) *Epiſt.* lib. 2. Ep. 19. *apud eund.* ibid. pag. 196.

(24) That of a Cardinal, which he obtained afterwards.

ARETIN (PETER) a native of Arezzo, famous for his obſcene and ſatyrical writings, lived in the ſixteenth Century. Thoſe who have a mind to know what ſort of a Medal is pretended to have been ſtruck, to inform all the world that the greateſt Princes were afraid of his Satyrs, will find it in Moreri's Dictionary. Aretin boaſted in this Medal of having put under contribution thoſe to whom other men paid tributes and taxes. This tradition is ſo general, that he is no leſs known by the title of the *Scourge of Princes*, than by the name of *Aretin* or *Peter Aretin* [A]. They have alſo given him another very glorious title, which was the ſame that all antiquity beſtowed on the great merit of Plato, which is that of Divine, *il Divino Aretino* [B]: he was ſtiled upon the medals *Divus Petrus*

[A] *He is no leſs known under the title of* Scourge of Princes, *than under the name .... of* P. Aretin.] He boaſted of having this reputation all over the world. Read his letter to Herſilia del Monte, a relation of Pope Julius III: *In tanto è manifeſto ch'io ſono noto al Sophi, à gli Indiani, & il Mondo al paro di qualunche boggi in bocca de la fama riſuoni: che piu? i Principi da i populi tributati di continuo, tuttavia me loro ſchiavo & flagello tributano* (1). i. e. "So far it is plain that "I am known to the Sophi, and to the Indians, "and that the world is at this time filled with "my renown: What more? the Princes of the "people being under a continual tribute, inceſſantly "call me their ſcourge." He ſays in another letter, that it was ſworn the Princes were his tributaries, not becauſe he praiſed them, but for fear he ſhould blame them; and adds, that it was thoroughly deceiving themſelves, ſeeing moſt of the great maſters are not afraid of the wrath of God. *Would they then dread my pen?* continues he: *Impero che la maggior parte de i gran maeſtri non temona l'ira di Dio, è temeranno il furore de la mia penna* (2)? This reaſoning is not good; the fear of men makes us abſtain from a thouſand things, from which we ſhould not abſtain out of fear of divine vengeance (3).

[B] *They give him the title .... of Divine,* il Divino Aretino] It will not be unpleaſing to ſee the judgment

(1) Aretin, in the ſixth book of his *Letters*, fol. 115.

(2) Ibid. folio 120 *verſo.*

(3) See the *Penſées ſur les Cométes*, num. 162 & *ſuiv.*

Petrus Aretinus (*a*). Some have ſaid that perhaps he gave himſelf this title to ſignify that he performed the functions of a God upon earth by the thunderbolts, with which he ſtruck the heads of the moſt illuſtrious [*C*]. He boaſted that his Libels did more good in the world than Sermons [*D*]. He was told in a Letter that his pen had ſubjected more Princes to him, than the greateſt Kings had ever overcome by their arms [*E*], and was encouraged to continue in that ſtrain, that the Monarchs might reform [*F*]. Our age has Satyriſts as full of venom and as bold as Aretin could be; but I do not believe that any of them has eſtabliſhed his contributions in the enemy's country. Several miſtaken writers make him paſs for the Author of the book *de tribus Impoſtoribus* [*G*]. I cannot tell how to believe that they have engraven on his tomb, in St. Luke's church at Venice, the Epitaph

(*a*) Spizelius, in his *Scrutin. Atheiſmi*, pag. 19, affirms he has ſeen of them.

The JUDGMENT of Montagne upon *Aretin.*

judgment of Montagne on this elogium: *Plato*, ſays he (4), *has born this ſurname of Divine by ſo univerſal a conſent, that no one has attempted to vie with him; and the Italians, who juſtly boaſt of having commonly a more lively wit, and more ſound diſcourſe, than the other nations of their time, have lately aſcribed it to Aretin, who does not ſeem to me to have any thing above the common Authors of his age, if you except his meteorus manner of ſpeaking, teeming with thoughts ingenious indeed, but far fetcht and fantaſtical, not to mention his very indifferent eloquence; ſo far is he from coming near this antient divinity.*

(4) Montagne, *Eſſais*, liv. 1. chap. 51. at the end.

[*C*] *Some ſay that he performed the functions of God upon earth by the thunder-bolts with which he ſtruck the heads of the moſt illuſtrious.*] I have ſeen this thought in an Italian Author, quoted by a German Author. *Cur verò ſibi arrogaverit aliorum conſenſu divinitatem, neſcio, niſi fortè Dei munus exercuiſſe dicendus ſit, cum ſumma capita velut celſiſſimos montes fulminaverit, linguâ corrigens & mulctans, quæ ab aliis caſtigari nequeunt* (5). i. e. "But why he arrogated Divinity to "himſelf by the conſent of others, I know not, unleſs perhaps he be ſaid to have exerciſed the office "of GOD, when he ſtruck the higheſt heads like the "loftieſt mountains, with lightning, correcting and "puniſhing thoſe with his tongue, who cannot be "chaſtiſed any other way."

(5) Jacobus Gaddius, *de Scriptoribus non Eccleſiaſticis*, tom. 1. pag. 13. *apud* Spizelium, *in Felice Literato*, pag. 112.

[*D*] *He boaſted that his libels did more good in the world, than Sermons.*] He ſays in the Epiſtle Dedicatory to the ſecond part of his *Raggionamenti*, that if he is not eſteemed on account of his inventions, he muſt at leaſt be allowed ſome glory for the ſervice he has done to truth, by thruſting it into the chambers and into the ears of the great, to the ſhame of flattery and lying. He relates that an Ambaſſador of the Duke of Urbino ſaid, that if the Miniſters of Princes, and their Courtiers were recompenſed for their ſervices, they would owe the obligation to the pen of Peter Aretin. He adds, that another ſaid: *Aretin is more neceſſary to human life than ſermons, becauſe ſermons put only the meaner perſon into the good way; but his writings put the great Lords into it.* Theſe are his words in Italian: *Quando io non foſſi degno di honor veruno, mercè de le inventioni con le quali do l'anima a lo ſtilo, merito pur qualche poco di gloria per havere ſpinto la verita ne le camere, e ne le orecchie de Potenti ad onta de l'adulatione, & de la menzogna: & per non difraudere il mio grado, uſero le parole ſteſſe del ſingulare* M. Gianiacopo, *Ambaſciadore d'Urbino: Noi che ſpendiamo il tempo ne ſervigi de Prencipi inſieme con ogni huomo di Corte, e non ciaſcun virtuoſo, ſiamo riguardati e riconoſciuti da noſtri padroni, bontà de gaſtighi che gli ha dati la penna di Pietro. E lo ſa Milano, come cadde de la ſacra bocca di colui, che in pochi meſi mi ha arrichito di due Coppe d'oro: l'Aretino è piu neceſſario a la vita humana, che le Predicationi, e che ſia il vero eſſe pongono in ſu le dritte ſtrade le perſone ſemplici, & i ſuoi Scritti le ſignorili, & il mio non è vanto, ma un modo di procedere per ſoſtener ſe medeſimo obſervato da Enea, dove non era conoſciuto.*

[*E*] *He was told in a letter, that his pen had ſubjected more Princes to him, than the greateſt Kings had ever ſubdued by their arms.*] I read this in a letter written to him by Baptiſta Tornielli (6). He declares to him that he deſerved the title of *Germanicus, Pannonicus*, &c. as formerly the Emperors took the name of the Provinces where they had triumphed. *Non ſapete voi, che non la penna voſtra in mano havete ſoggiogato piu Principi, ch' ogni altro potentiſſimo Principe con l'arme? La penna voſtra à qual non mette terrore, à quale non è formidabile, à chi anche non grata, a chi non cara, ove ſi moſtra amica? La penna voſtra ſi puo dir, che v' ha fatto trionfator quaſi di tutti i Principi del Mondo; che quaſi tutti vi ſono tributarii, & come infeudati. Meritareſte eſſer chiamato Germanico, Pannonico, Gallico, Hiſpanico, & finalmente inſignito di quei titoli, quali ſi davano a gli antichi Imperadori Romani, ſecondo le provincie per forza d'arma, & per eſſer piu di loro potenti, non era gran meraviglia, maggior meraviglia aſſai è, che un privato, inerme, haggio ſaggiogato infiniti potenti: che l'un potente l'altro, non è meraviglia.* i. e. "Do you not know that you "have ſubdued more Princes pen-in-hand, than "any one of the moſt powerful Princes has with "his arms? Whom does not your pen terrify, to "whom is it not formidable? to whom alſo is it "not agreeable, to whom is it not dear, when it ap"pears favourable? Your pen has, if I may ſo ſay, "triumphed in a manner over all the Princes of "the world; who are all become a ſort of tributa"ries and vaſſals to you. You deſerve to be called "*Germanicus, Pannonicus, Gallicus, Hiſpanicus*, in "ſhort, to be diſtinguiſhed with ſuch titles as were "given to the ancient Roman Emperors, according "to the Province they had ſubdued. But that they "ſhould conquer a Province by force of arms, and "by being more powerful, is no great wonder; but "it is very wonderful that a private man, unarmed, "ſhould ſubdue an infinite number of thoſe, who are "powerful: but that one Potentate ſhould ſubdue an"other, is no wonder."

(6) It is in a collection publiſhed in 1558, at Venice, *appreſſo Dominico Giglio*, in 8°, page 128 *verſo* of the firſt book.

[*F*] *He was encouraged .... to ſatyriſe Princes, that they might reform.*] It is the Marquis du Guaſt, that gave him this exhortation, in a letter written with his own hand (7). He does not deſire to be privileged: he deſires his deſects to be cenſured by Aretin; and exhorts him to do it. Probably he was pretty ſure he ſhould not be taken at his word. Aretin did not confound his friends with his enemies: he made his executions only upon thoſe who had neglected to redeem themſelves. *Seguite dico col ſolito animo*, ſays the Marquis du Guaſt to him, *e ſe in me voſtro amico alcuna coſa men che laudabile conoſcete, ricordatevi di non laſciar di riprenderla: accioche fatto accorto dell' error, come deſidero, lo fugga, e divenga migliore. Seguite lo ſtil voſtro, che di nuovo ve ne prego: accioche, ſe i defetti con verità ſaranno in altri trovati, ſi vergognino, & vergognandoſi, & mendandoſi fuggano dal vitio alla virtù. Onde i rei divenuti buoni, abbraciati con eſſa virtù, ſi confermino nel bene Del che quanto in ciò l'humana Repub. ſi avanzi; lo giudichino quelli, che lo ſanno meglio intender, ch' io no'l ſo eſprimere.* i. e. "Purſue your own manner, and if you obſerve any "thing that is leſs commendable in me your friend, "be ſure you do not forget to reprove me; that ſo "being admoniſhed of my error, as I deſire, I may "avoid it and become better. Purſue your own man"ner, I entreat you again: that ſo, if the faults ſhall "indeed be found in others, they may be aſhamed, "and by amending may fly from vice to virtue. "Whence the guilty being become good, and engaged "in virtue, may be confirmed in goodneſs. Whence "how much mankind will improve herein, thoſe may "judge, who can underſtand it better than I can ex"preſs."

(7) It is in the 44th page of the ſecond book of the Collection, the title of which is in the preceding quotation.

[*G*] *He has had the Book* de tribus Impoſtoribus *falſly imputed to him.*] We ſhall perhaps have occaſion to examine this matter at large, and to ſhew that there is very little probability of this Book having ever exiſted. Mr. L'Abbé Nicaiſe, one of the worthieſt men of this age (8), who holds correſpondence with all the learned in Europe, amongſt whom he maintained a very honourable place, was ſo kind as to ſend me laſt year (9), a very curious diſſertation of Mr. de la Monnoie

(8) See the commendation given of him in the *Menagiana*. tom. 2. pag. 68. edit. Pariſ. 1715.

(9) That is, the year 1693.

Epitaph related by Moreri [*H*]. The Author of this Epitaph exaggerated the affair without doubt. If they had reaſon to think that Aretin did not love God, they could have no reaſon to ſay that he did not know him. His works of piety ſufficiently ſhew the

noie, his countryman (10), upon the Book *de tribus Impoſtoribus*. It is full of very well choſen Remarks, and highly deſerved to be printed *. Mr. de Beauval has juſt given a little extract of it (11). The author ſhews by very ſtrong reaſons, that this Book is a meer chimæra. Grotius thought, and perhaps upon bad grounds, that this Book was ſpoken of before Aretin was born. He ſays the enemies of Frederick Barbaroſſa accuſed him of having cauſed this Book to be written (12). He ſhould have ſaid that Frederick II was accuſed of having ſaid that the world had been deceived by three impoſtors (13). The good father Merſenne has related, that one of his friends, who had read the Book in queſtion, found in it the ſtyle of Peter Aretin (14). Mere trifles theſe! Yet there is no ſaying how far this propoſition of father Merſenne has ſpread.

(10) They are of Dijon.

* [It was printed in 1715, at the end of the 4th tom. of the *Menagiana*, edit. *de Pariſ.* Add. of the Amſterdam edition.]

(11) *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans, mois de Fevrier*, 1694, pag. 278, 279. He has related the commendation which the *Menagiana* gives of M. de la Monnoie.

(12) Grotius, *Append. ad Comment. de Antichriſto*, p. 133.

(13) *Vide* Dickherum, *de Scriptis Adeſpotis*, p. 374. edit. *anni* 1686.

(14) Merſennus *in Geneſim*, pag. 1830.

[*H*] *I cannot believe that the Epitaph related by Moreri was engraven on his monument.*] He does not ſay poſitively and preciſely, that this Epitaph was engraven on Peter Aretin's monument, in the church of St. Luke: but there is no man who has not a right to ſuppoſe that it is what he meant; for he expreſſed himſelf after this manner: "He died at Venice, "where he is buried in the church of Saint Luke." Here follows his Epitaph:

"*Condit Aretini cineres lapis iſte ſepultos,*
"*Mortales atro qui ſale perfricuit.*
"*Intactus Deus eſt illi, cauſamque rogatus*
"*Hanc dedit, ille, inquit, non mihi notus erat* (15).

(15) Voetius, *Diſputation.* vol. 1. pag. 206. *and* Spizelius, *Atheiſmi Scrutinio*, pag. 18.

"It is more ingenious in Italian, in theſe terms:

"*Qui giace l'Aretin Poëta Toſco,*
"*Che d'ognun diſſe malo che* (16) *di Dio,*
"*Scuſandoſi col dir' io no' l'conoſco.*"

(16) It ſhould be read *mal fuor che.*

There is nothing in Moreri's narration, that can give us the leaſt ſuſpicion in the world, that theſe four verſes are not the very inſcription on Aretin's monument. It is deceiving a reader then, who is not capable of avoiding the miſtake by his own reflections. It is in particular laying a ſnare for the Proteſtants, who if they do not tread a little cautiouſly, are ready to believe that there is hardly any ſubject of offence which the Italians do not admit into their churches. Several amongſt them would eaſily believe, upon Moreri's word, that the Patriarch of Venice ſuffered, not only that an Atheiſt ſhould be buried in holy ground, but alſo that the Epitaph of this Atheiſt in four verſes, which turn the thing into a jeſt, ſhould be expoſed in a church to the eyes of the world. For my part I cannot believe that the corruption and negligence of the Clergy ever went ſo far as to ſuffer ſuch ſepulchral inſcriptions in a church. I am apt to think that the four verſes related by Moreri are one of thoſe ſatyrical pieces, which are made upon the death of perſons, and have the title and form of an Epitaph. How many ſuch have been made upon the Cardinals Richelieu and Mazarin? Thoſe who make the Elogies of illuſtrious men, and after the example of Paulus Jovius, delight in ſetting down their Epitaphs, ought always to explain whether they were verſes actually engraven on the monument, or only a piece of wit. If this precaution had been taken with regard to Aretin, we ſhould not have ſeen in Paul Freherus's Theatre, and in the *Felix Literatus* of Spizelius (17), that the four verſes in queſtion are upon the monument of the perſon at Venice (18). A Divine of Utrecht affirms, that the Epitaph of Peter Aretin, inſerted in the Elogies of Paulus Jovius, and that which Pazzi has related, teſtify that he was a great Apoſtle of Atheiſm. "*Aretini Epitaphium, apud* Jovium in Elo- "giis Virorum doctorum, ſays he (19), *& alterum* "*apud* Giuzeppe Pazzi, *indicat qualis & quantus Atheiſmi præco fuerit; ſic enim Pazzi in libro cui tit.* "Continuatione della monſtruoſa farina, *Venetiis*, "1609. Qui giace l'Aretini Poeta Toſca (20), che "diſſe mal d'ogn' un fuor che di Dio; ma ſi ſcuſo "dicendo, no, 'l (21) conoſco. *Aliter ſic:* Qui giace "eſtinto quell' amaro Toſco, ch' ogn' huom vivendo "con mal dir trafiſſe. Vero e che mal di Dio giamai "non diſſe, che ſi ſcuſo dicendo io no 'l conoſco." Upon this, I have to ſay in the firſt place, that Paulus Jovius does not relate Peter Aretin's Epitaph. How ſhould he relate it, when he died before him? It is that of Leonard Aretin which he relates; but it contains nothing that can call the Chriſtianity of the deceaſed in queſtion; it mentions nothing of Religion. In the ſecond place there is nothing to be built upon the two Italian Epitaphs; for they were made without being owned, and were not engraven on the monument. It was a piece of wit of ſome ſatyrical Poet. Spizelius has copied almoſt word for word the whole paſſage of Voetius without quoting it (22). Obſerve that Lorenzo Craſſo (23) inſinuates ſtill more plainly than Moreri, that the four Latin verſes are upon the tomb of this Atheiſt in the Church of Saint Luke.

(17) Page 111.

(18) Venetiis *ſepultus jacet, cum hoc Epitaphio*, Condit Aretini &c. Paulus Freher. *in Theatro Viror. illuſtrium*, pag. 1461.

(19) Voetius, *Diſput.* tom. 1. pag. 206.

(20) It ſhould be *Toſco.*

(21) It ſhould be *io no'l.*

(22) Spizelii *Scrutinium Atheiſmi*, pag. 18.

(23) In page 38 of the firſt volume of his *Elogia.*

Let us add here a good Supplement (24). "It is "the cuſtom, among the Catholicks, to fix to ſome "column, or other thing, near the grave of the "dead, and upon all the dead of reputation, ſome "funeral inſcriptions in paper. The truth is that "theſe inſcriptions are and ought to be always to "the honour of the deceaſed. But Aretin having "been a diſtinguiſhed libertine, it is very poſſible that "ſome banterer, during the time of or ſoon after the "interment, had carried into the church of Saint "Luke the Epitaph related by Moreri and ſo many "others before him. It is thus that we muſt under- "ſtand the words of Ghilini, who has expreſſed him- "ſelf clearly enough about it in this ſenſe, when, af- "ter having ſaid, *e ſopra il ſuo ſepolcro fu poſto queſto* "*Epitaffio*, i. e. "and this Epitaph was put upon his "tomb," "Condit Aretini cineres, &c. he adds imme- "diately, *fu parimente appeſo alla ſua tomba queſt' altro* "*quaſi tradotto d'al ſuddetto, che va attorno nella bocca ſino* "*delle perſone idiote, Qui giace l'Aretin, &c.* i. e. "this "other alſo was hung on this monument, being as it were "tranſlated from the beforementioned, which goes about "in the mouth of every illiterate perſon, *Qui giace* "*l'Aretin, &c.* The Italian Epitaph, as it is related "by Ghilini, is much more correct than it is in Pazzi, "in Voetius, or in Moreri; and I do not underſtand "this laſt, when he ſays it is more ingenious than "the Latin. He alſo and Ghilini ſeem to me to be "miſtaken in taking the Italian for a copy of the "Latin. It is in my opinion quite the contrary; "and what convinces me of the truth of this, is that "the Italian one is related in the *Nouvelles Récréati-* "*ons*, printed under the name of Bonaventure des "Periers, *in* 16, at Paris, in 1572 *, and that the "Latin cannot be ſhewn in any book ſo old. . . . . "There are ſome miſtakes in the Italian Epitaph pro- "duced by Moreri, and by Voetius. . . . . The moſt "correct is that, which is in theſe words in Ghilini:

(24) Mr. de la Monnoie's manuſcript notes.

* I quote this edition, becauſe in the firſt, which was printed at Lyons in 8°, by Robert Granjon, in 1558, and which is not ſo full as this by 35 tales, the Epitaph of Aretin is not related.

"*Qui giace l'Aretin amaro toſco*
"*Del ſem' human, la cui lingua trafiſſe*
"*Et vivi, & morti: d'Iddio mal non diſſe,*
"*Et ſi ſcuſo, co 'l dir, io no 'l conoſco.*

That is,

"Here Aretin the bitter Tuſcan lies
"A man, who never fail'd to ſatyriſe
"Both dead and living: God alone was free;
"He gave this reaſon; he's unknown to me."

This, far from enervating my criticiſm on Moreri, is rather a confirmation of it.

In the converſation I had in 1696, with Father Coronelli, who accompanied the Ambaſſadors from the Republick of Venice, to England, I aſked him what he thought of Aretin's Epitaph. He anſwered, he did not think it was as Moreri had related it, and promiſed to inform himſelf about it. He wrote to me from Venice, the 2d of November of the ſame year, and told me that it was very true, that Aretin was interred in the church of Saint Luke; but that he had not yet been able to diſcover any thing concerning the Epitaph. He ſent me a paſſage taken (25) out

(25) Page 120.

the contrary [*I*]. I do not believe that any principle of Atheiſm is found in his writings; but as many of his Libels violently attack the diſorders of the Clergy, and deſcribe in a profane and debauched ſtile, an infinite number of impurities aſcribed to the monaſtic life, it

out of the *Venetia deſcritta dal Sanſovino, coll' Additioni de Martinioni.* This is what it contains: *Vi dorme parimente in un depoſito poſto in aria quel Pietro Aretino, il quale fu cognominato flagello de Principi, per la licentioſa preſuntione della ſua mordaciſſima penna, & il quale morendo perde del tutto il nome: poiche eſſendo ignaro di lettere, e operando per forza di natura ne' ſuoi caprici, hebbe dopo morte il meritato premio della ſua petulantia: conciofia che eſſendo le coſe ſue reputate dalla Chieſa poco Criſtiane, furono vietate del tutto à Lettori, e ſi ſarebbe affatto cancellata la memoria, ſe l'Arioſto burlandoſi del titolo ch' egli ſi haveva preſo indebitamente, non haveſſe detto nel Furioſo,*

Ecco il flagello
De Prencipi, il divin Pietro Aretino.

i. e. "Here alſo is depoſited Peter Aretin, who was "ſurnamed the Scourge of Princes, for the licentious "preſumption of his moſt ſtinging pen, and who be-"ing dead loſt all his reputation; for being igno-"rant of letters, and writing by the mere force of "nature, and his own caprice, he has received after "death the due reward of his petulance; for his pieces "being thought by the Church not very conſiſtent "with Chriſtianity, were entirely prohibited from "being read, and his memory had been entirely ef-"faced if Arioſto, by way of ridicule on the title "which he had unjuſtly taken, had not ſaid in his "*Furioſo*.

"Behold the ſcourge
"Of Princes, the divine Peter Aretin."

Obſerve theſe words of Mr. Miſſon. "I can hardly "believe, as ſome have aſſured me, that the ſevere "Epigram againſt Aretin has been turned into an E-"pitaph. At a venture I will ſet down here the co-"py of it, which was given me (26)." It is a miſ-fortune that he never found St. Luke's church open; he went thither ſeveral times *on purpoſe to ſee Aretin's Monument.* If he could have ſeen it, he would have furniſhed us with a good deciſion of this affair. The Journaliſts of Utrecht, ſpeaking of this *Voyage*, relate the four verſes, *Condit Aretini cineres, &c.* and declare that they are ſaid to be engraven on the monument of this Satyriſt, *Cujus ſepulchro ſequentes verſus inſcripti eſſe dicuntur* (27). Once again, I do not believe a word of it.

(26) Miſſon, *Nouveau Voiage d'Italie*, tom. 1. p. 281, Hague edition, in 1698. This book has been ſo well received by the public, and not without reaſon, that it has been already printed three times.

(27) *Biblioth. Librorum novorum*, tom. 3. pag. 630.

[*I*] *It was doing him injuſtice to ſay that he did not know God: his works of piety ſufficiently ſhew the contrary.*] Paul Freher relates, that ſome Princes of Italy being far from imitators of the Emperor and the King of France, who made preſents to Aretin, that they might not be laſhed by him, cauſed him to be well cudgelled; and that this chaſtiſement had ſo good an effect, that our Author renounced Satyrs and defamatory Libels, and ſpent the reſt of his time in writing books of piety. *Quidam Principes Italiæ minus ſibi convenire exiſtimantes donis eum afficere, fuſtibus ad mortem uſque cædere per alios curârunt, & hoc modo linguam ejus maledicam refrænârunt, qui deinceps à ſcriptis ſatyricis abſtinens ſacra ſcripſit, non ſicut priora per inquiſitionem prohibita* (28). It happened to him much as it did to thoſe of whom Horace ſpeaks in the firſt Epiſtle of the ſecond book, verſ. 154.

(28) Freher. *Theatr. Viror. illuſtrium*, pag. 1461. Ghilini ſays the ſame thing in the 132d page of the firſt part of his *Teatro*.

——— *Vertere modum formidine fuſtis*
Ad bene dicendum delectandumque redacti.

That is,

"Fear made them civil, and deſign to write
"With modeſty; ſpeak well and to delight."
Creech.

I ſhall mention only two differences. The firſt is, that he did not give over out of fear. The cudgel had plaid to ſome purpoſe upon his poor ſhoulders. The ſecond is that he did not divert much by changing his ſtyle, he was gone out of his element. One does not much ſignalize one's wit, when in the latter part of our days one ſets about writing books of Devotion: This is ſaid upon Freher's ſuppoſition, which I ſhall examine by and by. In the opinion of ſome perſons however, his books in this way ſhew him a true convert. *It is well known what was the converſion of the famous Aretin. Every thing was changed in him, even his very name: and ſome pretend that he has ſucceeded ſo well in it, that it is ſcarce poſſible to find in the books of devotion of Partenio Etiro* (29), *any marks of the old man, which are ſo ſtrongly imprinted in the works of Pietro Aretino* (30). There is a paſſage in the Converſations of Mr. Menage which ought to have a place here. "Aretin has written alſo ſome books "of devotion, and that has cauſed it to be ſaid of "him, *Ubi benè, nemo melius; ubi malè, nemo pejus.* "... The following is an Epigram on Aretin's *Pa-"raphraſe on the ſeven Penitential Pſalms.*

(29) He took this Anagram of his name at the beginning of his books of piety.

(30) Baillet, *Jugem. ſur les Poëtes*, tom. 1. pag. 133.

"*Si ce Livre unit le deſtin*
"*De David & de l'Aretin*
"*Dans leur merveilleuſe ſcience,*
"*Lecteur, n'en ſois pas empêché,*
"*Qui paraphraſe la péché*
"*Paraphraſe la penitence* (31)."

That is,

"When in this book the lot you find
"Of Aretin and David join'd
"Alike in their offence,
"Reader, be not ſurpriz'd, that he
"Who paraphras'd the ſin, ſhould be
"The Paraphraſt of Penitence."

(31) *Menagiana*, pag. 266.

Note that in the ſecond edition of the *Menagiana*, the words *ubi benè, nemo melius*, are taken out, and it is ſaid that upon ſubjects of devotion, the ſtyle of Aretin is inſufferable, and that nothing in the world can be more wretched than the *Life of J. C. of the Virgin, of S. Thomas Aquinas, Geneſis, and the Paraphraſe upon the Pſalms*, either for the thoughts, or the expreſſion.

It appears by the paſſage I have quoted from Freher, that it was thought the books of Libertiniſm and thoſe of Devotion were compoſed at different times by Aretin; the firſt before, the latter after his converſion. Moreri ſays he wrote, *towards the latter end of his days*, ſome works of piety. I queſtion this very much, for he ſays himſelf in the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the ſecond part of his *Ragionamenti*, that he valued himſelf chiefly upon working quick, and upon his own fund; and, to prove the fruitfulneſs and readineſs of his pen, he enumerates the titles of ſeveral works which he had compoſed in a very little time, ſome upon religious, the others upon gay ſubjects. *Tutto e ciancia, eccetto il far toſto, e del ſuo. Eccovi lai Salmi, eccovi la Hiſtoria di* Chriſto, *eccovi le Comedie, eccovi il Dialogo, eccovi i volumi divoti & allegri, ſecondo i ſoggetti, & ho partorito ogni opera quaſi in un di, e per che ſi forniſca di vedere cio che ſa far la dote, che ſi ha ne le faſce, toſto udiranſi i furori de l'armi è le paſſioni d'amore, che io doverei laſciar di cantare per deſcrivere i geſti di quel Carlo Auguſto.* i. e. "All is a "trifle, except the doing them inſtantly, and without "help. There are the Pſalms, there is the Hiſtory of "Chriſt, there is the Comedy, there is the Dialogue, "there are the Books of devotion and of gaiety, ac-"cording to the ſubjects, and I have brought forth "each work as it were in a day, and to ſhew how "far my talent reaches, whilſt the fury of arms and "the paſſion of love was heard, I was inſtantly ob-"liged to leave off ſinging, to deſcribe the actions of "Charles Auguſtus." His Paraphraſe on the Penitential Pſalms was tranſlated into French, and printed at Lyons, in 1540. His Paraphraſe upon Geneſis with the Viſion, wherein Noah knew *the myſteries of the old and new Teſtament*, was printed at Lyons, in 1542, tranſlated from the Italian (32). Who dare to ſay, that at that time this Author had renounced his ſins and his libels? Be that as it will, here is the title of ſome of his works of Devotion. *Specchio delle Opere di Dio; Parafraſi ſopra i ſette Salmi; Vita della beata Virgine; Humanita del Figliuolo di Dio; Vita di Santo Tomaſo d'Aquino; Vita di Santa Catarina Vergine & Martire* (33).

(32) *Biblioth. de du Verdier.*

(33) Freherus, *Theatr. Viror. illuſt.* p. 1461, *ex Theatro Ghilini.*

Here

it muſt not be wondered at that they have made him paſs for an Atheiſt. But however, a man that had any reſpect for religion, and for moral honeſty, would never have written dialogues upon ſuch ſubjects as Aretin has choſen, and would not have employed in it ſuch looſe expreſſions. It may eaſily be perceived that I ſpeak of his *Ragionamenti* [K]. They

Here follows a complete confirmation of what I have advanced (34). "Aretin compoſed his works of piety, "only to exerciſe his imagination, and to ſhew that "he was capable of every thing, to appeaſe the de- "votees that were ſtirred up againſt him, and to "draw to himſelf the greateſt part of the liberalities "of ſome great Ladies, to whom he ſent copies of "ſuch Books as theſe. He was not a whit the more "virtuous for that, ſeeing after he had publiſhed his "Paraphraſe upon the ſeven Pſalms, and his *Huma-* "*nita di Chriſto* in 1535, he thought fit about the "end of 1537, to dedicate to Battiſta Zatti, of Breſ- "cia, a Roman citizen, thoſe infamous poſtures, which "have been ſo much ſpoken of, at the bottom of "each of which he had put a ſonnet, as ſhameful, "according to Mr. Felibien, as the actions repre- "ſented. The Epiſtle Dedicatory to his Battiſta Zatti "is in the firſt volume of Aretin's letters. It appears "alſo by the portrait, which this author makes of "his manners in the CCXCth letter of the fourth "volume, dated December 1547, that notwithſtand- "ing he was then in the fifty ſeventh year of his age "* he led a life not leſs licentious. The place where "he ſpeaks of the interruption, which he is obliged "to make whilſt he is writing this letter, is ſome- "thing very ſingular (35)." .... The CCCCXXXIXth letter of the ſame volume, ſhews alſo that he was not very ſcrupulous in his profeſſion of morality.

(34) Mr. de la Monnoie's manuſcript remarks.

* The proof of this is taken from his ſpeaking of his being 54 years of age in a letter to Paulus Jovius, May 1545, pag. 141. *verſ.* of the 3d volume, Paris edition in 1609, in 8vo.

(35) This paſſage is too licentious to be related.

They have been in the wrong therefore who have pretended that he compoſed his pious Books after having renounced his libertine life by a ſerious repentance. He compoſed Books of piety and Books of debauchery alternately, being always a man of ill principles, and plunged in corruption; and if, with regard to men, he was leſs pernicious when he exerciſed himſelf in pious ſubjects, than when he treated of ſuch as were obſcene, he was ſtill more criminal in the eyes of God in the former than in the latter. It did not belong to ſuch a profane perſon to touch upon holy things: he did them a greater injury, in explaining them with a depraved heart, and upon ill motives, than if he had openly inſulted them. We may apply to him the terrible cenſure contained in theſe words of the Pſalmiſt:

Auſſi dira l'Eternel au Meſchant,
Pourquoi vas-tu mes édits tant preſchant,
Et prens ma Loi en ta bouche maligne,
Veu que tu as en haine diſcipline,
Et que mes dits jettes & ne reçois?
Si un larron d'avanture apperçois,
Avec lui cours: car autant que lui vaux,
T'accompagnant de paillards & ribaux:
Ta bouche mets à mal e mediſances,
Ta langue braſſe & fraudes & nuiſances,
Cauſant aſſis pour ton prochain blâmer,
Et pour ton frere ou couſin diffamer:
Tu fais ces maux, & cependant que riens
Je ne t'en dis, tu m' eſtimes & tiens
Semblable a toi: mais quoique tard le face,
J'en reprendrai quelque jour en ta face (36).

That is,

"But to the wicked thus ſaith God,
"How dar'ſt thou teach my laws abroad,
"Or in thy mouth my Cov'nant take?
"For ſtubborn thou, confirm'd in ſin,
"Haſt proof againſt inſtruction been,
"And of my word didſt lightly ſpeak.
"When thou a ſubtle thief didſt ſee,
"Thou gladly didſt with him agree,
"And with Adult'rers didſt partake.
"Vile ſlander is thy chief delight;
"Thy tongue by envy mov'd and ſpight,
"Deceitful tales does hourly ſpread.
"Thou doſt with hateful ſcandals wound
"Thy brother, and with lies confound
"The off-ſpring of thy mother's bed.
"Theſe things didſt thou, whom ſtill I ſtrove
"To gain with ſilence and with love;
"Till thou didſt wickedly ſurmiſe,
"That I was ſuch a one as thou;
"But I'll reprove and ſhame thee now,
"And ſet thy ſins before thine eyes.

Brady and Tate.

(36) Pſalm l. I make uſe of the verſion of Clement Marot.

I confeſs that the generality of mankind are not ſhocked at the Books of Devotion, which are compoſed by an irreligious and profane perſon; but thoſe who have a nice and delicate taſte are more offended at them, than they would be if the Author was to ſpeak ſincerely. Such as theſe would ſay, *Take your choice; be either the one or the other: do not give the Printer a Book of Piety to day, and one of Libertiniſm to morrow. We do not deſire ſuch a Comedy: ſince you perſevere in the evil, we had rather you would inceſſantly keep the appearances of it.*

. . . . . *Quanto conſtantior idem*
In vitiis, tanto levius miſer ac prior ille,
Qui jam contento, jam laxo fune laborat (37).

That is,

"He that is conſtant in his vicious race,
"Runs the ſame courſe, and keeps an equal pace,
"Is certainly not half ſo great a wretch,
"As he that now rides looſe, and now on ſtretch.

Creech.

(37) Horat. Sat. 7. lib. 2. ver. 18.

It were to be wiſhed that nobody would meddle with Books of Devotion, without being well perſuaded of what he ſays, and putting it in practice; for to perſons of reflection, it is a great ſubject of offence to ſee a frequent claſhing between the thoughts and words of thoſe, who write ſuch Books, and ſtill more between their actions and their writings.

[K] *I ſpeak of his* Ragionamenti.] They are divided into a hundred and eleven parts, the laſt of which, that treats of the court, and of cards, is much more tolerable than the reſt. The firſt treats of the diſorders of the Nuns, the married women, and the Ladies of pleaſure. It is enough to ſay in general, that the ſecond is the ſpirit and hiſtory of *Whoring*. How abominable ſoever theſe dialogues may be, they are yet leſs ſo than the Book, which is imputed to him *de omnibus Veneris Schematibus*.

The following remark was ſent me (38). "This "Book (*de omnibus Veneris Schematibus,*) which is here "aſcribed to Aretin, and which abundance of people "believe to have been compoſed by him in Latin, be- "cauſe out of modeſty you give it a Latin title, is "nothing but a collection of ſixteen immodeſt figures, "engraven by the famous Marco Antonio of Bologna, "after the deſigns of Julio Romano, at the bottom "of each of which is a ſonnet of Aretin's. He ſpeaks "of it in a letter dated the 27th of November 1527, "wherein he tells Seignior Cæſar Fregoſa, that he ſends "him *il Libro de i Sonnetti e de le Figure luſſurioſe*. Va- "ſari, and after him Mr. Felibien, have ſaid that "theſe figures and ſonnets were to the number of "twenty; but Aretin himſelf, in the dedication "which he made to that Battiſta Zatti, of whom I "ſpake before, reckons only ſixteen. There is a "dialogue of *Maddalena* and *Giulia*, entitled *la Putana* "*errante*, which treats at large *de i diverſi Congiun-* "*gimenti*, to the number of five and thirty. This "is greatly ſurpaſſing the ancient debauchery,

(38) Mr. de la Monnoie's manuſcript notes.

"*Quales nec Didymæ ſciunt puellæ,*
"*Nec molles Elephantidos libelli....*
"*Sunt illic Veneris novem figuræ.*

"It is thus that Lindenbruch (39) quotes the XLIIId "Epigram of the twelfth Book of Martial; others "read *novæ* inſtead of *novem*. Aretin, notwithſtand- "ing the work was always printed under his name, "diſavows it, and ſays it was done by one of his "pupils, named Veniero. He explains himſelf "upon this ſubject to the Duke of Mantua, in the "following manner, in his *Capitolo*.

(39) *Notis in Priapeia*, p. 305.

"Ma

They were printed during his life; but it is difficult to discover when they were printed the first time [*L*]. We have six volumes of his Letters, which are not worth much [*M*].

" *Ma perch' io ſento il preſente all' odore,*
" *Un operetta in quel cambio galante.*
" *Vi mando hora in ſtil ladro traditore*
" *Intitolata* la Putana errante
" *Dal Veniero compoſta mio creato,*
" *Che me in dir mal quatro giornate inante.*"

I add to this a fine paſſage of Mr. Chevillier: " It " was about the year 1525, that Julio Romano, the " moſt famous Painter of Italy, being inſtigated by " the enemy of the ſalvation of mankind, invented " drawings to engrave twenty plates. The ſubjects " of them are ſo immodeſt that I dare only name " them. Peter Aretin, a man publickly infamous " for his impiety and Atheiſm, compoſed ſonnets for " each picture. George Vaſari, who relates this in " his lives of the Painters, ſays, he does not know " which would be the greateſt impurity, to caſt one's " eyes upon the drawings of Julio, or to dip into the verſes of Aretin:" *Io non ſo qual fuſſe piu o brutto lo ſpettacolo de i Deſigni di Giulio all' occhio, o le parole dell' Aretino à gl' orecchi.* 3. *Part. pa.* 302. " An En- " graver named Marco Antonio, had the aſſurance to " engrave ſuch a number of infamous things upon " twenty plates, that Pope Clement VII cauſed him " to be put into priſon; but the Cardinal de Medi- " cis ſaved his life. And notwithſtanding Julio's great " merit as a Painter, he would have been very rigo- " rouſly puniſhed if he had not retired to Mantua. " It happened in 1527, when Rome was plundered " by the army of Charles the fifth, that this Engra- " ver's lot was to loſe all his wealth, and being obliged " to quit the city, he died ſoon afterwards." Mr. Chevillier adds, " that Mr. Jollain, a Merchant in the " Rue St. Jaques at Paris, knowing where there were " ſome of theſe infamous plates, which repreſented " theſe abominable drawings of Julio, and the im- " pure ſonnets of Aretin, went thither, and bought " them for a hundred crowns, with an intent to de- " ſtroy them, which he executed.... He has always " believed they were the original plates engraven by " Marco Antonio, which he deſtroyed (40).

(40) Chevillier, *Origine de l' Imprimerie de Paris*, pag. 224.

[*L*] *His* Ragionamenti *were printed during his life; but it is difficult to diſcover when they were printed the firſt time.*] The Preface of the Edition of 1584, leaves us no room to doubt of the firſt of theſe two facts. The Bookſeller under the fictitious name of Barbagrigia, declares that the Author had reſolved to publiſh his dialogues, divided by days, after the manner of Boccace, and as they are in the Edition which I have quoted; but that others prevented him, and publiſhed this work againſt his will, and in great diſorder. *Hoggi oi preſento di loro una buona parte.... da me ridotte ne la maniera ch'egli le compoſe, e ne la medeſima maniera ch'egli haveva diterminato di farle la prima volta ſtampare, s'altri (contra ſua voglia) non haveſſero prima da lui date per mezzo de la ſtampa in luce aſſai male acconcie: concioſia coſa che Giornate queſto nomaſſe per ſeguitare l'alte pedate del gran Giovanni Boccacio.* I add to this ſomething more exact, and I do it with ſo much the more ſatisfaction, becauſe I acquit my ſelf at the ſame time of an indiſpenſable duty towards Mr. Minutoli, by the public teſtimony I give him of my ſingular eſteem, and of the great value I ſet upon the friendſhip, with which he honours me. I had conſulted this able Profeſſor of Geneva, and he communicated to me the following extract of a letter that had been written to him from Dijon. " I muſt ſpeak " to you at preſent, Sir, of a Book that is quite the " reverſe of that (41), the *Ragionamenti di Pietro Aretino*. You deſire me to clear up ſome things re- " lating to them. The *Ragionamenti*, or whimſical " diſcourſes of Aretin appeared before his death: we " cannot queſtion this ſince in 1551, there was an " invective of Joachim Perion a Benedictine Monk " againſt the Author of the *Ragionamenti*, who did " not die till 1556 (42). Antonio Franceſco Doni, " in the firſt part of his *Librairie*, publiſhed in 1550, " which contains the printed Books, ſpeaks of two " dialogues *delle Donne* (43), which are different from " the *Ragionamenti*, of which he does not ſpeak a " word, becauſe they were certainly not then printed. " With regard to the *Letters*, the firſt volume only " deſerves to be read, tho' it contains very little ſatyr: " the other five are extremely inſipid, and you may de- " pend upon Mr. Menage, in the *Menagiana*, who " does them rather too much honour, when he values " them for the ſtyle." In another letter, Mr. Minutoli has been ſo kind as to communicate two remarks to me, which he made in reading the letters of illuſtrious men publiſhed by John Michael Brutus. He found theſe words in the 369 page, in a letter of Joannes Maludanus to Dionyſius Lambinus: *Pœnè me fugerat, quod ſcribendum in primis fuiſſe arbitror. A Perionio editam eſſe audio orationem adverſus Petrum Aretinum. Periculum eſt ne ut jampridem Principum, ita poſthac & Μοναχῶν flagellum eſſe & nominari velit laceſſitus Aretinus.* i. e. " I had almoſt forgotten what " was principally to be written. I hear that Perion's " oration againſt Peter Aretin is publiſhed. There " is ſome danger that Aretin being provoked may have " a mind to be and be called the ſcourge of Monks, " as he has been before that of Princes." In this letter there is only the date of the day, *Nonis Maiis*; but as Lambinus's anſwer is dated *Nonis Juniis anno* CIↃ IↃ LI, it is eaſy to gueſs in what year Maludanus had written to him. My reader will be very glad to find in this place, what Lambinus, who was then at Rome, judged of Perion's Oration. *Perionii Orationem in Petrum Aretinum jampridem legeramus, ſed multo non ſine riſu. Quid enim magis ridiculum excogitari poteſt, quam hominem Benedictinum, Philoſophum, Ciceronianum, Theologum, cum P. Aretino verbis decertare? Omnino ſuæ exiſtimationi parum conſuluiſſe judicatur, nam quod arguit illum eſſe impurum, ſceleratum, impium, quid tum poſtea? Tales homines non verbis aut ſcriptis caſtigandi, ſed legibus & pœnis ſunt coërcendi. Sed hac de re alias plura.* i. e. " I have read Perion's Ora- " tion againſt Peter Aretin, and not without laughing " heartily. For what can be imagined more ridicu- " lous, than that a Benedictin, a Philoſopher, a Ci- " ceronian, a Divine ſhould diſpute with P. Aretin? " He ſeems intirely to have neglected his own repu- " tation, for what ſignifies it to prove him to be im- " modeſt, wicked, and impious? Such men are not " to be chaſtiſed by a pen, but by the ſeverity of the " laws."

With regard to the ſecond part of the text of this remark, read what follows, and you will admire the exactneſs and extent of the inquiries of that learned man whom I quote (44). " It is difficult to note the " preciſe time of the firſt edition of the *Ragionamen-* " *ti*, both becauſe it is become ſo ſcarce, that it is " almoſt impoſſible to meet with any copies of it, " and alſo becauſe the Dialogues, which compoſe the " two parts of this work, did not all appear at the " ſame time. The firſt part came out ſome years " before the reſt; and it is certain, that they were " both printed in 1537; the Epiſtles Dedicatory of " both parts being inſerted in the edition of the firſt " volume of Aretin's Letters, at Venice, *in folio*, by " Franceſco Marcolini, the ſame year. The title of " theſe *Ragionamenti* has varied. The Author, in " the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the ſecond part of theſe " Diſcourſes, calls the firſt *i tre Giorni di capricci*, and " alſo barely *Dialogo*; for this is what he underſtands " by theſe words, *eccovi il Dialogo*, which are not found " however in the ſame Epiſtle inſerted amongſt the " Letters of the firſt volume: where there is ſtill an- " other conſiderable variation, which is, that after " theſe words *e per non defraudare il mio grado*, all " that follows to, *e lo ſa Milano come cadde* incluſive- " ly, is entirely omitted; inſtead of which there is " *uſaro le parole cadute de la ſacra bocca del magno* " *Antonio da Leva, l'Aretino è più, &c.* Sometimes, " inſtead of *Dialogo*, he ſpeaks at length, as in the " Epiſtle to his ape, *il Dialogo de la Nanna e de la* " *Antonia*. Sometimes, as in his Dialogue *della Cor-* " *te*, by the *Nanna*, he underſtands the firſt part of " the *Ragionamenti*, and by the *Pippa*, the ſecond. " In a Letter of the 15th of May 1537, to Franceſco " da l'Orme, he means the two parts by *i due Dia-* " *loghi*, when Antonio Franceſco Doni means the " ſame alſo by *Dialoghi due delle Donne* *. It is " manifeſt

(44) Mr. de la Monnoie's manuſcript remarks.

* *Libraria de l Doni*, Part 1. pag 39. *verſa.*

(41) He had juſt ſpoken of Mr. Baillet's book concerning *the devotion to the Holy Virgin.*

(42) See the note [*N*].

(43) Freher puts theſe two Dialogues amongſt the works of Aretin, and does not ſpeak of the *Ragionamenti*. Perhaps theſe two Dialogues are this 1ſt edition, which was publiſhed againſt the will of the Author, and in a different order from his own.

it muſt not be wondered at that they have made him paſs for an Atheiſt. But however, a man that had any reſpect for religion, and for moral honeſty, would never have written dialogues upon ſuch ſubjects as Aretin has choſen, and would not have employed in it ſuch looſe expreſſions. It may eaſily be perceived that I ſpeak of his *Ragionamenti* [*K*]. They

(34) Mr. de la Monnoie's manuſcript remarks.

Here follows a complete confirmation of what I have advanced (34). "Aretin compoſed his works of piety, "only to exerciſe his imagination, and to ſhew that "he was capable of every thing, to appeaſe the de- "votees that were ſtirred up againſt him, and to "draw to himſelf the greateſt part of the liberalities "of ſome great Ladies, to whom he ſent copies of "ſuch Books as theſe. He was not a whit the more "virtuous for that, ſeeing after he had publiſhed his "Paraphraſe upon the ſeven Pſalms, and his *Huma-* "*nita di Chriſto* in 1535, he thought fit about the "end of 1537, to dedicate to Battiſta Zatti, of Breſ- "cia, a Roman citizen, thoſe infamous poſtures, which "have been ſo much ſpoken of, at the bottom of "each of which he had put a ſonnet, as ſhameful, "according to Mr. Felibien, as the actions repre- "ſented. The Epiſtle Dedicatory to his Battiſta Zatti "is in the firſt volume of Aretin's letters. It appears "alſo by the portrait, which this author makes of "his manners in the CCXCth letter of the fourth "volume, dated December 1547, that notwithſtand- "ing he was then in the fifty ſeventh year of his age "* he led a life not leſs licentious. The place where "he ſpeaks of the interruption, which he is obliged "to make whilſt he is writing this letter, is ſome- "thing very ſingular (35)." .... The CCCCXXXIXth letter of the ſame volume, ſhews alſo that he was not very ſcrupulous in his profeſſion of morality.

* The proof of this is taken from his ſpeaking of his being 54 years of age in a letter to Paulus Jovius, May 1545, pag. 141. *verſ.* of the 3d volume, Paris edition in 1609, in 8vo.

(35) This paſſage is too licentious to be related.

They have been in the wrong therefore who have pretended that he compoſed his pious Books after having renounced his libertine life by a ſerious repentance. He compoſed Books of piety and Books of debauchery alternately, being always a man of ill principles, and plunged in corruption; and if, with regard to men, he was leſs pernicious when he exerciſed himſelf in pious ſubjects, than when he treated of ſuch as were obſcene, he was ſtill more criminal in the eyes of God in the former than in the latter. It did not belong to ſuch a profane perſon to touch upon holy things: he did them a greater injury, in explaining them with a depraved heart, and upon ill motives, than if he had openly inſulted them. We may apply to him the terrible cenſure contained in theſe words of the Pſalmiſt:

Auſſi dira l'Eternel au Meſchant,
Pourquoi vas-tu mes édits tant preſchant,
Et prens ma Loi en ta bouche maligne,
Veu que tu as en haine diſcipline,
Et que mes dits jettes & ne reçois?
Si un larron d'avanture apperçois,
Avec lui cours: car autant que lui vaux,
T'accompagnant de paillards & ribaux:
Ta bouche mets à mal e mediſances,
Ta langue braſſe & fraudes & nuiſances,
Cauſant aſſis pour ton prochain blâmer,
Et pour ton frere ou couſin diffamer:
Tu fais ces maux, & cependant que riens
Je ne s'en dis, tu m' eſtimes & tiens
Semblable a toi: mais quoique tard le face,
J'en reprendrai quelque jour en ta face (36).

(36) Pſalm l. I make uſe of the verſion of Clement Marot.

That is,

"But to the wicked thus ſaith God,
"How dar'ſt thou teach my laws abroad,
"Or in thy mouth my Cov'nant take?
"For ſtubborn thou, confirm'd in ſin,
"Haſt proof againſt inſtruction been,
"And of my word didſt lightly ſpeak.
"When thou a ſubtle thief didſt ſee,
"Thou gladly didſt with him agree,
"And with Adult'rers didſt partake.
"Vile ſlander is thy chief delight;
"Thy tongue by envy mov'd and ſpight,
"Deceitful tales does hourly ſpread.
"Thou doſt with hateful ſcandals wound
"Thy brother, and with lies confound
"The off-ſpring of thy mother's bed.
"Theſe things didſt thou, whom ſtill I ſtrove
"To gain with ſilence and with love;
"Till thou didſt wickedly ſurmiſe,
"That I was ſuch a one as thou;
"But I'll reprove and ſhame thee now,
"And ſet thy ſins before thine eyes.

Brady and Tate.

I confeſs that the generality of mankind are not ſhocked at the Books of Devotion, which are compoſed by an irreligious and profane perſon; but thoſe who have a nice and delicate taſte are more offended at them, than they would be if the Author was to ſpeak ſincerely. Such as theſe would ſay, *Take your choice; be either the one or the other: do not give the Printer a Book of Piety to day, and one of Libertiniſm to morrow. We do not deſire ſuch a Comedy: ſince you perſevere in the evil, we had rather you would inceſſantly keep the appearances of it.*

. . . . . Quanto conſtantior idem
In vitiis, tanto levius miſer ac prior ille,
Qui jam contento, jam laxo fune laborat (37).

(37) Horat. Sat. 7. lib. 2. ver. 18.

That is,

"He that is conſtant in his vicious race,
"Runs the ſame courſe, and keeps an equal pace,
"Is certainly not half ſo great a wretch,
"As he that now rides looſe, and now on ſtretch.

Creech.

It were to be wiſhed that nobody would meddle with Books of Devotion, without being well perſuaded of what he ſays, and putting it in practice; for to perſons of reflection, it is a great ſubject of offence to ſee a frequent claſhing between the thoughts and words of thoſe, who write ſuch Books, and ſtill more between their actions and their writings.

[*K*] *I ſpeak of his* Ragionamenti.] They are divided into a hundred and eleven parts, the laſt of which, that treats of the court, and of cards, is much more tolerable than the reſt. The firſt treats of the diſorders of the Nuns, the married women, and the Ladies of pleaſure. It is enough to ſay in general, that the ſecond is the ſpirit and hiſtory of *Whoring*. How abominable ſoever theſe dialogues may be, they are yet leſs ſo than the Book, which is imputed to him *de omnibus Veneris Schematibus*.

(38) Mr. de la Monnoie's manuſcript notes.

The following remark was ſent me (38). "This "Book (*de omnibus Veneris Schematibus*,) which is here "aſcribed to Aretin, and which abundance of people "believe to have been compoſed by him in Latin, be- "cauſe out of modeſty you give it a Latin title, is "nothing but a collection of ſixteen immodeſt figures, "engraven by the famous Marco Antonio of Bologna, "after the deſigns of Julio Romano, at the bottom "of each of which is a ſonnet of Aretin's. He ſpeaks "of it in a letter dated the 27th of November 1527, "wherein he tells Seignior Cæſar Fregoſa, that he ſends "him *il Libro de i Sonnetti e de le Figure luſſurioſe*. Va- "ſari, and after him Mr. Felibien, have ſaid that "theſe figures and ſonnets were to the number of "twenty; but Aretin himſelf, in the dedication "which he made to that Battiſta Zatti, of whom I "ſpake before, reckons only ſixteen. There is a "dialogue of *Maddalena* and *Giulia*, entitled *la Putana* "*errante*, which treats at large *de i diverſi Congiun-* "*gimenti*, to the number of five and thirty. This "is greatly ſurpaſſing the ancient debauchery,

"*Quales nec Didymæ ſciunt puellæ,*
"*Nec molles Elephantidos libelli....*
"*Sunt illic Veneris novem figuræ.*

"It is thus that Lindenbruch (39) quotes the XLIIId "Epigram of the twelfth Book of Martial; others "read *novæ* inſtead of *novem*. Aretin, notwithſtand- "ing the work was always printed under his name, "diſavows it, and ſays it was done by one of his "pupils, named Veniero. He explains himſelf "upon this ſubject to the Duke of Mantua, in the "following manner, in his *Capitolo*.

(39) *Notis in Priapeia*, p. 305.

"Ma

They were printed during his life; but it is difficult to discover when they were printed the first time [*L*]. We have six volumes of his Letters, which are not worth much [*M*].

" *Ma perch' io ſento il preſente all' odore,*
" *Un operetta in quel cambio galante.*
" *Vi mando hora in ſtil ladro traditore*
" *Intitolata* la Putana errante
" *Dal Veniero compoſta mio creato,*
" *Che me in dir mal quatro giornate inante.*"

I add to this a fine paſſage of Mr. Chevillier: " It " was about the year 1525, that Julio Romano, the " moſt famous Painter of Italy, being inſtigated by " the enemy of the ſalvation of mankind, invented " drawings to engrave twenty plates. The ſubjects " of them are ſo immodeſt that I dare only name " them. Peter Aretin, a man publickly infamous " for his impiety and Atheiſm, compoſed ſonnets for " each picture. George Vaſari, who relates this in " his lives of the Painters, ſays, he does not know " which would be the greateſt impurity, to caſt one's " eyes upon the drawings of Julio, or to dip into the verſes of Aretin:" *Io non ſo qual fuſſe piu o brutto lo ſpettacolo de i Deſigni di Giulio all' occhio, o le parole dell' Aretino à gl' orecchi.* 3. *Part. pa.* 302. " An En- " graver named Marco Antonio, had the aſſurance to " engrave ſuch a number of infamous things upon " twenty plates, that Pope Clement VII cauſed him " to be put into priſon; but the Cardinal de Medi- " cis ſaved his life. And notwithſtanding Julio's great " merit as a Painter, he would have been very rigo- " rouſly puniſhed if he had not retired to Mantua. " It happened in 1527, when Rome was plundered " by the army of Charles the fifth, that this Engra- " ver's lot was to loſe all his wealth, and being obliged " to quit the city, he died ſoon afterwards." Mr. Chevillier adds, " that Mr. Jollain, a Merchant in the " Rue St. Jaques at Paris, knowing where there were " ſome of theſe infamous plates, which repreſented " theſe abominable drawings of Julio, and the im- " pure ſonnets of Aretin, went thither, and bought " them for a hundred crowns, with an intent to de- " ſtroy them, which he executed.... He has always " believed they were the original plates engraven by " Marco Antonio, which he deſtroyed (40).

(40) Chevillier, *Origine de l' Imprimerie de Paris*, pag. 224.

[*L*] *His* Ragionamenti *were printed during his life; but it is difficult to diſcover when they were printed the firſt time.*] The Preface of the Edition of 1584, leaves us no room to doubt of the firſt of theſe two facts. The Bookſeller under the fictitious name of Barbagrigia, declares that the Author had reſolved to publiſh his dialogues, divided by days, after the manner of Boccace, and as they are in the Edition which I have quoted; but that others prevented him, and publiſhed this work againſt his will, and in great diſorder. *Hoggi oi preſento di loro una buona parte.... da me ridotte ne la maniera ch'egli le compoſe, e ne la medeſima maniera ch'egli haveva diterminato di farle la prima volta ſtampare, s'altri (contra ſua voglia) non haveſſero prima da lui date per mezzo de la ſtampa in luce aſſai mala acconcie: concioſia coſa che Giornate queſto nomaſſe per ſeguitare l'alte pedate del gran Giovanni Boccacio.* I add to this ſomething more exact, and I do it with ſo much the more ſatisfaction, becauſe I acquit my ſelf at the ſame time of an indiſpenſable duty towards Mr. Minutoli, by the public teſtimony I give him of my ſingular eſteem, and of the great value I ſet upon the friendſhip, with which he honours me. I had conſulted this able Profeſſor of Geneva, and he communicated to me the following extract of a letter that had been written to him from Dijon. " I muſt ſpeak " to you at preſent, Sir, of a Book that is quite the " reverſe of that (41), the *Ragionamenti di Pietro Aretino*. You deſire me to clear up ſome things re- " lating to them. The *Ragionamenti*, or whimſical " diſcourſes of Aretin appeared before his death: we " cannot queſtion this ſince in 1551, there was an " invective of Joachim Perion a Benedictine Monk " againſt the Author of the *Ragionamenti*, who did " not die till 1556 (42). Antonio Franceſco Doni, " in the firſt part of his *Librairie*, publiſhed in 1550, " which contains the printed Books, ſpeaks of two " dialogues *delle Donne* (43), which are different from " the *Ragionamenti*, of which he does not ſpeak a " word, becauſe they were certainly not then printed.

(41) He had juſt ſpoken of Mr. Baillet's book concerning *the devotion to the Holy Virgin.*

(42) See the note [*N*].

(43) Freher puts theſe two Dialogues amongſt the works of Aretin, and does not ſpeak of the *Ragionamenti*. Perhaps theſe two Dialogues are this 1ſt edition, which was publiſhed againſt the will of the Author, and in a different order from his own.

" With regard to the *Letters*, the firſt volume only " deſerves to be read, tho' it contains very little ſatyr: " the other five are extremely inſipid, and you may de- " pend upon Mr. Menage, in the *Menagiana*, who " does them rather too much honour, when he values " them for the ſtyle." In another letter, Mr. Minutoli has been ſo kind as to communicate two remarks to me, which he made in reading the letters of illuſtrious men publiſhed by John Michael Brutus. He found theſe words in the 369 page, in a letter of Joannes Maludanus to Dionyſius Lambinus: *Pœnè me fugerat, quod ſcribendum in primis fuiſſe arbitror. A Perionio editam eſſe audio orationem adverſus Petrum Aretinum. Periculum eſt ne ut jampridem Principum, ita poſthac & Μενιππου flagellum eſſe & nominari velit laceſſitus Aretinus.* i. e. " I had almoſt forgotten what " was principally to be written. I hear that Perion's " oration againſt Peter Aretin is publiſhed. There " is ſome danger that Aretin being provoked may have " a mind to be and be called the ſcourge of Monks, " as he has been before that of Princes." In this letter there is only the date of the day, *Nonis Maiis*; but as Lambinus's anſwer is dated *Nonis Juniis anno* CIↃ IↃ LI, it is eaſy to gueſs in what year Maludanus had written to him. My reader will be very glad to find in this place, what Lambinus, who was then at Rome, judged of Perion's Oration. *Perionii Orationem in Petrum Aretinum jampridem legeramus, ſed multo non ſine riſu. Quid enim magis ridiculum excogitari poteſt, quam hominem Benedictinum, Philoſophum, Ciceronianum, Theologum, cum P. Aretino verbis decertare? Omnino ſuæ exiſtimationi parum conſuluiſſe judicatur, nam quod arguit illum eſſe impurum, ſceleratum, impium, quid tum poſtea? Tales homines non verbis aut ſcriptis caſtigandi, ſed legibus & pœnis ſunt coërcendi. Sed hac de re alias plura.* i. e. " I have read Perion's Ora- " tion againſt Peter Aretin, and not without laughing " heartily. For what can be imagined more ridicu- " lous, than that a Benedictin, a Philoſopher, a Ci- " ceronian, a Divine ſhould diſpute with P. Aretin? " He ſeems intirely to have neglected his own repu- " tation, for what ſignifies it to prove him to be im- " modeſt, wicked, and impious? Such men are not " to be chaſtiſed by a pen, but by the ſeverity of the " laws."

With regard to the ſecond part of the text of this remark, read what follows, and you will admire the exactneſs and extent of the inquiries of that learned man whom I quote (44). " It is difficult to note the " preciſe time of the firſt edition of the *Ragionamen-* " *ti*, both becauſe it is become ſo ſcarce, that it is " almoſt impoſſible to meet with any copies of it, " and alſo becauſe the Dialogues, which compoſe the " two parts of this work, did not all appear at the " ſame time. The firſt part came out ſome years " before the reſt; and it is certain, that they were " both printed in 1537; the Epiſtles Dedicatory of " both parts being inſerted in the edition of the firſt " volume of Aretin's Letters, at Venice, *in folio*, by " Franceſco Marcolini, the ſame year. The title of " theſe *Ragionamenti* has varied. The Author, in " the Epiſtle Dedicatory of the ſecond part of theſe " Diſcourſes, calls the firſt *i tre Giorni di capricci*, and " alſo barely *Dialogo*; for this is what he underſtands " by theſe words, *eccovi il Dialogo*, which are not found " however in the ſame Epiſtle inſerted amongſt the " Letters of the firſt volume: where there is ſtill an- " other conſiderable variation, which is, that after " theſe words *e per non-diſraudare il mio grado*, all " that follows to, *e lo ſa Milano come cadde* incluſive- " ly, is entirely omitted; inſtead of which there is " *uſaro le parole cadute de la ſacra bocca del magno* " *Antonio da Leva, l'Aretino è più, &c.* Sometimes, " inſtead of *Dialogo*, he ſpeaks at length, as in the " Epiſtle to his ape, *il Dialogo de la Nanna e de la* " *Antonia*. Sometimes, as in his Dialogue *della Cor-* " *te*, by the *Nanna*, he underſtands the firſt part of " the *Ragionamenti*, and by the *Pippa*, the ſecond. " In a Letter of the 15th of May 1537, to Franceſco " da l'Orme, he means the two parts by *i due Dia-* " *loghi*, when Antonio Franceſco Doni means the " ſame alſo by *Dialoghi due delle Donne* *. It is " manifeſt

(44) Mr. de la Monnoie's manuſcript remarks.

* *Libraria de l Doni*, Part 1. pag 39. *verſo.*

much [*M*]. His works of devotion have had no great ſale (*b*), and yet they have met with approvers, who have given them a great many praiſes (*c*). His Comedies in proſe are much better in their kind. He died about the year 1556, being ſixty five years old, more or leſs [*N*].

It is reported that he fell into ſuch a fit of laughing on hearing ſome ſmutty diſcourſes, that he overturned the chair upon which he ſat, and that in the falling he hurt his head, and died upon the ſpot [*O*]. He repented his making of verſes againſt Peter Strozzi, for this brave man threatened to have him ſtabbed even in his bed, which affrighted this Poet ſo much, that he durſt not let any body come into his houſe, and had not the courage to go out of it himſelf, as long as Strozzi ſtaid in the State of Venice. I ſhall quote my Author [*P*]. Note that this ſo ſatyrical a Poet was laviſh of his praiſes to the laſt exceſs. We find the moſt pompous hyperboles and the moſt fawning flatteries, in the letters which he wrote to Kings and Princes, to Generals of armies, to Cardinals, and other great men of the world. So far are they from the appearance of an Author, who made himſelf be feared, or who required tribute, that they ſhew all the meanneſs of an Author, who in the moſt abject manner is begging a bit of bread. He makes uſe of moving expreſſions to repreſent his poverty; he has recourſe even to the language of Canaan, I mean pious phraſes, the better to excite compaſſion, and animate to charity thoſe who expect from God the recompence of their good works. We muſt not forget that one of his ſubjects of importunity was the portion of his beloved daughter Adria [*Q*].

He

" manifeſt that theſe Dialogues were never intitled *Ragionamenti* by the Author of them. It is " only ſince the edition of 1584 that they have born " this title; for the true one was *Capricci*. Perion " ſhews it in his Invective againſt Aretin. *Scripſit e-* " *nim*, ſays he, *atque edidit nefarium librum quem-* " *dam*, *quem* Capricium *à caprarum laſciviâ & libi-* " *dine inſcripſit*. i. e. " For he wrote and publiſhed " a wicked book, which he intitled *Capricci* from the " goatiſh laſciviouſneſs and luſtfulneſs of it." " And " a little afterwards, *Galli plerique jam Italicè ſciunt*; " *quo quidem ſermone iſtius* Capricius *aliique libri ſcrip-* " *ti ſunt*. i. e. " Moſt Frenchmen now underſtand " Italian, in which his *Capricci*, and his other books " are written." " Bandel miſtakes, when in his 34th " Novel, pag. 235 of the firſt part, he ſays that for " *la Zanina* read *la Nanna*; theſe are his words, *O* " *ſia Raffaella de l'Aretino*. In ſhort, the *Nanna* " and the *Raffaella* are two different works, and by " two different Authors. By the *Nanna* we ought to " underſtand the firſt part of the *Ragionamenti* of A- " retin: by the *Raffaella*, the Dialogue of Madonna " Raffaella and Margareta, intitled *della bella Creanza* " *delle Donne*, which teaches women Coquetry. It " is Aleſſandro Piccolhuomini's, under the name of " Stordito Intronato, which was his name as an Aca- " demician. This quotation of the *Nanna* by Ban- " del ſerves however to ſhew, that the firſt part of " the *Ragionamenti* appeared at leaſt about the year " 1535; for towards the end of this ſame Novel, " where the *Nanna* is quoted, there is mention made " of Bernia as then alive, who, notwithſtanding Mr. " Baillet places him after thoſe Poets, who died in " 1606, died moſt certainly in May 1535. *Il Ber-* " *nia Vicario Poëta d'Aretino morì apopletico*, ſays " Paulus Jovius in a Letter of the laſt of May 1535 " to the Biſhop of Faenza Rodolfo Pio, afterwards " called the Cardinal de Carpi, Nuncio at that time " in France. Mr. Menage, who has written a chap- " ter expreſly upon Bernia in the firſt part of his " *Anti-Baillet*, has not taken notice of this miſtake."

[*M*] *His ſix volumes of Letters . . . . are not worth much.*] We have ſeen the opinion of a learned man of Dijon upon this ſubject already (45); to which I ſhall add that of Mr. Menage. *I have read*, ſays he (46), *all Peter Aretin's Letters, without finding any thing in them that I could inſert in any of my books. There is nothing but the ſtyle of them worth regarding.* One cannot give a more expreſſive idea of a work that is dry, and like a houſe ſtript of its furniture, like a ſandy ſoil, uncultivated, or like heaths; for Mr. Menage was one of the beſt men in the world to make advantage of reading, and had the beſt art of varying the applications of it.

(45) Above, immediately after the quotation (43).

(46) Menagiana, pag. 396 of the firſt Dutch edition.

[*N*] *He died about the year* 1556, *and at the age of* 65, *more or leſs* (47).] " What makes me con- " jecture, that Aretin died either about the end of " 1555, or in the year 1556, is, that after the month " of October 1555, being the date of the Epiſtle De- " dicatory of the laſt volume of his Letters, it does " not appear that he wrote any thing; and that Ruſ- " celli, who wrote his *Rimario*, in 1557, ſpeaks " therein of Aretin as of a perſon lately dead. *Onde* " *il mio Aretino di buona memoria*, ſays he at the " word *Roſta*, in the Vocabulary at the end of the *Ri-* " *mario*. That this *Rimario* was compoſed in 1557, " appears by the paſſage I have marked above (48) " with relation to Silvio Antoniano (49)." Paul Freher is miſtaken, when he ſays that Aretin died about the year 1566 (50).

(47) See the marginal quotation *, between (34) and (35).

(48) At the end of the note [*D*] of the article ANTONIANO.

(49) Mr. de la Monnoie's manuſcript notes.

(50) Paul. Freher. *in Theatro Virorum illuſtrium*, pag. 1461.

[*O*] *It is reported, that he fell into ſuch a fit of laughing, on hearing ſome ſmutty diſcourſes, that he tumbled down . . . and died upon the ſpot.*] Theſe are the very words of the Author, who relates this fact. *Infandas obſcœnitates de meretricibus, ut aiunt, ſoro-* *ribus ſuis, cum audiret, ex riſu ſellam in qua ſedebat* *evertiſſe, occiputque vehementer graviterque ad terram* *affixiſſe atque alliſiſſe, ut extemplo nequiſſimè interi-* *ret* (51).

(51) Ant. Laurentinus Politianus, *in Dialogo de Riſu*, pag. 78.

[*P*] *He repinted his making of verſes againſt Strozzi . . . . I ſhall quote my Author.*] It is Remi of Florence. *Volſe*, ſays he (52), *Pietro Aretino burlare &* *mottegiare il Sig. Pietro Strozzi, quando egli diede Ma-* *rano a Venetiani, e gli fece un Sonetto, che commin-* *ciava*:

(52) Remigio Fiorentino, *Conſiderat. civili ſopra Guicciardini*, cap. 6. folio 8 *verſo*. *See* Rime Piacevoli, Part 2. folio 12.

Mentre il gran Strozzi Arma virumque cano, &c.

Ma il Signior Pietro, come huomo valoroſo, & che non voleva ſue burle nè ſuoi motti, gli fece intendere, che attendeſſe ad altro, perche lo ſarebbe ammazzare in- ſin nel letto. Onde il povero Aretino, che conoſceva il Signor Pietro huomo pui da farlo che da dirlo, ſi miſe tanto ſpavento, che ſerrato in caſa, nè dando ingreſſo a perſona alcuna, guardava pure ſe i pognali piovevano, & menò giorno e notte una vita infeliciſſima, e per fin che lo Strozzi ſtette in paeſe de Veneziani, non ardì mai uſcir di caſa. i. e. " Peter Aretin had a mind " to ridicule Signior Peter Strozzi, when he gave Ma- " rano to the Venetians, and he made a Sonnet on " him, which began,

" *Whilſt the great Strozzi Arva virumque cano &c.*

" But Signior Strozzi being a man of courage, and " not liking his drollery, gave him to underſtand, " that if he proceeded, he would have him killed in " his bed. Whereupon poor Aretin, who knew Sig- " nior Strozzi to be a man more of deeds than words, " was ſo affrighted, that he ſhut himſelf up in his " houſe, not ſuffering any body to come in, and " thought inceſſantly that daggers were ſhow'ring " down upon him, and led a moſt unhappy life " night and day, and as long as Strozzi ſtaid in the " territories of the Venetians, he durſt not go out of " doors." I fancy, that when his danger was over, he returned to his old courſes.

[*Q*] *One of his ſubjects of importunity was the portion of his beloved daughter Adria.*] He loved her very tenderly, and had engaged himſelf to give a thouſand ducats to

him,

He took a great deal of pains to get her married, and he ſaw her ſo unhappy in that ſtate, that he repented of his impatience [*R*], a misfortune too common among men; for how many things diſquiet them extreamly when they are not done, and yet afflict them much more when they are done?

him, to whom he had promiſed her in marriage. But this lover was not one, that could be referred to the dedication of the next book: ſuch an aſſignment, which ſeveral Authors have made to their creditors, was not able to content him; he ſtipulated that a thouſand ducats ſhould be told on the table, before he gave his miſtreſs the ring. *Mille ducati è la promeſſa da me fatta allo ſpoſo in contanti, prima che ſe li dia l'anello* (53). Aretin had nothing to make up the payment of this ſum with, but the golden chain which he had received from the Prince of Spain (54). He addreſſed himſelf to the Cardinal of Lorrain, for aſſiſtance in this neceſſity: I do not know whether he obtained any thing from him; but I know he was aſſiſted by the Duke of Florence. The bill of exchange which this Prince remitted to him (55), had this condition, that it ſhould not be paid but upon good atteſtations that the marriage had been conſummated (56). This condition made the wedding be haſtened: the father had a mind to defer it, becauſe the young Adria ſeemed to be of too tender an age: He ſaid that his daughter, by ſubmitting herſelf to the nuptial bed, ſeemed like a pure victim laid upon the ſacred altar: *Per importarmi piu l'honore della parola obligata, che il riſpetto della etade tenera, conſentii che la innocentia ſi copulaſſe co 'l ſacramento. Ella, nello entrare nel letto, parue una oſtia pura, poſta ſopra l'altare ſacro* (57). It appears that the ſon-in-law did not rigorouſly inſiſt upon the ſum being paid him in ſpecie before the marriage: he contented himſelf with being ſecured by the golden chain which the Emperor's ſon had given Aretin: with being ſecured, I ſay, for the payment of what was wanting of the thouſand ducats; but that embarraſſed the father-in-law nevertheleſs, who had a mind to keep this golden chain, and at the ſame time ſaw himſelf incumbred with his daughter till the whole ſum was paid; for till then the ſon-in-law would not carry his ſpouſe home. The Duke of Florence was again importuned and diſburſed ſomething (58).

(53) Aretin, *Letter* 145 of the 5th book, folio 72 *verſo*, Paris edition in 1609.
(54) Ibid.
(55) See the 24th Letter of the ſame book. It is dated from Venice in 1548.
(56) See the 220th Letter of the 5th book. It is dated in March 1549.
(57) Ibid. folio 102.
(58) See the 6th book of Aretin's Letters, folio 121.

[*R*] *He ſaw his daughter ſo unhappy in marriage, that he repented his impatience.*] This marriage was not happy: poor Adria was treated ſo ill by her huſband, that ſhe was forced to return home to her father; but her huſband having promiſed to uſe her better, ſhe ſuffered herſelf to be perſuaded to a re-union, and was not more happy than before (59). He continued to take from her the power of the keys; a power that is never annexed to the diſtaff in the church, but is much affected by the women in a family. She could neither eat, nor drink, but when others were pleaſed to diſpoſe of the keys in her favour. She was eternally cavilled at about her dreſs; ſhe was not ſuffered to wear jewels: and he would have forced her to ſell a diamond which her father had given her. Thus ſhe was attacked in the moſt ſenſible points: it was tearing out her very bowels. Aretin implored the protection of the Ducheſs d'Urbino for her (60). What a heart-breaking was this, to ſee himſelf deſpiſed by his ſon-in-law, whilſt his fame was ſpread as far as to the court of Perſia (61)! What domeſtick bitterneſs, in the midſt of the pretended ſweetneſſes of a great reputation! Could he comfort himſelf with the conſideration that this brute deſpiſed alſo the Duke of Florence, who had ſo much recommended to him the good treatment of his ſpouſe? It was on the contrary a new ſubject of confuſion to him, that he had choſen ſuch a ſon-in-law. *Benchè en quanto al non fare niſſuna ſtima di me ſimil' cane, non è maraviglia, è ben' da ſtupire del ſi poco riſpetto che moſtra d'havere lo aſinaccio al gran' Duca, la cui benignità manſueta, uſcendo noi di Peſaro, per il viaggio di Roma, coſì qual era à cavallo, chiamollo, & diſſegli: Se tu vuoi che non ti ſi manchi di gratie, tratta la moglie tua, ſi come di me nata fuſſe* (62). i. e. "That he ſhould regard me no "more than if I had been a dog is no wonder, but "it is enough to aſtoniſh one that the fool ſhould "ſhew ſo little reſpect to the Grand Duke, whoſe "goodneſs and condeſcenſion was ſuch, that, as we "were going from Peſaro, in the way to Rome, as "he was on horſeback, he called to him and ſaid: "If you would not be out of my favour, treat your "wife as if ſhe was my daughter." Note that Peter Aretin had another daughter, whom he was very deſirous of getting married (63).

(59) See the 6th book of the Letters of Aretin, folio 281.
(60) His Letter to the Ducheſs of Urbino is dated from Venice in Nov. 1554.
(61) See the note [*A*].
(62) Aretin, in the 282d page of the 6th book of his *Letters*.
(63) Her name was Auſtria. See the 210th Letter of the 5th book, and page 258 of the 6th book.

ARGHUN KHAN, the eighth Emperor of the Mogols of the race of Jenghiz Khân, was the eldeſt ſon (*a*) of Abâka Khân, and ſucceeded his uncle Nicûdâr Oglan, or Ahmed Khan, in the year of the Hejra 683 (*b*), having diſpoſſeſſed him of the throne in the manner which will be related elſewhere (*c*). Arghûn had the government of Khoraſân, and the chief command of the troops in that province conferred on him in his father's life-time, being by him deſigned his ſucceſſor (*d*). He had no ſooner got rid of his uncle, who had ſtepped in between him and the crown, than he committed the chief management of his affairs to the Emir Buga, the great inſtrument of his advancement, who to get the adminiſtration wholly into his own hands, cauſed Shamſo'ddin Saïd, Preſident of the Diwân or Council, and a man of extraordinary merit, to be put to death [*A*], on a falſe accuſation of having poiſoned the Emperor Abaka Khan, and gave the office to a creature of his own. Buga having no longer a partner in power, ſet no bounds to his ambition, and flattered himſelf that he might eaſily place the crown on his own head; ſo that in the year 686 (*e*) he openly rebelled againſt his maſter, but with ill ſucceſs, being defeated and ſlain in the attempt. After Buga's death a Jewiſh Phyſician, named Saado'ddawla,

(*a*) Al Beidâwi, *in Nedhâm al tawârikh*. MS.
(*b*) A. C. 1284. Abu'lfeda places his acceſſion a year ſooner.
(*c*) In the article of NICUDAR OGLAN.
(*d*) Al Beidâwi, *ubi ſupra*.
(*e*) A. C. 1287.

[*A*] *Buga cauſed Shamſo'ddin Said, Preſident of the Diwân, to be put to death.*] Shamſo'ddin had ſerved Abaka and Ahmed Khan in the ſame high ſtation, and had been in the laſt reign accuſed of the crime imputed to him by Buga; but his maſter refuſed to deliver him up to Arghun when he demanded him (1). Abu'lfaragius, who lived in the time of thoſe Princes, relates the ſtory of Shamſo'ddin in a different manner from Khondemir. He ſays that when Arghun came to the Empire, Shamſo'ddin, not thinking himſelf ſafe, fled to the mountains of Ahwâz, and put himſelf under the protection of a certain tribe of Curds, whoſe Prince, named Yuſof Shah, to curry favour with Arghun, delivered him up to that Prince. When he was brought before the Emperor, he offered a prodigious ſum to ſave his life; but after having ſold all he had, and borrowed what he could of his relations and friends, not being able to make up the whole demanded of him, he was obliged to ſubmit to fate, and was accordingly put to death (2). Khondemir (3) ſays, that Shamſo'ddin fled to Iſpahân, and was ſetting out from thence for the Indies; but that he came back voluntarily, on promiſe of ſecurity from Arghun, who reinſtated him in his office. Abu'lfaragius (4) gives him a great character for wiſdom, experience in public affairs, and ſingular humility. It is ſaid that (5) when the executioner came in to put him to death, he made the ablution, and then opening his Koran to conſult it for an omen, (a common practice among the Mohammedans (6),) the words he firſt light on were theſe: *As for thoſe who ſay, Our Lord is God, and who behave uprightly; the angels ſhall deſcend unto them, and ſhall ſay, Fear not, neither be ye grieved; but rejoice in the hopes of paradiſe, which ye have been promiſed* (7).

(1) Abu'lfarag. *Hiſt. Dynaſt.* p. *ult.*
(2) Idem, ibid.
(3) *Vide* D'Herbel. *Bibl. Orient.* p. 226.
(4) *Ubi ſupra.*
(5) *Vide* D'Herbel. p. 227.
(6) See the Preliminary Diſcourſe before the tranſlation of the *Koran*, by Mr. Sale, p. 69.
(7) *Koran*, chap. 41. p. 391.

Saado'ddawla, a man of very agreeable converſation, inſinuated himſelf ſo far into the good graces of Arghun Khân, that the chief affairs of the Empire depended on his favour and credit. This man greatly advanced thoſe of his own nation, preferring ſeveral of them to poſts of power and truſt, by which means their intereſt equalled that of the Chriſtians, which was very conſiderable under the Mogol Emperors of this race (*f*), and the Mohammedans, who had begun to raiſe their heads in the laſt reign, were deprived of all offices, diſcountenanced, and at length forbidden to appear at court: nay ſome pretend that Arghun had promiſed the Chriſtians to convert the temple of Mecca into a church, and that images ſhould be worſhipped there inſtead of the true God; but Divine Providence, ſay the Moſlems, prevented the execution of ſo impious a deſign, the Emperor falling ſick about this time of the illneſs of which he died. Saado'ddawla lived not quite ſo long as his maſter, being aſſaſſinated by his enemies under pretence of having poiſoned Arghun, who had the mortification to hear the news of his favourite's tragical end when near his laſt agony. This Prince died in the year 690 (*g*), having reigned about ſeven years. After his death the Tartars took the opportunity of revenging themſelves on the Jews, whoſe high credit they had beheld with an evil eye, by maſſacring great numbers of them, on a ſuſpicion, as was given out at leaſt, of their being acceſſary to the Emperor's death. Arghun Khan is allowed to have been valiant and of great agility of body. Some Hiſtorians charge him with tyranny and cruelty; but others commend him for his great juſtice and moderation: however the Mohammedan writers agree to place his death among the moſt ſignal acts of Providence in favour of their Religion, which had greatly ſuffered in his reign (*h*). Y.

(*f*) See the Article of GAYUC KHAN.

(*g*) A. C. 1291.

(*h*) Abu'lfeda, Khondemir, *apud* D'Herbel. *Bibl. Orient.* Art. ARGOUN KHAN.

☞ ARGONNE (NOEL D'), an eminent Carthuſian Monk, and Author of a celebrated Treatiſe *concerning the method of reading of the Fathers of the Church* [*A*], was born at Paris, as we are informed by Mr. du Pin (*a*); and was a Monk of the Monaſtry of Gaillon in the Dioceſe of Roan. He publiſhed the work abovementioned in the year 1688, but it was afterwards reprinted with very conſiderable additions in 1697. It appeared from thence, that this Author was a man of good taſte, ſagacity, and judgment. He was ſuppoſed to have been the Author of the *Mêlanges d'Hiſtoire & de Literature*, publiſhed under the fictitious name of Monſieur *de Vigneul-Marville* at Roan. But Mr. Du Pin (*b*) is of opinion, that this book was not written by a perſon, whoſe profeſſion excluded him from all commerce with the world. But it is abſolutely affirmed in the Paris edition of Moreri in 1732, that he was actually the Author of the *Mêlanges*, and that the extenſive converſation which he had with the Men of Letters, before he entered himſelf into the Order

(*a*) *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* tom. 19. p. 352. edit. Amſterdam 1715.

(*b*) Pag. 354.

[*A*] *Author of a celebrated treatiſe concerning the reading of the Fathers.*] The firſt Edition of it was divided into two parts; in the former of which the Author treated of the diſpoſitions neceſſary for a perſon in order to receive advantage by reading the Fathers. The firſt and moſt neceſſary is to read them with the ſame ſpirit, with which they were written, with charity and humility, without which even ſacred ſtudies are abſolutely profane. Beſides theſe virtues of the mind, there are ſeveral other qualifications both natural and acquired requiſite. It is neceſſary to have a conſiderable ſhare of genius, to underſtand the languages, criticiſm, Philoſophy, hiſtory, and the laws, and to be able to explain one Science by another. The ſecond part ſhews the method proper to be obſerved in reading of the Fathers. The ſubject of their writings may be ranged under four heads, the Interpretation of Scripture, Doctrines of Faith, Chriſtian Morality, and the Diſcipline of the Church. The ſecond Edition of this work is as large again as the former, and divided into four parts. The firſt is concerning the authority of the Fathers. The name of Fathers may be applied to the writers of the twelve firſt centuries. The Author divides them into three ages. The firſt contains thoſe of the three firſt centuries; the ſecond thoſe of the three following ages; and the laſt extends to the thirteenth century, in which School-Divinity was eſtabliſhed. He pays ſo much the greater regard to the Fathers of the firſt age, as they lived nearer to the Apoſtles time. He is of opinion, that no leſs deference is to be paid to thoſe of the ſecond age in the eſſential points of faith, which they have maintained with equal learning and eloquence. And with reſpect to the Fathers of the third age, which have neither the antiquity nor the learning of the two former, he ſuppoſes that they have the ſame advantages with them, ſince they have faithfully collected what the others had ſown. The Proteſtants have ſometimes rejected, and at other times admitted the authority of the Fathers. The Roman Catholic Divines are divided with regard to their authority. Some of the latter have put them on an equality with the canonical Writers themſelves. Cardinal Cajetan affirmed, that in interpreting the ſcripture, we ought, without any regard to the character of perſons, to rely upon thoſe, who were moſt capable of explaining the ſenſe of it. Others have taken the middle way, and declared that there are ſome occaſions, when the opinions of the Fathers can only paſs for mere conjectures, and only form a kind of probability; but upon other occaſions, when they determine unanimouſly upon a point of doctrine, their conſent is an infallible proof of the truth, and it is not lawful to recede from their deciſions. St. Auſtin and St. Jerom were of opinion, that it was allowed to examine the ſentiments of the Fathers, who lived before them, and that there were none but the Canonical Writers, to whom an entire ſubmiſſion of mind was due. Vincentius Lirinenſis lays it down as a certain maxim, that we ought to hold every thing as indubitable, which the Fathers have maintained and taught in points of faith unanimouſly, clearly, and without ever contradicting it. The errors, which ſome of the Fathers have committed, do not deſtroy their authority. Several of them have eſpouſed opinions, which are not approved of. Some of them were Millenarians; others, as Clemens Alexandrinus, adopted the falſe imaginations of the Pagans; but they all agree in the eſſentials of religion. They had not a very extenſive knowledge of the Sciences and Languages; which are of uſe to a Divine. Logic, Grammar, Chronology, and Geography ought not to be neglected; but then they ſhould not be raiſed ſo high, as to make religion depend upon them. St. Auſtin did not underſtand the languages; and therefore he is never conſulted with regard to the hiſtory or letter of the ſcripture. There are difficulties in the Fathers. The ſtyle of Tertullian is ſo very peculiar and unaccountable, that Salmaſius aſſures us, that there was not a ſingle perſon, who could underſtand perfectly his Book *de Pallio*. St. Epiphanius has ſo little perſpicuity, that it is difficult to penetrate into the ſenſe of him. St. Hilary has a great deal of affectation in his ſentiments and expreſſions. It is a prodigious taſk to diſtinguiſh in the polemical works of theſe ancient wri-

Order of St. Bruno, was the occaſion that he received even after his retirement an infinite number of Letters, and other little pieces, containing a variety of curious obſervations with

ters the principal point, which they intend from the incidental ones, which they treat of. They quote ſometimes paſſages out of ſcripture by memory, without troubling themſelves to give the expreſs terms. They make uſe of Apocryphal books; and ſome of them give the title of Canonical to thoſe only, which were received by the Jews. St. Jerom has inſerted in his writings paſſages from ſuſpected Authors, and made uſe of the works of Heretics, and their explications of ſcripture. He has vindicated his conduct in this point by alledging, that Heretics are not Heretics every where; and that a great many valuable things are to be found in their books, which we ought to make the proper uſe of. The Fathers ſometimes alledge the teſtimonies of the Heathens after the example of St. Paul, who cites profane Authors in his diſcourſe to the Corinthians. The Author concludes this firſt part with explaining the reaſons, which occaſion'd the forging of ſuppoſititious books. The ſecond part is that which was placed in the beginning of the firſt Edition of this work. He treats there of the neceſſity of School-Divinity in order to read the Fathers. By School-Divinity he does not mean the art of diſputing upon all ſubjects, but a real ſcience founded upon the ſtrength of reaſoning, and digeſted into order. From the earlieſt times the church had ſchools, in which the ſcriptures were taught. The ancient Fathers were Logicians; and St. Auſtin wrote a piece upon that art. In the ſeventh century Tayon Biſhop of Saragoſſa compiled a ſum of Divinity from St. Auſtin and Pope Gregory the Great. St. John Damaſcenus publiſhed in the following age a Body of Divinity under the title of *the Orthodox Faith*. This method opened a way for School-Divinity, which began to appear in the Weſt towards the end of the eleventh century under the care of St. Anſelm, who wrote concerning *the Doctrines of Faith*. Peter Lombard publiſhed in the following century a ſyſtem of Divinity drawn from the ſcriptures and the Fathers; which afterwards gave occaſion to an infinite number of commentators. This School-Divinity afterwards degenerated into a ſett of mere ſubtleties, which were unworthy to be taught in Chriſtian ſchools. In this manner d'Argonne traces up the original and progreſs of School-Divinity, which the reader may compare with what we have already obſerved in the article of AQUINAS, note [*E*]. He tells us afterwards, that the ſtudy of the Scriptures is neceſſary to the underſtanding of the Fathers. He thinks it proper, that we ſhould know the Author of every one of the ſacred books; that in order to explain his work, we ſhould be acquainted with his peculiar character and manner of writing; that we ſhould attend to what precedes and what follows, in order to ſee the full ſenſe of a paſſage. He directs us, to examine whether the copy be corrupted or not; and obſerves that Lucas Bragenſis Dean of St. Omers has given us an account that notwithſtanding all the care, which had been taken by two eminent Popes in the edition of the Vulgate Tranſlation, there are ſtill in it above four thouſand paſſages, which want to be reviſed; which Bellarmin, who took care of the edition of Pope Clement VIII, could not venture to deny. Eccleſiaſtical and Profane Hiſtory is likewiſe neceſſary in order to underſtand the Fathers. If we want to have a clear idea of what St. Athanaſius, St. Auſtin, and St. Optatus have written againſt the Arians, Pelagians and Donatiſts, it is requiſite to read what the Hiſtorians have given us an account of concerning the genius and manners of thoſe hereticks. To know the Hiſtory of the Martyrs it is neceſſary to know that of the Emperors. The Hiſtory of Julian written by Ammianus Marcellinus confirms what St. Gregory Nazianzen has ſaid concerning the levity and inconſtancy of that Emperor. And here the Author lays down rules for the ſtudying of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. He ſpeaks likewiſe of the manuſcripts and editions of the Fathers; and quotes ſeveral curious books, as that of Henry Stephens *de Origine mundorum*, that of Poſtellus *de duodecim Linguis*; and that of Duretus *de Linguis & Characteribus omnium Linguarum*. The *third* part of this work of d'Argonne contains the method of reading the Fathers. The little order, which is obſerved in reading, is the occaſion, that very ſmall advantage is gained by it. The Author remarks, that the Fathers themſelves are defective in point of order and method. There are two things to be obſerved in reading them: the firſt is to read them according to the order of time, and the ſecond to do it according to the difference of their ſubjects. Some perſons are of opinion, that we ſhould read them all; others, that we ſhould make a proper choice of them. The Author follows the diviſion, which he had marked in the firſt edition of the four kinds of works of the Fathers. With regard to the literal explanation of the Scripture, he acknowledges, that moſt of them have not confined themſelves to it. With relation to the explication of the Scripture concerning Doctrines of Faith, the Author obſerves, that the Fathers, who wrote before the hereſy of Pelagius, ſpoke in very ſtrong terms of free-will; and that thoſe, who wrote againſt the Pelagians, have expreſſed themſelves very poſitively in favour of Grace. However that there is no contradiction between them, and though they have explained themſelves in a different manner, their doctrine is the ſame. He mentions the critical works of the Fathers, which may be of uſe in underſtanding the Bible, as the *Philocalia* of Origen, the treatiſe *of the Chriſtian Doctrine* of St. Auſtin, the *Synopſis* of St. Athanaſius, and the Letters and Prefaces of St. Jerom. He prefers this laſt to all the other Fathers with regard to the explanation of the letter of the Scripture. The works of the Fathers with reſpect to Doctrines, are either Catecheſes, or Homilies, or Letters, or Treatiſes. Their Catecheſes contain only a plain Expoſition of Faith. Their Homilies were addreſſed either to believers alone, or in general to all, who were preſent. The fathers ſpeak more explicitly in the former, and obſerve more caution in the latter. The Author has a great deal of regard for the Letters of the Fathers, and directs that they ſhould be read with great attention. He adviſes, that we ſhould begin the reading of their works with thoſe againſt the Pagans; to proceed then to their treatiſes againſt the Jews; and afterwards to thoſe againſt Hereticks. When we find in them ſome paſſages clear, and others obſcure, we ſhould take care to explain the latter by the former; upon which occaſion he mentions ſeveral rules drawn from Father Petavius, and the Treatiſe *concerning the Perpetuity of the Faith of the Euchariſt*. He excepts particularly againſt the conduct of thoſe, who conſult the modern Caſuiſts rather than the Fathers in points of morality. He recommends upon this ſubject the reading of the *Pedagogue* of St. Clemens Alexandrinus, the Letters of St. Paulinus, St. Auſtin, and St. Bernard, the Treatiſe of St. Auſtin againſt Lying, the Letters of St. Baſil, the Paradoxes of St. Chryſoſtom, the Letters of St. Jerom, and the Morals of St. Gregory. With relation to Diſcipline, it is proper to read the Canons of the Councils, and the Canonical Letters of the Fathers. The Author obſerves, that a great many points of diſcipline have been changed; that there are ſome practices founded merely upon errors; that ſome have been transferred from the old Law into the new, and others, which have been derived from the cuſtoms of the Pagans; in ſhort, that there are others, which ſprung from the concupiſcence of carnal men, or the ignorance and ſuperſtition of the weak. Theſe laſt are ſuch abuſes as the Church ſometimes ſuffers, but which it never can approve of. The *fourth* part is concerning the uſe which we ought to make of the Fathers. The Author adviſes, that we ſhould not undertake to read more than we can conveniently perform; that our ſtudies ſhould be regulated in a proper manner, and we ſhould read with attention. He takes notice of the manner of making collections, and of the different views which we may have in making them. He commends the editions of the Fathers publiſhed by the Benedictins. He propoſes for a model of obſervations thoſe of Father Petavius upon St. Epiphanius, and extolls the Diſſertations of Father Queſnel upon St. Leo. He does not even omit the tranſlations of the works of the Fathers, and ſhews the uſe, which may be made of them. The Author promiſed another work, in which he deſigned to treat with great exactneſs of the Divinity of the ancient and modern Writers. T.

with regard to History and Literature, which he afterwards formed into that work, in which we meet with a great deal of useful and agreeable knowledge. There have been four editions of that book, the last of which was published in three volumes at Paris 1725, with Additions and Corrections, since the death of D'Argonne. There was ascribed to him likewise a piece intitled *L'Education de Moncade*, printed in 12°. in 1691. He died at Paris in the year 1705 (c).

(c) Idem ibid.

(a) And not *Argirophilus*, nor *Argyrophylus*, as in Moreri.

ARGYROPYLUS (a) (JOHN) a native of Constantinople, retired into Italy, whilst the Turks ravaged all Greece [A]. He was very well received by Cosmo de Medicis, who made him Tutor to his son and his grandson Laurence (b), and Professor of Greek in the city of Florence. He testified his gratitude in the translation that he made of the *Physics* and of the *Ethics of Aristotle*. He had a particular happiness in this work, since Theodore Gaza, who had made a version of the same Author, threw it into the fire, that he might not prejudice the fortune of Argyropylus his good friend. Gaza surpassed him in eloquence, his version had infallibly obscured the other; and, as he was not ignorant of the ambition of Argyropylus, he made a sacrifice to him, which, considering his humour, did not cost him much. He was a man who did not care either for praises or money. Argyropylus's discourses offended and tired learned men, especially when he maintained that Cicero was ignorant of Greek. He left Tuscany in a time of pestilence, and went to Rome, and there read Lectures upon the Greek text of Aristotle. He had a considerable salary; but as he loved to eat a great deal, and to drink as much; and as his constitution was able to bear it, he spent all that he got. Thus what has been reported of his corpulency will easily be believed [B]. He died at the age of seventy years of a fever that he got by eating too many melons (c). He shewed a great deal of constancy when one of his sons was killed at Rome (d). See concerning the order that Pope Paul II gave to pursue the murderers, and about the funerals of the deceased, the CCth Letter of the Cardinal of Pavia, pag. 620. It has been observed that he was the first of the Greeks who taught Philosophy in that city [C]. He disputed with much warmth, and had a very extensive knowledge. He left one son, who was an excellent Musician (e). The judgments they have made of his translations differ extremely from one another [D].

(b) And not his *Nephew*, as in Moreri.

(c) Taken from Paulus Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 27.

(d) Petrus Alcyonius, *in Medice Legato priore*, pag. 25.

(e) *Obiit relicto filio Isacio, nobili Musico.* Volat. lib. 21. p. 776.

[A] *He retired into Italy, whilst the Turks ravaged all Greece.*] I did not dare to say with Moreri, that he retired into Italy, after they had conquered Constantinople; for I have two reasons to doubt of that. One is, that Paulus Jovius, says Argyropylus, was driven into Italy by the same storm that forced Theodore Gaza to retire thither (1). Now he observes that this Theodore fled thither, when Amurath made all Greece tremble with his victorious arms. *Amurathe Græciam omnem victricibus armis quatiente in Italiam venit* (2). This intimates that Argyropylus quitted his country before the city of Constantinople had been taken by the Ottomans. My second reason is, that he addressed a *Treatise of Consolation* to the Emperor of Constantinople. I acknowledge that, to make a good argument of this, I should prove that he composed this piece in Italy; and I confess, that I cannot prove it. So I give you this observation, only as a motive to continue in suspence. Paulus Jovius is greatly to be blamed for his neglecting Chronology so much as he does in his Elogies; for it would have been easy for him to discover the date of the offices, the voyages, and the death of his illustrious men. But this by the by. Vossius observes, that this *Treatise* of Argyropylus, and his *Monody*, and his book *de Regno*, and his *Parallels between the ancient and modern Princes*, are in the Library of the most Christian King (3). Moreri, who had never seen these works, affirms nevertheless, that the Author dedicated them to the glory of the House de Medicis. Why did not he content himself with affirming that concerning the versions of Aristotle? for his Guide goes no farther (4).

(1) Paulus Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 27. pag. 64.

(2) Idem, ibid. cap. 26. p. 61.

(3) Vossius, *de Histor. Græcis*, lib. 4. cap. 19. pag. 493.

(4) Paulus Jovius, *Elogior.* cap. 27.

[B] *What has been reported of his corpulency, will easily be believed.*] Let us quote Paulus Jovius. *Vini & cibi æquè avidus & capax, & multo abdomine ventricosus; immodico melopeponum esu autumnalem accersivit febrem, atque ita septuagesimo ætatis anno ereptus est* (5). i. e. "He was greedy both in eating and "drinking, and could bear a prodigious deal. His "belly was very protuberant, and by eating melons "immoderately, he got an autumnal fever, and so "was taken off in the seventieth year of his age." To die of too much eating is a scandalous thing for any rational creature; but more so for a man of letters. It would have been more for the honour of Argyropylus to have died of hunger or fasting. But however let us not take the enormous bulk of his belly,

(5) Idem, ibid. pag. 65.

for a reason to oppose those who praise him as an ingenious person. The success of such a dispute would be very uncertain. See the collections which I shall exhibit in the notes on the article GORGIAS.

[C] *It has been observed that he was the first of the Greeks who taught Philosophy at Rome.*] I am going to quote his disciple, Politian: I read these words of Hornius: *Primus ex Græcis Romæ Philosophiam professus fuit Argyropylus, cujus sectatorem se fuisse memorat Angelus Politianus Miscel. cap. 1. eumque cum literarum Latinarum minime incuriosum, tum sapientiæ decretorum, disciplinarumque aded cunctarum quæ Cyclicæ à Martiano dicuntur, eruditissimum illis temporibus habitum atque in disputando acerrimum* (6). i. e. "Argyropylus was the first of the Greeks that profes- "sed Philosophy at Rome, whose follower Angelus "Politianus; in the first chapter of his *Miscellanies*, re- "lates himself to have been: and adds that he was "no incurious person in Latin; that he was greatly "skilled in Philosophy, Law and the whole circle of "Sciences, and a very sharp disputant in them."

(6) Hornius, *Historia Philos.* lib. 6. cap. 6. pag. 304, 305.

[D] *The judgments they have made of his translations differ extremely from one another.*] Thuanus observes, that Perion having a mind to depart from the method of Argyropylus, threw himself into another extreme. He found that Argyropylus had translated *Aristotle* more faithfully than elegantly; therefore he undertook a translation capable of pleasing those who love fine Latin; but by attaching himself too much to the elegance of the style, he came to be accused of not following the sense of the Author. *Is* (Joachimus Perionius) *cum Aristotelem hactenus à Johanne Argyropylo fideliter potius quàm ornatè versum auribus Latinis proponendum statuisset, dum elegantioris stili potius quàm veri rationem plerumque Ciceroni suo addictus habet, in contrariam ab Argyropylo reprehensionem incidit* (7). That judgment amounts to this: the translations of Argyropylus are faithful, but without beauty and ornaments. Others judge of them after a quite contrary manner; for they say we find in them more elegance than fidelity, and blame him for not having translated his original word for word, "as it is the "duty of those, who translate the holy Scriptures and "Aristotle." *Aliquot Aristotelis libros convertit magis eleganter quàm fideliter; cum in hoc Philosopho haud aliter quàm in sacris literis verbum verbo reddere oporteat* (8). If we consult a Professor of Louvain, we shall find this judgment of Volaterranus to be ill

(7) Thuan. *Hist.* lib. 23. pag. 472, *ad ann.* 1559.

(8) Volater. lib. 21. pag. 776.

grounded,

ARIARATHES, the name of ſeveral Kings of Cappadocia. See the Article of CAPPADOCIA.

ARIGONI (POMPEIUS) Cardinal and Archbiſhop of Benevento, was born at Rome in the year 1552. Whilſt he was of the number of the Conſiſtory-Advocates, he pleaded the cauſes of Philip II King of Spain. He harangued under the Pontificate of Sixtus V, to ſhew that the bleſſed Diego de Alcala ſhould be canoniſed. He was made an Auditor *de Rota* in the year 1591, and Cardinal in 1596, and exerciſed the office of Datary under Leo XI, and Paul V. The Archbiſhoprick of Benevento was conferred on him by this laſt Pope. He died the 4th of April 1616, at the Grecian Tower near Naples, whither he had retired for change of air. His corps was carried to Benevento, where his nephew erected a marble monument for him in the metropolitan church. Beſides the Oration I mentioned before, which was printed by Peter Galeſini (*a*), there are ſome *Latin Letters* of our Pompey among thoſe of John Baptiſta Lauri. As for his *Deciſions of the Rota* they are only in manuſcript in the cloſets of many learned men. Charles Carthari gives him great praiſes in his liſt of Conſiſtory Advocates (*b*).

(*a*) *In Libello pro Canonizatione B. Didaci Complutenſis. Vide etiam* Franciſcum Pegna, *in Vitâ ejuſdem* Didaci.

(*b*) *Ex Bibliothecâ Romanâ Proſperi Mandoſii.*

grounded, we ſhall ſee that Argyropylus attached himſelf more ſervilely to the words than to the thoughts of Ariſtotle, and that his tranſlations cannot be accounted either faithful, or elegant. Theſe are the words of this Profeſſor: *Superiori ſeculo, quidam verba verbis ita admenſi ſunt, ut ſententiam depravârint, non aliter quam indocti pictores, qui operoſi in cultu effingendo, membra ſecundum veſtem diſtorquent: quum Apelles Parrhaſiique prius nudum corpus efformare, quam amictum ſuperinducere ſoleant. In quorum numero Argyropylum reponas & Ruffinum, alterum interpretem Ariſtotelis, alterum Gregorii Nazianzeni, de quibus ferè ad hemiſtichii dici poteſt:* Dant fine mente ſonum. *Fit autem illud vel ex inſcitia, vel ex κακοζηλία, quum enim ſententiam apprehendere nequeunt, verba reddunt, quaſi quod ipſi non intellexerint, alius ex illorum verbis intelligere queat, cum verba non minus ex ſententia vim ſuam & ſignificatum accipiant, quam ſententiam conſtituant. Aliqui rurſus fidem exiſtimant à numero verborum non diſcedere* (9). i. e. "In the laſt age, ſome "meaſured out their tranſlations word for word in "ſuch a manner that they corrupted the ſenſe, like "ſome unſkilful Painters, who being very laborious "about the drapery, diſtort the members to make "them ſuit the garments: whereas Apelles and Par"rhaſius uſed to draw the naked body before they "put on the cloaths. In which number Argyropy"lus and Ruffinus may be reckoned, of whom the "firſt tranſlated Ariſtotle, and the other Gregory Na"zianzen, and who may almoſt have that hemiſtich "applied to them; *They give a ſound without a mean*"*ing*. Now this is done either thro' ignorance or a "falſe zeal, for when they cannot underſtand a ſen"tence, they tranſlate the words, as if another could "underſtand from their words what they do not "underſtand themſelves; whereas words receive their "force and ſignification from a ſentence, as well "as compoſe it. Others again think that to be "faithful it is neceſſary not to depart from the number "of words." Some learned men pretend, that Argyropylus was accuſed of confining himſelf to the words of the original; and, if he could not take the thought and the ſenſe of his Author, *of having recourſe to a round of words that mean nothing* (10). I queſtion its being exactly as Nannius has ſaid. Huetius agrees with the opinion of Thuanus (11); and conſequently condemns that of Volaterranus. He condemns Paulus Jovius alſo, who has preferred Gaza's verſions to thoſe of Argyropylus; and declares, that if the former is more eloquent, the latter is more faithful. *Non efficies quin major quidem eloquentiæ laus Gazæ, accuratè autem interpretandi Argyropylo debeatur* (12). See above, in the note [*B*] of the article of DONATUS ACCIAIOLI, and admire the diverſity of theſe judgments.

(9) Petrus Nannius, *Alcmariamus, in Collegio Buſlidiano apud Lovanienſes Latinus Profeſſor, Συμμίκτων*, lib. 1. cap. 3. p. 6.

(10) *See* Mr. Baillet, *Jugem. des Sçavans*, tom. 4. num. 814. pag. 355.

(11) Huetius, *claris Interpretibus*, pag. 239.

(12) Idem, ibid.

ARIMANIUS, one of the principal Divinities of the Perſians. This nation owed its Philoſophy to Zoroaſter, of whom the Manichees revived one of the moſt fundamental doctrines, which was, that there are two firſt principles, the one of good, the other of evil. The Perſians named *Oromaſdes* the Divinity, whom they acknowledged for the principle of all good, and for the author of the firſt ſtate wherein things were produced; and they called *Arimanius* the Divinity whom they acknowledged for the principle of evil, and for the author of the corruption into which the firſt nature is fallen. They ſay that *Oromaſdes* having produced the good ſpirits and the ſtars, ſhut them up in an egg [*A*], and that *Arimanius* produced the evil genii who broke this egg; whence proceeded the confuſion and mixture of good and evil. They add, that at laſt, after many combats, wherein the victory ſhall be ſometimes on one ſide and ſometimes on the other, *Oromaſdes* ſhall entirely overcome *Arimanius*, and utterly deſtroy him, which will be followed by a great

[*A*] *Oromaſdes . . . . ſhut up the Stars in an egg.*] I have mentioned in another place (1), that I would ſay ſomething here concerning the egg, which, according to the ancient Heathen Theology, ſerved to produce beings, when the chaos was cleared up. I ſay then, that according to the Phœnicians, the obſcure air, and the chaos were the principle of all things. This obſcure air is, without doubt, the ſame thing that others call night, and to which they aſcribe the generation of an egg, from which love and mankind proceeded. Τίκτει πρώτιστον νὺξ ἡ μελανόπτερος ὠόν (2). We may explain this ingeniouſly of the earth, and adjuſt it to the words of Moſes, by ſuppoſing that the groſſeſt parts of this obſcure and thick air precipitated themſelves upon the circumference of the abyſs, where they found a fat and glutinous ſcum, with which they entangled themſelves, to form together a ſort of mud, which hardening itſelf became the habitable earth (3). Some of the ancients have ſaid that a dove, ſitting upon an egg, had produced Venus or Love. *Verba citat Grotius ex Nigidio in Scholiaſten Germanici, ovum miræ magnitudinis quod volventes ejecerunt in terram, atque ita columbam inſedisſe, & poſt aliquot dies excluſiſſe Deam Syriæ quæ vocatur Venus* (4). Lucius Ampelius ſaid that it was a fiſh's egg: *Ovum piſcis columbam adſedisſe dies plurimos, & excluſiſſe Deam Benignam* (5). Dr. Burnet by the egg underſtands the chaos, by the dove the Holy Spirit, and by Venus the earth (6). But methinks he ſhould not confine this Venus that comes out of the egg to the production only of the earth. It ſeems rather to expreſs the univerſe. The Doctor obſerves, that the egg was a very ſacred thing in the myſteries of Bacchus, on account of its conformity with the Being, that engenders and encloſes every thing in itſelf: Ὡς μίμημα τοῦ τὰ πάντα γιγνόμενος καὶ περιέχοντος ἐν ἑαυτῷ (7). He does not forget to obſerve that the expreſſion of Moſes alludes to the action of fowls when they ſit. *Huic doctrinæ de Ovo mundano datæque interpretationi tacitè favere mihi videtur* incubatio Spiritus Sancti *in abyſſum, de qua Moſes in prima telluris productione, ubi ad ovum manifeſto alluditur* (8).

(1) In the note [*A*] of the article ADAM.

(2) Ariſtophanes, *apud* T. Burnetium, *Tell. Theor. Sacr.* lib. 2. cap. 7. p. 243.

(3) This is what Dr. Burnet does, ibid. p. 244.

(4) Idem, ibid. pag. 259.

(5) Idem, ibid.

(6) Idem, ibid.

(7) *Ex Plutarchi Sympoſ.* lib. 2. Qu. 3.

(8) Burnet. *Telluris Theoria Sacra*, p. 286.

great happineſs for mankind, and with a very advantageous charge, which will cauſe the body of man to become tranſparent, and preſerve itſelf without nouriſhment (a).

(a) Taken from the *Telluris Theoria Sacra* (*Theory of the Earth*) of Dr. T. Burnet, book 2. chap. 10. pag. 289, 290: he quotes Plutarch. *de Iſide & Oſiride.*

What I have juſt now ſaid was taken out of an author, who had borrowed it from Plutarch, whoſe paſſage I ſhall relate entirely in another place (b). It is obſerved that the King of Perſia, ſeeing Themiſtocles taking refuge under his protection, beſought Arimanius always to inſpire his enemies with ſuch thoughts, that they ſhould baniſh their braveſt men (c); which is a proof that the Perſians looked upon Arimanius as a Divinity that delighted only in doing evil [B]. They meant without doubt the ſame Divinity, when, upon the complaints that Darius made againſt the Perſian Dæmon, when he heard that the Queen his wife died a priſoner of Alexander; it was anſwered him, *with regard to the honours of Sepulture, &c. you have no reaſon to accuſe the evil genius of the nation* (d). *There was nothing of their firſt fortune wanting either to your wife, to your mother, or your children, but to ſee your light, which the Lord Oromaſdes will reſtore to its ſplendor* (e). We may ſee in theſe words the oppoſition that the Perſians made between Oromaſdes and Arimanius.

(b) In the note [C] of the article MANICHEES, and in the note [E] of the article ZOROASTER.

(c) Plutarch. *in Themiſt.* p. 126.

(d) Τὸν αὐτῶν δαίμονα. Plutarch *in Alexandro*, p. 682.

(e) Idem, ibid.

[B] *The Perſians look'd upon Arimanius as a Divinity that delighted only in doing evil.*] If any one would deny me this, he might object that the King of Perſia was greatly delighted with having gained Themiſtocles: wherefore he muſt have thought that it was a great happineſs to his land, that ſuch perſons were baniſhed from their own country, and took refuge in his court. Thus when he prayed Arimanius to inſpire his enemies with the reſolution of baniſhing the braveſt of their citizens, he aſked a particular favour of him; and conſequently he look'd on him as a beneficent being in ſome reſpects to the Perſians. I anſwer that this reaſoning does not prove what it intends. This Monarch did not differ from the ſentiments of his Divines: he conſidered Arimanius only as a being that did evil: he aſked of him the baniſhment of the great men of Greece, only as it was prejudicial to that country. It was an action ſuitable to the diſpoſition of Arimanius, as it was unjuſt and pernicious to the cities which baniſhed them: but ſo far as it benefitted the Perſians, it was diſagreeable to him; and it was not under this notion that he entreated him to operate. In a word, to remove this objection, it is ſufficient to ſay, that the affairs of the world being ſo mingled, that ordinarily ſpeaking one country reaps advantage from the misfortune of another, Arimanius could hardly do any thing that was purely and ſimply pernicious: there always aroſe ſome advantage from it, either by accident, or ſome other way. But as he did a thing, only on account of the evil that he ſaw in it, one cannot pretend that he was the principle of any good. He would have hindred, if he could, the Perſians from gaining any advantage by the prejudice of the Athenians. Thus it is true that the prayer, of which we are ſpeaking, does not prove that he is to be look'd upon any otherwiſe than as a Being, that delighted only in doing harm.

ARIMINI (GREGORY Dr.) See RIMINI.

ARION, an admirable horſe, and much more famous in Poetic Hiſtory, than Bucephalus in the Hiſtory of Alexander. They ſpeak variouſly of his origin, although they agree in giving him a divine one. Some ſay that Neptune, being willing to procure to men the ſervices that horſes were capable of doing them, ſtruck the ground in Theſſaly with his trident, and cauſed ſuddenly two horſes to come out of it, one of which was our Arion (a). Others ſay that Neptune, diſputing with Minerva who ſhould name the city of Athens, the Gods ſaid, that thoſe who made the beſt preſent to men, ſhould give the name to this city; upon that Neptune ſtruck the ſhore, and made a horſe come out of it [A]; but Minerva produced an olive tree, and carried the victory, becauſe they judged that peace, of which the olive tree is the ſymbol, is better than war, for which the horſe is proper. There are ſome, who pretend that the horſe which was produced on this occaſion, was named *Arion*; others ſay that this horſe had Ceres for his mother and Neptune for his father (b). This Goddeſs wandring about the world to look for her daughter, met Neptune, who ſpoke earneſtly of love to her; ſo that, as ſhe did not think proper to ſatisfy him, ſhe thought fit to take the form of a mare. This was done near the city of Oncium in Arcadia. It was in vain for Ceres to feed among other animals; Neptune did not fail of diſcerning her, and enjoying her in the form of a horſe. She was angry at firſt, but being afterwards appeaſed, ſhe waſhed her ſelf in a neighbouring river. She had by Neptune not only a daughter, whoſe name was not lawful to be told the prophane, but alſo our horſe Arion. Some ſay that ſhe was under the form of a Fury, when Neptune impregnated her with this horſe: or that in effect a Fury procreated him from the embrace of Neptune [B]. The Poet Antimachus, quoted by Pauſanias, gives him no other origin than the earth in Arcadia; but Quintus Calaber makes him the ſon

(a) Lutatius *in Statii Theb.* lib. 4. ver. 43.

(b) Pauſan. lib. 8. pag. 257.

[A] *Neptune diſputing with Minerva who ſhould name the city of Athens .... ſtruck the ſhore, and made a horſe come out of it.*] Servius informs us of this upon the words of Virgil:

. . . . . *Tuque ô, cui prima frementem*
Fudit equum magno tellus percuſſa tridenti
Neptuno (1)

That is,

"And thou, whoſe trident ſtruck the teeming earth,
"And made a paſſage for the courſer's birth."

Dryden.

See alſo Probus upon the ſame paſſage of Virgil.

(1) Virgil. *Georg.* lib. 1. ver. 12.

[B] *Some ſay that Ceres was under the form of a Fury, when Neptune impregnated her with this horſe, or that in effect a Fury procreated him from the embrace of Neptune.*] Theſe are the ſentiments of Apollodorus and of Heſychius. Here follow their words. Τοῦτον δὲ Ποσειδῶνος ἵππον Δημήτηρ ἐποιήσατο Ἐρινύι κατὰ τὴν συνουσίαν (2). i. e. "Ceres brought him forth, being in the "form of Erynnys at the time of her being embraced "by Neptune." Ἄρειον ὁ ἵππος Ποσειδῶνος υἱός, ἐ μῆτερ αὐτῶ Ἐρινύς (3). i. e. "Arion the horſe, the ſon of "Neptune and Erynnys." Barthius has confounded the opinion of Apollodorus with that of Heſychius. *Unius ex Erynnibus* (ſays he (4), *fabulam aſſentitur Apollodoro Heſychius Lexicographus.* This expreſſes that Apollodorus relates that Arion was born of one of the furies; but he ſays expreſly, that Ceres was the mother

(2) Apollodor. *Bibliothec.* l. 3.

(3) Heſychius.

(4) Barth. *in Stat.* Part 1. pag. 899.

ſon

ſon of the wind Zephyrus and of a Harpy [C]. However, it is believed that he was nurſed by the Nereïds [D], and that being ſometimes yoked with the Sea-Horſes of Neptune to the Chariot of this God, he had drawn him with incredible ſwiftneſs thro' all the ſeas (c). He had this ſingularity in him, that his right feet reſembled thoſe of a man (d). Hercules mounted him, when he took the city of Elis, and afterwards preſented him to Adraſtus. This is what Pauſanias tells us, who adds that Antimachus made Adraſtus the third poſſeſſor of him [E]. Heſiod repreſents him in the ſervice of Hercules in the combat againſt Cygnus (e). Statius ſays in general that he ſerved Hercules in his travels, and that afterwards the Gods gave him to Adraſtus (f). Probus aſcribes to Neptune all the honour of this preſent (g). It is under this laſt maſter, that Arion has ſignalized himſelf the moſt: he won the prize for racing at the Nemean games [F], which the Princes who went to beſiege Thebes, inſtituted in the honour of Archemorus; and was the cauſe that Adraſtus did not periſh in this famous expedition, as all the other chiefs did. Apollodorus affirms it in the third Book.

(c) Stat. *Theb.* lib. 6. ver. 308.
(d) Lutat. *in Stat. Theb.* lib. 6. ver. 302.
(e) Heſiod. *in Clypeo Herculis.*
(f) Statius, *Thebaidos*, lib. 6. ver. 308.
(g) Probus, *in Virgil. Georg.* 1.

ther of this horſe, and that ſhe had only taken the form of a fury at the time of copulation. Lloyd has copied after Barthius, without correcting him in this place.

[C] *Quintus Calaber makes him the ſon of the wind Zephyrus, and of a Harpy.*] Here is a ſecond miſtake of Barthius, which Mr. Lloyd has tranſcribed into his Dictionary, juſt as he found it. *Intercedit Quintus Smyrnæus*, ſays Barthius (5), *Harpyiæ patronus, cujus fuerit potius ſeminio oriundus patre Zephyro, ingratiis etiam Neptuni*. i. e. Quintus Smyrnæus comes in the "way, a patron of the Harpy, from whoſe ſeed he "rather ſprung, having Zephyrus for his father, even "in ſpite of Neptune." There is nothing in this Poet, which expreſſes that Zephyrus and the Harpy produced Arion, either with the conſent of Neptune or without it (6).

(5) Idem, ibid.

(6) See in the 4th book, ver. 571.

[D] *It is believed that he was nurſed by the Nereïds.*] I ſhall quote only Claudian.

Si Dominus legeretur equis, tua poſceret ultro
Verbera, Nereïdum ſtabulis nutritus Arion (7).
That is,
"If the whole race of horſes ſhould accord,
"To chuſe o'er all an univerſal Lord,
"Tho' bred by Nereïds, to thy regal ſway
"The glad Arion willing would obey."

(7) Claudian. *Conſul.* 4. *Honorii*, verſ. 555. Lloyd quotes this twice.

[E] *Adraſtus was the third poſſeſſor of him.*] That was true according to the ſtory of the Scholiaſt on Homer, upon the three hundred and forty ſixth verſe of the twenty third Book of the Iliad. He ſays, that Neptune fell in love with Erynnys (8), metamorphoſed himſelf into a horſe, and had to do with her in Bœotia near the fountain Tiphlouſa; that he got this horſe upon her, which was called *Arion*, becauſe he ſurpaſſed all others; that he gave him to Capreüs King of Haliartus; that he made a preſent of him to Hercules, who gained the prize in the race with this horſe, againſt Cygnus the ſon of Mars near Trœzena; and that at laſt, Hercules made a preſent of him to Adraſtus.

(8) That is, with one of the Furies.

[F] *He won the prize for racing at the Nemean games.*] Apollodorus, in the third Book, ſays, that Adraſtus was conqueror at the horſe-race; but Statius feigns that this Prince gave his Arion to Polynices his ſon in law, and that Arion threw this new rider, and continuing to run outſtripped all the reſt; which did not hinder Amphiaraüs from carrying off the crown; for tho' he did not gain it from Arion, it was ſufficient that he had gained it from his antagoniſts, and that Polynices being thrown off his ſeat, could have no pretenſion in virtue of the ſuperior ſwiftneſs of his horſe.

Forſitan & victo prior iſſet Arione Cygnus,
Sed vetat æquoreus vinci pater: hinc vice juſta
Gloria manſit equo, ceſſit victoria vati (9).
That is,
"Cygnus perhaps Arion had out-run,
"And from the horſe divine, the race had won:
"But his earth-ſhaking father this denies,
"Gives him the glory, but the Seer the prize.

(9) Statius, *Thebaidos*, lib. 6. ver. 528.

Apollodorus allows that Amphiaraüs carried the prize at the chariot-race, ἅρμασι; which his Latin tranſlator ought to render *curru*, and not *curſu*, as Barthius has obſerved (10). As for the diſtich of Propertius, which repreſents Arion as a ſpeaking animal,

Qualis & Adraſti fuerit vocalis Arion
Triſtis ad Archemori funera victor equus (11),
That is,
"And how Adraſtus' vocal horſe became
"Sadly victorious at the fun'ral game
"Of great Archemorus,"

(10) Barth. *in Stat.* tom. 3. p. 537.

(11) Propert. *Elegia ult.* lib. 2.

I am not of opinion that we ought to underſtand ſuch a ſadneſs as Paſſerat imagines: I think the word *triſtis* relates to the misfortune of Archemorus, which occaſioned the celebration of this game; and not to the vexation of Arion, for finding himſelf made uſe of by another than Adraſtus (12).

(12) See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, July 1702, pag. 110.

ARIOSTA (LIPPA) Concubine of Opizzon, Marquis of Eſte and Ferrara, confirmed in ſuch a manner by her faithfulneſs and political ſkill, the impreſſions that her beauty had made upon the heart of this Marquis, that at laſt he made her his lawful wife, in 1352. He died in the ſame year, and left to her the adminiſtration of his dominions, in which ſhe acquitted herſelf very well, *during the minority of her eleven children. From her came all the houſe of Eſt, which ſtill ſubſiſts in the branch of the Dukes of Modena, and of Rhegio* (a) The author, from whom I borrow this, obſerves, that Lippa Arioſta *did more honour* to her family, which *is one of the nobleſt in Ferrara .... than ſhe had taken from it* [A]. There are ſome reflections upon that ſubject, in the remark which I join to this Article.

(a) Le Laboureur, *Relation du Voyage de Pologne*, Part 3. p. 172.

☞ ARIOSTO

[A] *She did more honour to her family .... than ſhe had taken from it.*] I have ſpoken already (1) of the ſingular efficacy of marriage. One cannot ſufficiently admire it; for in ſhort it changes the three different ſorts of time: the paſt is no more free from its influences, than the preſent and the future. "Do not "you admire what force and what authority cuſtom "has upon the world? With theſe words, *Ego con-* "*jungo vos*, it makes a young fellow lie with a girl, "in the ſight and with the conſent of the whole "world; and this is called *A ſacrament adminiſtred* "*by a ſacred perſon*. The ſame action, without theſe "three words, is an enormous crime, that diſhonours "a poor woman; and he that has conducted the "affair, is called a .... The father and mother, in "the firſt of theſe caſes, rejoice, dance, and carry "their daughter to bed themſelves; and in the ſe- "cond they are almoſt diſtracted, get her ſhaved, "and put her into a Nunnery. Theſe laws muſt be "confeſſed to be very pleaſant (2)." This is not the moſt

(1) In the article of ALES, note [D] immediately after the quotation (11).

(2) Buſſi Rabutin, *Letter* 136 of the 4th Part, p. 192. Holland edition.

☞ARIOSTO (LODOVICO or LEWIS), a celebrated Italian Poet of the XVIth Century was born at the caſtle of Reggio in Lombardy in the year 1474 (a), and deſcended from a good family [A]. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf when he was very young by the marks of an excellent genius, which prompted him to try his talent in Poetry, and compoſe ſeveral pieces of that kind; among which his tale of Pyramus and Thiſbe was the moſt remarkable. He formed this ſtory into a play, which was acted by his brothers and ſiſters (b). This performance of his was ſo highly applauded, that every perſon who ſaw it preſaged, that he would undoubtedly prove one of the greateſt Poets of the age, if his father had not oppoſed his inclinations, and inſiſted upon his applying himſelf to the ſtudy of the law, in order to make his fortune [B]. When he was twenty four

(a) Franceſco Sanſovino, *Vitâ di M. Lodovico Arioſto tratta dall' opere ſue medeſime*, prefixed to his edition of the *Orlando Furioſo* publiſhed at Venice in 4to, 1562.

(b) Sir John Harington's *Life of Arioſto*, publiſhed in the 3d edition of his tranſlation of the *Orlando Furioſo* at London 1634, p. 415.

moſt ſurpriſing part of the affair: the principal ſingularity conſiſts in the retroactive effect. Our Arioſta had been a concubine: her children were baſtards; it was a blemiſh upon her honour and her family: but all this was effaced, waſhed off, and annihilated by the three words of the Prieſt *Ego conjungo vos*. The Marquis of Ferrara, marrying this miſtreſs of his a little before he left the world, converted her into a woman of honour, and gave a legitimacy to his children, who legally deſerved the contrary title. A like metamorphoſis may be ſeen every day, and ſome have pretended that the very children, that are born at a time when the fathers and mothers could not be married for want of a diſpenſation, ought *to be legitimated by a ſubſequent marriage*; but the Parliament of Paris decreed againſt this pretenſion, in 1664 (3). It may be asked perhaps why this Marquis kept off till the year of his death. I could anſwer that a keeper, who perceives himſelf near his end, is much more diſpoſed to conduct himſelf in this manner, than if he had hopes of living ſtill a long while. The remorſes of conſcience, ſtirred up either of themſelves, or by the diſcourſes of a Caſuiſt, are more lively, when one is afraid of dying: ſo that we make the leſs difficulty about going thro' a troubleſome ceremony that appeaſes them. Add to this, that a great Lord, being ſollicited to marriage, by a miſtreſs he is fond of, may imagine ſhe will be a thouſand times more complaiſant and faithful, whilſt ſhe flatters herſelf with the hopes of obtaining the character of a lawful wife; and that when ſhe has obtained it ſhe will ſhew her haughtineſs, ill temper, &c. It is therefore thought proper to keep her in ſuſpence by a bare hope; but when once we ſee our ſelves paſt hope of recovery, we renounce all thoſe managements. Some perſons however are ſo ſevere, that the conduct of this Marquis of Ferrara, and his imitators, does not pleaſe them; they would have a girl, or a woman, that has diſgraced herſelf, and been a long time a ſcandal to a whole country, live all her life under diſgrace, and by the example of not being reſtored to her reputation, be prevented from ſerving as a bait to allure other girls, and concealing under ſuch a hope the infamy of concubinage (4).

(3) See the *Journal des Sçavans*, Jan. 12, 1665, pag. 46.

(4) See above the note [D] of the article ALES.

[A] *Deſcended from a good family.*] This family was originally from Bologna, tho' it was not derived, as ſome imagined, from the old Ariſtii or Arioviſti: It was ſo conſiderable for its rank in that city, that Margues Obyſo (1), the third of the houſe of Eſt, did not think it beneath his quality to marry a Lady of that family, whoſe name was Lippa Arioſta. She was a woman of great beauty and wit, and by her intereſt ſeveral of that family removed to Ferrara, where they eſtabliſhed themſelves, and were treated with great reſpect (2). Our Poet himſelf obſerves in his Satyrs, that the origin of his family was from Bologna;

(1) Mr. Bayle calls him *Opizzon*. See the preceding Article.

(2) Sir John Harington's *Life of Arioſto*, publiſhed at the end of his Tranſlation of the *Orlando Furioſo*, at London 1634, p. 415.

Ch' altro a quel ne in Ferrara ne in Bologna,
Onde hai l'antica origine s'accoſta.

His Father, whoſe name was Nicholas Arioſto, was Governor of the caſtle of Reggio in Lombardy at the time, when our Poet was born there. His uncles likewiſe were men of great merit and diſtinction, and poſſeſſed the moſt conſiderable offices in Ferrara (3). His mother, whoſe name was Daria, was deſcended from the noble family of Malaguzza, and is mentioned by him in the following lines (4);

(3) Sanſovino, *Vita di M. Lodovico Arioſto.*

(4) Idem, ibid.

Che s'al mio genitor toſto ch' a Rheggio
Daria mi partorì facevo il givoco.

Our Author was the eldeſt ſon; and he had four brothers and five ſiſters, as appears from theſe verſes;

Si che di me ſol foſſe queſto poco;
Nel quel dieci tra i frati & le ſirocchie:
E biſognato, che tutti habbiam loco.

He obſerves afterwards, that the eſtate of the family was not very conſiderable;

Ne mai fu troppo a miei Mercurio amico:

By which verſe, wherein he tells us that Mercury was no great friend to his family, he inſinuates, that none of them had endeavoured to enlarge their eſtate by trade or merchandize, or, as Sanſovino obſerves, by the practice of the Law. His brothers names were Charles, Cleandro, Galaſſo, and Gabriel, and he gives an account of them in his ſecond Satyr.

Di cinque che noi ſiam Carlo è nel regno,
Onde cacciero i Turchi il mio Cleandro,
Et di ſtarvi alcun tempo ſà diſegna.
Galaſſo brama in la città d'Evandro,
Por la camicia ſopra la guarnaccia,
Et ne ſei col Signorito Aleſſandro.
Ecci Gabriel ma che vuoi tu che faccia,
Che da fanciul reſtò per mala ſorte
De li piedi impedito e de le braccia?

[B] *Inſiſted upon his applying himſelf to the ſtudy of the Law in order to make his fortune.*] His caſe was very like that of Ovid, as appears from the tenth Elegy of the fourth book of the *Triſtia*.

At mihi jam puero cæleſtia ſacra placebant;
Inque ſuum furtim Muſa trahebat opus.
Sæpe pater dixit, ſtudium quid inutile tentas?
Mæonides nullas ipſe reliquit opes.
Motus eram dictis, totoque Helicone relicto,
Scribere conabar verba ſoluta modis.
Sponte ſuâ carmen numeros veniebat adaptos,
Et quod tentabam ſcribere, verſus erat.

Arioſto laments his misfortune in this reſpect in the following verſes to Bembo:

Ahi laſſo quando hebbi al Pegaſeo melo
L'età diſpoſta, & che la freſche guancie
Non ſi vedeano ancor fiorir d'un pelo,
Mio padre mi cacciò con ſpiedi e lancie
Non che con ſproni a volger teſti & chioſe,
Et mi occupò cinque anni in quelle ciancie.
Ma poi che vide poco fruttuoſe
L'opre, & il tempo in van getterſi, dopo
Molto contraſto in libertà mi poſe.

Our celebrated Milton has written a fine Latin Poem to his Father, in order to perſuade him to give him the liberty of purſuing his inclinations to Poetry. He ſhews him the great eſteem, in which that art was held among the ancients, and the advantages, which reſult from it. He tells his father, that he cannot poſſibly be averſe to the Muſes, ſince he was ſo well ſkilled in Muſic; and therefore he is not to wonder, if his ſon ſhould be inclined to Poetry, ſince there is ſo ſtrict a connexion and affinity between it and Muſic.

Nec tu perge, precor, ſacras contemnere Muſas,
Nec vanas inopeſque puta, quarum ipſe peritus
Munere, mille ſonos numeros componis ad aptos,
Millibus & vocem modulis variare canoram
Doctus, Arionii merito ſis nominis hæres. Nunc

four years of age his father died, and left him in very indifferent circumstances, either because the estate was divided among all his brothers, or because his fathers's fortune consisted principally of places of profit, which determined at his death. Our Ariosto was therefore extremely perplexed with the charge of so great a family, so that he had almost taken a resolution to abandon his studies, if the emulation, which he had with Pandolfo Ariosto, a gentleman of his own family, had not awakened in him his former inclination. But some time after Pandolfo died; which proved a great discouragement to our Author, who discontinued the prosecution of his studies for a while. However, he had before given the world some proofs of his admirable genius in Poetry. When he was about thirty years of age, his reputation for wit introduced him to the acquaintance of Hippolito Cardinal of Est, a great patron of learned men, who entertained him at his Court in a very honourable manner (*c*). Before that time he had only written some few Sonnets, which were highly applauded. This success inspired him with a new ambition of distinguishing himself by some nobler work, and gaining immortal honour. He considered with himself that Sannazarius, Bembo, Naugerius, and Sadolet were eminent for the beauty of their Latin Poems; he resolved therefore to apply himself chiefly to the cultivation of his native tongue [*C*], tho' he wrote likewise several pieces in Latin [*D*]. He read over all the French, Provencal, and Spanish Poems, which he could procure; and proposing to himself the idea of the great originals of Homer and Virgil, as Sansovino (*d*) tells us, he undertook a Poem upon the loves of Orlando. He took the subject of it from Bojardo's *Orlando Innamorato*, or *Orlando in Love* (*e*), upon

(*c*) Idem, ibid. pag. 416.

(*d*) *Ubi supra.*

(*e*) *See* Sign. Rolli's *Remarks upon M. Voltaire's Essay on the Epic Poetry, &c.* pag. 48. edit. 1727.

Nunc tibi quid mirum, si me genuisse poetam
Contigerit, charo si tam prope sanguine juncti
Cognatas artes studiumque affine sequamur.
Ipse volens Phœbus se dispartire duobus,
Altera dona mihi, dedit altera dona parenti;
Dividuumque Deum genitorque puerque tenemus.

He then observes, that tho' his father might pretend an aversion to the Muses, yet it was not a real one, since he had not obliged him to apply himself to any of the lucrative professions, and particularly to that of the Law, which he represents as very disagreeable; but had permitted him to indulge his fondness for polite Literature, and to learn the treasures of the Latin, Greek and Hebrew tongues, and all the beauties of the French and Italian.

Tu tamen, ut simules teneras odisse Camœnas,
Non odisse reor; neque enim, pater, ire jubebas,
Quà via lata patet, quà pronior area lucri,
Certaque condendi fulget spes aurea nummi.
Nec rapis ad leges, malè custoditaque gentis
Jura, nec insulsis damnas clamoribus aures.
Sed magis exultam cupiens ditescere mentem,
Me procul urbano strepitu, secessibus altis
Abductum Aoniæ jucunda per otia ripæ
Phœbæo lateri comitem finis ire beatum.

He then professes his disregard for all the riches of Peru in comparison of learning; and declares that he was as much obliged to his father for giving him an education in Literature, as Phaeton would have been to his father Apollo, even tho' he could have securely enjoyed the command of his chariot. He promises himself a rank superior to the common herd of mankind and to all the attacks of envy, with the honour of an immortal name.

I nunc, confer opes quisquis maledanus avitas
Austriaci gazas, Peruanaque regna peroptas.
Quæ potuit majora pater tribuisse, vel ipse
Jupiter, excepto, donâsset ut omnia, cœlo?
. . . . . .
Ergo ego jam doctæ pars quamlibet ima catervæ
Victrices hederas inter laurésque sedebo;
Jamque nec obscurus populo miscebor inerti,
Vitabuntque oculos vestigia nostra profanos.
Este procul vigiles curæ, procul este querelæ,
Invidiæque acies transverso tortilis hirquo,
Sæva nec anguiferos extende calumnia rictus,
In me triste nihil, fœdissima turba, potestis,
Nec vestri sum juris ego: securaque tutus
Pectora, vipereo gradiar sublimis ab ictu.

These inchanting prospects of glory, and the strong enthusiasm which possesses the minds of great genius's, such as Ariosto and Milton, render them insensible to all the low pursuits of interest, and afford them such an exquisite satisfaction, as is more than equivalent for the want of all the gratifications of sense. We find, that Ariosto's Father was a man of no taste for learning, and consequently regarded more what study would be most profitable for his son to follow, than what nature and inclination determined him to. He obliged him therefore to apply himself to the study of the Civil Law; which he did for several years together, tho' with great reluctance, and made but little progress in it. At last he entirely abandoned it, and returned to the more agreeable pursuits of Poetry. He tells us, that when he was twenty years old, he wanted a schoolmaster to qualify him to understand Æsop's Fables;

Passar venti anni io mi trovava & huopo
Haver di pedagogo, ch' a fatica
Intesi haurei quel che tradusse Esopo.

But this seems very surprizing, since it is said, that when he was very young he composed and spoke in publick a Latin Oration, which was greatly admired. It is most probable therefore, that when his Father obliged him to apply himself to the Law contrary to his own inclination, he lost his knowledge of the Latin tongue. But afterwards he used his utmost efforts to recover it under the care of Gregorio da Spoleti, a man of great merit and learning, as he tells us in the verses immediately following those quoted above;

Fortuna multo albora mi fu amico,
Chi me offersi Gregorio da Spoleti,
Che ragion vuol che sempre lo benedica.

He was extremely conversant in Horace, and understood the most difficult and obscure passages in his Odes; which was very uncommon at that time (5).

(5) Sir John Harington, *ubi supra*, p. 416.

[*C*] *Applied himself to the cultivation of his native tongue.*] He had a great mastery of the Latin tongue; but he chose to write in his own language, either because he thought, that he could not raise himself to the highest rank among the Latin Poets, which was already possessed by others; or because he found it most suitable to his subject and the Age he lived in; or because he was desirous to enrich his own language with such works, as would render it more valuable and important to other nations. But the first of these, as Sir John Harington observes (6), was the true cause; for when Bembo would have dissuaded him from writing in Italian, alledging that he might gain much more honour by the Latin tongue, which was more lasting and extensive; his answer was, that he had rather be the principal of the Tuscan Writers, than the second or third among the Latins; and he added, that he found his genius most inclined to the former.

(6) Pag. 417.

[*D*] *He wrote likewise several pieces in Latin.*] They were printed by Valgrese with the Poems of Pigna and Calcagnini (7), and afterwards published in the first volume of the *Deliciæ Poetarum Italorum*. They are confounded in that collection with the works of several other Poets of very little reputation (8).

(7) *See* Mr. de la Monnoye's Notes upon Baillet, *Jugemens des Savans*, tom. 4. Part 1. n. 1261. pag. 140. edit. Amsterdam 1725.

(8) Baillet. *ubi supra.*

upon whoſe model he proceeded, becauſe that work of Bojardo was familiar to every perſon, and becauſe he thought it proper to avoid the introducing of names and ſubjects, which were quite new to his countrymen, who on the other hand would be pleaſed to ſee Bojardo's ſcheme compleated (*f*). This Poem he began when he was about thirty years of age; and it is the moſt celebrated of all his works, tho' there have been very different opinions concerning it [*E*]. His attachment to Poetry did not ſo far engage him,

(*f*) Sir John Harington's *Life of Arioſto*, pag. 417.

[*E*] *There have been very different opinions concerning his* Orlando Furioſo.] The firſt judgment, which was paſſed upon this Poem, was by no means favourable to it. It was that of Cardinal Hippolito d'Eſt, who being preſented with it, as it was dedicated to him, and having read it over, aſked Arioſto, "Where the Devil he had got ſuch a number of "ſtrange unaccountable whimſies?" *Dove, Diavolo, Meſſer Ludovico, avete pigliate tante coglionerie?* However Muretus (9) and Paulus Jovius were of opinion, that this work would be immortal as well as its Author; and it is certain, that he ſucceeded in that point, ſince Bumaldi (10) aſſures us, that there is ſcarce a country in the world, where it has not been printed, nor a language, eſpecially in Europe, into which it has not been tranſlated. It is a common notion in Italy, that this *Orlando* has eclipſed the reputation of every thing, that was publiſhed before it, and particularly the *Orlando* of Bojardo and the *Morgante* of Pulci; the latter of which has been excelled by Arioſto in the grandeur of the ſubject and the dignity of the verſe; and the former by our Poet's aſſuming the ſame title, and improving and perfecting Bojardo's *Invention* (11). So that, according to Mr. Roſteau (12), the *Orlando Furioſo* has no rival or ſuperior except the *Godfrey* of Taſſo, which was publiſhed ſince. There never was any Poem ſo full of a variety of incidents, battles, enchantments, and ſtrange adventures, as this of Arioſto; and it is ſaid, that the men of taſte in Italy are divided in their opinion between this and Taſſo's performance abovementioned. It ſeems to be a Trophy compoſed of the ſpoils of the other Italian Authors; and that nothing has been omitted, which Arioſto's genius or induſtry could ſuggeſt to him in order to compleat his work, and furniſh it with all the ornaments imaginable (13). The Gentlemen of Port-Royal (14) tell us, that he wrote with prodigious exactneſs, and that he may be read to great advantage, if we retrench ſome paſſages, which are inconſiſtent with decency. However he has not taken ſufficient care to give his ſtyle all the ſublimity and grandeur, which were proper for Epic Poetry; and we may eaſily diſcover in it the comic Author from the ſimilitude of the diction in many places. Notwithſtanding this defect, he does not want elevation even in the humorous and agreeable parts of his Poems. This Boileau particularly recommends in him in the third Canto of his *Art of Poetry*:

On peut être à la fois & pompeux & plaiſant,
Et je hais un ſublime ennuyeux & peſant:
J'aime mieux Arioſte & ſes fables comiques,
Que ces Auteurs toujours froids & melancholiques.

That is,

"At once be grand and pleaſant;
"I hate the tedious, heavy, dull ſublime.
"I'd rather read Orlando's Comic Tale,
"Than a dull Author always ſtiff and ſtale;
"Who thinks himſelf diſhonour'd in his ſtyle,
"If on his works the Graces ever ſmile."

But with all theſe excellencies of Arioſto, the Critics are not agreed that his Poem is a perfect one, or even a true Poem, if we judge of it according to the rules of art. Taſſo objects, that there is neither unity of fable nor action in it. James Mazzoni undertook the defence of Arioſto, and endeavoured to convince Taſſo of his miſtake, and obliged him to acknowledge, that the ſubject of the *Orlando Furioſo* is ſimple, without any multiplicity in the fable or action. *Ut etiam Torquatum Taſſum brevi argutâque argumentatione incluſum fateri coegerit poematis Arioſti argumentum non multiplex & varium, ſed eſſe ſimplex & unum* (15). But Father Mambrun in his Latin *Diſſertation upon Epic Poetry* (16), who never ſaw or heard of Mazzoni's reaſons, has determined very poſitively, that there is no unity of action in the *Orlando Furioſo*, and that the Poem is not a regular one either with regard to the œconomy of the whole, or the proportion of the parts of it. The other French Critics have not paſſed ſo favourable a judgment upon it. James Peletier of Mans in the firſt Book of his *Art of Poetry* (17), has found a great many things worthy of his cenſure in it. He objects in the firſt place againſt the title of it as ill-choſen; and he affirms that it is improper, or elſe the Poet has not anſwered it in his ſubject. For tho' he has aſſumed that of *Orlando*, yet he never mentions him, but in three or four Canto's; and after a variety of Digreſſions and incidents he concludes his Book with Ruggiero. This ſhews, that the Poem is faulty in the contrivance, and that the diſpoſition of it is defective. If he deſigned to do any ſervice or pay any compliment to the houſe of Eſt, he ſhould have done it under the title of Ruggiero rather than that of Orlando. He aſſerts likewiſe, that Arioſto ſhould not have confined himſelf ſo ſervilely to an imitation of Virgil in all the parts of his ſcheme, but ſhould have ſtudied more the genius and manners of his own age than that of the ancient Poet; and had a proper regard to the different circumſtances of the times. He obſerves likewiſe, that he introduces a great many trifling things unworthy of the grandeur of an heroic Poem; and that he amaſſes together a heap of ſtories and humorous paſſages, which are very unſuitable and ill-placed. Mr. de Balzac in his *Critical Diſcourſe upon the Herodes Infanticida of Daniel Heinſius* tells us, that if the Italians had reaſon to ſtile Arioſto the Prince of the Poets of their country, it was perhaps founded upon this conſideration, that he has acted in his Poem like a Prince in his dominions. It is, ſays he, in virtue of this ſovereignty that he acknowledges no laws, and aſſumes a ſuperiority above the common rights of mankind. He forms the myſteries of our religion into his Fables, and he diverts himſelf with what we adore. He treats religion with an unaccountable freedom and irreverence. Tho' it often happens, that his want of Order is agreeable in his writings, and his confuſion frequently occaſions more pleaſure than perplexity; yet it is ſtill diſorder and confuſion. He mingles almoſt every where falſhood with truth, and forms ſometimes a compoſition of them, which is ſhocking even to thoſe men of judgment, who are otherwiſe Libertines in their manner of thinking about religion. He introduces the true God ſwearing by the river Styx; and when he blends together and compares the miracles and hiſtory of the old teſtament with fable, he ſeems to caſt diſhonour upon the truth of the ſacred hiſtory. Father Rapin in his *General Reflections upon Poetry* (18), has been as ſevere as Balzac in diſcovering the errors of Arioſto. He obſerves in one place, that he had too much fire; in another, that he was too full of miraculous and ſupernatural events, which have too much reſemblance with the crude imaginations of a ſick man, and which ſhock the perſons of good ſenſe, becauſe they have no ſhadow of probability in them. He tells us likewiſe in the *Second part* of his *Reflections* (19), that our Poet's deſign was too vaſt, and diſproportionate, and indigeſted; that it is a bad model of an Epic Poem; that his Epiſodes are too forced, and improbable, and very often impertinent to the ſubject (20); that his heroes are mere Knight-errants; and that his Poem has rather the air of Romance than of true Heroiſm. He owns however in another place (21), that Arioſto is pure, ſublime, grand, and admirable in his expreſſions, and his deſcriptions are maſter-pieces in their kind; but that he wants judgment, and that there is nothing valuable in him but the beauty of his ſtyle and the charms of his verſe, which have ſo far impoſed upon mankind, and prejudiced other Poets in his favour that they have not been able to diſtinguiſh the enormous errors, which he has been guilty of (22). His genius, continues our critic, ſeems to be like thoſe fruitful lands, which produce flowers and weeds at the ſame time; and tho' all the ſeveral parts of his Poem are very beautiful, yet the work entire does not deſerve

(9) *Variar. Lect.* lib. 18. cap. 8. edit. 1604. Francof. in 8°, *apud* Baillet, p. 142.

(10) Minerv. *Bonon. ſive Anadem. Civ. Bonon. Script. illuſtr.* p. 152, &c.

(11) *See* Paul. Jovius, *in Elogiis* pag. 84.

(12) *Sentimens ſur quelques Livres qu'il a lus. apud* Baillet, p. 142.

(13) Paul. Jovius, *ubi ſupra.*

(14) *Aut. Anon. de la Gram. Ital. Nouv. Method.* Preface pag. 13 and 14. *de P. R. apud* Baillet, pag. 143.

(15) Jan. Nicius *Erythr. Pinacoth.* p. 67. edit. Lipſiæ 1712.

(16) *Quæſt.* 5. pag. 372.

(17) C. 5. *de Imitation*; and in Du Verdier's *Biblioth. apud* Baillet, p. 144.

(18) *Reflex.* 2. 11 and 23.

(19) *Reflex.* 3.

(20) Ibid. *Reflex.* 18.

(21) Ibid. *Reflex.* 16.

(22) *Reflex. Partic.* 3. Part 2.

him, but that he was employed in Embaſſies, and the management of affairs in ſeveral parts

ſerve the character of an Epic Poem. Father Mambrun in his *Diſſertation concerning Epic Poetry* (23), had cenſured Arioſto for introducing too raſhly women in the armies. This ſeems likewiſe to be diſapproved of by Father Rapin (24), where he tells us, that this Poet diveſts women of their proper character, which is modeſty and a fear of danger; and adds, that he has fallen into the ſame error with regard to his Heroes whom he ſinks below their proper dignity, and repreſents as acting the moſt trifling parts imaginable. In ſhort, Arioſto had never ſtudied the rules of Ariſtotle, as Taſſo afterwards did with great application; who is therefore much ſuperior to Arioſto, ſays Father Rapin, notwithſtanding all that the academy of Florence can urge to the contrary. Rapin's judgment in this point is exactly agreeable to that of the French academy and of the beſt judges on this ſide the Alps; ſince according to Mr. *Godeau* Biſhop of Graſſe in the preface to his *Poem upon St. Paul*, it was commonly ſaid, that *Arioſto's tomb was in Taſſo*. However, he has had a great many partizans in Italy. But next to the Academy *della Cruſca* and Mazzoni above-mentioned, there have not been more zealous defenders of him than Simon Fornari, who wrote commentaries upon him; Paul Beni, who made a compariſon between him and Homer; and Ludovico Dolce, who made an apology for him. Sir John Harington in his *Apology of Poetry* prefixed to his Engliſh tranſlation of the *Orlando Furioſo*, tells us, that he had heard, that this Poem had been diſliked by ſome perſons, tho' by few of any wit or judgment; and he compares Virgil and Arioſto together. The one, ſays he, begins,

Arma virumque cano;
The other,
Le Donne i Cavalieri, l'arme, gli amore,
Le Corteſie, l'audaci impreſi io canto.
That is,
" Of Dames, of Knights, of Arms, of Loves de-
" light,
" Of Courteſies, of high Attempts I ſpeak."

Virgil ends with the death of Turnus; Arioſto with that of Rodomont.

Beſtemmiendo fuggì l'alma ſdegnoſa,
Che fu ſi altera al mondo, e ſi ergoglioſa:
That is,
" Down to the lake, where damned Ghoſts do lie,
" Sunk his diſdainful ſoul, now cold as ice,
" Blaſpheming as it went, and curſing loud,
" That was on earth ſo lofty and ſo proud."

Virgil extols Æneas to pleaſe Auguſtus, from whom he was ſuppoſed to be deſcended: Arioſto extols Rogero in honour of the houſe of Eſt. Æneas hath his Dido, who detains him; Rogero his Alcine. In ſhort, there is nothing remarkable in Virgil, but has very happily been imitated by Arioſto. Virgil's Poem has been juſtly admired for the excellent morality of it; and Dante the Italian Poet expreſly declares, that he was firſt reclaimed from his vicious indulgences by reading it. Now every thing that is commendable upon that account in Virgil, is equally to be found in Arioſto, with ſeveral things, which the former could not give us thro' the ignorance of the age in which he lived. In proof of which Sir John Harington inſtances in the devout and Chriſtian behaviour of Charlemagne in the fourteenth Book, with his prayer,

Non voglia tua Bonta per mio fallire,
Ch'l tuo popol fidele habbia a patire, &c.

And in the beginning of the XVIIth Book;

Il giuſto Dio, quando i peccati noſtri, &c.
That is,
The moſt juſt God, when once man's ſins do grow
Beyond the bounds of pardon and of grace,
Becauſe that men his judgments juſt may know,
No leſs than love, to rule on earth doth place
Vile monſters, ſuch as tyrannize us ſo,
With wrong the right, with luſt they laws deface:
For this ſame cauſe were Sylla ſent and Marius,
The Nerons both, and filthy-minded Varius (25).

(25) It is *Caio Furibundo*, i. e. " Furious Caius" in the original.

And then in the fifth Stanza:

No doubt but God in heav'nly throne that ſits,
And thence our deeds and thoughts doth plainly ſee,
Us to be ſpoil'd and conquer'd thus permits
By thoſe, that are perhaps as ill as we.
But if to pleaſe him we would bend our wits,
Then from theſe foes he ſoon would ſet us free,
And we ſhall ſee their puniſhment e'er long,
That us oppreſs by villany and wrong.

In the forty firſt Book we have an account of the converſion of Rogero to the Chriſtian religion, where the Hermit is introduced diſcourſing with him, and guarding him againſt preſumption and deſpair.

Now, (as I ſaid,) this wiſe the Hermit ſpoke,
And part doth comfort him, and part doth checke.
He blameth him, that in that pleaſant yoke
He had ſo long deferred to put his necke,
But did to wrath his Maker ſtill provoke;
And did not come at his firſt call and becke.
But ſtill did hide himſelfe away from God,
Until he ſaw him comming with his rod.
Then did he comfort him, and make him know,
That Grace is ne'er deny'd to ſuch as aſke;
As do the workmen in the Goſpel ſhow,
Receiving pay alike for divers taſke.

Sir John Harington then endeavours to vindicate Arioſto from the imputation of obſcenity, with regard to ſeveral parts of his Poem; and to ſhew, that however looſe the Stories may be, there is no manner of impurity in the expreſſion, any more than in Virgil; *and ſo I dare*, continues he, *take upon me, that in all Arioſto* (*and yet I think it is as much as three Æneids*) *there is not a word of ribaldry or obſcenouſneſſe. Farther, there is ſo meet a decorum in the perſons of thoſe, that ſpeak laſciviouſly, as any of judgment muſt needs allow. And therefore tho' I rather crave pardon than praiſe for him in this point, yet methinks I can ſmile at the fineneſs of ſome, that will condemn him, and yet not allow, but admire our Chaucer, who both in words and ſenſe incurreth farre more the reprehenſion of flat ſcurrilitie, as I could recite many places, not only in his Miller's tale, but in the good wife of Bathe's tale, and many more, in which only the decorum which he keeps is that that excuſeth it, and maketh it more tolerable.* In anſwer to the objection, that Arioſto wants art, and recedes from the example of Homer and the precepts of Ariſtotle, Sir John Harington obſerves, that what was proper in Homer at the time when he wrote, would now appear otherwiſe from the different circumſtances of the age. Beſides, tho' our Poet's tales are thought by many perſons to be introduced without any propriety, we may remark, that Homer himſelf has ſeveral of the ſame kind; as in the Iliad, the converſation between Glaucus and Diomedes with regard to Bellerophon; and in the Odyſſey, the diſcourſe of the Hog with Ulyſſes. The title of the Poem has likewiſe been objected to, becauſe the Author called it *Orlando Furioſo*, inſtead of *Rogero*; but he may be defended from the example of Homer, who tho' he profeſſes to write the actions of Achilles, yet has entitled his Poem the *Iliad* from Troy, and not the *Achilleid*. With reſpect to the rules of Ariſtotle, Sir John Harington is of opinion, that he followed them very ſtrictly. For Ariſtotle and the greateſt Critics determine, that the *Epopæia* or heroic Poem ſhould be founded upon ſome hiſtory, and include a ſhort period of time in it. Agreeably to this Arioſto choſe the ſtory of Charles the Great, and has not exceeded a year in his whole work. The Critics again preſcribe, that no fiction ſhould be made uſe of, which is abſolutely incredible. *And ſure*, ſays our Author, *Arioſto neither in his inchantments exceedeth credit, (for who knows not how ſtrong the illuſions of the Devil are?) neither in the miracles, that Aſtolfo by the power of St. John is fained to do, ſince the church holdeth that Prophets both alive and dead have done mighty great miracles.* " Thirdly they would have an heroical Poem " (as

(23) Prefix'd to his *Conſtantin.* pag. 390, 391. *apud* Baillet, p. 147.
(24) *Reflex. General.* 25. *ſur la Poetique.*

parts of Italy [F]. The Cardinal of Eſt afterwards reſolved to carry him to Hungary among other illuſtrious perſons, who attended him; but upon Arioſto's refuſal to go, he loſt

" (as well as a tragedy) to be full of *Peripetiæ*; " which I interpret an agnition of ſome unlooked " for fortune either good or bad, and a ſudden change " thereof. Of this what ſtore there be the reader " ſhall quickly find. As for apt ſimilitudes, for paſ- " ſions well expreſſed, of love, of pity, of hate, of " wrath, a blind man may ſee, if he can but hear, " that this work is full of them." There are two other objections urged againſt him, which Sir John Harington imagines rather to be two peculiar excellencies in him ſuperior to all other writers before him in that kind. The former is, that he breaks off his narrations very abruptly, ſo that the reader without a ſtrong attention will ſcarce be able to retain the thread of the ſtory. But this may be conſidered as an inſtance of the Author's art, which engages us to read over the whole work with an impatient deſire to ſee the Cataſtrophe, and which at laſt unravels the different ſubjects in a ſhort and perſpicuous manner. If Sir Philip Sidney had eſteemed this a fault, he would undoubtedly have avoided it in his *Arcadia*. The latter objection is, that he ſpeaks too much in his own perſon by way of digreſſion; which the objectors ſay is contrary to the laws of Poetry, becauſe neither Homer nor Virgil did it. *Methinks*, ſays Sir John Harington in anſwer to this, *it is a ſufficient defence to ſay, Arioſto doth it. Sure I am, it is both delightful and very profitable to have a ſeat or reſting place for the reader; and even as if a man walked in a fair long alley, to have a ſeat or reſting place here and there is eaſie and commodious. But if at the ſame ſeat were planted ſome excellent tree, that not only with the ſhade ſhould keep us from the heat, but with ſome pleaſant and right wholeſome fruit ſhould allay our thirſt, and comfort our ſtomacke, we would think it for the time a little paradiſe. So are Arioſto's morals and pretty digreſſions ſprinkled thro' his long work to the no leſs pleaſure than profit of the reader.* Father Bouhours in his *Maniere de bien penſer dans les Ouvrages d'Eſprit** cenſures a very extravagant thought of our Poet, who ſays of one of his Heroes, " that in the heat of the " engagement not perceiving that he was killed, he " ſtill fought on vigorouſly, dead as he was."

* Dialog. i.

Il pover' huomo, che non ſen' era accorto,
Andava combattendo, & era morto.

There have been ſeveral editions of this Poem of Arioſto, particularly at Venice, in 4to, 1562, with the following title; ORLANDO FURIOSO *di M. Ludovico Arioſto, tutto di nuovo con figure adornato, et riveduto con ogni diligenza; con nuova giunta di Annotationi a ciaſcun Canto, con gli argomenti in Stanze di M. Livio Coraldo e con i cinque Canti, che ne gli altri non erano:* i. e. " The *Orlando Furioſo* of Signor Lewis Arioſto, " adorn'd with Cuts, and reviſed with the utmoſt care, " with Notes upon every Canto, and the Argument " of each Canto in Stanza's by Signor Livio Coraldo; " to which are added five Canto's, which were never " publiſhed in the former editions." The year before Franceſco Sanſovino publiſhed at Venice in 4to. *Annotationi ſopra l'Orlando Furioſo di Lodovico Arioſto* (26). i. e. " Annotations upon the *Orlando Furioſo* of " Lewis Arioſto." Several other Commentaries were likewiſe written upon this Poem; among which was *La Spoſitione di Simon Fornari ſopra l'Orlando Furioſo dell' Arioſto*: i. e. " The Expoſition of Simon Fornari " upon the *Orlando Furioſo* of Arioſto," publiſhed at Florence in 8vo, 1549; and the ſecond part of it in 1550. There was an edition of this Poem publiſh'd at Venice by Girolamo Porro in 4to, in 1568 and 1584. There was a French tranſlation of Arioſto's *Orlando Furioſo* in proſe, publiſhed at Lyons in 8vo, 1582. There was likewiſe a Continuation of the ſame Poem, in French proſe, publiſhed in the ſame city the year following in 8vo, " containing the Death of the moſt magnanimous and " moſt valiant Rogero, the Flower of the Paladins " of France, and all the great Succeſſes, high and " noble Attempts propoſed, but not mentioned by the " divine Arioſto; with allegorical Explanations upon " every Canto for the eaſier underſtanding of them, " by which we may comprehend the effects of vice " and virtue: Tranſlated from the Italian into French " by William Chappuys." The title of it is as follows: *La Suite de Roland Furieux, contenant la Mort du tres-magnanime & tres-vaillant Roger, Fleur des Paladins de France, & tous les grands Succez, hautes & genereuſes Entrepinſes propoſees, & non fournies par le divin Arioſte: Avec les Sommaires allegoriques ſur chacun Diſcours pour une plus facile Intelligence d'iceux, par leſquels l'on peut comprendre les effects du Vice & de la Virtu. Miſe d'Italien en François par Gabriel Chappuys Tourangeau.* It was tranſlated into Engliſh by Sir John Harington about the year 1591, and dedicated it to Queen Elizabeth. The third edition was publiſhed at London in fol. 1634, with the following title: ORLANDO FURIOSO *in Engliſh Heroical Verſe, by Sir John Harington of Bathe Knight. Newo thirdly reviſed and amended; with the Addition of the Author's Epigrams.* This edition contains I. *The Epiſtle Dedicatory to the Queen's Majeſtie.* II. *A Preface or rather a brieſe Apologie of Poetry and of the Author and Tranſlator of this Poem.* III. *An Advertiſement to the Reader before he reads this Poem of ſome things to be obſerved as well in the ſubſtance of this Worke, as alſo in the ſetting forth thereof, with the uſe of the Pictures, Table, and Annotations to the ſame annexed.* IV. *The firſt XXIII Cantos or Bookes of Orlando, ending with Orlando's falling mad.* V. *The other XXIII Cantos of* Orlando Furioſo, *in which he recovered his wits; ending with Bradamant's Marriage.* VI. *A brieſe and ſummarie Allegorie of* Orlando Furioſo, *not unpleaſant nor unprofitable for thoſe that have read this Poem.* The Tranſlator concludes this Allegory with the following words: " Thus much I thought good to note " of the generall Allegorie of the whole Worke, to " give you occaſion to ruminate, as it were, and bet- " ter to digeſt that, which you before in reading, did " perhaps ſwallow whole down without chewing. Now " methinke it is even high time to take away, and " bid much good do it you, or at leaſt no harme do " it you. Or if you thinke it will for all this, the " beſt phyſicke I can preſcribe you, is a leaf or two " of St. Matthewes Goſpel, or of St. Pauls Epiſtles, and " it ſhall reſtore you to your perfect health." VII. *The Life of Arioſto briefly and compendiouſly gathered out of ſundrie Italian Writers by Sir John Harington.* VIII. *An exact and neceſſary Table &c. with the principal Tales in* Orlando Furioſo, *that may be read by themſelves.* To this edition are added *the moſt elegant and wittie Epigrams of Sir John Harington Knt. digeſted into four Bookes.*

(26) Niceron, *Memoires pour ſervir a l'Hiſt. des Hommes Illuſtres*, tom. 22. pag. 84. edit. de Paris 1733.

[F] *He was employed in embaſſies and the management of affairs in ſeveral parts of Italy*] When Pope Julio II intended to make war upon the Duke of Ferrara, Cardinal Hippolito's brother, Arioſto was choſen as a proper perſon to go upon an embaſſy to him, in order to pacify his reſentments and divert his deſign. He tranſacted this affair with ſo much ſucceſs, that he raiſed himſelf a prodigious character at his return. However it was not long after this, that the ſame Pope, who was a man of a reſtleſs ſpirit, and much more inclined to military affairs than to the practice of the mild and pacific precepts of the Goſpel, engaged in a new war againſt the Duke, and ſent a conſiderable body of ſoldiers to paſs the River Po, which runs by Ferrara. They were met by the Duke's forces upon the river; and Arioſto acted with ſuch reſolution, that he took one of the enemy's ſhips, which was the largeſt and beſt ſtored with proviſion and ammunition of all the fleet. But theſe armies being diſbanded, the Duke thought proper to ſend another Embaſſy in order to pacify the Pope; and every perſon avoiding this employment, knowing the violent and revengeful temper of Julio, Arioſto again undertook this commiſſion out of regard to his country, notwithſtanding the dangers, which attended it. For it was very unſafe in the time of war to go with ſo ſlight a guard; and the Pope's reſentment was inſupportable, whenever he thought proper to fix it upon any perſon. However Arioſto performed his journey, and preſented himſelf to the Pope; but finding by ſome ſecret intelligence, that his embaſſy would be to no manner of purpoſe, but expoſe him to the utmoſt danger,

loſt all his intereſt with his patron [G]. After the death of Hippolito, he engaged in the ſervice of Alfonſo Duke of Ferrara, the Cardinal's brother, who ſhewed the utmoſt regard for him, and took a great delight in his converſation. He had ſeveral noble offers made him by Pope Leo X, and by many great Princes and Cardinals; but he refuſed to accept them out of the great love, which he had for liberty and an eaſy diſengaged manner of life (*f*). Signor Rolli in his notes upon the 3d Satyr of our Poet (*g*), obſerves, that the reaſon why he was not preferred by Pope Leo X, who was a great patron of letters, was as follows. This Pope had inherited from Julio II, a great averſion to Alfonſo Duke of Ferrara, and a ſtrong deſire to poſſeſs himſelf of that city. It happened afterwards that he had Modena delivered to him by the Emperor as a pledge for forty thouſand ducats; and he deſigned to unite it with Reggio, which he had already in his poſſeſſion, as well as with Parma and Placentia, and to give the perpetual government of them to his brother Julian, with the addition of Ferrara (*b*). This deſign of his was incompatible with any view of promoting Arioſto to the Cardinalſhip, ſince he was a ſubject and very dear to Alfonſo: and therefore if he had been made a Cardinal, he would not only have refuſed to agree to any ſcheme the leaſt injurious to his maſter, but with the advantages of that high preferment would have endeavoured to impede the Pope's deſigns againſt the Duke. It is no wonder therefore, that Leo X ſhould act as almoſt all the men of power have done in every age, by preferring his own ambition to the friendſhip and eſteem, which he had for Arioſto. Sanſovino informs us, that upon Pope Hadrian VI's ſucceſſion to the See of Rome, the Duke of Ferrara appointed him governor of Graffignana [H]; which poſt he executed with great ſucceſs. After his return home he ſpent the reſt of his life in retirement, except when he was employed by the Duke of Ferrara in managing his affairs at Rome; and he proſecuted his ſtudies in a houſe, which he had built for himſelf at Ferrara [I]. He tranſlated divers pieces out of French and Spaniſh into Italian;

(*f*) Idem, ibid. pag. 418.

(*g*) Publiſhed at London in 1716, among the reſt of Arioſto's Satyrs, Elegies, and Sonnets, p. 56.

(*b*) *See* Guicciardin. lib. 12.

danger, he returned home thro' all the difficulties and hazards imaginable; and was highly eſteemed and honoured for his great courage and reſolution in this affair.

[G] *He loſt all his intereſt with his patron.*] When the Duke of Ferrara's ſucceſs had eſtabliſhed his affairs in the utmoſt ſecurity and tranquillity, Arioſto returned with vigour to his ſtudies, and proceeded in the compoſition of his Poem, which, from what he had already written of it, raiſed a great expectation in the publick. But of a ſudden he unfortunately fell under the Cardinal's diſpleaſure, by refuſing to attend him to Hungary. However Hippolito, out of regard to his merit, would not openly diſgrace him, tho' Arioſto had enemies enough, who prompted the Cardinal to uſe the utmoſt rigour towards him. Our Poet finding this, was ſo greatly diſcouraged, that he diſcontinued writing for many years. And to aggravate his misfortune, a perſon, who took the opportunity of the Cardinal's neglect of him, engaged him in a very expenſive and fatiguing law-ſuit about an eſtate of his; *for undoubtedly*, ſays Sir John Harington (27), *the clattering of armour, the noiſe of great ordinance, the ſound of trumpet and drumme, the neighing of horſes, do not ſo much trouble the ſweete Muſes, as doth the brabling of Lawyers, the paltering of Attorneys, and the civil war, or rather moſt uncivil diſagreeing of forſworne jurors.* This interruption of Arioſto with regard to writing continued fourteen years, till the Cardinal's death, when he was taken into favour by the Duke of Ferrara. He mentions himſelf the circumſtance of his falling under the Cardinal's diſpleaſure, in the following verſes:

(27) *Life of Arioſto*, p. 417.

A me per eſſer ſtato contumace
Di non voler Agria veder ne Buda,
Che ſi ritoglia il ſuo gia non mi ſpiace.

And again afterwards,

Che ſenza fede, & ſenz' amor mi nome
E che dimoſtri con parole e cenni
Ch' in odio e ch' in diſpetto habbia il mio nome.
E queſto fu cagion ch' io mi ritenni
Di non gli comparir inanzi mai
Dal dì ch' indarno ad eſcuſar mi venni,
Ruggier s' a la progenie tua mi fai
Si poco grato & nulla mi preſvaglio
Che gli altri goſti e il tuo valor cantai
Che debbo far io, qui poi ch' io non vaglio
Smembrar ſu la forcina in aria ſtarne
Ne ſo a ſparvier, ne a can metter guinzaglio.

He tells us afterwards, that he choſe an eaſy and ſedentary manner of life, rather than the fatigues of travel.

Et piu mi piache di poſer le poltre
Membra, che di vantarle, ch' a gli Scithi
Sien ſtate, a gli Indi, a gli Ethiopi & oltre.

He expreſſes his fondneſs for his own country in his Satyr, where he ſays:

Da me ſteſſo mi tol chi mi remove
Da la mia terra, e fuor non ne potrei
Viver contento ancor ch' in grembo a Giove.

[H] *Upon Pope Hadrian VI's ſucceſſion to the See of Rome, the Duke of Ferrara appointed him Governor of Graffignana.*] Sir John Harington tells us (28), that he was employed, tho' a little againſt his will, as a Lieutenant or High-Sheriff in the county of Graffignana, which was then full of factions and diviſions. Arioſto acted in this poſt with ſo much reſolution and addreſs, that he reduced the country to a ſtate of abſolute tranquillity, and gained himſelf a great character by his conduct, which endeared him to thoſe of a ſuperior rank, and procured him the higheſt reverence among the lower orders of the people. The robbers themſelves had a great awe of his virtue, as appeared by an accident, which happened to him, while he was Governor there. For as he rid one day attended with five or ſix horſemen in one of the moſt licentious and diſorderly parts of the country, he was obliged to paſs near Rhodea by a company of armed men, who lay diſperſed in the ſhade, at a time when by means of a conteſt between two conſiderable men of that country, whoſe names were Domenico Morotto and Philippo Pacchione, there were daily outrages committed upon the paſſengers. So that Arioſto was under an apprehenſion of being attacked by the men, who lay thus in ambuſh. But as ſoon as he had paſſed by them, the chief of that company demanded of the ſervant, who rode laſt, what his maſter's name was, and hearing it, he ran after him immediately armed as he was. Arioſto ſtop'd ſhort, being doubtful for what purpoſe he came. But when the man came nearer him, he begg'd his pardon for not paying his compliments to him as he paſſed by. He told him likewiſe, that he was Philippo Pacchione, and deſired the honour of his acquaintance, and profeſſed, that he was entirely at his command in all reſpects (29).

(28) Pag. 419.

(29) Sir John Harington, pag. 419.

[I] *Proſecuted his ſtudies in a houſe, which he had built for himſelf at Ferrara.*] He had a garden adjoining

Italian; and wrote beſides his *Orlando Furioſo* ſeveral *Satyrs*, which are ſtill highly eſteemed by the beſt judges, as Monſieur de la Monnoye obſerves (*i*), tho' Mr. Baillet inſinuates, that they are now abſolutely diſregarded. We have five *Comedies* of his [*K*], which the Duke was ſo extremely pleaſed with, that he built a large and magnificent ſtage in the Hall at Ferrara for the repreſentation of them, and made ſeveral noble preſents to him on account of his admirable compoſitions (*k*). He deſired Arioſto to tranſlate the *Mænechmi* of Plautus into Italian, which he performed with great ſucceſs; and all his other Comedies were frequently acted, and generally by perſons of the beſt quality; ſo that Ferdinand of Eſt, who was afterwards Marquis of Maſſa, when the *Lena* was firſt repreſented, ſpoke the Prologue in public, in order to do honour to the Comedy (*l*). While Arioſto was compoſing his *Orlando Furioſo*, he roſe very early, ſometimes at one or two a clock in the morning, when he lodged at his friends houſes, as well as when he was at home, and continued to write as long as he found himſelf in the proper diſpoſition for it. He uſed to read his verſes to his friends and the Ladies of his acquaintance,

(*i*) See his Notes upon Baillet's *Jugemens ſur les Poetes*, tom. 4. Part 1. n. 1261. p. 140. ed. Amſterd. 1725.

(*k*) Sir John Harington's *Life of Arioſto*, pag. 418.

(*l*) Idem, ibid.

joining to it, which was the uſual ſcene of his meditations and compoſitions in Poetry. He was aſked, why he had not built his houſe in a more magnificent manner, ſince he had given ſuch noble deſcriptions of ſumptuous palaces, beautiful porticos, and pleaſant fountains in his *Orlando Furioſo*. He replied, that words were cheaper laid together than ſtones. Upon his door he inſcribed a verſe, *which*, ſays Sir John Harington (30), *few of the builders of this latter Age can truly write, or at leaſt if they could, I would ſay, their houſes were ſtrongly built indeed, for more than the third heir*;

(30) Pag. 421.

Parva, ſed apta mihi, ſed nulli obnoxia, ſed non
Sordida, parta meo ſed tamen ære domus.

That is, according to Harington's tranſlation;

" This houſe is ſmall, but fit for me, but hurtful
" unto none,
" But yet not ſluttiſh, as you ſee, yet pay'd for
" with mine owne."

He made alterations in it very frequently; and he ſaid of himſelf, that he uſed his houſe as he did his verſes, mend them ſo much, that he quite deſtroyed the beauty of them. *For indeed*, ſays the Author quoted above, *as a tree planted in an orchard, if it be once or twice well pickt and pruned, it doth further the growing of it; but if a man be ever fidling about it, it will looſe the naturall beauty, and hardly keepe life. So it is with one of his Stanzas or Staves, as we call them, at the firſt conceiving of it, one may mend that which he ſhall ſodainly ſet downe; but if one will ſtill be turning and wreſting of it, he may make it leeſe the grace it had at firſt.* But whatever fault he might find in his own verſes, it is certain, that they were univerſally admired in Italy, and procured him a great many noble preſents from the Duke of Ferrara, Pope Leo X, Cardinal Farneſe, Cardinal Bibiena, the Marquiſs of Vaſto, and ſeveral other perſons of the higheſt quality.

[*K*] *His five Comedies.*] They are intitled I. *La Caſſaria* in proſe and verſe, printed in 1536; II. *La Lena*, in proſe and verſe; III. *Il Negromante*, in proſe and verſe; IV. *Gli Suppoſiti*, in proſe and verſe; V. *La Scolaſtica*, in verſe. Bumaldi in his *Minerv. Bonon. ſive Anadem. Civ. Bonon. Script. Illuſtr.* (31) tells us, that all theſe Comedies are written in an excellent manner. Mr. de Balzac in his *Treatiſe of the Character of Comedy* aſſerts (32), that there is in Arioſto's Comedies, as well as in thoſe of Terence, a juſt medium between the ſublime and low ſpecies of writing; and that it was this pure, elegant, and agreeable manner, which was ſo well practiſed and ſo highly admired among the ancients. The ſame Critic likewiſe in the nineteenth Letter of his fourth book to Chapelain obſerves, that he was not ſatisfied with Father Pallavicini, afterwards Cardinal, upon Arioſto's Comedies, and that he did not underſtand that *Grande Poſitivo* in what he aſſerted. He adds, that he did not think his Epic Poem ſuperior in its kind to his Comedies; and that with regard to regularity there was no compariſon between them. Tho' all his Comedies were received by the publick with great applauſe, yet we are informed by Paulus Jovius (33), that the *Suppoſiti* had the advantage over the reſt; and that if we conſider the invention and variety of wit and humour in it, it will not be found inferior to any one of Plautus's. Ludovico Riccoboni in his *Hiſtoire du Theatre Italien* printed at Paris in 1728, *p.* 145 *& ſeq.* tells us, that our Poet publiſhed theſe five Comedies, four of which were at firſt printed in proſe, and afterwards turned into verſe by the Author. With regard to the *Scolaſtica*, he wrote it in verſe as far as the third Scene of the fourth Act, and it was finiſhed afterwards by his brother Gabriel. Our Poet was the firſt, who made uſe of *Verſo Sdrucciolo* for the comic Theatre. That kind of verſe conſiſts of ten ſyllables. His deſign evidently was to approach as near as poſſible to common converſation. His Comedies ſhew evident marks of his great genius. The comic humour appears every where to ſuch advantage, as gives an exquiſite pleaſure to the reader. Riccoboni (34) had a deſign to introduce upon the Italian Stage ſome of the beſt Comedies which were written in the ſixteenth Century, when Comedy was at the height in Italy, and ſubſiſted without the aid of the Harlequin and other burleſque perſonages now eſſential to the Theatre there. He thought it neceſſary to chooſe an Author, whoſe name would give a ſanction to his attempt of reforming the ſtage: and therefore fixed upon the *Scolaſtica* of Arioſto. He retrenched the character of the Monk, and ſubſtituted another in the room of it, and by altering about an hundred and fifty verſes in the Play, he render'd it fit for the ſtage, without leaving any thing in it that might claſh with good manners. He exhibited it at Venice for the firſt time; and the name of Arioſto was ſufficient to draw a prodigious number of ſpectators together; but the misfortune was, that all the people did not know that Arioſto had written any Comedies. Before it was begun to be acted Riccoboni was informed, that they had got a notion, that the Play was taken from the *Orlando Furioſo* of that Author. The Comedy was opened; but the ſpectators not ſeeing Angelica, Orlando, Bradamante, and other perſons appear, they began to be uneaſy, and in ſhort Riccoboni was obliged to drop the curtain at the end of the fourth Act. They had prepared themſelves, as he obſerves (35), for the pleaſure of ſeeing the adventures of *Orlando Furioſo*, and were exaſperated at the diſappointment. If the piece had not been given out under the name of its Author, they would have attended to it with more patience, and perhaps have been ſenſible of the beauties of it. But the misfortune of this ill ſucceſs made ſo great an impreſſion upon Riccoboni, that he informs us (36), that he was almoſt thrown into a fit of ſickneſs by it. We find in his book (37) a very agreeable ſtory relating to Arioſto. His father one day was in an extreme paſſion with him, and talked with a prodigious ſeverity to him for a long while. The ſon heard him with great attention without making any anſwer; and they parted at laſt without Arioſto's ſpeaking one word to his father to excuſe himſelf with regard to the reproaches, which were made to him. When his father was gone, Arioſto's brother aſked him what was the reaſon, that he did not ſay any thing to his father in his defence. He replied, that he was then actually compoſing a Comedy, and had ſtopt ſhort at a Scene, in which an old man was reprimanding his ſon. That when his father began to ſpeak, the thought came into his head to obſerve him with the utmoſt attention, in order that he might draw the repreſentation after nature; ſo that he only regarded his tone of voice, and geſtures, and expreſſions, without concerning himſelf about his defence.

(31) Pag. 151, 152.

(32) Pag. 38 of the Holland edition, and p. 511 of the 2d volume in fol.

(33) *Elogior.* num. 84.

(34) See his *Hiſt. du Theatre Italien* pag. 86, 87.

(35) Pag. 146.

(36) Pag. 87.

(37) Pag. 147.

acquaintance, who were extremely charmed with the agreeableneſs of his converſation (*m*). He had an excellent manner of reading [*L*], which gave a peculiar ſpirit to every thing that he pronounced. Titian made an admirable portrait of him. He was honoured with the lawrel by the hands of the Emperor Charles V at Mantua in the year 1533 (*n*). He was extremely fond of retirement and liberty; upon which account Sanſovino tells us, he would neither marry nor become a Prieſt, knowing the mutability of his own diſpoſition, and being apprehenſive of engaging in a ſtate which he might afterwards repent of in vain. He loved a plain and frugal manner of life, without any inclination to the luxury and delicacies of banquets; ſo that he tells us in one of his Poems, that he was a proper man to have lived in the world, when acorns were the common food of mankind (*o*). He was of a very amorous diſpoſition, which he indulged in ſeveral inſtances [*M*]. He had two natural ſons [*N*]. He was affable, eaſy, and condeſcending in his behaviour, but ſhewed a proper degree of ſpirit and reſolution, whenever he was ill treated even by perſons of the higheſt rank. He was averſe to travelling abroad [*O*]. He enjoyed the friendſhip of the moſt eminent men of learning of his time, who had a great eſteem for him, and he mentions them with prodigious reſpect in the laſt Canto of his *Orlando Furioſo*. In his Satyrs likewiſe he pays a compliment to his friends Bembo, Sadolet, Paulus Jovius,

(*m*) Idem, ibid.

(*n*) Sanſovino, *ubi ſupra.*

(*o*) Sir John Harington's *Life of Arioſto*, pag. 418.

[*L*] *He had an excellent manner of reading.*] The Duke of Ferrara, whenever he was at leiſure, took a great pleaſure in hearing Arioſto read his own works and thoſe of other Authors, being charmed with his agreeable pronunciation. Our Poet was always extremely vexed, if he heard his own writings repeated with an ill grace and accent; a remarkable inſtance of which was as follows. As he was paſſing one day by a Potter's ſhop, it happened, that the Potter was ſinging a Stanza out of the *Orlando Furioſo*, probably the thirty ſecond Stanza of the firſt Book, where Rinaldo calls upon his horſe to tarry for him;

Ferma, Baiardo mio; deh ferma il piede,
Che l'eſſer ſenza te troppo mi noce. &c.
That is,
"Hollo, my boy, holla, (Renaldo cride)
"The want of thee annoy'd me much to day.
"But Bayard will not let his maſter ride,
"But takes his heels, and faſter goes away."

But he pronounced theſe verſes in ſo bad a manner, that Arioſto being really, or pretending to be in an exceſſive paſſion, with a little ſtick, which he had in his hand, broke ſeveral of the pots, which ſtood expoſed to ſale. The Potter expoſtulated with him in very ſevere terms for injuring a poor man, who had never done him the leaſt harm in his whole life. *Yes*, replied our Poet, *I have not yet ſufficiently revenged myſelf upon you, for the injury, which you have done me to my face; for I have broken but half a dozen pots of yours, which are not worth ſo many half-pence; but you have ſpoiled a fine Stanza of mine, which was worth a conſiderable ſum of gold* (39).

(39) Sir John Harington, pag. 420, 421.

[*M*] *He was of a very amorous diſpoſition, which he indulged in ſeveral inſtances.*] He was known to have been familiar with one Alexandra; tho' ſome affirmed, that he was privately married to her, but durſt not acknowledge it for fear of loſing ſome ſpiritual preferments, which he held, and which were incompatible with a married ſtate. However both the ſons, whom he had by her, were accounted illegitimate. There was likewiſe a beautiful Lady, whoſe name was Genevra, to whom he paid his addreſſes, but with what ſucceſs, is not certain. He fell in love with a Lady, (whether this Genevra or not, is unknown,) at Florence, in the houſe of his friend Niccolo Veſpucci, to whom ſhe was related. Sanſovino tells us, that he wrote a Sonnet upon her in the year 1513, which begins thus;

Non ſo s'io potrò ben chiuder in verſi.

He found her one day dreſſing a coat like a ſuit of armour for one of her ſons, who was to be preſent at a publick ſhew on Midſummer Eve; upon which occaſion he made that compariſon in the fifty fourth Stanza of the twenty fourth book of the *Orlando Furioſo* concerning the wound, which Zerbino Prince of Scotland had received of Mandricardo:

The Prince ſo eager was, he felt no ſmart,
Yet ran the blood out of his breſt amaine,
And of his armour all the former part,
With crimſon ſtreame of blood it did diſtaine.
So have I ſeene her hand, that to mine heart
Hath bene a cauſe of anguiſh great and paine,
When ſhe a purple ſeame or flowre hath drawne,
In ſilver kirtle or in ſleeve of lawne.

The beginning of the 16th and 35th Canto's of his *Orlando* ſhews likewiſe that he was ſubject to love, but that his love was fixed upon women of modeſty and merit. He begins his 16th Canto thus:

Great paines in love full many men have found,
Of which my ſelf have prov'd ſo great a part,
As by my ſkill ſome good may hap redound,
To ſuch as are leſſe ſkilful in this Art.
Wherefore what I affirme with judgement ſound,
To breed juſt cauſe of leſſe or greater ſmart,
Believe what I ſet downe for your behooſe,
Probatum eſt, I know 'tis true by proof.

I do affirm, and have, and ever ſhall,
That he, that binds himſelf in worthy bands,
Although his miſtreſſe ſhew him grace but ſmall,
Although he find no favour at her hands,
Sharp words, coy looks, ſmal thanks, hope none at all,
Though more and more aloofe from him ſhe ſtands,
Yet ſo his heart and thoughts be highly plac'd,
He muſt not mourn, no though he die diſgrac'd.

Sir John Harington having mentioned this irregularity in our Poet's conduct, with regard to his liberties with the women, concludes with theſe words: *Now though I dare not excuſe him in this ſo great a fault, yet partly in reſpect he was unmarried, partly becauſe theſe white Divels have ſuch a tempting power upon the earth, methinks I ſhould eaſily obtaine a pardon for him of all you that read this ſhort Diſcourſe of his life.*

[*N*] *He had two natural ſons.*] Their names were John Baptiſta and Virginio; the former of whom went into the army, and the latter applied himſelf to learning, as Arioſto ſays in his Poem to Bembo;

Bembo, io verrei come è il commun diſio
De' ſolleciti padre veder l'artè,
Che fanno lo huom tutte in Virginio mio.

He reſigned a great part of his benefices to Virginio, and left both his ſons in very good circumſtances (40).

(40) Sanſovino, *Vita di M. L. Arioſto tratta dall' opere ſue medeſime.*

[*O*] *He was averſe to travelling abroad.*] He was extremely fearful of the water; and therefore when he went out of a ſhip, he let others go before, uſing that ſaying *De puppe noviſſimus exi.* He expreſſes his averſion to travelling out of his own country in one of his Satyrs:

Che vuol andare a torno, a torno vada
Vegga Inghilterra, Ungheria, Francia e Spagna,
A me piace habitar la mia contrada,
Viſta ho Thoſcana, Lombardia, Romagna,
Quel monte che divide, e quel che ſerra
Italia, e un mare el' altro che la bagna.

Queſto

Jovius, Cavallo, Bloſio, Molza, Vida, and Tibaldeo. His charity and integrity were very exemplary [P]. His conſtitution was infirm, ſo that he was obliged to make uſe of the Phyſicians the greateſt part of his life (p). He bore his laſt ſickneſs with uncommon reſolution and ſerenity, affirming that he was willing to die on many accounts, and particularly becauſe he found, that the greateſt Divines were of opinion that we ſhall know each other in the other world. And he obſerved to thoſe who were with him, that many of his friends were departed, whom he deſired to viſit, and that he thought every moment tedious till he gained that happineſs (q). He died at Ferrara the ſixth of July 1534, according to Sanſovino, or the eighth of July 1533, according to Sir John Harington (r), being fifty nine years of age. He was interred in a very noble manner in the church of the Benedictine Monks, who, contrary to their cuſtom, attended his funeral. He had a buſt erected to him (s), and an epitaph inſcribed upon his tomb, which was written by himſelf, and begins thus, *Ludovici Arioſti humantur oſſa &c.* (t). His death was regretted by all who were acquainted with him, and particularly by the Men of Letters, who honoured his memory in Latin and Italian Poems (u). Nicolo Eugenico compoſed a Sonnet in praiſe of him, which we ſhall give the reader [Q]. Sign. Rolli in his *Remarks upon M. Voltaire's Eſſay on the Epic Poetry of the European Nations* (x), tells us, that *Homer's ſteps have been unqueſtionably followed by Virgil, Arioſto, Milton and Taſſo*; and he obſerves, that Arioſto is ſo highly eſteemed in Italy, that the Venetian Gondeliers have our Poet and Taſſo almoſt by heart. But he admires, that he ſhould be omitted in Mr. Voltaire's *Eſſay* [R].

(p) Sanſovino, *ubi ſupra.*

(q) Sir John Harington, *ubi ſupra*, p. 422.

(r) Ibid.

(s) Idem, ibid.

(t) Sanſovino, *ubi ſupra.*

(u) Idem, ibid.

(x) Pag. 5.

Mr.

Queſto mi baſta, il reſto della terra
Senza mai pagar l'hoſte, andro cercando
Con Tolomeo, ſia il mondo in pace o in guerra.

That is,

" Who liſt to ride about, about may ride;
" See England, Hungary, and France, and Spain;
" I love in mine owne country ſtill to bide,
" In viewing which I ſure have tane ſome paine,
" Thoſcan, Romagna, Lombardie, beſide
" The hills that Italie cloſe and divide
" Sufficeth me; the reſt of all the maine
" With Ptolomy to ſearch and ev'ry coaſt,
" In peace or warre, and never pay mine hoſt."

[P] *His charity and integrity were very exemplary.*] His beneficence was very extenſive; and he had a peculiar regard for his mother, whom he treated with the utmoſt reſpect in her old age, and mentions frequently in his Satyrs and other writings; ſaying in one place,

L'eta di cara madre mi percuo te, de pieta il cuore.

His character for honeſty was ſo well known, that an old Prieſt, who had three or four rich benefices, and was under ſtrong apprehenſions leſt he ſhould be poiſoned by ſome of thoſe perſons, who were to ſucceed him in them, choſe our Poet before all his own relations and friends, to live with him, as he tells us himſelf;

Ma ne di vio, ne di piu giunti a lui
D'amicitia fidar unqua ſi volle;
Io di fuor tutti ſcielto vinco fui.

In ſhort Sir John Harington concludes his account of him in theſe words: *His learning, his good behaviour, his honeſty, made him both beloved of all good men in his life, and bewailed of all honeſt men in his death; ſo as methink reading over his Life, I could find in my heart to wiſh (ſaving for ſome very few things),*

Sic mihi contingat vivere, ſicque mori.

[Q] *Nicolo Eugenico compoſed a Sonnet in praiſe of him, which we ſhall give the reader.*] It is publiſhed at the end of the Venice edition of the *Orlando Furioſo* in 4to, 1562.

Porto gran tempo al mare altiero il corno
Il Mincio, e ſparſe le ſue arene d'oro
Mentre che 'l padre de Pierio Choro
Fece nel grembo ſuo dolce ſoggiorno.
Non men hor lietto, e d'egual ſpoglie adorno
Va 'l Po, ſpargando il nuovo ſuo teſoro,
Poi che cantando in lui Cigno canoro
Fa riſonar le ricche ſponde intorno.
L'un perche irriga Mantoa, donde uſcio
Quel ch' i fatti d'Enea piu che mortali
Con ſtil divino a tutto 'l mundo aprio,
L'altro Ferrara, onde i concetti eguali
Spiegò chi l'opre di Ruggier ſcoprio
Monſtrandole ad ogn' un chiare immortali.

That is,

" Long did the Mincio roll his golden waves
" O'er the wide lands in triumph to the ſea,
" While the great Father of the Muſes Choir
" Choſe on its flow'ry banks a calm retreat.
" Not in leſs triumph flows the rapid Po,
" While the ſweet Swan awakes his tuneful ſtrains,
" And bids the waves convey his charming ſong.
" The Mincio waſhes Mantua, which produc'd
" Immortal Virgil, who records the acts
" Of fam'd Æneas, and the riſe of Rome.
" The Po Ferrara viſits, whence aroſe
" Great Arioſto, who with equal force
" And equal fame Rogero's valour ſings."

[R] *Admires, that Arioſto ſhould be omitted in Mr. Voltaire's Eſſay on Epic Poetry.*] His words are as follow (41). *But what is become of Arioſto in this Eſſay? In page 46 'tis ſaid to ſurvey all the Epic Writers in their reſpective countries from Homer down to Milton. Arioſto called by all Italy,* Omero Ferrareſe, *(the Homer of Ferrara),* Divino Arioſto, *(the divine Arioſto), a title given only to him and to Dante, the Italian Terence for his Comedies, the Italian Horace for his Satyrs, the Italian Tibullus for his Elegies. Arioſto was not worthy of M. V. his notice. He thinks, I ſuppoſe, that* Orlando Furioſo *is not an Epic Poem, but a Romance; he being perhaps one of thoſe, of whom Gravina ſays in the aforeſaid book (the ſecond book of his* Ragione Poetica), *they think Romances a different kind from Epic Poems, perſuaded from the name, which human caprice gives to things, more than from the knowledge of the things in themſelves. If Epic* (ſays he) *is nothing elſe but narrative, why ſhall not he be as much an Epic Poet, who relates in one volume many great exploits, as he, who relates but few of them, and ſuch as concern a principal one? If the Epic Poet is employed about poetical fictions as well as the Hiſtorian about true events, why ſhould not Arioſto, for example, be as much an Epic Poet, as Titus Livius an Hiſtorian; provided you would not exclude Livius from the number of the Hiſtorians, becauſe he relates all the deeds of the Romans, and put in his ſtead Saluſtius, becauſe he relates only the war of Jugurtha and the Conſpiracy? So far Gravina.* Sign. Rolli is of opinion, that our Poet was the greateſt of all the moderns of that nation; and he obſerves that tho' there never was ſo long a Poem as *Orlando Furioſo*, yet he never heard of any perſon, that read it even in tranſlations, who did not regret, that it was no longer (42). And whereas Monſr. Voltaire had aſſerted in his *Eſſay* (43), that *the Virtuoſi in Italy have diſputed for a long while, and ſtill conteſt which of the two, Arioſto or Taſſo, deſerves the precedency*; our Critic anſwers (44), that *in this diſpute there were ſo few on the ſide of Taſſo, that it was over at the very ſtarting of it. It is enough to let Mr. Voltaire know that the name of* Divino, *commonly given to Arioſto, was never given to Taſſo; from whence our Author may argue*

(41) *Remarks upon M. Voltaire's Eſſay, &c.* pag. 32.

(42) Ibid. pag. 28.

(43) Pag. 89. edit. 1727.

(44) *Remarks, &c.* p. 53.

Mr. Dryden likewiſe in the *Dedication* of his Tranſlation of *Virgil's Æneis* (*y*), tells us, that *with all his faults he muſt be acknowledged a great Poet.*

(*y*) Pag. 416. vol. 2. edit. London 1730, in 8°.

gue the National Taſte. Monſr. Voltaire having obſerved (45), that "every where elſe the chiefeſt exception, that men of underſtanding take to Taſſo, is that of having too much of Arioſto in him;" Sign. Rolli replies (46), that *in Italy the chiefeſt exception taken to Taſſo would be his having too little of Arioſto in him; and every reader may ſee it in reality.*

(45) Pag. 89, 90.

(46) Pag. 54.

T.

ARISTANDER, a famous Soothſayer under Alexander the Great, was of a city of Aſia, where almoſt every body was born with diſpoſitions to prophecy (*a*). He followed Alexander to the conqueſt of Perſia, and gained a wonderful influence over this Monarch [*A*] by the good ſucceſs of his art [*B*]. He had already had the ſame employment at the court of King Philip, and it was he who explained better than his brethren the dream that this Prince had after having married Olympias. He dreamed that he put upon the

(*a*) TELMESSUS. See the article of it. Plutarch, Arrian, Lucian, Clemens of Alexandria, and ſeveral others, obſerve that Ariſtander was of this city.

[*A*] *He gained a wonderful influence upon Alexander the Great.*] It is certain, there was no Soothſayer in the Macedonian army, that had ſo much reputation and authority as Ariſtander; *Peritiſſimus vatum* (1); i. e. "A moſt ſkilfull Prophet." *Cui maxima fides habebatur* (2); i. e. "who was in the greateſt credit." *Cui tum plurimum credebatur ex vatibus* (3). "Who "at that time was more believed than any of the "other Prophets." It is alſo very evident that Alexander was greatly ſuperſtitious. *Erat non intactus ea ſuperſtitione mentis* (4). i. e. "He was not untouched "with that ſuperſtition of mind." *Superſtitionis potens non erat* (5). i. e. "He was a ſlave to ſuperſtition." Hence it is eaſy to conclude that Ariſtander had power enough over him. This Prince, as Quintus Curtius obſerves, had given up his faith to him. *Qui poſt Darium victum ariolos & vates conſulere deſierat, rurſus ad ſuperſtitionem humanarum gentium ludibria devolutus, Ariſtandrum,* CUI CREDULITATEM SUAM ADDIXERAT, *exploraré eventum rerum ſacrificiis jubet* (6). It was with him that he ſhut himſelf up when he wanted to have the Gods propitious to him in the grand criſes of his affairs; it was with him, I ſay, that he ſhut himſelf up, to execute the moſt myſterious and ineffable ceremonies of religion. We learn this from Plutarch, where he is relating the preparations for the battle of Arbela. Ἀλέξανδρος δὲ τῶν Μακεδόνων ἀναπαυομένων, αὐτὸς πρὸ τῆς σκηνῆς μετὰ τοῦ μάντεως Ἀριστάνδρου διέτριβεν ἱερουργίας τινὰς ἀπορρήτους ἱερουργούμενος καὶ τῷ Φοίβῳ σφαγιαζόμενος (7). i. e. "Whilſt the Macedo- "nians were at reſt, Alexander being before his tent "with Ariſtander the ſoothſayer, performed ſome ſa- "cred rites, and ſacrificed to Apollo." Quintus Curtius ſays that on this occaſion, Alexander had much difficulty to get Ariſtander to him, to implore the ſuccour of the Gods; and that Ariſtander, in his ſacred veſtment, dictated to him the form of the prayers. *Alexander non alias magis territus ad vota & preces Ariſtandrum vocari jubet. Ille in candida veſte verbenas manu præferens, capite velato precibus regi Jovem, Minervam, Victoriamque propitiantibus* (8). We muſt not be ſurprized that this Prince ſet ſo great a value on his ſoothſayer; for he gained more by him than by any of his Generals. By his means, he filled his army with hopes and courage; which went a great way towards the ſucceſs of his enterpriſes. Do but conſider this Ariſtander, who in the height of the battle of Arbela, cloathed in white, and having the bays in his hand, tells the ſoldiers that he ſees an eagle over the head of Alexander, a ſure pledge of victory, and that they may ſee it as well as he. How much do you think that conduced to the victory, whether the ſoldier ſaw it or no? He would truſt to the eyes of the ſoothſayer; and if he ſaw nothing, he would impute it to his own eyes, or to the little time he had to look for ſuch an object in the middle of the air. *Vates Ariſtander albâ veſte indutus, & dextrâ præferens lauream, militibus in pugnam intentis avem monſtravit, haud dubium victoriæ auſpicium. Ingens ergo alacritas ac fiducia paulo ante territos accendit ad pugnam* (9). Plutarch obſerves, that Alexander lent a hand to his ſoothſayers (10); and for fear the event ſhould not anſwer the expectation of thoſe who confided in the promiſe of Ariſtander, that the city of Tyre ſhould be taken before the end of the month, ordered that the preſent day which was the laſt, ſhould for the future be reckoned only the 28th of the month. He had a mind to give his Prophet time, who nevertheleſs had not gone too far, for the city was taken on that very day, if we may believe Plutarch, an Author very much to be ſuſpected in theſe affairs! We muſt not forget that no body made ſo good a comforter to his maſter as our Ariſtander. He did not make uſe of a great deal of Rhetoric, to get him out of the moſt grievous troubles. A dream ſerved him for every thing. Alexander, being quite in deſpair, for having killed Clitus, was out of breath with groaning and crying. It was feared he would break his heart; his chamber door was broke open; he would hear no body; but as ſoon as Ariſtander puts him in mind of a dream that related to the death of Clitus, and repreſents to him that this unfortunate man was predeſtined to it a long time before, immediately the Prince was comforted. Ἀριστάνδρου δὲ τοῦ μάντεως ὑπομιμνήσκοντος αὐτὸν τὴν τι ὄψιν ὁ Ἴδιος περὶ τοῦ Κλείτου, καὶ τὸ σημεῖον ὡς δὴ πάλαι καθημαρμένον τοῦτον ἴδοξεν ἐκδιδόναι (11).

(1) Curtius, lib. 4. cap. 2.

(2) Idem, ibid. cap. 6.

(3) Idem, lib. 5. cap. 4.

(4) Idem, lib. 4. cap. 6.

(5) Idem, lib. 7. cap. 7.

(6) Idem, lib. 7. cap. 7.

(7) Plutarch. *in Alexand.* p. 683.

(8) Quint. Curtius, lib. 4. cap. 13.

(9) Idem, lib. 4. cap. 15.

(10) Διπορημένου αὐτὸν ἰδὼν ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ συμφιλοτιμούμενος (the edition of Frankfort of 1620 has it συμφιλοτιμούμενον, which would quite alter the ſenſe) αἰεὶ τοῖς μαντεύμασιν, ἐκέλευε. Plutarch. *in Alexandro*, pag. 679. *The King finding him in a perplexity, and always favouring prophecies, forbad, &c.*

(11) Plutarch. *in Alexandro*, pag. 694.

[*B*] . . . . . *by the good ſucceſs of his art.*] Thoſe who meddle with predicting futurity, are happy, when they ſerve a Prince deſigned by Providence for great actions. A thouſand human reaſons lead them to predict all ſorts of proſperity at a venture, and they have the happineſs of ſeeing the event juſtify their raſhneſs. Ariſtander was in this caſe. He embaraſſed himſelf with predictions at all adventures; and Alexander, with his good fortune extricated him. The ſoothſayer had a great deal of reaſon to love ſuch a Conqueror; and the Conqueror was excuſable for confiding in a man that divined ſo juſtly. I was once ſurprized at Alexander's being ſuperſtitious; and ſoon after, I ſhould have been ſurprized if he had not been ſo: and I am aſtoniſhed that his regard for ſoothſayers was interrupted in the time of his higheſt proſperity (12). He could not be ignorant that his good fortune went a thouſand times farther than his wiſdom, or the force of his courage. Hence he muſt neceſſarily believe that an inviſible and moſt powerful virtue took a particular care of his affairs: he muſt, to ſpeak naturally, be always diſpoſed to gain the favour of this power, by all the expedients that the ſoothſayers ſuggeſted to him; the ſoothſayers, I ſay, whom he conſidered as the continual obſervers of the time, when fortune was in a good or bad humour, and as the arbitraters of the means of pleaſing and appeaſing this Goddeſs. We ſhould think it leſs ſtrange that certain Princes deſpiſe all the counſels of thoſe who preſide over their devotions; certain Princes, I ſay, who ſucceed in their enterprizes only in proportion to the human means they employ, to render them almoſt infallible, and who are worſted on all occaſions, when their prudence has not taken all neceſſary meaſures. They are the Antipodes of great Conquerors; but I acknowledge it is always a ſubject of great aſtoniſhment. Could ſuch a great mind as Alexander's repreſent God to it ſelf under the idea that is formed of him by ſuperſtition? He had lucid intervals in his ſuperſtition, as when he rejected one of his ſoothſayers, who came to divert him from an attack, for which he was making great preparations: "In the midſt of "ſuch preparations as theſe, ſays he, nothing can be "more troubleſome than a ſuperſtitious ſoothſayer!" "*Si quis, inquit, arti tuæ intentum & exta ſpectan-* "*tem ſic interpellet, non dubitem quin incommodus ac* "*moleſtus videri tibi poſſit.*" *Et cum ille ita prorſus futurum reſpondiſſet,* "*Cenſeſne,* inquit, *tantas* "*res non pecudum fibras ante oculos habenti, ullum ma-* "*jus eſſe impedimentum, quam vatem ſuperſtitione cap-*

tum (13)?

(12) See what was quoted from Q. Curtius, in citation (5).

the Queen's belly a ſeal, with the figure of a lyon engraven on it. The other Soothſayers adviſed him to obſerve the conduct of his wife more carefully [C]. But Ariſtander maintained that this dream ſignified that the Queen was with child of a ſon, who ſhould have the courage of a lyon (a). She was then big with child of Alexander. King Philip himſelf endeavoured to explain this dream, and underſtood nothing of it [D]. Though Ariſtander applied himſelf much to the underſtanding of dreams, and though he was one of the Authors who wrote the moſt learnedly upon this ſubject (b), he did not forbear exerciſing his art upon all ſorts of prodigies. If they came to tell him that a ſtatue of Orpheus had ſweated, he ſaid that it foretold that the Poets ſhould one day ſweat in ſinging the victories of Alexander (c). If a ſwallow came to trouble this Prince, and even ſettle upon his head, Ariſtander ſaid it was a ſign that there was a conſpiracy againſt the King; but that the conſpiracy ſhould be diſcovered (d). If during the preparations for the ſiege of Tyre, the blood which came from the bread of a Soldier aſtoniſhed the King, Ariſtander ſatisfies him. He told him, that ſince the blood came from the inward part of the bread, it was a fatal ſign to the city, which they beſieged (e). At another time, he interprets the ſignification of a crow, which had let ſomething drop upon the head of Alexander, and afterwards went and ſat upon a tower, where it was taken (f). The entrails of victims were alſo the Province of this great Soothſayer (g): He alſo explained the ſignification of the actions of men [E]. It is very probable therefore that we are to aſcribe to him a Book mentioned by Pliny, which is filled with

(a) Plutarchus, *in Alexandr. init.* pag. 665.

(b) Artemidor. lib. 1. cap. 33. pag. 30.

(c) Plutarch. *in Alexandro*, pag. 671.

(d) Arrian. lib. 1. cap. 8.

(e) Q. Curtius, lib. 4. cap. 2.

(f) Idem, ibid. cap. 6.

(g) Q. Curtius, lib. 7. cap. 7. Plutarchus, *in Alexandro*, pag. 679.

(13) Quint. Curt. lib. 9. cap. 4.

tum (13)? The confidence he had in his own good fortune hindred him ſometimes from ſubmitting to the advice of Ariſtander. He thought himſelf to be deſtined for great things, which is one of the moſt powerful ſprings of Providence; and ſo he raiſed the courage of this ſoothſayer. *Rex juſſum conſidere felicitati ſuæ remiſit. Sibi enim ad alia gloriam concedere Deos* (14).

(14) Idem, lib. 7. cap. 7.

If any one thinks theſe remarks too long, I muſt let him know that I had my reaſons for the length of them. I had a mind to diſburthen another Article, where there was too great an abundance of matter (15). People read four things with more pleaſure than one, tho' that one be ſhorter than the four. This has obliged me to ſcatter a good many things here and there, which naturally belong only to one ſubject. What muſt not one do, to accommodate one's ſelf to a taſtleſs age?

(15) That of Alexander the Great.

[C] *He explained Philip's dream better than his brethren, who adviſed him to obſerve the conduct of his wife more carefully.*] Their reaſon was at leaſt as good as Ariſtander's, which was this. *One does not ſeal an empty box; and therefore the Queen muſt be with child, becauſe the King has dreamed that he ſealed her womb* (16). The others reaſoned in the following manner: *One does not ſeal a box, when there is no danger of its being opened: one ſeals it only when one diſtruſts thoſe who may come near it; therefore the Queen's box muſt be expoſed to theft, becauſe the King has dreamed that he ſealed it. The Lyon engraven upon the ſeal ſhews the neceſſity of a great precaution. This diſcovers the place to be beſieged, and that there are thoughts of ſurrendring; and that unleſs a ſtrong and couragious garriſon be ſoon ſent into it, the beſiegers will ſhortly enter.* Cicero, to expoſe the interpreters of dreams, alledges the different explications, that were given in a caſe, which very much reſembled this. *Parere quædam Matrona cupiens, dubitans eſſetne prægnans, viſa eſt in quiete obſignatam habere naturam: ad conjectorem retulit. Negavit eam, quoniam obſignata fuiſſet, concipere potuiſſe. Ac alter prægnantem eſſe dixit, nam inane obſignari nihil ſolere. Quæ eſt ars conjectoris, eludentis ingenio* (17)? i. e. "A certain matron having "a mind to have a child, and queſtioning whether "ſhe was pregnant, ſeemed in a dream to have a "ſeal put upon her womb. She conſulted a Di- "viner, who ſaid ſhe could not conceive, becauſe "ſhe had been ſealed. But another affirmed ſhe "was pregnant, becauſe nothing that is empty "uſes to be ſealed. What is this art of divining "which is deceitfully ingenious?" But, ſome will ſay, Ariſtander had better ſucceſs; therefore he reaſoned better. I deny the conſequence: one may be happier in conjectures, without the leaſt ſhare of ability more; and might not both of them be in the right? Does chaſtity always attend pregnancy? Olympias might be a little like Julia, who ſaid, *Nunquam niſi navi plena tollo vectorem* (18). i. e. "I never take "up a paſſenger but when my ſhip is full." We ſhall ſee another explication of this dream preſently.

(16) Plutarch. *in Alexandro.*

(17) Cicer. *de Divinat.* lib. 2. cap. 70.

(18) Macrob. Saturnalium, lib. 2. cap. 5.

[D] *King Philip endeavoured to explain this dream, and underſtood nothing of it.*] We do not learn this from Plutarch or any other heathen Author, but from a Father of the church. I ſhall relate all that he ſays thereupon: for we learn ſeveral things from it. *Philippus Macedo, nondum pater, Olympiadis uxoris naturam obſignaſſe viderat annulo. Leo erat ſignum: crediderat præcluſam genituram, opinor, quia Leo ſemel pater eſt. Ariſtodemus, vel Ariſtophon, conjectans immo nihil vacuum obſignari, filium & quidem maximi impetus portendi. Alexandrum qui ſciunt Leonem annuli cognoſcunt* (19). Hence it appears, I, that the ſeal being applied in a dream to the natural parts of Olympias, made her huſband believe ſhe would have no children. There was ſome probability in this thought; and one might almoſt ſuſpect that Philip was one of thoſe European Pagans, who had read, as they ſay, the holy ſcripture; One might ſuſpect it, I ſay, if the ideas only of common ſenſe did not lead pretty naturally to the conjecture of this Prince: but it is certain that the word of God repreſents the ſterility of women under this idea. If the ſhutting up of the womb is uſed to expreſs the puniſhment, which God inflicted by cauſing barrenneſs (20), the opening of it repreſents the benediction, by which he cauſed this evil to ceaſe (21). II. It appears, that Tertullian made no reflection on this idea, which the ſcripture furniſhes, and which might ariſe naturally. He took notice only of the Lion, which was engraven on the ſeal: he believed that Philip founded his whole conjecture upon this Lion. Tertullian ſuppoſes wrong in this place, and concludes amiſs. It is falſe that a Lion is a father but once (22); and beſides would not a man who could believe that, be thought ridiculous in predicting from it, that he ſhould never have any children? he ought to conclude from it that he ſhould have one at leaſt. III. It appears, that Tertullian had forgotten the name of the ſoothſayer, who got the better of all the reſt: he does not know whether he ought to call him Ariſtophon, or Ariſtodemus. He had retained only the two firſt ſyllables of the name, and could not juſtly ſupply the reſt. In a word, he did not recollect the name of Ariſtander. IV. We ſee that he was very well ſatisfied with the explication of the dream. It is one of thoſe, which he alledges to prove the excellence of our ſoul. Let us conclude here with ſaying, that perhaps King Philip diſputed a long time againſt his ſoothſayers, for the explication which he gave to the dream; and that Ariſtander perhaps ſaid to him as a Muſician did on a like occaſion, *God forbid that your Majeſty ſhould ever be ſo unhappy, as to underſtand theſe things better than I.* Μὴ γένοιτό σοι οὕτως, ὦ βασιλεῦ, κακῶς, ἵνα ἐμοῦ ταῦτα βέλτιον εἰδῇς (23).

(19) Tertullian. *de Animâ*, cap. 46.

(20) Geneſ. xx. 18.

(21) Ibid. chap. 30. ver. 22. See alſo chap. 29. ver. 31.

(22) See the Notes of Rigaltius on this place of Tertullian.

(23) Plutarchus, *de Diſcrim. Adulat. & Amici*, pag. 67.

[E] *He explained the ſignification of the actions of men.*] For example, he predicted that Lyſimachus, one of Alexander's guards, would come to be King, but that it would not be without much difficulty (24). His reaſon was, that Lyſimachus not being able to follow his maſter on foot, who was well mounted, took hold of the horſe's tail, that he might not quit his maſter.

(24) Appianus, *in Syriacis.*

with prodigious events [*F*]. But with regard to the Books of Agriculture, of which Varro and Columella have ſpoken (*b*), I could eaſily believe they belonged to another ARISTANDER; notwithſtanding Varro has given the ſurname of Athenian to him, who made them. Our Ariſtander out-lived the King his maſter, and was the cauſe by his remonſtrances, that they thought in earneſt of interring him. I do not know if this particularity has been touched upon by any but Ælian, who mentions it in the laſt Chapter of the XIIth Book of his various Hiſtory.

(*b*) Father Hardouin, in his *Index Auctorum*, takes the Ariſtander of Varro and Columella, and that of Pliny to be the ſame.

maſter. He had the misfortune to have an accidental blow in the forehead by Alexander's lance, who was ſo kind as to make uſe of his diadem, for want of a bandage to the wound: and the diadem happened to be ſtained with blood. It was upon ſuch a foundation as this, that Ariſtander built his prediction.

[*F*] *It is very probable that we are to aſcribe to him, a book mentioned by Pliny, which is filled with prodigious events.*] Theſe are his words: *Prodigio autem fiunt ex dulcibus acerba poma, aut dulcia ex acerbis: è caprifico fici, aut contra: gravi oſtento cum in deteriora mutantur ex olea in oleaſtrum, ex candida uva & fico in nigras: ut Laodiceæ, Xerxis adventu platano in oleam mutata: qualibus oſtentis ARISTANDRI apud Græcos volumen ſcatet, ne in infinitum habeamus: apud nos verò C. Epidii Commentarii, in quibus arbores locutæ quoque reperiuntur* (25). i. e. "It is taken for "no leſs than a miracle if ſweet apples become ſour "or ſour turn to ſweet: and if a wild fig-tree pro- "duce figs, or on the contrary. It is looked up- "on as an ill omen, if an olive-tree degenerate into "the wild ſort, or a white grape or fig become black. "At Laodicea, upon the arrival of Xerxes, a plane- "tree was changed into an olive-tree. If any one "deſire to know more of ſuch miracles as theſe, I "refer him to ARISTANDER a Greek writer, whoſe "book abounds with them; for it would be endleſs "to recite them all; and to C. Epidius, one of our "own countrymen, in whoſe Commentaries he may "find alſo that trees have ſpoken." Compare with this, the paſſage of Cicero concerning the inhabitants of TELMESSUS, which is related in the article of that city (26), and admire the incredible readineſs of the ancient Heathens to multiply prodigies.

(25) Plinius, lib. 17. cap. 25.

(26) Note [*C*].

ARISTARCHUS, a Grecian Philoſopher, a native of Samos, is one of the firſt who maintained that the earth turns upon its own center, and that it every year deſcribes a circle around the Sun [*A*]. He invented one kind of Sun-dial (*a*). The time in which he lived is not well agreed upon: all that is certainly known is that he was not born after the death of Archimedes [*B*]. We have none of his works remaining, except a *Treatiſe of the greatneſs and diſtance of the Sun and Moon*, tranſlated into Latin, and commented upon

(*a*) Vitruv. lib. 9. cap. 9.

[*A*] *He is one of the firſt, who maintained that the earth turns about its centre, and deſcribes a circle around the Sun.*] Sextus Empiricus, in ſpeaking of the hypotheſis of the earth's motion, plainly inſinuates, that Ariſtarchus had been the principal diſcoverer of it; for he names nobody but him. Οἵ γε μὲν τὴν τοῦ κόσμου κίνησιν ἀναίλουσιν, τὴν δὲ γῆν κινοῦσι δεξάσθαι φασίν, ὡς οἱ περὶ Ἀρίσαρχον τὸν Μαθηματικὸν, ὑ κωλύσεσθαι νοεῖν χρόνον (1). i. e. "They indeed who diſallowed the Motion "of the univerſe, but were of opinion that the earth "moved, as Ariſtarchus the Mathematician, were no "ways hindered from having a right notion of time." Plutarch, undertaking to clear up a thought of Plato, and aſking the queſtion whether that Philoſopher did not believe the Mobility of the earth, adds that this opinion was agreeable to that of Ariſtarchus and Seleucus, and that Ariſtarchus gave it out as an hypotheſis, and Seleucus as a poſitive aſſertion. Ὡς ὕστερον Ἀρίσαρχος καὶ Σέλευκος ἀπεδείκνυσαν· ὁ μὲν ὑποτιθέμενος μόνον· ὁ δὲ Σέλευκος, καὶ ἀποφαινόμενος (2). i. e. "As "Ariſtarchus and Seleucus afterwards ſhewed; the "one indeed only ſuppoſed it, but Seleucus abſolutely "affirmed it." Which is as much as to inſinuate to us, that Ariſtarchus was reckoned as the Inventor of that opinion. Archimedes inſinuates it to us in a more definitive manner. Theſe are his words: Ταῦτα δὲ ἐν ταῖς γραφομέναις παρὰ τῶν Ἀστρολόγων διαιρέσας Ἀρίσαρχος ὁ Σάμιος, ὑποθέσεών τινων ἐξέδωκεν γράψας, ἐν αἷς, ἐκ τῶν ὑποκειμένων συμβαίνει τὸν κόσμον πολλαπλάσιον εἶναι τοῦ νῦν εἰρημένου· ὑποτίθεται δὲ τοὺς μὲν ἀπλανῆ τῶν ἄστρων, καὶ τὸν ἥλιον μένειν ἀκίνητον· τὴν δὲ γῆν περιφέρεσθαι περὶ τὸν ἥλιον, κατὰ κύκλου περιφέρειαν, ὃς ἐστιν ἐν μέσῳ τῷ δρόμῳ κείμενος (3). That is, as Frederick Commandine has tranſlated it: *Hæc igitur in iis quæ ab Aſtrologis ſcripta ſunt, redarguens Ariſtarchus Samius, poſitiones quaſdam edidit: ex quibus ſequitur mundum proximè dicti mundi multiplicem eſſe: ponit enim ſtellas inerrantes atque ſolem immobiles permanere; terram ipſam circumferri circa ſolem, ſecundum circumferentiam circuli, qui eſt in medio curſu conſtitutus.* i. e. "Ariſtarchus of Samos refuting thoſe "things which are to be found in the writings of "the Aſtrologers, has advanced ſome poſitions: from "which it follows that the world, as it was juſt now "defined, is manifold: for he lays it down, that "the ſixt Stars and Sun remain unmoved; that the "earth itſelf is carried round the Sun in a circle, "which is placed in the centre of its courſe." The Copyiſts have probably falſified the paſſage of Plutarch, where we read, that Ariſtarchus maintained that Greece ought to proſecute for irreligion Cleanthes, who believed the Motion of the earth. Μόνον (εἶπεν) ὦ τἄν, μὴ κρίσιν ἡμῖν ἀσεβείας ἐπαγγείλῃς ὥσπερ Ἀρίσαρχος ἔφετο δεῖν Κλεάνθη τὸν Σάμιον ἀσεβείας προκαλεῖσθαι τοὺς Ἕλληνας, ὡς κινοῦντα τοῦ κόσμου τὴν ἑστίαν, ὅτι φαινόμενα σώζειν ἀνὴρ ἐπειρᾶτο, μένειν τὸν οὐρανὸν ὑποτιθέμενος. ἐξελίττεσθαι δὲ καγὼ λοξοῦ κύκλου τὴν γῆν ἅμα καὶ περὶ τὸν αὑτῆς ἄξονα δινουμένην (4). i. e. "Hark "ye (ſays he) don't bring us in guilty of impiety, "after the ſame manner as Ariſtarchus thought Cle- "anthes the Samian ought to be proſecuted by the "Greeks for a violation of their Religion, as hav- "ing removed the ſtability of the univerſe, becauſe "the man endeavouring to confirm the Phænomena "of the heavenly bodies by juſt reaſonings, laid it "down that the heaven remained at reſt, and that "the earth rolled by an oblique circle, and in the "mean time turned round its own axis." It ſeems to me as if the Copyiſts have tranſpoſed the names: It ſhould be read, *Cleanthes thought that Greece ought to proſecute Ariſtarchus the Samian for irreligion, &c.* It is the conjecture of Gaſſendus (5): it is a correction which Mr. Menage adopts as being quite certain. *In verbis Plutarchi*, ſays he (6), *legendum omnino ὥσπερ Ἀρίσαρχον τὸν Σάμιον ἔφετο Κλεάνθης δεῖν ἀσεβείας προκαλεῖσθαι τοὺς Ἕλληνας.* Amiot was not at all aware of the miſtake.

(1) Sextus Empiricus *adverſus Mathemat.* pag. 410. Mr. Menage upon Diogen. Laertius, lib. 8. num. 85. quotes this paſſage twice in the ſame page, the firſt time as from Sextus Empiricus, and the ſecond as from Pyrrho.

(2) Plut. *in Quæſt. Plat.* p. 1006. C.

(3) Archimedes, *in Pſammite*, pag. 449. *apud* Menagium *in Diogenem Laertium*, lib. 8. pag. 389.

(4) Plutarchus, *de facie in Orbe Lunæ*, pag. 922. F.

(5) Gaſſend. *Phyſicæ*. Sect. 2. lib. 3. cap. 5. p. 617. tom. 1. Oper.

(6) Menagius *in Diogen. Laert.* lib. 8. num. 85. pag. 389.

[*B*] *The time in which he lived is not well agreed upon: all that is certainly known is that he was not born after the death of Archimedes.*] The words which I have quoted (7) prove, that at the lateſt our Ariſtarchus could only be contemporary with Archimedes: but we know that Archimedes loſt his life when Syracuſe was taken by the Romans, in the firſt year of the 142d Olympiad, during the ſecond Punic War. Note that according to Plutarch, as quoted above, Timæus of Locris lived before Ariſtarchus; for the thought of Plato, which he endeavours to clear up, is found in Plato, as though Timæus had ſaid it in converſation. But ſince Plato was the Diſciple of this Timæus (8), and that after he had been in Egypt, it muſt be concluded, that if Plutarch has been exact as to time, Ariſtarchus flouriſhed after Plato. We know therefore, that he did not flouriſh after Archimedes, nor

(7) In the foregoing note citation (3).

(8) Cicero *de Finib.* lib. 5. cap. 29. and Tuſculan. lib. 1. fol. 248. A.

upon by Frederick Commandine, and publiſhed with Pappus's Explanations in 1572. Dr. Wallis publiſhed it in Greek, with Commandine's Latin Verſion, in 1688, and he has inſerted it in the third tome of his Mathematical Works, printed at Oxford, in 1699. The *Syſtem of the World*, which has appeared under his name, is the work of Roberval (*b*). We ſhall take notice (*c*) of a fault which has ſlipped into the text of Plutarch.

(*b*) *See* Menage on *Diogen. Laertius* book 8. num. 85. pag. 389.

(*c*) In the note [*A*], citation (4).

nor before Plato, and I do not believe that he can be eaſily fixed to any thing more exact. Blancanus has placed Ariſtarchus two Ages before Hipparchus, and has placed him an hundred years after the death of Alexander, that is to ſay, an hundred years after the first of the 114th Olympiad (9). He therefore thought that Ariſtarchus flouriſhed about the 89th Olympiad, a little after the birth of Plato. That does not agree with the paſſage of Plutarch, which I have cited. The opinion of Simler does not agree better therewith. That writer has made Ariſtarchus flouriſh under the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, which reached from the firſt year of the 79th Olympiad, to the laſt year of the 88th (10). Libertus Fromondus is ſtill wider from Plutarch's opinion, inſomuch as he does not know whether Ariſtarchus preceded or followed Pythagoras (11). I believe Voſſius (12) might have refuted that uncertainty by Plutarch's authority, if he had remembred the words which I have quoted. J. Stadius thought that Ariſtarchus ſurvived Archimedes; for he makes him flouriſh in the 144th Olympiad (13). Note that Vitruvius, in ſpeaking of ſome Mathematicians who had made diſcoveries, places Ariſtarchus in the firſt rank (14). If that were to be a rule, we muſt judge him to have preceded Philolaüs, and Archytas of Tarentum.

(9) Blancanus, *in Mathematicorum Chronologia, ad calcem libri de Ariſtotelis locis Mathematicis*, pag. 46 and 49.

(10) Simlerus, *in Epitome Bibliothecæ Geſneri.*

(11) Lib. Fromond. *de Orbe Terræ immobili* pag. 1. he named that book *Anti-Ariſtarchus.*

(12) Voſſius *de Scient. Mathem.* pag. 157.

(13) Joh. Stadius, *in Pref. Tabularum Bergenſium, apud* Voſſium, *de Scient. Mathem.* pag. 157.

(14) Vitruv. *de Architect.* lib. 1. cap. 1.

ARISTARCHUS, a celebrated Grammarian, was born in Samothracia, and for the place of his reſidence made choice of the city of Alexandria (*a*). He was much eſteemed by Ptolomy Philometor, who committed to him the education of his Son [*A*]. He applied himſelf exceedingly to criticiſm, and made a reviſal of *Homer's Poems*, with incredible exactneſs, but in a manner rather too magiſterial; for ſuch verſes as he did not like he

(*a*) Ἀλεξανδρεὺς μὲν ἦσαι, τὸ δὲ φύσει Σαμοθρᾴξ. Suidas, *in* Ἀριστάρχος.

[*A*] *He was much eſteemed by Ptolomy Philometor, who committed to him the education of his ſon.*] The words of Suidas plainly amount to that. Γέγονε, ſays he (1), κατὰ τὴν ρνς ὀλυμπιάδα, ἐπὶ Πτολεμαίου τοῦ Φιλομήτορος, ᾧ καὶ τὸν υἱὸν ἐπαίδευσεν. i. e. "He lived "in the 156th Olympiad, in the time of Ptolomy "Philometor, whoſe ſon he alſo educated." The Olympiad which he points out anſwers very well to the reign of this Ptolomy; but ſome will ſay, we don't find that this Prince had any ſons. The Hiſtorians allow him only one daughter; and that he who ſucceeded him was his brother. This objection is of no weight; for on one hand, if the ſon which he cauſed to be inſtructed by our Ariſtarchus, died during his minority, the Hiſtorians now extant might not think there was occaſion to mention him. On the other hand, it is falſe that they all are ſilent. Juſtin allows a ſon to Ptolomy Philometor, and ſays further that Ptolomy his uncle cauſed him to be put to death (2). The learned Allatius has not taken notice of this; he will have it that the diſciple which Suidas aſſigns to Ariſtarchus muſt be the ſecond Ptolomy Evergetes: *Cujus* (Ptolomei Philometoris) *filium ſecundum Evergetem erudiit Olympiade CLVI, ut Suidas tradit* (3). i. e. "Whoſe ſon, *(Ptolomy Philometor's)* the "ſecond Evergetes, he taught in the 156th Olympiad, "as Suidas ſays." That is a miſtake: the ſecond Ptolomy Evergetes was the brother of Ptolomy Philometor, and not his ſon. Voſſius was not miſtaken when he thought that Ptolomy Philometor made choice of Ariſtarchus to be the Preceptor of his ſon Ptolomy Lathyrus (4): he ſhould have known Ptolomy Lathyrus, or Lathurus, was the ſon of the ſecond Ptolomy Evergetes. What Suidas obſerves, that Ariſtarchus was the diſciple of Ariſtophanes the Byzantine does not furniſh one objection; for it is well known that an egregious miſtake is ſlipped into that paſſage of Suidas, where we read that Ariſtophanes of Byzantium flouriſhed in the 45th Olympiad. It ſhould be read *in the 145th Olympiad*, as Allatius and Jonſius have obſerved (5). *Ariſtophanis meminit Suidas, in quo obiter Librariorum error in Olympiade notandus eſt. Ipſe namque habet* Γέγονε δὲ κατὰ τὴν μέ Ὀλυμπιάδα, *quæ Hieronymus Wolphius vertit*, Vixit Olympiade XLV, *cum omnino ſcribendum ſit ϱμέ, id eſt*, CXLV (6). i. e. "Suidas mentions Ariſtophanes, in whom, "by the way, there is an error of the Librarians with "regard to the Olympiad to be taken notice of. For "he has it, Γέγονε δὲ κατὰ τὴν μέ Ὀλυμπιάδα, which "Hieronymus Wolphius tranſlated, *He lived in the* "*45th Olympiad*, when it ought to be written ϱμέ, "that is, 145." It is under this that the anonymous Author of the deſcription of the Olympiads places Ariſtophanes of Byzantium. The obſervation of Suidas, that the ſame Ariſtophanes was in his youth a diſciple of Callimachus is no ways contradictory thereto. Μαθητὴς Καλλιμάχου καὶ Ζηνοδότου, ἀλλὰ δ μὲν νέος δ δὲ παῖς ἤκουσε (7). i. e. "The diſciple of Cal- "limachus and Zenodotus, but attended the lectures "of the one when a young man, and the other when "a boy." A man who flouriſhed in the 145th Olympiad, might be the diſciple of Callimachus; for that Poet lived till the reign of Ptolomy Evergetes, the ſon of Ptolomy Philadelphus, and we know that this Ptolomy Evergetes reigned till the end of the 139th Olympiad. But if Ariſtarchus was the diſciple of Ariſtophanes the Byzantian, it is better to take notice of the ſtate where he flouriſhed, than to place him, as Suidas has done, under the 156th Olympiad. They who ſhall well conſider all theſe things, will have ſome trouble to conform to this propoſition: *Ariſtarchus . . . . lived in the time of Ptolomy Philadelphus, at the ſame time with Callimachus* (8). The learned Heinſius obſerves, that there are people who ſay ſo (9); and as he does not cenſure them for it, it may be ſuppoſed that he approved the opinion. He had better have condemned it. Monſr. le Fevre is in this caſe rather to be credited than his ſon-in-law: he places Ariſtarchus under the reign of Ptolomy Philometor (10). See the note [*G*], where we ſhall prove the truth of this opinion by Crates being contemporary with Ariſtarchus. A paſſage of Athenæus has made it ſeem credible that our Critic lived under Ptolomy Philadelphus: it is the place where Athenæus relates, that Ptolomy Evergetes was one of Ariſtarchus's diſciples (11). For want of examining the matter thoroughly, one might perſuade one's ſelf that this Ptolomy Evergetes was the ſon of Ptolomy Philadelphus; but it is certain that he ought to be underſtood to mean Ptolomy Phyſcon (12), the brother of Ptolomy Philometor. And indeed Athenæus ſpeaks of one Ptolomy, who was a Writer, and who is neceſſarily the ſame with him whom he quotes at the 12th Book (13), and whom he reckons as the ſeventh King of Egypt.

Here are ſome freſh proofs againſt Mr. Dacier's opinion. It is certain, that Demetrius Scepſius (14) lived at the ſame time with Ariſtarchus. This is what Strabo teſtifies, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον γεγονὼς Κράτητι καὶ Ἀριστάρχῳ (15), i. e. "being of the ſame age, "with Crates and Ariſtarchus." Voſſius did not conſider theſe words attentively, when he advanced that Strabo aſſerts, that Demetrius Scepſius was the diſciple of Crates and Ariſtarchus (16). But this Demetrius was contemporary with one Metrodorus (17), whom Mithridates put to death in the 181ſt year of Rome (18). Judge whether a man, who has flouriſhed under Ptolomy Philadelphus, could be contemporary with this Metrodorus. The death of that Ptolomy happened about the 506th year of Rome. Note, one might collect from Diogenes Laertius, that Demetrius was older than Metrodorus; and granting, that nothing can be retorted on me, nor can any one ſay that I prove too much. Note alſo, that a ſon of one of Ariſtarchus's

(1) Suidas *in* Ἀριστάρχος.

(2) Juſtinus, lib. 38. cap. 8.

(3) Leo Allatius, *de Patria Homeri*, pag. 103, 104.

(4) Voſſius, *de Poetis Græcis*, pag. 67. Note that in the 21ſt chap. of the 1ſt book *de Hiſtoricis Græcis*, he ſays that the ſecond Ptolomy Evergetes was the ſon of Philometor.

(5) Jonſius, *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſoph.* pag. 166, 167.

(6) Allatius, *de Patria Homeri*, pag. 103.

(7) Suidas *in* Ἀριστοφάνης. Pertus has ill tranſlated theſe words: *Hunc quidem*, ſays he, *adoleſcens, illum verò puer audivit.*

(8) Dacier, *Remarques ſur l'Art Poetique d'Horace.* ver. 450. pag. 371. of the Holland edition.

(9) Heinſius *in Prolegomenis Ariſtarchi Sacri*, folio **3.

(10) Le Fevre, *Vie de Poetes Grecs*, p. 7.

(11) Athen. lib. 2. *ſub finem*, pag. 71. B.

(12) That is the ſame as the ſecond Evergetes.

(13) Pag. 549. He quotes him in ſeveral other places.

(14) That is to ſay, a native of Scepſis, a city of Myſia.

(15) Strabo, lib. 13. pag. 419.

(16) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Græcis*, pag. 135.

(17) Diogen. Laert. lib. 5. num. 84, ſays *that Demetrius Scepſius advanced his countryman Metrodorus.* That is he whom Mithridates put to death.

(18) Plutarch. *in Lucullo*, pag. 506. *See alſo* Strabo lib. 13. pag. 419, who does not determine whether Mithridates put him to death.

he treated as ſpurious [*B*]. That edition of Homer was very much eſteemed, as well as very much criticized (*b*). He commented upon *Pindar* (*c*), upon *Aratus* (*d*), and upon *other Poets*; and it is not true, that in order to criticize every body, without fear of having the like

(*b*) See the note [*B*].

(*c*) See *Anti-Baillet*, tom. 1. pag. 80, 81.

(*d*) *See* Voſſius, *de Scient. Mathemat.* pag. 156.

Ariſtarchus's diſciples (19) was ſtill living, when Strabo was of a ſufficient age to attend at the publick Lectures (20). But, as Strabo lived till the reign of Tiberius, he could not hear the Lectures of the ſon of a diſciple of Ariſtarchus, if Ariſtarchus flouriſhed under Ptolomy Philadelphus.

(19) He was called Ariſtodemus; his father, named Menecrates, had been the diſciple of Ariſtarchus. *See* Strabo, lib. 14. p. 447.

(20) Strabo, ibid.

[*B*] *Such verſes of Homer, as he did not like, he treated as ſpurious.*] Cicero teſtifies that in theſe words: *Si, ut ſcribis, eæ litteræ non fuerunt diſertæ, ſcito meas non fuiſſe. Ut enim Ariſtarchus Homeri verſum negat, quem non probat, ſic tu (libet enim mihi jocari) quod diſertum non erit, ne putaris meum* (21). i. e. "If thoſe letters were not elegant, as you write "word, take notice that they were none of mine. For as "Ariſtarchus does not allow that to be a verſe of Homer which he diſlikes, ſo (give me leave to joke) "I would not have you take that for mine which is "not elegant." To this may be added that other paſſage of the ſame Author: *Niſi forte ſcire vis, me inter Niciam noſtrum & Vidium judicem eſſe. Profert alter (ut opinor) duobus verſiculis expenſum Niciæ: alter Ariſtarchus hos* ὀβελίζει. *Ego tanquam criticus antiquus, judicaturus ſum, utrum ſint τοῦ ποιητοῦ, an παρεμβεβλημένοι* (22). i. e. "Unleſs perhaps you have "a mind to know that I am judge betwixt Nicias "and Vidius. The one (as I ſuppoſe) publiſhes in "two verſes the expence of Nicias; the other, Ariſ"tarchus like, puts the mark of expurgation upon "them. I as an ancient Critic am to determine "whether they be the Poet's, or ſuppoſititious." It is ſaid, that Ariſtarchus marked the figure of a dart at the ſide of ſuch verſes as he condemned as ſpurious, and that from thence it came, that ὀβελίζειν ſignifies to condemn. *Tranſlatum ab Ariſtarcho, qui Homeri carmina in corpus redegit, atque in libros digeſſit, verſus nothos, hoc eſt adulterinos & ſubditicios, qui non videntur ſapere venam illam Homericam,* ὀβελίσκοις, *id eſt, minutis verubus præ-notatis damnans: contrà qui viderentur inſignes ac genuini* ἀστερίσκοις, *id eſt, ſtellis illuſtrans* (23). i. e. "Taken from Ariſtarchus, who reduced the verſes of "Homer into a body, and digeſted them into books, "condemning the ſpurious, that is, the ſophiſticated "and ſuppoſititious verſes, which did not ſeem a"greeable to Homer's genius, ὀβελίσκοις, that is, by "little darts ſet before them; and on the other hand "illuſtrating thoſe which ſeemed fine and genuine, "ἀστερίσκοις, that is, by Stars." Obſerve Auſonius's Poem, entitled *Ludus ſeptem Sapientum*; where he aſks for a rigorous cenſure of his Poem from Drepanius Pacatus. He deſires to be treated after the ſame manner as Ariſtarchus had uſed Homer, and he makes uſe of theſe lines:

(21) Cicero, *Epiſt.* 11. *ad Famil.* lib. 3. pag. 169.

(22) Idem, ibid. lib. 9. *Epiſt.* 10. pag. 23, 24.

(23) Eraſmus, *Adag. Chiliade* 1. *Centur.* 5. num. 57. p. 178.

Mæonio qualem cultum quæſivit Homero
Cenſor Ariſtarchus, normaque Zenodoti,
Pone obelos igitur ſuperiorum ſtigmata vatum,
Palmas, non culpas eſſe putabo meas (24).
That is,
"Such treatment as did Ariſtarchus give
"Mæonian Homer's verſe, may I receive:
"Or by Zenodotus's rules be try'd,
"And ſtigmatizing obeliſks apply'd,
"Againſt what you diſlike amongſt my lays;
"And I your cenſure ſhall eſteem as praiſe."

(24) Auſonius, *in Ludo Septem Sapientum, circa initium*, pag. 265.

It is thought that he ſpeaks of Ariſtarchus in the latter of theſe two verſes:

Quique ſacri lacerum collegit corpus Homeri,
Quique notas ſpuriis verſibus appoſuit (25).
That is,
"Who ſacred Homer's ſcatter'd works combin'd,
"And to each ſpurious verſe a mark aſſign'd."

(25) Idem, *Epiſt.* 18. pag. 649.

Charles Stephens, Lloyd and Hofman tell us in their Dictionaries, that Ælian teſtifies that Ariſtarchus's criticiſm was ſo juſt, that whenever he had condemned a verſe as not being Homer's, it was treated as ſpurious. *Ælianus tradit hunc tam caſtigato fuiſſe judicio, ut Homeri verſus non putaretur, quem ipſe non probaſſet.* Quenſtedt aſſerts the ſame thing (26). I do not think that Ælian does ſay ſo: and if he did he was miſtaken; for we learn from Athenæus, that this great Critic's taſte was often condemned (27): and that thoſe have been allowed to be the verſes of Homer, which he had rejected, and that his arguments were laughed at. His aſſurance alone was ſufficient to diſcredit his judgment: he determined upon ſeveral occaſions, that ſuch and ſuch verſes of the Iliad ought to be transferred into the Odyſſey (28). Allatius knew very well that Ariſtarchus's criticiſm was often cenſured. He quotes upon that ſubject Athenæus (29), Plutarch, and the Scholiaſt on Homer. He tells us, that Ptolomy of Aſcalon the Grammarian publiſhed a book *de Ariſtarchi correctione in Odyſſea* (30), and that Zenodotus of Alexandria was ordered to reviſe Ariſtarchus's criticiſm. *Zenodotus alter Alexandrinus ideo advocatus eſt, ut de reprobatis ab Ariſtarcho Homericis carminibus judicium ferret* (31). Idem (Suidas) Ζηνόδοτος Ἀλεξανδρεὺς γραμματικὸς ὁ ἐν ἄγει κληθεὶς πρὸς τὸ ὑπ' Ἀριστάρχου ἀθετούμενα τοῦ Ποιητοῦ. And yet he aſſures us, that antiquity had ſo great a regard for the judgment of Ariſtarchus, that it was not believed that the verſes which he diſliked were Homer's. *Ariſtarchi porro judicium adeò probavit Antiquitas, ut Homeri verſus non putarentur, quos ipſe non probaret* (32). Does not this ſhew a great error in his judgment? Elias Vinetus deſerves much cenſure here. *Cujus* (Ariſtarchi), ſays he (33), *veteres tanti fecerant judicium, ut quem non probaret, Homeri verſum non crederent. Ita Cicero, Suidas, Eraſmus.* i. e. "Whoſe (*Ariſtarchus's*) "judgment the ancients held in ſuch eſteem, that "they would not believe a verſe, which he diſap"proved of, to be Homer's. So ſay Cicero, Suidas, "and Eraſmus." It is falſe that Cicero ſays it: he only ſays that Ariſtarchus allowed none to be true verſes of Homer, but what ſeemed good to him (34). Nor does Suidas ſay what Vinetus imputes to him. I can certify the ſame thing for Eraſmus, with reſpect to the place from whence I have extracted the aforeſaid paſſage (35). Mr. Saldenus having a mind to make ſome alteration in the words of Charles Stephens which I have quoted, has made an unreaſonable blunder. He has not quoted Ælian, and he has not aſſerted that Ariſtarchus's criticiſm was exact: he contents himſelf with ſaying that that Critic thought it ſo. So far all is very well: Charles Stephens is dropped upon a falſe quotation, and no anſwer is made but what is very probable, namely that the corrector of Homer imagined himſelf a perſon of great abilities. But here lies the miſchief: from this high opinion, which he had of his own genius, it is concluded that the ancients received none as Homer's verſes, but ſuch as pleaſed Ariſtarchus. This is a very wrong concluſion. *Grammaticus ille, qui hoc nomen* (Ariſtarchi) *geſſit, tam caſtigato ſe putavit eſſe judicio, ut Homeri verſus nullus haberetur quem ipſe non probaret* (36). i. e. "The Grammarian, who bore this name (*of A*"*riſtarchus*), thought himſelf to have ſo refined a "judgment, that no verſe which he diſapproved, "ſhould be allowed to be Homer's." Thus reaſons Mr. Saldenus; and to prove his reaſoning, he quotes thoſe words, where Cicero ſays that Ariſtarchus rejected all ſuch verſes as were not to his taſte as foiſted into Homer. This proof amounts to no more than the theſis itſelf, in defence of which it was brought. I have read in the Commentary of a certain Modern, that *Ariſtarchus had ſo fine and penetrating a talent of criticiſm, that he was commonly called* the Prophet *or* the Diviner, *on account of his great ſagacity* (37). I have been ſurprized at not finding the leaſt trace of this great *Elogium* in an infinite number of writers, which I have run through in the paſſages where they ſpeak of this Grammarian. In ſhort, I have found this in a note of Corradus upon Tully's Epiſtles: *Hinc illum* (Ariſtarchum) μάλιστα ἐκάλει Παπαίτιος ὁ Ῥόδιος φιλόσοφος διὰ τὸ ῥᾳδίως καταμαντεύεσθαι τῆς τῶν ποιημάτων διανοίας. *Athen. l.* 14 (38). I have conſulted the XIVth book of Athenæus; but to no purpoſe. Howſoever that be, there is a great difference betwixt this quotation of Corradus, and that of Mr. Dacier. The Greek words only ſignify, that Panetius gave the appellation of

(26) Quenſtedt, *de Patriis Viror. Illuſtrium*, p. 433.

(27) *Vide* Athenæum, lib. 4. *paſſim, & ibi Caſaubonum*; *item* lib. 5. pag. 188, 189. *See alſo* Plutarch *de audiendis Poetis*, pag. 26.

(28) Athen. lib. 4. cap. 28. pag. 180.

(29) He only quotes the 5th book of Athenæus.

(30) Ἔγραψε περὶ τῆς ἐν Ὀδυσσείᾳ Ἀριστάρχου διορθώσεως. Suidas apud Allatium, *de Patria Homeri* pag. 105.

(31) Idem, ibid.

(32) Idem, ibid. pag. 104.

(33) Elias Vinetus *in Auſonii Ludum Septem Sapientum, init.* pag. 265.

(34) *See* Cicero's words above, citation (21).

(35) Citation (23).

(36) Salden. *de Libris*, p. 388.

(37) Dacier, *Remarques ſur l'Art Poetique d'Horace*, pag. 371, 372.

(38) Corradus *in Epiſtolam* 14. Ciceronis *ad Atticum.* lib. 1.

like retorted on himſelf, he had the cunning not to publiſh any thing [C]. They which ſay that he was contemporary with Piſiſtratus are groſsly miſtaken [D]. His reputation laſted a long while: Cicero and Horace made uſe of his name to expreſs a very rigid Critic [E]. It is ſtill uſed upon the ſame occaſion to this day. Some people attribute to him

of Diviner to our Ariſtarchus; and not that it was the ordinary ſtyle of antiquity.

Note that ſeveral perſons are of opinion that it was Ariſtarchus who divided each of Homer's two grand Poems into as many Books as there are letters in the alphabet, and that he gave to each Book the name of a letter. Plutarchus lib. de Homero: *Iliadem & Odyſſeam Homeri ab Ariſtarcho Grammatico in numerum librorum diviſam ad ordinem & numerum Græcarum literarum.* i. e. "That the Iliad and Odyſſey of Homer were divided by Ariſtarchus the Grammarian into a number of Books, according to the order and number of the Greek Letters. Euſtathius in Iliados α tradit. *Ariſtarchum & Zenodotum confuſum antea Homeri opus digeſſiſſe in certos libros, eoſque literis diſtinxiſſe. Unde non ſolum primus tam Odyſſeæ quam Iliadis liber α vocatur, ſecundus β, & ſic deinceps; verum etiam ipſum opus γράμματα nominatur.* Et ſanè verum eſt, hanc per literas diviſionem recentiorem. Nam antiqui nunquam eâ uſi, ut patet ex Ariſtotele de Poëtica. Cap. XXIV (39). i. e. "Euſtathius tells us in his Commentary upon the firſt Book of the Iliad, that Ariſtarchus and Zenodotus digeſted Homer's works, which before lay in confuſion, into certain Books, and diſtinguiſhed them by letters. From whence not only the firſt Book both of the Iliad and Odyſſey is called α, the ſecond β, and ſo on: but the work it ſelf is likewiſe named γράμματα. *And it is really true, that this diviſion by letters is of later date. For the Ancients never made uſe of it, as appears from Ariſtotle de Poetica Cap. XXIV.*"

(39) Johannes a Wower *de Polymathiâ* cap. 18. pag. 153, 154.

[C] *It is not true that in order to criticize every body, without fear of having the like retorted upon himſelf, he had the cunning not to publiſh any thing.*] Saldenus, under the fictitious name of Chriſtianus Liberius, publiſhed a falſity, when he ſaid, *Sic Ariſtarchus Grammaticus nullos non reprehendebat, nihil ipſe ſcribens, ne ab aliis reprehendi poſſet* (40). i. e. "Thus "Ariſtarchus the Grammarian found fault with every "body, writing nothing himſelf, leſt other people "ſhould find fault with him." I don't know whether he publiſhed it with the ſame reſtriction, as in the work, which he publiſhed under his own name in 1688. If he did make uſe of them, Mr. Menage has not quoted him fairly; for he cut off an eſſential part of the paſſage which he produces. Theſe are Saldenus's words in the work which he publiſhed in 1688. *Sicuti* Ariſtarchus Grammaticus *neminem non reprehendebat, nihil interim ipſe ſcribens, ne reprehendi ab aliis poſſet, ut nonnulli volunt: licet alii ſint, ac plerique quidem qui πολυγράφους ipſum accenſent, ut ſupra diximus* (41). i. e. "As *Ariſtarchus the Grammarian* "found fault with every body, and at the ſame time "wrote nothing himſelf, leſt other people ſhould find "fault with him, as ſome people are of opinion: altho' "there are others, and indeed a good many who will "have it, that he wrote ſeveral pieces, as we have "ſaid above." What he ſays concerning the cunning of thoſe people, who in order to cenſure all writers without fear of a retalliation, publiſh nothing themſelves, might ſerve as a ſupplement to one of the pages of my plan (42). To which might be added to theſe words of Mr. le Fevre addreſſed to a Journaliſt: *Yet, if you had publiſhed any Book of your own compoſing, it would have been well enough: but as matters now ſtand, I find that you play with rather too great advantage: it is a jeſt to ſtake but a farthing to a guinea; I don't know who would play with you* (43).

(40) Chriſtianus Liberius *in Bibliophil.* pag. 21. cited by Menage *Anti-Baillet*, tom. 1. p. 81.

(41) Guill. Saldenus, *de Libris* pag. 43. he had ſaid pag. 13. Ariſtarchus Grammaticus *ſupra mille Commentarios literis conſignavit*: he ſhould have ſaid, as Suidas did, *ſupra octingentos.*

(42) See the latter end of the ſixth paragraph of this plan, at the end of the 4th volume of this Dictionary.

(43) Le Fevre, *ſeconde Journaline*, pag. 48 of the Holland edition.

[D] *They who make him contemporary with Piſiſtratus are groſsly miſtaken.*] That miſtake is very ancient. Allatius recites a long paſſage where one of the Commentators upon Dionyſius of Thrace relates that Piſiſtratus cauſed proclamation to be made throughout Greece, that all ſuch as could bring him any verſes of Homer ſhould be rewarded for them at ſo much a verſe. When he had got together as many as he poſſibly could, he ſent for ſeventy Grammarians, and delivered each of them a copy of this collection. They were told that it was deſired, that each of them would ſeparately ſet to work, and put theſe verſes into the beſt order he could. After they had executed this commiſſion, they were aſſembled together by order of Piſiſtratus, and ſhewed each other what every one had done. They unanimouſly agreed in acknowledging that the work of Ariſtarchus and that of Zenodotus merited the preference; after which they declared that the work of Zenodotus ought to give place to that of Ariſtarchus (44). This ſtory amongſt other falſhoods contains this, that Ariſtarchus and Piſiſtratus lived at the ſame time. It were eaſy to diſcover this falſity; and yet the Commentators upon Dionyſius of Thrace have perſuaded a great many people into it. Euſtathius has related it, and after him Genebrard and Jaſon de Nores. Read this paſſage of Allatius: *Multis aliis recentioribus fucum fecerunt. Nam Euſtathius in* A *Iliados idem aſſerit.* Οἱ δὲ συνθέμενοι ταύτην κατ' ἐπιταγὴν, ὡς φασὶ, Πισιστράτου τοῦ τῶν Ἀθηναίων τυράννου Γραμματικοὶ, καὶ διορθωσάμενοι κατὰ τὸ ἐκείνοις ἀρέσκον. ὧν κορυφαῖος Ἀρίσταρχος, ὃ μετ' ἐκεῖνον Ξηνόδοτος. *Et inferius:* Τῷ δὲ ἀπαγγέλλειν τὴν Ὁμήρου ποίησιν σκιδασθῆναι ἀρχὴν ἐποιήσατο Κίναιθος ὁ Χῖος. Ἐλυμῶντο δὲ, φασὶν, αὐτὴν πάμπολλα οἱ περὶ τὸν Κίναιθον. καὶ πολλὰ τῶν ἐπῶν αὐτοὶ ποιήσαντες παρενέβαλον. Διὸ καὶ διαρθώθηναι αἱ Ὁμηρικαὶ βίβλοι, ὡς ἀνωτέρω εἴρηται. *Gilbertus Genebrardus Chron. lib. II.* Piſiſtrati juſſu Ariſtarchus Homeri rapſodiam recenſuit, & in 24 partes pro numero elementorum diſtribuit. *Jaſon de Nores in artem Poëticam Horatii*, Ariſtarchus miro quodam acumine caſtigabat veterum ſcripta, atque ideo colligendis Homeri verſibus præpoſitus fuit. *In quibus vides miros Anachroniſmos. Primus, qui Ariſtarchum ſub Piſiſtrato collocat. Secundus, qui Cinæthum Chium aſſerit primum Homeri Poeſim diſperſam recitaſſe. Cum uterque poſt Piſiſtrati tempora floruerit. Cinæthus enim, ſi Pindari Scholiaſtæ credimus in Nemeon, od. II. ſub Olympiade ſexageſimâ nonâ apud Syracuſas Homeri carmina ἐρραψώδησε* (45). i. e. "They "have impoſed upon many other moderns. For Euſtathius in the firſt Book of the Iliad aſſerts the ſame "thing. But the Grammarians, ſays he, put it together "by the command, as it is ſaid, of Piſiſtratus the "Athenian tyrant, and corrected it as they thought "proper, the chief of which was Ariſtarchus, and "next to him Zenodotus. And a little after; But Ci"næthus the Chian was the firſt who began to recite "the ſcattered Poetry of Homer. But they who fol"lowed Cinæthus debaſed it various ways, and mixed "amongſt it a great many verſes of their own. For "which reaſon the Books of Homer were corrected "as we ſaid above. Gilbert Genebrard in his "*Chron.* B. 2. tells us, that Ariſtarchus reviſed the "rhapſody of Homer at the command of Piſiſtratus, "and divided it into twenty four parts according to "the number of the letters. *Jaſon de Nores* obſerves, "that Ariſtarchus corrected the writings of the "Ancients with a ſurprizing ſagacity, and for that "reaſon the care of collecting Homer's verſes was com"mitted to him. Wherein one may ſee ſurprizing "Anachroniſms. The firſt, which places Ariſtarchus "under Piſiſtratus. The ſecond, which aſſerts that "Cinæthus the Chian was the firſt who recited the ſcat"tered Poems of Homer. When they both flouriſhed "after Piſiſtratus's time. For Cinæthus, if we believe "the Scholiaſt of Pindar in Nemeon, od. 2. recited "Homer's verſes at Syracuſe under the 69th Olympiad."

(44) Allatius, *de Patria Homeri*, pag. 93, *& ſeq.* He ſays that theſe Commentaries are not printed.

(45) Allatius, *de Patriâ Homeri*, pag. 96, 97.

[E] *Cicero and Horace made uſe of his name to expreſs a very rigid Critic.*] Conſult the oration againſt Piſo, you will there find theſe words: *Verum tamen, quoniam te non Ariſtarchum, ſed Phalarim Grammaticum habemus, qui non notam apponas ad malum verſum, ſed Poetam armis perſequare, ſcire cupio quid tandem iſto in verſu reprehendas, Cedant arma togæ* (46). i. e. "However, ſince we do not take you for Ariſtarchus, "but Phalaris the Grammarian, who do not ſet your "mark againſt a bad verſe, but perſecute the Poet "with your arms, I deſire to know what fault it is "that you find in that verſe, *Cedant arma togæ.*" The ſame Orator declares, that he was afraid of the ſcratches of his friend Atticus. *Noſtrum opus tibi probari lætor: ex quo ἄνθη ipſa poſuiſti, quæ mihi florentiora ſunt viſa tuo judicio. Cerulas enim tuas miniatulas*

(46) Cic. *Orat. in L. Piſonem*, cap. 30.

him a thought which others aſcribe either to Theocritus, or Iſocrates [F]. He had a great many conteſts at Pergamus with Crates the Grammarian [G]; and he died in the Iſland of Cyprus, aged ſeventy two years. He was grown dropſical, and found no better remedy againſt that diſtemper, than to ſtarve himſelf to death. There aroſe from his ſchool

(46) Cicero *ad Atticum*, lib. 16. Epiſt. 10.

tulas illas extimeſcebam (46). i. e. "I am glad that "my work has met with your approbation: on which "account you have ſet thereto the very ἄνθη, which "to me ſeem the more beautiful for your judgment; "for I was afraid of your red ſtrokes." That is, as any one would expreſs himſelf at preſent, to ſignify the cenſures, which a reader would mark in the margin of any Book, and the *Cerulæ Miniatulæ* of the paſſage which I ſpeak of. Atticus then was one of thoſe faithful friends, who examine with ſeverity the compoſitions of their friends. To ſhew this, Cicero calls him his Ariſtarchus. *Quid multa? totum hunc locum, quem ego variè meis orationibus, quarum tu Ariſtarchus es, ſoleo pingere, de flamma, de ferro (noſti illas λιχνίδας) valde graviter pertexuit* (47). The following verſes of Horace amount to a ſtrong proof of my text.

(47) Idem, ibid. lib. 1. Epiſt. 10.

Vir bonus & prudens verſus reprehendet inertes,
Culpabit duros; incomptis allinet atrum
Tranſverſo calamo ſignum: ambitioſa recidet
Ornamenta: parum claris lucem dare coget:
Arguet ambiguè dictum: mutanda notabit:
Fiet Ariſtarchus: nec dicet, Cur ego amicum
Offendam in nugis (48)?

(48) Horat. *de Arte Poeticâ*, ver. 445.

That is,

"An honeſt judge will blame each idle line,
"And tell you, you muſt make the cloudy ſhine;
"Shew you what words are harſh, blot out the
"rough,
"And cut the uſeleſs gaudy painting off:
"Look through your faults with [*Ariſtarchus'*] eye
"And tell you what you muſt correct, and why:
"Critique *indeed*, *nor ſay*, ſhall I diſpleaſe
"Mine honeſt friend for ſuch ſmall toys as theſe?

Creech.

[F] *Some people attribute to him a thought, which others aſcribe either to Theocritus, or Iſocrates.*] They relate this ſaying of Ariſtarchus: *I cannot write as I would, and I will not write as I can* (49). See what Mr. Dacier has ſaid upon theſe words of Horace: *Si quantum cuperem poſſem quoque* (50). Hitherto none of the writers, whom I have conſulted, has directed me to the original: my ſearches have been ſtill more in vain in this reſpect than with regard to Ariſtarchus being deemed a Prophet. It is that which makes me heartily wiſh that Mr. Dacier, and ſeveral others who reſemble him in that particular, would be ſo good as to leave off the cuſtom of not quoting. Are they afraid that the great and polite world, for whoſe uſe their labours are deſigned, would think that quotations have too much the air of the Author, the learned world, and the univerſity? But I don't know how to believe that ſuch a perſon as the Comte de Guiche (51), for example, would have been ſorry to know where any body had found that Ariſtarchus ſaid this, and where it is that he is conſidered as a Prophet. Every Lady, who has a taſte for learning, would ſtill be better pleaſed to know whether Plutarch or Ariſtotle relates a fact, than to know in general that it is related. But this by the by. Let us return to our ſubject. We read in Stobæus's collections, that Theocritus, being aſked why he did not write, made anſwer, *Becauſe I cannot do it as I would, and becauſe I will not do it as I can.* Ερωτηθεὶς διὰ τί ὐ συγγράφει, ὅτι ὡς βούλομαι, ὐ δύναμαι, ὡς δὲ δύναμαι ὐ βούλομαι (52). Iſocrates being at the table of Nicocreon King of Cyprus, was deſired to bear a part in the converſation: he would not meddle with it, and alledged this excuſe. *What I underſtand is not ſeaſonable, and what would be ſeaſonable I know nothing of.* Οἷς μὲν ἐγὼ λέγω, οὐχ ἁ νῦν καιρός. Οἷς δὲ ὁ νῦν καιρός, οὐχ ἐγὼ λέγω (53). This often puts me in mind of that thought of Seneca, "I was never deſirous of pleaſing the po-"pulace; for they do not approve of what I under-"ſtand, and I do not underſtand what they approve." *Nunquam volui populo placere, nam quæ ego ſcio non probat populus; quæ probat populus, ego neſcio* (54).

(49) Dacier's Notes upon the 1ſt Epiſtle of the 2d book of Horace, p. 435.

(50) Horat. Ep. 1. lib. 2. ver. 256.

(51) It is ſaid in *la Suite du Menagiana*, pag. 6. of the Holland edition, that this Count, in the midſt of the pleaſures and buſineſs of the court, did not fail ſtudying at leaſt three hours a day regularly.

(52) Stobæus, Serm. 21. *de cognoſc. ſeipſo.*

(53) Plutarchus, *in Vita Iſocrat.* pag. 838. F. *See alſo* Sympoſiac. lib. 1. cap. 1. pag. 613. A.

(54) Seneca, Ep. 29. pag. 219.

[G] *He had a great many conteſts at Pergamus with the Grammarian Crates*] (55). The words of Suidas expreſly imply the meaning above: Κράτης τῷ γραμματικῷ Περγαμήνῳ πλεῖστα διημιλλήσατο ἐν Περγάμῳ (56). Caſaubon, upon the authority of this paſſage, maintains that the antagoniſt of Ariſtarchus was not Crates Mallotes, but another Crates a native of Pergamus (57). As this Crates Mallotes was contemporary with Ariſtarchus, and well known to the King of Pergamus, one might eaſily judge that it was he who diſputed at different times with Ariſtarchus. On this occaſion it is worth the while to take notice that Suidas gives the ſirname of *Pergamenian* to the adverſary of Ariſtarchus. Perhaps he is miſtaken; for they who cite Crates of Pergamus do not repreſent him to us, near ſo much a Grammarian, as an Hiſtorian (58); and it is certain that Grammar was the principal ſtudy of Crates Mallotes. Read but this paſſage: *Primus quantum opinamur ſtudium Grammaticæ in urbem intulit Crates Mallotes Ariſtarchi æqualis, qui miſſus ad Senatum ab Attalo rege inter ſecundum ac tertium bellum Punicum, ſub ipſam Ennii mortem, quum in regione Palatii prolapſus in cloacæ foramen crus fregiſſet, per omne legationis ſimul & valetudinis tempus plurimas ἀκροάσεις ſubinde fecit aſſiduèque diſſeruit, ac noſtris exemplo fuit ad imitandum* (59). i. e. "Crates Mallotes the rival "of Ariſtarchus was, as we apprehend, the firſt who "introduced the ſtudy of Grammar into the city, "who being ſent from King Attalus to the Senate be-"twixt the ſecond and third Punic war, about the time "of the death of Ennius, when he had ſlipt into "the hole of a bog-houſe on the mount Palatine, "and broke his leg; during the whole time of his "embaſſy and indiſpoſition, he very often gave lec-"tures, and diſcourſed thereon with great aſſiduity, "and was an example worthy our people's imitation." It is of Crates Mallotes that this paſſage of Varro is generally underſtood: *Crates mobilis Grammaticus, qui fretus Chryſippo homine acutiſſimo, qui reliquit ſex libros* περὶ τῆς ἀνωμαλίας: *heis libreis contra Analogiam atque Ariſtarchum eſt nixus* (60). i. e. "Crates a noble "Grammarian, who eſpouſed the tenets of Chryſip-"pus a man of very great acuteneſs, who left ſix books "concerning irregularity: in theſe books he bore "hard upon analogy and Ariſtarchus." If Varro ſpoke in that place of Crates Mallotes, it is probable that Suidas took the one for the other; I mean, that Crates Mallotes, and not Crates of Pergamus, was the rival of our Ariſtarchus. I do not know whether the Commentators upon Suetonius, have ever thought of criticizing him on a point of Chronology, of which I ſhall juſt ſay a word. He ſays that Crates Mallotes came to Rome, in the name of King Attalus, about the time of Ennius's death. The death of that Poet happened in the 585th year of Rome. But at that time he that reigned at Pergamus was called Eumenes. He began to reign in the 556th, and died in the 596th year of Rome, leaving the tuition of his ſon, and the regency to his brother Attalus. So that if Crates Mallotes was deputed to the Romans by this Attalus, Chronological exactneſs will not allow it to be ſaid that he made that voyage about the time that Ennius died. But nevertheleſs Suetonius furniſhes wherewithal to confirm the opinion of thoſe that make Ariſtarchus flouriſh under Ptolemæus Philometor in the 156th Olympiad (61). Euſebius and Suidas are of that number.

(55) Suidas, *in* Ἀρίσταρχος.

(56) Idem, ibid.

(57) Caſaubon, *in Sueton. de Illuſtr. Gram.* cap. 2.

(58) *See* Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græcâ*, pag. 347.

(59) Sueton. *de illuſt. Grammat.* cap. 2.

Voſſius has not followed Suetonius: for inſtead of ſaying that Ariſtarchus and Crates Mallotes were contemporaries, he has ſaid as much of Crates Mallotes and Apollodorus the diſciple of Ariſtarchus (62). I do not pretend to ſay that this is falſe: for the ſame perſon might be contemporary both with the maſter and the ſcholar; but I take occaſion to obſerve that he is miſtaken in another reſpect; he thought that a Dramatic piece, which was tranſlated by Ennius, and which was called *the Achilles of Ariſtarchus*, bore that name only becauſe that great Critic had corrected it. *Ab hoc & vetus quædam Comœdia, quam Ennius poſtea tranſtulit,*

(60) Varro, *de Linguâ Latinâ*, lib. 8. *initio. See alſo* lib. 7. p. 97. *See in* Voſſius *de Hiſt. Græc.* pag. 347. Several Authorities which ſay that Crates Mallotes was a Grammarian.

(61) That anſwers to the end of the 6th Century of Rome.

(62) Voſſius *de Arte Grammaticâ* lib. 1. cap. 6. pag. 24.

school no less than forty Grammarians [*H*]. He left two sons, whose whole merit consisted in their great simplicity. He who bore the name of his father was sold, but the Athenians redeemed him (*e*). I shall have something to say against Moreri [*I*].

(*e*) Extracted from Suidas in Ἀρίσταρχος.

transtulit, dicebatur Achilles Aristarchi. Meminit ejus Plautus (63). *At sic non alia de causa vocabatur, quam quod ab eo esset emendata.* i. e. "From him a certain old Comedy, which Ennius afterward translated, "was called the Achilles of Aristarchus. Plautus speaks "of it, but it was called so for no other reason but "because it had been corrected by him." This is a mistake: That piece was a tragedy of Aristarchus the Tegean, who was contemporary with Euripides. See Scaliger (64).

(63) Plautus *in Prologo Pœnuli*, ver. 1.

(64) Scaliger. *Animadv. in Eusebium*, num. 1563. p. 103.

[*H*] *There arose from his school no less than forty Grammarians.*] He may be reckoned as the Head of a Sect, as appears from these words of Varro: *Relinquitur de casibus, in quo Aristarchei suos intendunt nervos* (65). *Hoc in oratione diligentius quam alii ab Aristarcho Grammatici* (66). See also the ralleries of Herodicus (67). It appears from Suidas, that the School of Aristarchus subsisted several Ages in Alexandria (68).

(65) Varro *de Linguâ Latinâ*, lib. 7. pag. 96.
(66) Idem, ibid. lib. 9. pag. 134.
(67) *Apud* Athenæum, lib. 5. *in fine.*
(68) Suidas, *in* Ἀμμώνιος.

[*I*] *I shall have something to say against Moreri.*] I. He has suffered himself to be misled by Vossius, when he said that Aristarchus was of Samos (69). II. Nothing can be more trifling, than to observe that Aristarchus was *contemporary with Crates* (70). That is explaining one obscure thing by another more obscure, *obscurum per obscurius.* There have been several Crates's: Diogenes Laertius reckons up ten of them, some of whom were Philosophers, others Poets, Grammarians, Orators, Geometricians, &c. (71). They did not all live at the same time; they were not of the same country; what then can be less to the purpose, than to remark that Aristarchus flourished in the time of Crates? The most famous of all the Crates's was the Cynic Philosopher. So that the most natural sense of Moreri's words, is, that Aristarchus was contemporary with that Cynic: but that is very false; there is a great distance of time betwixt the one and the other (72). This censure does not touch Suetonius, who has said that Crates Mallotes was contemporary with Aristarchus; for there were few men of letters in Suetonius's time, but what knew in what time Aristarchus lived. III. I do not believe that any body says that this Grammarian wrote *nine books of Corrections of the Iliad and Odyssey.* It is of Crates Mallotes, that Suidas says that (73), as Vossius observes (74), Moreri did not understand the words of Vossius. IV. It is false, that Ptolomy Lathyrus was the son of Ptolomy Philometor. V. I believe that after all it is true, that our Aristarchus was living in the 158th Olympiad; but since Eusebius and Suidas make him flourish in the 156th, that is what should be taken notice of. Vossius falsly charges upon Eusebius the having placed him in the 158th (75).

(69) Vossius, *de Poetis Græcis*, pag. 67.
(70) It is *Crates* in the ed. of 1688.
(71) Diogen. Laert. *in Vitis Philosoph.* lib. 4. num. 23.
(72) Diog. Laert. lib. 5. num. 87. says that Crates the Cynic flourished about the 113th Olympiad.
(73) Suidas in Κράτης.
(74) Vossius, *de Poetis Græcis*, pag. 67.
(75) Idem, *de Hist Græcis*, cap. 18. pag. 119.

ARISTÆUS, the son of Apollo and Cyrene [*A*]. His article has been very imperfectly given by Moreri, who has confined himself to telling us: I, That in pursuing Euridice the wife of Orpheus, he was the cause of her being stung to death by a serpent: II, That the nymphs, to be revenged on Aristæus, destroyed his bees: III, That *having made a sacrifice of some bulls, he recovered his loss* (*a*): IV, *That he found out the secret of extracting*

(*a*) All this is in the 4th book of Virgil's *Georgics.*

[*A*] *He was the son of Apollo and Cyrene.*] That is the general tradition: and there are very few of them amongst the fables that are more certain than that. Notwithstanding Cicero alledges another: *The Greeks assure us*, says he, *that Aristæus was the son of Bacchus.* He adds, that he was honoured in Sicily, in the temple of that Deity. *Quid?* he addresses himself to Verres, *ex æde Liberi simulacrum Aristæi non tuo imperio palam ablatum est? .... Aristæus, qui*, ut Græci ferunt, *Liberi filius, inventor olei esse dicitur, unà cum Libero patre apud illos eodem erat in templo consecratus* (1). i. e. "What? Is the image of "Aristæus openly taken away from the temple of "Bacchus without your order? .... Aristæus, who, "*as the Greeks relate*, is said to be the son of Bac"chus, and inventor of oil, was by them worshipped "in the same temple together with his Father Bac"chus." In another book he adheres to the most common opinion; he says that Apollo was the father of Aristæus. *Quid? Aristæus qui olivæ dicitur inventor Apollinis filius* (2)? i. e. "What? Aristæus the son "of Apollo, who is said to have discovered the olive"tree?" Let us speak of Cyrene: she was the daughter of Hypseus King of the Lapithæ, the son of Peneus and Creusa (3). This last was the daughter of the earth; Peneus was the son of the Ocean; Cyrene despised the employments of the other daughters and their good cheer (4); and did not love to sleep long in the morning (5). She cared for nothing but hunting, and made a great slaughter of wild beasts. Apollo having met with her at a time, when she was in single combat with a lion, asked Chiron who she was, and whether it would not be right to lay hands on her, and lye with her?

(1) Cicero *in Verrem*, Orat. 9. cap. 57.
(2) Idem, *de Naturâ Deorum*, lib. 3. cap. 18.
(3) Pindari, Ode 9. *Pythior.* pag. 433.
(4) Idem, ibid. pag. 434.
(5) Τὸν δὲ σύγχορτον γυκὺν παῖδον ἐπὶ βλεφάροις ὕπνον πεπαλάκωσε, ῥίπτοντα πρὸς αὐὼ. Pindar. Od. 9. *Pythior.* p. 433.

Ὦ τία
Κλυτὰν χεῖρά οἱ προσπτύξαι
Ἢ ῥα καὶ ἐκ λοχέων
Κῆρον μελιηδία ποίας (6);

That is,

"Is it lawful to lay my illustrious hand on her? and "crop from its bed that delicious flower?"

(6) Idem, ibid. pag. 437.

Chiron, beginning to answer to the last question, represents that lovers ought to use the key of the heart, that is, kind and gentle expressions, which may persuade the fair one to yield to their desires. He adds, that both amongst the Gods and men modesty opposes itself against an over-hastiness, wherewith any one shall make the first offer at enjoyment, and to explain himself in plain terms:

Καὶ ἐν τοῖς θεοῖς
Τοῦτο κἀνθρώποις ἁμῶς
Αἰδὼς ἀμφαδὸν ἀ-
θλίως τυχεῖν τὸ πρῶτον χύτας (7).

That is,

"Both amongst Gods and men there is a like sense "of modesty, if the first request for enjoyment be "over-bluntly urged."

(7) Idem, ibid.

"To conclude, continues he, it is by a visible effect "of your great civility, that you honour me so far as "to ask me the question: You, who know all things, "ask me whose daughter this damsel is." This is the sense of Pindar; I do not pretend to give a verbal translation; it is enough for me to shew his meaning. But if this be what he means, who can see without indignation the liberty that a certain French Writer takes, who makes him speak thus: Is it lawful for "me to look at her? May I venture to approach "her? Shall not I be too bold, if I take hold of "her fair hand, and crop from her mouth one of those "damask roses which I see there painted? But the "Centaur, smiling thereat, answered him in this "manner: A chaste love, Apollo, ought always to "be secret, and the fair sex, both amongst the Gods "and mortals, do not grant their favours in the "sight of the world. That is undoubtedly the reason "why you have just now spoke with so much cau"tion. A lover less chaste than your self would not "have had so much respect; and it is more owing "to your own good manners than my advice, that "you behave with so much modesty (8)." This translation contradicts the original, and is not consistent in its falsities; for if it be supposed that Apollo did not speak his mind bluntly, but in a delicate and chaste manner, Chiron's answer is ridiculous and contradictory. The end was, that Apollo immediately took Cyrene, and carried her into Africa, and enjoyed her without delay:

(8) Notes upon the *Aristæus of Virgil*, translated into French, and printed at Lions, 1668, p. 28, 29.

Ὠκεῖα

extracting honey, and of making oil, and cheese [*B*]. There were a great many other things to say concerning this son of Apollo; for we might have been told that he was born in that part of Lybia where the city of Cyrene was built; that he was brought up by the nymphs; that going to Thebes, he there married Autonoe the daughter of Cadmus; that by her he had Actæon, who was torn in pieces by his own dogs; that after the loss of that son he consulted the Oracle of Apollo; that by reason of the answer which was made him with regard to the honours that he should receive in the Island of Cea, he transported himself thither [*C*]; that a pestilence raging throughout Greece, he offered sacrifices which caused that

Ὠκεῖαι δ' ἐπεμάρανον ἤδη Θεῶν
πρᾶξις, ἐδεί τε βραχύβιοι.
καῖνο καὶ' ἄματι δαίτα-
σεν. Θαλάμῳ δὲ μάγῳ
ἐν πολυχρύσῳ Λιβύας (9).

(9) Pindari, Ode 9. *Pythior.* pag. 443.

That is,

"But the motion of the Gods, that are in haste, is "swift, and their ways of working short. That very "day compleated the business. For they lay together "in a gilded chamber of Lybia."

Chiron was for having him make fine speeches, and spin out his address; but the Gods of the Poets, as Pindar observes, could never bring themselves to have so much patience: they were for bringing matters to bear at once, and coming to the point the shortest way; coming directly to close quarters, and point blank to enjoyment either by fair means or foul. They cared for no part of a romance but the conclusion (10), and might have said like Boreas, *Apta mihi vis est* (11); i. e. "Force is agreeable to me." Cyrene conceived and brought forth our Aristæus. Note, that Virgil (12), and Hyginus (13), who make her the daughter of Peneus, follow therein an ancient tradition (14). It is for that reason, that we may say that Frischlin was highly wrong in blaming Boccace, and not knowing what they had affirmed. *Constat non recte scripsisse Bocatium l. 7. Geneal. c. 28. dum asserit Cyrenem Penei fuisse filiam* (15). i. e. "It is "plain that Boccace l. 7. Geneal. c. 28. has written "what is untrue, when he asserts that Cyrene was "the daughter of Peneus." Apollonius supposes that she was a shepherdess, and that she had resolved upon leading a single life; but that Apollo, who carried her off would not let her keep her virginity (16).

(10) Compare the 4th Scene of the *Precieuses ridicules.*

(11) Ovid. Metamorph. lib. 6. ver. 690.

(12) Virgil. *Georgic.* lib. 4. ver. 355. *See also* Servius on the 317th verse of Virgil.

(13) Hygin. cap. 161.

(14) Scholiast. Apollon. in lib. 2. Argonaut. ver. 502.

(15) Frischlin *in Callimach.* Hymn. 2. pag. 392. edit. Ultraject. an. 1697.

(16) Apollon. *Argon.* lib. 2. ver. 502, *& seq.*

[*B*] *He found out the secret of extracting honey, and of making oil and cheese.*] Diodorus Siculus relates, that Aristæus having learnt of the Nymphs, who nursed him, the art of curdling milk, of preparing bee-hives, and of cultivating olive-trees, was the first who communicated those three inventions to mankind; the advantages which they drew from thence, made them so grateful, that they paid the same divine honours to him as to Bacchus. The same Historian also says, that the Nymphs gave him three names, that of Nomius, Aristæus, and Agreus (17). This agrees well enough with Pindar (18). But observe, that he says that the Hours and Earth, to whom Mercury carried this infant, nourished him with nectar and ambrosia. Note also that some others say, that Aristæus having found out in the Island of Cea the manner of preparing honey and oil, and having raised those winds, which are called the Etesian, was surnamed Jupiter Aristæus (19), and Apollo Agreus, and Nomius (20). The surname of Nomius fitted him on account of his care of cattle, and that of Agreus by reason of his application to hunting (21). Here is a curious authority relating to this application: *Those who catch wolves and bears with pit-falls and traps, offer their devotions to Aristæus, because he was the first who found out the method of catching them in gins and springes.* It is a passage of Amiot's Plutarch; here is the original: Εὔχονται δ' Ἀριστέᾳ δολοῦσιν ἐρύγμασι καὶ βρόχοις λύκους καὶ Ἄρκτους ὃς πρῶτος θήρευσιν ἔπυξε παγάς (22). The Scholiast on Apollonius does not give the same explication of the etymology of the two surnames. He deduces that of Nomius from this, that Cyrene had to do with Apollo during the time of her being a Shepherdess; and that of Agreus from the affair's being transacted in the midst of the fields. He adds that, according to others, the etymology comes from Aristæus's having taught the Shepherds Agriculture. Ἀγρέα καὶ Νόμιον, says he, τὸ μὲν ὅτι ἐν Ἄγρῃ ὁμίγη τῇ μητρὶ αὐτοῦ ὁ Ἀπόλλων. Νόμιον δέ, ὅτι νομεῦσι ὁμίγη. οἱ δέ, ὅτι τὴν κατὰ τοὺς ἀγροὺς θηρατείαν τοῖς

(17) Diod. Sicul. lib. 4. cap. 83. pag. 167.

(18) Pindari, Ode 9. *Pythior.* pag. 441.

(19) Scholiast. Apollon. *in Argon.* lib. 2. ver. 500.

(20) Apollon. *Argon.* lib. 4. ver. 1218. mentions a temple of Apollo Nomius.

(21) Benedictus *in Pindarum*, Ode 9. *Pythior.* pag. 442.

(22) Plutarch. *in Amator.* p. 757.

νομεῦσι προσηγόρευσε (23). The passage where Apollonius says, that the inhabitants of Thessaly gave these two surnames to Aristæus, contains some things which it is proper to mention here. It is there found that Aristæus was brought up in Chiron's cave; and that when he was grown up, the Muses gave him in marriage, and taught him Physick, and the arts of Divination, and made him preside over all their flocks (24). It is said in another passage of the same Poet that he found out honey and oil (25). He says in Virgil, that the pains he had taken to improve Agriculture, and breed cattle, had gained him all the glory that he enjoyed.

(23) Scholiast. Apollonii in lib. 2. ver. 509.

En etiam hunc ipsum vitæ mortalis honorem,
Quem mihi vix frugum & pecudum custodia solers
Omnia tentanti extuderat, te matre, relinquo (26).

(24) Apollon. *Argonaut.* lib. 4. ver. 512. *& seq.*

(25) Idem, ibid. ver. 1132.

(26) Virgil. *Georgic.* lib. 4. ver. 326.

That is,

"For thee, inhuman parent, I must leave
"What short-liv'd honours I from men receive,
"Which care of sheep, and the laborious plough
"To thy industrious son will scarce allow."

He is one of the Deities whom Virgil invokes when going to write upon Agriculture:

Et cultor nemorum, cui pinguia Ceæ
Ter centum nivei tondent dumeta juvenci (27).

(27) Idem, ibid. lib. 1. ver. 14.

That is,

"And thou, for whom the Cean shore sustains
"Thy milky herds, that graze the flow'ry plains.
Dryden.

Oppian (28), Nonnus (29), the Scholiast on Pindar, on Apollonius, &c. agree in making him the inventor of those things which I have specified. The reader will find by and by some passages on that subject. Here is one that makes the city of Athens his native place. *Oleum & trapetas Aristæus Athenienses. Idem mella* (30). The word *trapetas* signifies mill-stones to grind the olives (31). We must not forget that he found out the *Silphium*. This is what an ancient writer quoted by the Scholiast on Aristophanes tells us (32), as you may see in pag. 356 of Salmasius's Commentary on Solinus.

(28) Oppian. *Cyneg.* lib. 4.

(29) Nonnus Dionys. lib. 5.

(30) Plin. lib. 7. cap. 56. p. 99.

(31) Varro, *de Linguâ Lat.* lib. 4. pag. 34.

(32) Ἀριστᾶιος... πρῶτον τὴν ἐγγασιαν τῷ σιλφίῳ ἐξεῦρεν ὥσπερ καὶ τὸ μέλιτος.

Note, that Justin says (33) that Cyrene being impregnated by Apollo, *à Deo repleta*, had four sons, Nomius, Aristæus, Authocus, and Argæus (34). So that he has made two men of Aristæus's two surnames (35).

(33) Lib. 13. cap. 7.

(34) It should be read *Agræus.*

(35) *See* Vossius, *de Theology Gentili*, lib. 7. cap. 10. pag. 350.

[*C*] *He transported himself into the Island of Cea.*] The Greek of Diodorus Siculus has it εἰς Κῶ νῆσον, and a little after ἐν τῇ Κῶ. Rhodomanus translates it *in Co Insulam*, and *in Co*. This translation perplexes the readers; for it leads them to believe that the Greek Historian speaks of the Island of Cos, the country of the great Hippocrates, and not the Island of Cea, as the other writers make it in treating of Aristæus. Nevertheless let us be assured that he speaks of the Island of Cea, and that the text ought to be corrected by putting Κίῳ in the stead of Κῷ (36), whether it were that the rules of contraction allow to say indifferently Κῷ or Κίῳ, when treating of this Island (37). Let us take heed to these words of Diodorus, κατὰ τῶν Κίων τιμαῖς, i. e. "concerning honours amongst the Ceans "(38)." They shew plainly that he does not mean to speak of the Island of Cos. However that be, let us instance some writers who have asserted, that Aristæus fixt his abode in the Island of Cea, and begin with the Commentary of Servius on these words of Virgil:

(36) It is the thought of Vossius, *de Theol. Gent.* lib. 7. cap. 10. pag. 350.

(37) And not *apud Coos* as Rhodomanus has translated it.

(38) It is what Salmasius on *Solinus* pretends, pag. 144, 145.

Et cultor nemorum, cui pinguia Ceæ, &c.

Which we had above (39). *Aristæum invocat, id est, Apollinis & Cyrenes filium, ... hic (ut etiam Sallustius*

(39) Citation (27).

that evil to ceaſe; that having left his family in the Iſland of Cea he returned to Lybia, from whence with a fleet which his mother gave him, he ſailed for Sardinia [*D*]; that there he choſe a dwelling; that he cultivated that country with great care; that he baniſhed from thence their barbarity and ſavage way of living; that he viſited ſome other Iſlands; that the largeneſs of the crops, and the multitude of the cattle, obliged him to ſtay ſome time in Sicily, where he taught the inhabitants his excellent ſecrets; that in acknowledgment thereof they honoured him as a God, and principally thoſe who cultivated the olive trees; that at length he paſſed into Thrace; that he was there admitted by Bacchus to the myſteries of the Orgia, and that in the familiarity which he had with him he learnt a great many things profitable to human life; that having dwelt ſome time near Mount Hæmus, he diſappeared; and that not only the barbarous people of that country, but likewiſe the Greeks decreed him divine honours (*b*). Moreri's obſervation that Diodorus Siculus mentions another Ariſtæus 84th chapter of the 4th book, is wrong; for that and the preceding chapter contain what I have juſt been ſaying. I am ſurprized that no notice has been taken there of Arcadia, which was one of Ariſtæus's principal ſtations [*E*]. You will ſee in the notes the differences of Authors, the ill grounds of ſome cenſures, and other ſuch particulars; and I ſhall not forget the aſtronomical diſcovery that is aſcribed to Ariſtæus [*F*], nor his worſhip of the Dog-ſtar, nor his daughter

(*b*) Taken from Diodorus Siculus, book 4. ch. 83, 84.

ſtius docet) poſt laniatum à canibus Actæonem filium Thebas reliquit, & Ceam inſulam tenuit primo adhuc hominibus vacuam (40). i. e. "He invokes Ariſtæus, that "is the ſon of Apollo and Cyrene. . .This man (as Salluſt "alſo tells us) after his ſon Actæon was torn in pieces "by his dogs left Thebes, and took the firſt poſſeſſion "of the Iſland of Cea, which till then was uninhabited." Apollonius tells us, that Ariſtæus having been invited by the inhabitants of the Cyclades, to put a ſtop to the peſtilence, paſſed from Theſſaly into the Iſland of Cea.

(40) Servius *in Georgic.* lib. 1. ver. 14.

Λίπεν δ' ὅγε πατρὸς ἰφτιμῆ
Φθίην ὁ δὲ Κέω κατνάσσατο λαὸν ἀγείρας
Παῤῥάσιον (41).

(41) Apollon. *Argon.* lib. 2. ver. 521.

That is,

"He having left Phthia by the command of his fa-
"ther went to dwell in Cea, having got together a
"company from Parrhaſia."

The Scholiaſt on this Poet aſſures us, as I have already ſaid, that it was in the ſame Iſland, that Ariſtæus taught the manner of making honey and oil. Ἀρισταῖος δὲ ὁ ἐν τῇ Κέῳ νήσῳ τὰ μελισσουργικὰ πρῶτος καὶ τὴν τοῦ ἐλαίου κατεργασίαν (42). We ſhall ſee in the note [*F*], that he there eſtabliſhed laws for the worſhip of the Dog-Star. Varro Atacinus gave an account in his Poem of the Argonautes, that a great mortality of cattle having viſited this Iſland, Ariſtæus by the advice of Apollo went thither, and delivered it from that plague after having offered ſacrifice to Jupiter Icmæus. The winds and violent heats which occaſioned the mortality ceaſed. Ariſtæus being dead, the inhabitants of the iſland of Cea obeyed the oracle, which commanded them to rank him in the number of the Gods, and they called him Nomius and Agræus, on account of the benefits, which he had procured them by his ſkill in the management of cattle, and the culture of the earth (43). We are not to be ſurprized to ſee here, that he occaſioned the mortality to ceaſe by calming the winds; and to find below that he made it ceaſe by raiſing the wind; for this is the way of ancient traditions; one contradicts another; the one forgets ſuch particulars, as are the only ones that the other does not forget. A compleat narration might teach us that by producing a change of the wind he reſtored health: but thoſe who don't know how to tell the whole, obſerve that the wind ceaſed; expect no more from them: or that the wind aroſe; that is all you are to know: they will not tell you that the adverſe wind was ſtilled, and that a favourable one ſucceeded it. The correction of a paſſage of Heraclides, which I have read in Salmaſius, appears to me to be an happy one: At the ſame time I ſhould not be poſitive that it was not in the original that the plague of the iſland of Cea had its riſe from the wind. Φθορᾶς νόσης φυτῶν & ζώων διὰ τὸ πνεῖν ἐτησίας (44). i. e. "When there happened a devaſtation both of "the plants and animals by reaſon of the blaſts of the "Eteſian winds. Salmaſius corrects it thus, Διὰ ἠτήσατο τὸ πνεῖν ἐτησίας. i. e. "He begged of Jupiter "to make the Eteſian winds blow (45):" which is agreeable to what I have to ſay in the Note [*F*].

(42) Schol. Apollon. in lib. 2. ver. 500.

(43) *See* Voſſius *de Theolog. Gentili*, lib. 7. cap. 10. pag. 350.

(44) Heraclides, *de Politiis*, p. 20.

(45) Salmaſ. *in Solin.* p. 144.

[*D*] *From Lybia he ſailed for Sardinia.*] According to Diodorus Siculus he ſettled himſelf in the iſland of Cea, after the death of Actæon, and next went into Lybia, and after that into Sardinia (46); but others pretend that his grief for the loſs of Actæon gave him ſuch a diſtaſte for Bœotia, and all the reſt of Greece, that he went to ſeek a dwelling in diſtant countries (47). It was at that time, ſay they, that he conducted a Colony into Sardinia. It is ſaid that Dædalus, having made his eſcape from the Iſle of Crete, joined himſelf with him to conduct this Colony (48); but Chronology abſolutely refutes that. He was contemporary with OEdipus King of Thebes (49); he could not therefore have any correſpondence with Ariſtæus the ſon-in-law of Cadmus. However that be, here are ſome very groſs contradictions. Pauſanias ſays, that a party of Lybians had eſtabliſhed themſelves in Sardinia, and united themſelves with the natives of the country, before Ariſtæus went thither; but Ariſtotle relates that Ariſtæus was the firſt, who cultivated it, and that before it only ſerved for a dwelling place for a great many large birds (50). Conſult Mr. Bochart, who maintains that this voyage of Ariſtæus is a fable (51).

(46) Diodor. Siculus, lib. 4. cap. 84.

(47) Pauſan. lib. 10. pag. 332. *See alſo* Silius Italic. lib. 12. pag. 498.

(48) Pauſan. lib. 10. pag. 332. Salluſt had ſaid that, as has been ſeen above in a paſſage of Servius, citation (40).

(49) Pauſan. lib. 10. p. 332.

(50) Ariſtotel. *de Mirabilibus Auſcult. Oper.* tom. 1. p. 831.

(51) Bochart. *Geograph. Sacr.* Part 2. lib. 1. cap. 31. p. 632, 633.

[*E*] *Arcadia.... was one of Ariſtæus's principal ſtations.*] It is for that reaſon that Virgil gives him the ſurname of *Arcadius*, when he relates the invention of producing new bees:

Tempus & Arcadii memoranda inventa Magiſtri
Pandere, quoque modo cæſis jam ſæpe juvencis
Inſincerus apes tulerit cruor (52).

(52) Virg. *Georg.* lib. 4. ver. 283.

That is,

"'Tis time to touch the precepts of an art
"The *Arcadian* maſter did of old impart:
"And how he ſtock'd his empty hives again,
"Renew'd with putrid gore of oxen ſlain.
Dryden.

That art was Ariſtæus's invention, and occaſioned him to be honoured as Jupiter in Arcadia. *Poſt eâ* (Cea) *relictâ, cum Dædalo ad Sardiniam tranſitum fecit. Huic opinioni Pindarus refragatur, qui eum ait de Cea inſulâ in Arcadiam migraſſe, ibique vitam coluiſſe. Nam apud Arcadas pro Jove colitur, quod primus oſtenderit qualiter apes debeant reparari* (53). i. e. "Afterwards "having left it (Cea), he paſſed over with Dædalus to "Sardinia. This opinion Pindar contradicts, who ſays, "that he removed from the iſland of Cea into Arcadia "and there dwelt. For he is worſhipped as Jupiter "by the Arcadians, becauſe he firſt ſhewed the me-"thod of recruiting loſt bees." Juſtin gives Ariſtæus a great Kingdom in Arcadia. I ſhall cite his words in the following note. It is not true, as Mr. Lloyd aſſerts, that Apollonius makes Ariſtæus paſs from Arcadia into the iſland of Cea. He has copied that miſtake from Salmaſius (54).

(53) Servius *in Georgic.* lib. 1. ver. 14.

(54) Salmaſ. *in Solin.* pag. 99.

[*F*] *I ſhall not omit the Aſtronomical diſcovery that is aſcribed to Ariſtæus.*] To conſider the words of Juſtin only in a ſuperficial manner, one might fancy that he attributes to Ariſtæus the firſt diſcovery of the Solſtices; but they who read with attention, may eaſily obſerve, that he ſpeaks of the riſing of the Dog-ſtar. *Ariſtæum in Arcadiâ latè regnaſſe, eumque primum & apium & mellis uſum & lactis ad coagula hominibus tradidiſſe, ſolſtitialeſque*

ſolſtitialeſque ortus ſideris primum inveniſſe (55). i. e. " That Ariſtæus had large dominions in Arcadia, and " that he firſt taught men the uſe of bees and honey, " and the method of curdling milk, and that he " found out the Solſtitial riſe of the ſtar." The moſt able Critics have remarked that it ſhould be read, either *Solſtitialiſque ortus Sideris*, i. e. " the riſing of the " Solſtitial St[illegible]," or *Solſtitialeſque ortus Sirii*, " the " Solſtitial riſing of Sirius (56)." Both theſe readings give us the Dog-ſtar, as they pretend. It is certain that this Star had a particular relation to our Ariſtæus; for this reaſon, the heats of the Dog-ſtar laid waſte the Cyclades, and occaſioned there a peſtilence, which Ariſtæus was entreated to put a ſtop to. He went directly into the iſland of Cea, and built an altar to Jupiter: he offered ſacrifices to that Deity; and offered ſome likewiſe to that malignant Star, and eſtabliſhed an anniverſary to it. That produced a very good effect; for it was from thence that the Eteſian winds had their origin which continue forty days, and temper the heat of the ſummer.

(55) Juſtin. lib. 13. cap. 7. pag. 313, 314.

(56) See the *Juſtin Variorum* of Mr. Grævius on this paſſage.

Καὶ βωμὸν ποίησε μέγαν διὸς ὑμαλίοιο·
Ἱερά τ' ὤ ἔρεξεν ἐν ἄρεσιν ἀφὲρι κείνῳ
Σειρίῳ, αὐτῷ τε προπίδη δλί. τοῖο δ' ἔκητι
Γαῖαι ἐπιψύχουσιν ἐτήσιοι ἐκ διὸς αὖραι
Ἡματα τεσσαράκοντα. Κέω δ' ἔτι νῦν ἱερῆες
Ἀστολίων προπάροιθε κυνὸς ῥίζοισι θυηλάς (57).

(57) Apollon. *Argon.* lib. 2. ver. 524.

That is,

" He then a large and ſplendid altar raiſed
" To ſhow'r-producing Jove, and him appeas'd
" By pious off'rings on the hills, which he
" To Jove and baleful *Sirius* did decree
" With this effect: Diurnal winds allay
" Each year with cooling blaſts his ſcorching ray,
" And forty days upon the iſland play;
" And ſtill the Cean Prieſts before the riſe
" Of parching *Sirius* offer ſacrifice."

Diodorus Siculus does not plainly enough intimate whether the Eteſian winds were the effect of Ariſtæus's ſacrifice (58). He ſeems to ſay that this ſacrifice having been offered about the time of the Dog-ſtar's riſing, a time which concurs with the ſeaſon of the Eteſian winds, the plague ceaſed. But it is certain that he pretends that the vehement heats of the Dog-ſtar were qualified by the religious acts which Ariſtæus performed. He finds therein a ſubject for admiration, that the ſame perſon, whoſe ſon had been torn to pieces by dogs, corrected the malignity of a Star called the Dog. I omit his Greek and only produce Rhodomannus's tranſlation. *Singularem hanc rerum converſionem, ſi quis penitius examinet, meritò demiretur. Qui enim filium a canibus diſcerptum vidit, is cœleſte ſidus canis nomine appellatum quod hominibus exitium adferre putatur, mitigavit, & mortalibus non paucis auctor ſalutis extitit* (59). i. e. " If any one examine narrowly this ſingular turn of " affairs, he may with reaſon admire it: for he who " ſaw his ſon torn to pieces by dogs, is the ſame " perſon who mitigated the fury of a celeſtial Star " called the Dog, which is ſuppoſed to bring de- " ſtruction on mankind, and thus he appeared as the " author of health to a great many mortals." Other writers ſay in clear and expreſs terms, that the devotions of Ariſtæus were the cauſe of theſe winds. *Canicula exoriens æſtu eorum* (60) *loca & agros fructibus orbabat: & ipſos morbo affectos pœnas Icario cum dolore ſufferre cogebat, eo quod latrones recepiſſent. Quorum rex Ariſtæus Apollinis & Cyrenes filius, Actæonis pater, petit a parente quo facto a calamitate civitatem poſſet liberare: quem Deus jubet multis hoſtiis expiare Icarii mortem, & ab Jove petere, ut quo tempore Canicula exoriretur, dies quadraginta ventum daret, qui æſtui Caniculæ mederetur. Quod juſſum Ariſtæus confecit, & ab Jove impetravit ut Eteſiæ flarent* (61). i. e. " The Dog-ſtar ariſing deſtroyed the fruits of their " gardens and fields by its heat: and brought diſeaſes " upon them with Icarian pains, which they were " obliged to ſuffer as a puniſhment for receiving rob- " bers. Their King Ariſtæus, the ſon of Apollo and " Cyrene, the father of Actæon, begged of his father, " to know by what means he might free the city " from its calamity. The God commands him " to expiate the death of Icarius by a great many " ſacrifices, and to beg of Jupiter, that at the time " of the riſing of the Dog-ſtar he would give them " ſuch a wind for forty days as might temper its heat. " This command Ariſtæus performed, and obtained " of Jupiter that the Eteſian winds ſhould blow." The Scholiaſt on Apollonius ſays expreſsly, that at the prayers of Ariſtæus the Eteſian winds blew. Ὅτι ἐτησίαι ἔπνευσαν Ἀριστέου αἰτησαμένου (62). Conſult alſo the Commentary of Germanicus on the Phænomena of Aratus (63). Let us ſay ſomewhat of the anniverſary which he eſtabliſhed. He ordained, that every year, the Prieſts of Cea ſhould offer ſacrifices before the riſing of the Dog-ſtar, and that the inhabitants ſhould put themſelves under arms, to obſerve the riſing of that conſtellation, and to offer victims thereunto (64). Ἐνομοθέτησε δὲ τοῖς κώοις (read it κέοις) κατ' ἐνιαυτὸν μεθ' ὅπλων ἐπιτηρεῖν τὴν ἐπιτολὴν τοῦ κυνὸς, & θύειν αὐτῷ (65). Cicero ſays, that they believed they could foreſee by the obſervation of the Star, whether the year would be healthful or not. *Ceos accepimus ortum caniculæ diligenter quotannis ſolere ſervare, conjecturamque capere, ut ſcribit Ponticus Heraclides, ſalubriſne an peſtilens annus futurus ſit* (66). Manilius attributes the ſame thing to the Cilicians (67). I do not know whether the inhabitants of Calabria, who made vows to the Dog-ſtar, had borrowed from Ariſtæus directly or indirectly, that act of religion:

(62) Schol. Apollon. in lib. 2. ver. 500.

(63) Germ. *in Aratea Phænom. in Aquario*, pag. 118, 119.

(64) Apollon. lib. 2. ver. 528. You will find the words above, citation (57).

(65) Schol. Apollon. in lib. 2. ver. 528.

(66) Cicero, *de Divinat.* lib. 1. cap. 57.

(67) Manil. *Aſtronom.* lib. 1. pag. 13.

Sic cum Stabulis & meſſibus ingens
Ira Deum & Calabri populator Sirius arvi
Incubuit, coit agreſtem manus inſcia priſcum
In nemus, & miſeris dictat pia vota ſacerdos (68).

That is,

" Thus have I ſeen, when threat'ning *Sirius* reigns,
" And with dire blaſts aſſails Calabria's plains,
" Th' unhappy ſwains approach the ſacred grove,
" And make what pious vows the Prieſts approve.

(68) Val. Flaccus, *Argonaut.* lib. 1. ver. 682.

What ſuperſtitions are here! but they are none of the ſtrangeſt that were among the Pagans. The paſſage of Juſtin, which I quoted at the beginning of this note, will here furniſh us with an incident. M. le Fevre of Saumur fancied himſelf the firſt that had underſtood him. " Juſtin, *ſays he*, does not offer to ſay that " Ariſtæus taught the uſe of milk: that had been " contrary to the truth, and to all antiquity; he " only ſpeaks of the art of curdling the milk. *Sed* " *oſtendiſſe hominibus qua arte coagulum ex lacte confici* " *confirmarique poſſet* (69). " Neither does he pretend, " that Ariſtæus found out the uſe of honey: Milk and " honey ſerved for the nouriſhment of the Sovereign of " the Gods. *Nam Jupiter pater ille hominumque* " *Deumque melle nutritus eſt ac lacte* (70). " He there- " fore ſpeaks of the invention of curdling the milk " with honey. *Ergo aliud docuit Ariſtæus, ſcilicet* " *coagulum fieri ex mixturâ, ſeu, ut Græci vocant, cra-* " *mate mellis & lactis. Hunc locum à nemine hactenus* " *intellectum arbitror* (71). i. e. Ariſtæus therefore taught " a quite different thing, namely that curd was made " by a mixture, or as the Greeks call it *Crama*, of " milk and honey. I am of opinion that this place " has not hitherto been underſtood by any one." This explication appears to me to be very ingenious; but the reaſons on which it is founded prove too much; for if the ancient tradition about the aliments which were given Jupiter in his infancy had hindered Juſtin from ſaying, that Ariſtæus ſhewed mankind the uſe of honey, he ſhould not have told that Gargoris King of the Cynetes (72), or Cunetes, was the firſt inventor of honey; and yet he has ſaid ſo expreſly, and in ſuch a manner as cannot poſſibly bear two ſenſes. *Quorum* (Cunetum) *rex vetuſtiſſimus Gargoris, mellis colligendi uſum primus invenit* (73). i. e. " Whoſe *(the Cune-* " *tes's)* moſt ancient King Gargoris firſt found out " the uſe of gathering honey." I do not ſee that it can be pretended, that Juſtin has had ſuch a regard for poetical traditions, as to be afraid of advancing ſuch things as contradicted them. A multitude of Writers have ſaid that Ariſtæus invented honey: their words amount to that abſolutely, and cannot be changed from this meaning, *He invented a certain mixture of honey and milk to make a coagulation.* Therefore one might reaſonably ſuppoſe that Juſtin ſaid as they did, and that he had no regard to what the Poets had aſſerted about the milk and honey of Jupiter. Obſerve by the way, that Ariſtæus's inventions conſiſted ſometimes in mixtures; for he was the firſt who taught the Thracians to mix honey with the Maronean wine. *Ariſtæum primum omnium in eadem gente mel miſcuiſſe vino,*

(69) Tanaq. Faber, *Not. in Juſtin.* lib. 13. c. 7.

(70) Idem, ibid.

(71) Idem, ibid.

(72) People of Spain.

(73) Juſtin. lib. 44. cap. 4.

(58) Diodor. Sicul. lib. 4. cap. 84.

(59) Idem, ibid. pag. 268.

(60) It ſhould be read ſo, and not *corum*. *See* Salmaſius *on Solinus*, pag. 144.

(61) Hygin. *Poetic. Aſtronom.* lib. 2. cap. 4. pag. 365.

daughter Macris [G]. It has been ſaid that for the ſervices which he had rendered to mankind by his knowledge of all profitable arts, the Gods placed him amongſt the Stars, and that he was the Aquarius of the Zodiac (c). The reſemblance of his Hiſtory to that of Moſes has been curiouſly and learnedly diſcuſſed by Huetius (d). Almoſt all that Lloyd has added to Charles Stephens on this head, has been taken word for word from the Commentary of La Cerda (e): yet he does not quote him.

(c) See the *Comment.* of Germanic. *in Aretea Phænomena*, cap. *de Aquario*, pag. 118.

(d) Huet *Demonſtr. Evang. Propoſ.* 4. cap. 8. num. 17. p. 110.

(e) In lib. 4. *Georgic. Virgilii.*

no, ſuavitate præcipua utriuſque naturæ ſponte provenientis (74). Ariſtæus firſt of all in that country mixed honey with wine, the chief ſweetneſs of both being cauſed by their mixture.

(74) Plin. lib. 14. cap. 4. p. 127.

[G] . . . . *Nor his daughter Macris.*] There are not many Authors that ſpeak of her; but ſee what Apollonius relates of her (75). It was ſhe who took the young Bacchus into her lap, after Mercury had drawn him out of the midſt of the flames. It was ſhe that made him take ſome honey. She lived at that time in the middle of the Iſland of Eubœa. She expoſed herſelf to the indignation of Juno on account of the good office ſhe had done this child, and was obliged to quit the country, and to retire into another of the Phæacian Iſlands, where ſhe did ſignal ſervice to the inhabitants (76). We may infer from hence that Ariſtæus, Bacchus's uncle by marriage (77), was a great deal older than he. That does not overturn what Diodorus Siculus relates about the admiſſion of Ariſtæus to the Orgia, &c; nor what others ſuppoſe, that he commanded ſome troops in Bacchus's army (78); for it is a ſtanding rule that the ſuperiority belongs to a ſon of Jupiter, even tho' he be the younger.

(75) Apollon. *Argon.* lib. 4. ver. 1131, *& ſeq.*

(76) Καὶ περὶ ὀλβον ἀθέσφατον ἴνναιετάουσιν; i. e. "And bleſſed "the Iſlanders "with endleſs "riches." Idem, ibid. ver. 1140.

(77) He married Autonoe, the ſiſter of Bacchus's mother.

(78) Nonnus, *Dionyſiacor.* l. 13.

ARISTÆUS the Geometrician lived before Euclid, and compoſed ſome works which bore a good character. See underneath a fine paſſage of Pappus [A].

[A] *Here is a fine paſſage of Pappus about our Ariſtæus.*] I call it ſo, becauſe it teaches us ſomething very curious concerning Euclid: which is, that this great Geometrician, out of regard to Ariſtæus, was unwilling to appear more knowing than him in Conicks. I have already ſpoken on this head (1). Theſe are Pappus's words, *Ariſtæus autem, qui ſcribit ea quæ ad hoc uſque tempus tradita ſunt, ſolidorum libros quinque conicis cohærentes vocavit. . . . . Euclides autem ſecutus Ariſtæum ſcriptorem luculentum in iis quæ de conicis tradiderat, neque antevertens neque volens eorum tractationem deſtruere, cum mitiſſimus eſſet & benignus erga omnes, præſertim eos qui mathematicas diſciplinas aliquâ ex parte augere & amplificare poſſent, ut par eſt, & nullo modo infenſus ſed accuratus, non arrogans velut hic* (Apollonius Pergæus) *quantum oſtendi potuit de loco per ejus conica memoriæ prodidit* (2). i. e. "But "Ariſtæus, the Author of thoſe things which are deli- "vered down to this very time, called his five books "of ſolid bodies connected with conicks. . . . But Eu- "clid followed Ariſtæus, a clear writer in thoſe things "which he had delivered about conicks, neither ſur- "paſſing him, nor being willing to overthrow his "manner of treating them, as he was very good "natured and benevolent to all, eſpecially thoſe who "could any way advance and improve mathematical "learning, as is proper, and not at all peeviſh but "accurate; not arrogant as this man (*Apollonius Per- "gæus*) has recorded, as far as could be ſhewn from "a paſſage in his Conicks."

(1) In the note [D] on the article of APOLLONIUS of Perga, citation (31).

(2) Pappus, *in Proœm.* lib. 7. *Mathemat. Collection.*

ARISTEAS the Proconneſian. Moreri thinking it ſufficient to ſay that he lived in the time of Cyrus [A], and that he wrote the *Hiſtory of the Arimaſpians, and a work concerning the origin of the Gods, the whole filled with fables* [B], has forgot a thing

[A] *Moreri ſatisfies himſelf with ſaying that he lived in the time of Cyrus.*] That is proved by the the teſtimony of Suidas. Note that Cyrus began to reign in Perſia in the 55th Olympiad. Voſſius infers from thence, that Suidas ſaying on the one hand that Ariſteas flouriſhed in the 50th Olympiad, and on the other, that it was in the time of Cyrus, he has not been exact (1). The anonymous writer, who has deſcribed the Olympiads, places Ariſteas under the fiftieth: that does not agree with what others have related, that Homer was his diſciple (2). Tatian has made him prior to Homer (3), and has been reprimanded for it by Voſſius, as though by that he was too willing to favour the good cauſe in this point, which is that the age of Homer followed a great while after that of Moſes (4). That cenſure does not ſeem to me to be well founded; for Tatian had a right to make uſe of a tradition which he found eſtabliſhed amongſt the Pagans. We have ſeen that our Ariſteas has been ſaid to have taught Homer; and we read in Herodotus, that Ariſteas appeared to the world three ages after having compoſed a Poem (5). It is not agreed then that he flouriſhed in the time of Cyrus. Note, that Herodotus was born in the firſt year of the 74th Olympiad, and that he does not ſpeak of this laſt appearance of Ariſteas as of a thing that had newly happened: he inſinuates, on the contrary, that the tradition of the Metapontines concerning this affair was of long ſtanding; for he does not ſay that they fixed the time of it.

(1) Voſſius, *de Hiſtoricis Græcis*, lib. 4. cap. 2. pag. 433.

(2) Strabo, lib. 14. pag. 439.

(3) Tatian. *Orat. ad Græcos, apud* Voſſium, *de Hiſt. Græcis*, lib. 1. cap. 1. p. 7.

(4) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græcis*, lib. 1. cap. 1. pag. 6.

(5) Herod. lib. 4. cap. 14.

[B] *His writings were filled with fables.*] Aulus Gellius relates, that being at Brunduſium he ſaw ſeveral parcels of books expoſed to ſale, and that he was offered thoſe which he cheapened at a very low price. They were all the works of Greek Writers, who had collected together a great many ſurprizing and incredible ſtories. Ariſteas is the firſt of theſe Writers: *Faſces librorum venalium expoſitos vidimus. Atque ego avide ſtatim pergo ad libros. Erant autem iſti omnes libri Græci miraculorum fabularumque pleni: res inauditæ, incredulæ; ſcriptores veteres non parvæ auctoritatis, Ariſteas Proconneſius, & Iſigonus Nicæenſis, & Cteſias, & Oneſicritus, & Polyſtephanus, & Hegeſias. Ipſa autem volumina ex diutino ſitu ſqualebant, & habitu adſpectuque tætro erant. Acceſſi tamen, percunctatuſque pretium ſum: & adductus mirâ atque inſperatâ vilitate libros plurimos ære pauco emo; eoſque omnes duabus proximis noctibus curſim tranſeo: atque in legendo carpſi exinde quædam & notavi mirabilia & ſcriptoribus ferè noſtris intentata; eaque his commentariis adſperſi* (6). i. e. "We ſaw ſome parcels of books ſet "out to ſale. And I made the beſt of my way di- "rectly to the books. But they were all Greek vo- "lumes full of ſtrange ſtories; incredible things, ſuch "as were never heard of; ancient Writers of no ſmall "authority, Ariſteas the Proconneſian, and Iſigonus the "Nicæan, and Cteſias, and Oneſicritus, and Poly- "ſtephanus, and Hegeſias. But the volumes by be- "ing grown mouldy, made a very mean figure. "However I went up and aſked the price, and being "tempted by the ſurprizing and unexpected cheapneſs, "I bought a great many books for a little money; "and run them all over the two next nights: and in "reading I obſerved and excerpted ſeveral ſtrange "things, and ſuch as had ſcarcely been attempted by "our Writers; and have ſcattered them up and down "theſe Commentaries." The remainder of this chapter of Aulus Gellius is wholly filled with chimerical narrations, which he had read either in theſe writings or in Pliny. We are to know, that the *Hiſtory of the Arimaſpians*, written by Ariſteas, was a Poem (7): *and let any one conſider*, you'll ſay to me, *whether the Author did not write it without deſigning that his ſtories ſhould be believed? Arioſto never had any ſuch thought. Wherefore*

(6) Aulus Gellius, lib. 9. cap. 4. pag. 229. NOTE that Mr. Huet, *Demonſtrat. Evangel.* Propoſ. 9. cap. 142. pag. 1037, cites this paſſage of Aulus Gellius as containing that the things which had been related touching Ariſteas were falſe. That is not Aulus Gellius's meaning.

(7) Herod. lib. 4. cap. 13 and 14. Strabo, lib. 1. pag. 15. and lib. 13. pag. 405.

thing which he might have ſet down as the moſt ſingular in this Article. Let us then make up the defect, and obſerve that this Ariſteas, being dead in his own country (*a*), was ſeen the very day and the ſame hour reading a lecture in Sicily. This ſpectacle having been repeated ſeveral times and for ſeveral years, obliged the Sicilians to build an altar to Ariſteas, and to offer ſacrifices to him (*b*). Herodotus has enlarged ſufficiently upon this miracle [*C*]. Pliny relates, that in the Iſle of Proconneſus the ſoul of Ariſteas was ſeen to go out of the body by his mouth, in the ſhape of a Raven (*c*). Others ſay, that his ſoul went forth of his body, and returned back as he pleaſed [*D*]. Strabo repreſents Ariſteas as one of the greateſt Enchanters that ever were (*d*). Some pretend that in order to obviate the diſbelief which ſome ſhewed of his doctrine, he perſuaded them that his ſoul took ſeveral flights ſeparate from the body (*e*). Six of his verſes are preſerved in the treatiſe of Longinus (*f*). Some others are found in the *Chiliads* of Tzetzes (*g*). We find him to be twice quoted in Pauſanias (*h*). They who pretend that he was not wholly dead, when his ſoul made theſe excurſions (*i*), do not a little take off from the marvellous of the prodigy. There is no need to

(*a*) The Iſland of Proconneſus in the Propontis.
(*b*) *Ex* Apollonii Dyſcol. *Hiſt. Comment.* cap. 2.
(*c*) Plinius, lib. 7. cap. 52. p. 85.
(*d*) Strabo, lib. 13. pag. 405.
(*e*) See the note [*B*].
(*f*) Longin. περὶ ὕψους, Sect. 9. pag. 26.
(*g*) Tzetzes, *Hiſt. Chil.* 7. pag. 144. *See* Caſaubon *on Athenæus* lib. 1. pag. 13.
(*h*) Pauſan. lib. 1. pag. 22. and lib. 5. p. 154.
(*i*) Maxim. *Tyr. Orat.* 28 p. 282.

Wherefore ſhould we not form our judgments of the ancient Poets in the ſame manner as of him? To this I anſwer, that it was not Ariſteas's intention to divert his readers by tales which were to be taken for fables; for he had not recourſe to theſe ſtories for any other reaſon but to remove the incredulity which he met with in ſome people. He was not thought to be a Philoſopher, and that notion was founded upon his ſaying that no body had ever inſtructed him (8). He removed that objection, by maintaining that his ſoul had quitted his body, and that in ſoaring towards heaven it had ſeen all the Grecian and Barbarian countries, and finiſhed its courſe in the Hyperborean climates. He boaſted that he had diſcovered by that means the ſituation of places, the cuſtoms of their inhabitants, the natural qualities of the elements, &c. and that he had even obſerved heaven with more exactneſs than the earth. Was not this producing his ſtories like credentials? Did he not intend thereby to eſtabliſh ſuch an authority as made the other things which he had to ſay be received? Therefore he muſt needs have propoſed theſe things as real facts. They were taken as ſuch; for more credit was given to this man, than to thoſe Philoſophers who taught without any diſguiſe (9). Note, that Dionyſius of Halicarnaſſus relates that it was not univerſally agreed, that our Ariſteas was the Author of the books which bore his name (10).

(8) Maxim. Tyrius, *Diſſert.* 22. pag. 223.
(9) Idem, pag. 224.
(10) Dionyſ. Halicarn. *in Judicio de Thucyd.* cap. 26. pag. 384.

[*C*] *He was ſeen ſeveral times after his death.... Herodotus has enlarged ſufficiently upon this miracle.*] Here is the ſubſtance of his narration. Ariſteas, one of the principal perſons in the Iſland of Proconneſus, entered one day into a Fuller's houſe, and there died. The Fuller ſhut up his door, and went to tell Ariſteas's relations of his death. This news ſoon ſpread all over the city; but whilſt the diſcourſe was hot about it, there came a man who declared that he had met Ariſteas going to Cyzicus (11), and had ſpoke with him. The relations went to the Fuller's houſe, with every thing neceſſary for his interment, and could neither find Ariſteas dead nor living. He ſhewed himſelf at the end of ſeven years, and compoſed the Poem of the Arimaſpians, and then diſappeared. Two or three years after he ſhewed himſelf to the inhabitants of Metapontum (12), and commanded them to raiſe an altar to Apollo, and to place hard by it a ſtatue in honour of Ariſteas the Proconneſian. He told them that they were the only Italians whom Apollo had honoured with a viſit, and that he had accompanied him in that journey, and that he was not Ariſteas, but a Raven, when he accompanied him thither. Having ſaid theſe things, he diſappeared. The Metapontines conſulted the oracle at Delphi, to know what was to be done in that caſe. It anſwered them that they would do well to be obedient. Then they executed that order (13). The Hiſtorian teſtifies that in his time the ſtatue of Ariſteas was to be ſeen in a place of public reſort at Metapontum, near the altar of Apollo, and ſurrounded with Bay-trees. Let us add to this a ſtory related by Athenæus. The Metapontines, after Ariſteas's return (14), dedicated a Brazen Bay-tree to Apollo. This Bay-tree having ſpoken at a time when a Theſſalian dancer was coming into the ſquare at Metapontum, the Prieſts, that were preſent, were ſuddenly ſeized with ſo ſtrange a fury, that they tore the woman to pieces. Note, that ſhe

(11) According to Plutarch in the *Life of Romulus*, pag. 35, there were people who aſſerted that they had ſeen him on the road of Crotona.
(12) A city of Italy.
(13) Herod. lib. 4. cap. 14.
(14) He ſaid that he had been as far as to the country of the Hyperboreans. Athenæus, lib. 13. pag. 605.

had received from Philomela a conſecrated preſent: which was a crown of Golden Bays, that the people of Lampſacus had conſecrated at the temple of Delphi (15). Obſerve alſo, that Æneas of Gaza, in relating the ſtory of Herodotus, has added thereto this circumſtance: that the ſacrifices of the Metapontines were thought to belong to Apollo and Ariſteas in common as to two Divinities (16). Origen has obſerved that it was at the deſire of Apollo that this Ariſteas was honoured as a God by the inhabitants of Metapontum (17). Meurſius pretends that Athenagoras has charged the Heathens with having honoured our Ariſteas in the Iſle of Chios, and having taken him for the ſame God with Apollo and Jupiter (18). Χῖοι Ἀριστέαν τὸν αὐτὸν Διὶ καὶ Ἀπόλλωνι νομίζοντες (19). i. e. "The Chians, who took Ariſteas to be the ſame perſon with Jupiter and Apollo." Huetius thinks with a great deal of probability, that inſtead of Χῖοι, it ſhould be read Κῆοι; and that he means there Ariſtæus the ſon of Apollo and Cyrene (20); for this laſt Ariſtæus was honoured in the Iſle of Cea (21). It is of him that Suffridus underſtands the paſſage of Athenagoras (22). Huetius ſhews, that theſe two perſons have often been confounded one with the other (23). Thoſe who will have all Romance to be founded upon ſome true adventure, might ſuppoſe that Ariſteas having feigned himſelf dead in the Fuller's houſe, found means to get from thence during the maſter's abſence, and to eſcape privately out of the city; that he returned thither after having kept himſelf concealed for ſome years; and that he wrote a Poem, where he gave an account of his extaſies (24); that he was well pleaſed to have it taken in a literal ſence, and not in ſuch a poetical one as we take theſe verſes of Horace,

Quo me, Bacche, rapis tui
Plenum, quæ in nemora aut quos agor in ſpecus
Velox mente nova (25),

That is,

"Whither, O Bacchus, doſt thou hurry me
"Fill'd as I am with thy Divinity?
"What groves and darkſome caves have I ſurvey'd
"With motions rapid by thy God-head made."

and ſeveral others which Huetius quotes (26). I cannot tell how to think as he does, that Maximus Tyrius confirms this conjecture, that is, that Ariſteas did not pretend to have his expreſſions taken in a literal ſenſe (27). Maximus Tyrius ſuppoſes the very contrary, as we have ſeen above (28). As for what regards the apparition to the Metapontines, it may be ſuppoſed that ſome impoſtor eaſily perſuaded them of what Herodotus relates; for they were Pythagoreans and conſequently believed the Metempſychoſis.

(15) Idem, ibid.
(16) Æneas Gazæus *in Theophraſtum, apud* Meurſ. *Not. in Apollon. Dyſcolum*, pag. 87.
(17) Origen. *contra Celſ.* lib. 3.
(18) Meurſii *Notæ in Apollon. Dyſcol.* pag. 87.
(19) Athenag. *Legat. pro Chriſtianis*, p. 28.
(20) Huet. *Demonſtr. Evangel. Propoſ.* 9. cap. 142. pag. 1037. Voſſius *de Theolog. Gentili*, lib. 7. cap. 10. p. 349, has the ſame thought.
(21) See the note [*C*] of the foregoing Article, citation (23).
(22) Suffridus, *Notis in Athen. Legat.* p. 242.
(23) Huet. *Demonſtr. Evangel. Propoſ.* 9. cap. 142. pag. 1037, and pag. 212.
(24) Ἔφη δὲ Ἀριστέας ἀπίκεσθαι ἐς Ἰσσηδόνας φοιβόλαμπτος γενόμενος; that is, "Ariſteas declared that being "filled with the "God Phœbus "he went to Iſſedonæ."
(25) Horat. lib. 3. Od. 25.
(26) Huet. *Demonſt. Evangel.* pag. 1038.
(27) Idem, ibid. pag. 1039.
(28) Citations (8) and (9).

[*D*] *It is ſaid that his ſoul went out of his body, and returned back as he pleaſed.*] That is what Heſychius Illuſtrius has ſaid, and after him Suidas. Here are their words. Ἀριστέᾳ τῷ Προκοννησίῳ φασὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ἐξελθεῖν ὅτε ἐβούλετο, καὶ ἐπανελθεῖν πάλιν (29). i. e. "It "is reported that the ſoul of Ariſteas the Proconneſian "went out of his body, and returned again juſt as "he would." Τοῦτο φασὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ὅταν ἐβούλετο ἐξελθεῖν καὶ ἐπανελθεῖν πάλιν (30). i. e. "They ſay that this "man's ſoul went out of his body, and back again "as often as he pleaſed."

(29) Heſych. Illuſtrius *de his qui eruditionis famâ claruere*, pag. 7.
(30) Suidas, *in* Ἀριστέας.

to obſerve that Plutarch ridicules this fine ſtory (*k*). Giraldus has made ſome miſtakes [*E*].

(*k*) Plut. *in Romulo*, pag. 35.

[*E*] *Giraldus has made ſeveral miſtakes about our Ariſteas.*] I. He makes Strabo ſay that the eloquence and addreſs of Ariſteas were very powerful. *Strabo Ariſteam facundiâ & blanditiis vehementem fuiſſe prodidit* (31). That muſt be owing to his not underſtanding this Greek, ἀνὴρ γόης εἴ τις ἄλλος (32), i. e. "a man that "for tricks was inferior to nobody." II. He makes Herodotus ſay that Ariſteas having given orders to the Metapontines to erect at once an altar and a ſtatue to himſelf, and to Apollo, and having at length told them that he was a Crow, he vaniſhed from their ſight. This is taking Herodotus's narration wrong: conſult it (33). III. He ſays, that Plutarch, approves the ſtory of Herodotus. That is falſe. Plutarch does but touch upon a very ſmall part of it, and even there he remarkably alters the circumſtances of the place, and then rejects that as a fable.

(31) Lilius, Gregorius Giraldus, *Dialog.* 3. *de Hiſtoria Poetarum*, pag. 85.
(32) Strabo, lib. 13. pag. 405.
(33) In the note [*C*], from the beginning to the citation (13).

☞ ARISTEAS, the author of a ſuppoſititious book concerning the 70 Interpreters of the Old Teſtament [*A*], the impoſture of which has been ſufficiently ſhewn by Mr. Van Dale [*B*], and

[*A*] *A ſuppoſititious book concerning the ſeventy Interpreters of the Old Teſtament.*] The Greek tranſlation of the Hebrew text of the Scriptures, which we call the *Septuagint*, was finiſhed, according to Archbiſhop Uſher (1), in the year 277 before the Birth of Chriſt, and in the 8th year of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. The account of this affair, according to this book publiſhed under the name of Ariſteas, is as follows (2). Ptolemy Philadelphus being intent upon collecting a great Library at Alexandria, committed the care of that affair to Demetrius Phalereus, a noble Athenian, who was then at his court, directing him to ſearch all nations for books of importance. In the enquiry which he made, he heard of the book of the Law of Moſes among the Jews, and acquainted the King, who deſired, that the book might be ſent for from Jeruſalem, with Interpreters from the ſame place, to tranſlate it into Greek. Ariſteas, Sofibius of Tarentum, and Andreas, three Noblemen at King Ptolemy's court, who were favourable to the Jews, took this opportunity to requeſt the King, in behalf of thoſe perſons of that nation, who had been taken captive by Ptolemy Soter, and were then in bondage in Egypt. The King granted their requeſt, and ordered their releaſe, and that twenty drachms for every perſon ſhould be paid out of his treaſury to thoſe, who had them in ſervitude, and the ſame ſum for their children, and the mothers, who bore them. This made the whole expence to amount to ſix hundred and ſixty talents, which proves the number of thoſe, who were ranſomed, to have been one hundred and ninety eight thouſand men, women, and children; for ſo many might have been ranſomed at the rate of twenty drachms each. When this was done, Ariſteas propoſed, that a letter ſhould be written to Eleazar, High-Prieſt of the Jews at Jeruſalem, to ſend from thence a true copy of the Hebrew Original of the Law, and with it ſix men out of each tribe of Iſrael, to tranſlate it into the Greek language; which was accordingly done, and Ariſteas, the pretended Author of this Hiſtory, and Andreas were ſent with the letter, who carried with them from the King ſeveral gifts for the temple, and money for the ſacrifices to be offered there, and for other uſes of the ſanctuary, one hundred talents; in utenſils of ſilver twenty talents, and of gold fifty talents. The precious ſtones, which adorned theſe utenſils, were twice the value of gold. When they came to Jeruſalem, they were received with great reſpect by the High-Prieſt and all the Jews, and had their requeſt immediately granted. The High-Prieſt gave them a true copy of the Law of Moſes, all written in letters of gold, and ſent with them ſix Elders out of every Tribe, who were ſeventy two in all, to tranſlate it into Greek; upon which they returned to Alexandria. On their arrival the King ſending for thoſe Elders to court, made trial of them by ſeventy two queſtions to each in order; and approving their wiſdom, which appeared from their anſwers, gave to each of them three talents, and ſent them to the Iſland of Pharos, which joined to Alexandria, in order to perform the work, which they were ſent for. Demetrius having conducted them over the *Heptaſtadium*, (which was a bank of ſeven furlongs in length, and joined that iſland to the continent,) into an houſe provided for them, they immediately applied themſelves to the tranſlation; and as they agreed to the verſion of each period, by a common conference together, Demetrius wrote it down. Thus in the ſpace of ſeventy two days they executed the work; and the whole being read over and approved of in the King's preſence, he gave to each of them three rich garments, two talents of gold, and a cup of gold of a talent weight; and then ſent them home into their own country.

(1) *Annal. ſub Anno Period. Jul.* 4437. *ante Chriſtum* 277.
(2) *See* Millar's *Hiſtory of the Church under the Old Teſtament*, chap. 3. pag. 322, 323. edit. Edinburgh 1730, in fol.

[*B*] *The impoſture of which has been ſufficiently ſhewn by Mr. Van Dale.*] This had been attempted before by ſeveral other Writers before him, and particularly by Dr. Hody; but Mr. Van Dale found, that they had not ſo far exhauſted the ſubject, but that his extenſive learning could furniſh him with materials for a more accurate diſcuſſion of that ſubject. And therefore he publiſhed in the year 1705 at Amſterdam his *Diſſertatio ſuper Ariſtea de LXX Interpretibus, cui ipſius prætenſi Ariſteæ textus ſubjungitur. Additur Hiſtoria Baptiſmorum, cum Judaicorum, tum potiſſimum priorum Chriſtianorum, tum denique & rituum nonnullorum, &c. Accedit & Diſſertatio ſuper Sanchoniatone*: i. e. "A Diſſertation upon the Hiſtory of Ariſteas "concerning the LXX Interpreters: to which is ad-"ded the Greek Text of the pretended Ariſteas; with "an account of the Baptiſms of the Jews, and "eſpecially of the primitive Chriſtians, and laſtly of "ſeveral Ceremonies &c. and a Diſſertation upon "Sanchoniathon," 4to, pagg. 506. He has given us Garbitius's tranſlation of Ariſteas. Mr. Van Dale obſerves in his *Diſſertation* (3), that the Jews were a people unknown for a conſiderable time, ſo that we do not find even the name of them in Herodotus. They made ſome little figure in the world under Alexander the Great. But it is ſaid, that what Joſephus relates of the honour, which was paid them by that King is contradicted by Diodorus Siculus, Quintus Curtius, and Arrian. Upon which occaſion our Author remarks how little regard is to be paid to the Jewiſh Hiſtorian, who has not ſcrupled to corrupt the ſacred Hiſtory in order to pay his court to the Greeks, for whom he wrote; which he proves from a prodigious number of inſtances. Mr. Bernard, the Author of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, obſerves upon this, that it were to be wiſhed, that ſome learned man would undertake a direct criticiſm upon Joſephus, by examining all the facts, which he relates, comparing them with the accounts of the other Hiſtorians, and remarking every where the certainty or doubtfulneſs of theſe facts. Such a work is ſo much the more neceſſary, as Joſephus is an Hiſtorian in great eſteem, and his authority conſidered as of vaſt importance, and his agreeable manner of writing capable of impoſing upon his readers. But it is evident, that he has committed a prodigious number of miſtakes. We ſhall mention but one. The Scripture tells us, that Saul having a deſign to expoſe David's life, promiſed his daughter in marriage to him, who ſhould bring him an hundred fore-ſkins of the Philiſtines; and that David ſlew two hundred of them, whoſe fore-ſkins he brought to Saul. Joſephus being apprehenſive leſt this fact ſhould appear ridiculous to the Greeks, changed theſe hundred fore-ſkins into *ſix hundred Heads* of the Philiſtins. Mr. Van Dale proves afterwards, that the copies of the books of Moſes were very rare before the Captivity of Babylon; and that the Jews, who were led into captivity, had the opportunity of carrying but a ſmall number with them. After their return they never had any commerce with the Gentiles but upon the moſt urgent neceſſity; from whence it may be concluded, that it

(3) *See* Mr. Bernard's *Nouvelles*, &c. Nov. 1705. Art. 4. p. 542.

and by ſeveral other learned writers [C]. It is not known who this Ariſteas was, but he

is very improbable, that there ſhould be found ſix men in every Tribe in Judæa, who underſtood Hebrew and Greek ſufficiently to make that tranſlation of their Law into Greek, which is aſcribed to them. It would be difficult to prove, that after the diſperſion of the ten Tribes there remained Iſraelites enough in Judæa, diſtinguiſhed from each other, to furniſh ſix intelligent perſons of each of theſe ten Tribes. If there had been ſo many Iſraelites in Paleſtine, there would have been no neceſſity, that the Cuthites and other ſtrangers, who came to ſettle there, ſhould ſend for a Jewiſh Prieſt from Babylon, to inſtruct them in the Jewiſh Religion. Beſides it is very improbable, that Ptolemy ſhould ſend for ſo great a number of Interpreters for the mere tranſlation of the Law; and granting, that he might think proper to employ ſo many of them, he might have found them in Egypt, where a multitude of Jews had ſettled, who might have been engaged in ſuch a tranſlation; ſince if we credit Ariſteas, after it was finiſhed, the Jews in Egypt approved of it, and found it very agreeable to the original. But that, which renders the Hiſtory of Ariſteas abſolutely ridiculous and contemptible, is the great number of abſurd ſtories, which it is full of. He tells us, for inſtance, that the River Jordan overflows its banks in the time of harveſt like the Nile, and waters a vaſt extent of the country, and that it afterwards joins another river, and then empties itſelf with it in the Sea. This is evident to every reader to be entirely falſe. He ſays, that the weaſel conceives at the ear, and brings forth her young at her mouth. There is nothing more impertinent than the greateſt part of the ſeventy two queſtions, which he tells us King Ptolemy propoſed to the LXXII Interpreters, to each of them one; and their anſwers are equally abſurd, tho' Ariſteas highly commends them, and repeats at every anſwer, that it was approved of by the King. The feſtival, which he pretends was inſtituted in memory of the arrival of theſe Interpreters, appears no leſs fabulous. Mr. Van Dale obſerves, that if he ſhould be aſked, whether he does not believe there was a tranſlation of the Law in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, he cannot abſolutely deny, but that ſome Grecizing Jew might have given ſome kind of verſion of the Pentateuch alone. But that ſuch an opinion is only founded upon mere conjectures, which do not appear very ſolid. He examines in particular what Ariſteas and the other ancient Writers have related concerning the manner, in which the pretended verſion of the ſeventy Interpreters was performed. He ſhews, that they do not agree among themſelves upon this point, and the difference of their accounts ſhews the little regard, which the Hiſtory deſerves. He endeavours likewiſe to confute Philo Judæus, Clemens Alexandrinus, St. Irenæus, St. Epiphanius, St. Auſtin, and ſeveral other Fathers, who imagined, that the ſeventy Interpreters were divinely inſpired in their tranſlation. Mr. Bernard obſerves (4), that Philo had particular reaſons to believe this; but with regard to the Fathers of the Church, it is very probable, that the Apoſtles having almoſt conſtantly made uſe of that verſion in their writings, was one of the principal reaſons, which gave them ſo high an opinion of the importance of it. Beſides it is certain, that the Authors of this verſion, whoever they were, did not tranſlate every where exactly, either out of ignorance or deſign. Mr. Van Dale takes notice of the thirteen conſiderable paſſages, in which they deſignedly made very great alterations, for fear of offending the King, or giving occaſion of ſcandal to the Gentiles, or diſcovering the myſteries of the Jewiſh Religion; for theſe are all the reaſons, which are alledged for thoſe alterations; which reaſons are only founded upon conjecture. St. Auſtin, who had a lively genius, ſolves very ingeniouſly the objection urged againſt theſe Interpreters, on account of their having falſly tranſlated ſeveral paſſages of the original. He ſays, that the Holy Ghoſt having inſpired theſe Interpreters, he might, as he was the Author of the Scriptures, make what alterations he thought proper. But it happens very unfortunately, that divers of theſe alterations are real faults, which proceeded from their having read the words of the original wrong, or miſunderſtood the ſenſe of them. Mr. Van Dale obſerves, that he could have wiſhed, that St. Auſtin had proved firſt, that there ever were ſuch men in the world as the LXXII Interpreters, and afterwards that they were divinely inſpired. He mentions then the diſputes, which the Jews had among themſelves about this verſion, and examines in what language it was written. He thinks, that what gave occaſion to this verſion was the temple, which the Jews built in Egypt in the territory of Heliopolis under the reign of Ptolemy Philometor and in the time of Judas Maccabæus, about 160 years before the Birth of our Saviour. Before the Jews had built this temple in Egypt, the Law was read only in Hebrew in their Synagogues, and there was occaſion but for a ſmall number of Scribes and Doctors for that purpoſe; and very few perſons underſtood Hebrew. But after Onias had cauſed that temple to be raiſed, and a greater number of Prieſts, Levites, and other Miniſters became neceſſary, as few of theſe perſons underſtood Hebrew, it was thought proper to tranſlate the Law into a language, which was more common, ſuch as the Greek, in order that they might more eaſily learn the religious rites and ceremonies, as well as the laws and precepts of morality. But for fear that the Hebraizing Jews, who deſpiſed and condemn'd this Greek tranſlation, ſhould abſolutely decry it, a great many wonderful ſtories were invented by degrees, which furniſhed materials for the Hiſtory of Ariſteas, and which it is probable that Author, who had but a very inconſiderable ſhare of judgment, was fond of propagating in the world. The reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus ſeemed a very proper time to place this event in, becauſe every perſon knew the prodigious pains, which that King was at in collecting a noble Library. It is not certainly known, what were the books of the Old Teſtament, which were tranſlated by the pretended LXXII Interpreters. The learned are not agreed upon that point. Some are of opinion, that they tranſlated only the five Books of Moſes; which is the ſentiment of Joſephus. But Voſſius pretends, that they tranſlated all the Books of the Old Teſtament, either, as he obſerves, becauſe it was reaſonable to do ſo, or becauſe they were engaged to do it by the King's bounty. Mr. Van Dale enquires from whence Voſſius had all this, and ſhews that it is nothing but a mere conjecture without any foundation. He examines likewiſe, whether it is true, that the ancient Poets and Philoſophers read the Scriptures in Greek or any other language, and confutes what the learned Huetius Biſhop of Avranches had advanced upon that ſubject. He thinks that there is not much greater ſolidity in the notion of ſome learned men, who have affirmed, that the Hiſtories of the Old Teſtament gave occaſion to many of the fables among the Pagans. And he does not incline to believe, that Plato borrowed his doctrines from the ſacred Writings, as ſeveral men of learning have aſſerted with a great deal of confidence. He ſhews that Juſtin Martyr, who cited very probably by memory ſeveral paſſages from Moſes, has repreſented that Legiſlator as ſaying ſome things, which he never intended. Lactantius, tho' in other reſpects he is ſufficiently credulous, yet is very oppoſite to thoſe, who imagine that Plato and other Philoſophers of Greece were acquainted with the Scriptures. *I am ſurprized,* ſays he (5), *that Pythagoras and afterwards Plato, who in order to diſcover the truth travelled among the Egyptians, Magi, and Perſians, that they might learn the cuſtoms and ſacred rites of thoſe nations, (for they thought that wiſdom was to be found in Religion,) did not go among the Jews, who were the only people, that poſſeſſed it, and whom it was very eaſy to have acceſs to. But I believe that divine Providence prevented them from underſtanding the truth; but it was not then permitted to ſtrangers to know the Religion of the true God and Righteouſneſs.* This paſſage is very remarkable, and deſerves a particular attention. Mr. Van Dale concludes his Diſſertation with an examination of what Philo ſays, that a feaſt was kept annually in the Iſle of Pharos in honour of the tranſlation of the LXXII Interpreters, and of the rewards, which Ptolemy gave to them and to the High-Prieſt of the Jews, who had ſent them.

(4) Pag. 547.

(5) Lib. 4. c. 2.

[C] *And by ſeveral other learned Writers.*] The reader may conſult Mr. Du Pin's *Hiſtory of the Writers*

he pretends that he was ſent to the High-prieſt of the Jews by Ptolemy Philadelphus King of Egypt, to deſire him to ſend ſix learned Interpreters of every Tribe, in order to tranſlate the Jewiſh Law into Greek. He profeſſes himſelf to be a Pagan; but he has failed extremely of ſupporting that character in his book, as Mr. Van Dale has ſhewn in many inſtances (*a*). It therefore appears from his whole performance that he was a diſguiſed Jew. It is certain, that he wrote before Flavius Joſephus; but it is probable, that he was later than Philo Judæus, who makes no mention of him. Nay it was Philo himſelf who furniſhed him with the rough-draught of his pretended Hiſtory, which he adorned in his own manner. The Fable itſelf is perhaps more antient than Philo; but ſeveral ornaments were added to it from time to time. Van Dale is of opinion, that the laſt mentioned Author was the firſt who publiſhed this ſtory. Scaliger in his *Animadverſions upon Euſebius's Chronicon* is of opinion, that this book was written by a Jew of Alexandria. Valeſius in his Notes upon Euſebius's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (*b*) obſerves, that the forgery is ſufficiently evident from the Epiſtle of Demetrius Phalereus to Ptolemy Philadelphus cited in that hiſtory; for Hecatæus of Abdera is quoted in the Epiſtle as an antient Author, whereas it is certain, that he was not older than Demetrius Phalereus. Beſides, that Epiſtle is full of barbariſms and ridiculous expreſſions, tho' it is well known that Demetrius, who was an Athenian, was remarkable for his eloquence. Ariſteas likewiſe ſpeaks of *Heptaſtadium*, which was not built till after the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, as Valeſius has proved in his Commentaries upon Ammianus Marcellinus. Mr. Van Dale remarks, that the firſt inventors of this Fable were miſtaken in the time in which they placed it. They pretend, that it was under Ptolemy Philadelphus, who out of regard to religion ordered the Jewiſh law to be tranſlated into Greek; and they mention a great many inſtances of his piety. But it is evident to all who are converſant in hiſtory, that this Prince was a very vicious and irreligious man. Demetrius Phalereus likewiſe, who is ſaid there to have firſt prompted Ptolemy to his deſign, was no leſs notorious for his ill character; and therefore it is improbable, that he ſhould have ſo great a regard for the Jewiſh law, as is pretended. But it is very remarkable, that this Demetrius, who is repreſented to have been Library-keeper to Ptolemy, was not living at the time, when this tranſlation is ſaid to have been undertaken. Add to this, that no profane Hiſtorian mentions his ever having held that place under that King. Beſides, Joſephus and Ariſteas do not agree in the ſum, which Ptolemy gave for the ranſom of every Jewiſh ſlave in Egypt; and Juſtin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, and many other writers, particularly Philo Judæus, who gives the Hiſtory of this tranſlation in ſo pompous a manner, do not mention at all the ranſoming of the Jews; which renders the ſtory extremely ſuſpected. Ptolemy's letter to the High Prieſt quoted by Joſephus, does not in the leaſt agree with that in Ariſteas; and what is very ſtrange, St. Epiphanius, who appeals to the authority of the latter, cites this letter in a different manner from the other two. This Father has likewiſe committed ſeveral other miſtakes, which prove that what he had advanced is entirely fabulous. It appears alſo, that Juſtin Martyr's account is no more credible than that of St. Epiphanius. And therefore Mr. Van Dale concludes from theſe and other remarks, which we ſhall mention in the note [*B*], that the pretended Ariſteas is a real Jew in diſguiſe, or one of thoſe Proſelytes, who uſed to go up to Jeruſalem to perform their devotions. That, which very probably gave occaſion to this fable, was, that Ptolemy took a great deal of pains in collecting all kinds of Books, which could be found, both ancient and modern, which he procured at a vaſt expence. We are informed, that he gave a very large ſum for the originals of Æſchylus, Sophocles, and Euripides (*c*).

(*a*) *See* Mr. Bernard's *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, Nov. 1705, Art. 4. p. 539.

(*b*) Lib. 5. c. 1.

(*c*) Bernard, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 541, 542.

ters of the Old and New Teſtament; Dr. Hody, Profeſſor of Greek at Oxford, mentioned in the preceding note, in his Book *De Bibliorum textibus originalibus, verſione Græcâ & Latinâ vulgatâ*; i. e. "Of the "original Texts, the Greek Verſion, and the Latin "Vulgate Tranſlation of the Bible:" Dr. Prideaux in his *Connection:* Archbiſhop Uſher's *Syntagma de ſeptuaginta Interpretum verſione*; i. e. Of the Tranſla- "tion of the Septuagint:" Morinus's firſt part of his *Exercitationes Biblicæ*; i. e. "Exercitations upon the "Bible:" Wouwer *de Græcâ & Latinâ Bibliorum Interpretatione*; i. e. "Of the Greek and Latin Tranſ- "lation of the Bible:" Dr. Walton's *Prolegomena* to the Polyglott Bible, *c.* 9. and Voſſius *de ſeptuaginta Interpretibus*; i. e. "Of the ſeventy Interpreters." Mr. Millar in his *Hiſtory of the Church in the Old Teſtament* (6) is of opinion, that there was without doubt a Verſion made of the Hebrew text in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus; but the Jews being then much given to religious romances, this narrative of Ariſteas appears to be one of that kind written by ſome Helleniſtical Jew; for tho' the Author pretends to be an Heathen Greek, yet he every where ſpeaks as a Jew. He makes Ptolemy, continues that learned Author, advance an incredible ſum for redeeming captives and making this Verſion, which Dr. Prideaux (7) computes to near two millions ſterling money, which is more than the whole Library was worth. The queſtions propoſed to the ſeventy two Interpreters, and their extemporary anſwers ſeem very much to carry the air of a fiction. The repreſentation of ſeventy two Elders being ſent to Alexandria from Jeruſalem, and chooſing ſix out of every Tribe, looks like a Jewiſh invention, with reſpect to the Jewiſh Sanhedrim, and the number of the twelve Tribes, ſince it is not probable, that an Heathen Greek ſhould know any thing of them; for the names of the twelve Tribes being ſunk into that of Jews, few knew them by any other deſignation. But how comes all this to be done by the advice of Demetrius Phalereus, when it appears from Hiſtory, that when this Verſion was made, he was baniſhed, impriſoned, or dead? Nor is it probable, that ſix Elders of every Tribe in Paleſtine ſhould be found ſo well ſkilled in both languages, as to make an exact Verſion from the Hebrew into Greek. Beſides no reaſon can be alledged why ſeventy two ſhould be ſent, when ſeven were ſufficient to execute that work (8).

T.

(6) Chap. 3. p. 323, 324.

(7) *Connect.* Pa 2. p. 35, 36.

(8) Millar, *ſupra.*

ARISTIDES,

ARISTIDES, ſurnamed the Juſt, flouriſhed at Athens in the ſame time with Themiſtocles. They could never agree together; and it appeared at that time, that to be ſuperior to another in virtue, is not the way to be ſo in credit [*A*]. The boiſterous eloquence of Themiſtocles cauſed him to triumph over the juſtice of his rival. It is remarkable that one of thoſe who voted for Ariſtides's baniſhment was ſwayed thereto by the great reputation of probity which he obſerved him to bear [*B*]: but here is a particular ſtill more remarkable. This great man, who ſo ſtrictly obſerved the rules of equity in his own houſe and towards his fellow citizens, yet made no ſcruple to prefer utility to honeſty in caſes of politicks [*C*]. He lived in great poverty, and gloried in it [*D*]. He did not leave behind him enough to marry his daughters, nor even to pay his funeral charges. The Republick undertook all thoſe expences (*a*). He was ſufficiently generous in not joining with the adverſaries of Themiſtocles, at a time when there was room to believe that they might quite cruſh him (*b*); for without Ariſtides's meddling in it, Themiſtocles would have been condemned to baniſhment. Authors differ about the circumſtances of Ariſtides's death (*c*); but it cannot be doubted that Seneca has made a great miſtake about that particular [*E*]. We ſhall relate in the article of

(*a*) Plut. *in Ariſtide*, p. 335.

(*b*) Idem, ibid. pag. 334.

(*c*) He died the 2d year of the 78th Olympiad, which was the 4th after the baniſhment of Themiſtocles. Cornel. Nepos *in ejus Vitâ.*

[*A*] *To be ſuperior to another in virtue; is not the way to be ſo in credit.*] This is Cornelius Nepos's thought. *In his cognitum eſt quanto antiſtaret eloquentia innocentiæ; quanquam enim adeo excellebat Ariſtides abſtinentia, ut unus poſt hominum memoriam, quod quidem nos audierimus, cognomine* Juſtus *ſit appellatus, tamen a Themiſtocle collabefactus teſtula illa exilio decem annorum multatus eſt* (1). i. e. "In theſe men it appeared "how much eloquence had the advantage of innocence; for altho' Ariſtides excelled ſo much in diſintereſtedneſs, that he alone, in the memory of man, "as far as we have heard, had the ſirname of the "Juſt, yet being overthrown by Themiſtocles he was "condemned by the oſtraciſm to a ten years baniſhment." Though you be the honeſteſt man in the world, and have not the art of clamouring and bluſtering in your ſpeeches, you muſt expect to be defeated, when you have a diſpute with the greateſt rogue in the city.

(1) Cornel. Nepos, *in Vita Ariſtidis.*

[*B*] *One of thoſe who voted for his baniſhment was ſwayed thereto by the great reputation for probity which he obſerved him to bear.*] One of the citizens of Athens, who gave his ſuffrage for Ariſtides's baniſhment, frankly told him, who aſked his reaſon for ſo voting, *I don't know the man, but I don't like him, becauſe he has taken ſo much pains to be ſurnamed the Juſt.* Cedenſque animadverteret quemdam ſcribentem ut patriâ pelleretur, quæſiſſe ab eo dicitur, *Quare id* Ariſtides *faceret, aut quid Ariſtides commiſiſſet, cur tantâ pœnâ dignus duceretur?* Cur ille reſpondit, *ſe ignorare Ariſtidem, ſed ſibi non placere, quod cupide elaboraſſet ut præter cæteros juſtus appellaretur* (2). A great many people are in this man's way of thinking; but don't ſpeak their minds ſo freely. Every thing that excells diſpleaſes them: they ſhew a more juſt regard for ſuch virtue as is very common, than for a diſtinguiſhed virtue. That reputation of Ariſtides, whereof the Athenians gave one day ſo authentick a teſtimony to his face (3), has ſuffered no injury by time: it has been preſerved through all ages; read this paſſage of Auſonius.

(2) Idem, ibid.

(3) See above the beginning of the note [*H*] on the article AMPHIARAUS.

Nec ſola antiquos oſtentat Roma Catones:
Aut unus tantum juſti ſpectator & æqui
Pollet Ariſtides, vetereſque illuſtrat Athenas (4).

That is,

"Rome does not only of her Cato's tell,
"Nor Ariſtides ſolely does excel
"In juſtice all that in old Athens dwell.

(4) Auſon. *in Moſellâ*, ver. 386. pag. 415.

[*C*] *He made no ſcruple to prefer utility to honeſty, in caſes of Politicks.*] Here is a new example of what we have ſaid above (5), concerning the RELIGION OF THE SOVEREIGN. Ariſtides had cauſed the Athenians to ſwear to a certain thing, and himſelf had taken the oath in their name. Afterwards he adviſed them to do whatſoever they ſhould find proper for the public advantage, and to throw the whole guilt of the perjury upon him alone, whilſt they ſhould take advantage of ſuch favourable circumſtances as fortune preſented them withal. This was his general maxim, as Theophraſtus has obſerved: Καθ' ὅλου δ' ὁ Θεόφραστος φησὶ τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦτον περὶ τὰ οἰκεῖα καὶ τοὺς πολίτας ἄκρως ὄντα δίκαιον, ἐν τοῖς κοινοῖς πολλὰ πράξαι πρὸς τὴν ὑπόθεσιν τῆς πατρίδος ὡς συχνῆς ἀδικίας δεομένην (6). i. e. "Upon the whole, Theophraſtus ſays, that this man "in his private affairs and his conduct towards the "citizens was ſtrictly juſt: but that in the buſineſs "of the publick, he took ſeveral ſuch time-ſerving "meaſures, as tho' the ſtate had required much roguery." What an unhappy ſituation it is to ſit at the helm of public affairs. The welfare of the State does not require only one or two pieces of injuſtice during a man's life, but a great many more. Ariſtides perhaps was not excuſed for an hundred. Note, that Cicero gives us quite another idea of him (7).

(5) In the note [*H*] on the article of AGESILAUS II.

(6) *Apud* Plutarch. *in Ariſtide*, pag. 334, A.

(7) Cicero, *de Officiis*, lib. 3. cap. 11. p. 318.

[*D*] *He gloried in his poverty.*] He had a very rich relation, named Callias, who obſerving that he was publickly accuſed of not furniſhing him with neceſſary food (8), begged of him to teſtify before the judges, whether it was not true that he never would receive ſuch ſums as Callias had very frequently offered him; and whether he had not made him anſwer, that he gloried more in his poverty, than Callias did in his riches: he anſwered, yes. His reaſon was, that one might ſee a great many people who made a good and a bad uſe of riches; but that it was rare to find a man who ſupported poverty nobly (9). It was therefore, it may be ſaid, from a principle of pride that he deſpiſed riches; that is to ſay, in order to diſtinguiſh himſelf from the crowd. It is a great pleaſure to covetous and ambitious men to be able to object that to thoſe who are not like themſelves. But what do they get by it? Though it were true that all men act from a principle of ſelf-love, is it nothing but to draw ones glory rather from this thing than that? Is it not a ſufficiently juſt motive to admire the one, and to deſpiſe the other? Ælian relates a thing which at firſt ſight appears not perfectly compatible with the manifeſt poverty of Ariſtides: *They who had betrothed his daughters, went off,* ſays he, *from that alliance; becauſe,* continues he, *his extreme poverty was then known* (10). I am apt to think him miſtaken in his reaſoning. That poverty was no ſecret during the life of Ariſtides; but it was known at the ſame time that he was a man of great credit. But the moſt venal and ſelf-intereſted minds do not think they engage in a diſadvantageous bargain, in marrying one in the moſt deſtitute circumſtances, ſo long as it can be ſaid that ſhe is the daughter of a favourite who has an hundred lucrative employments at his diſpoſal. Thus you ſee what might be the reaſon why the daughters of Ariſtides, with no dowry at all, found matches during his life time; but when he was dead, there was no more to be expected from them; they therefore were abandoned for want of money. A great genius (11) puts a judicious reflection into the mouth of a favourite: *Such a one thought himſelf honoured with my alliance upon even terms, and yet he thinks to make a ſacrifice to my favour, in aſking my niece of me.* So true it is, that when a perſon ſeeks after the kinſwomen of a man of great intereſt, he is more intent upon the advancements which he can procure for him, than the fortune of the relations.

(8) It was concluded from ſeeing Ariſtides ſo ill clad, that he wanted bread. Plutarch. *in Ariſtide*, p. 334.

(9) Idem, ibid.

A REFLECTION on ſelf-love, and on the pains taken to gain the daughters of a favourite.

(10) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 10. cap. 15.

(11) Mademoiſelle *des Jardins* in her *Exilez de la Cour d'Auguſte.*

[*E*] *Authors differ about the circumſtances of Ariſtides's death..... Seneca has made a great miſtake about it.*] Ariſtides, according to his account, was condemned to die. All thoſe who met him when he was going to ſuffer, caſt their eyes upon the ground ſighing, except one mean wretch who ſpit in his face. Ariſtides

of ARTEMIDORUS, that a grandſon of Ariſtides got his livelihood by interpreting dreams.

des ſmiled, and ſaid to the Officers who accompanied him, *Adviſe that fellow not to open his mouth ſo villainouſly any more.* Seneca relates the thing thus. *Ducebatur Athenis ad ſupplicium Ariſtides, cui quiſquis occurrerat, dejiciebat oculos, & ingemiſcebat non tanquam in hominem juſtum, ſed tanquam in ipſam juſtitiam animadverteretur. Inventus eſt tamen qui faciem ejus inſpueret: poterat ab hoc moleſte ferre, quod ſciebat neminem id auſurum puri oris. At ille abſterſit faciem, & ſubridens ait comitanti ſe magiſtratui, "Admone iſtum, "ne poſteà tam improbe oſcitet* (12)." Lipſius has very well remarked upon this paſſage, that Seneca has taken one perſon for another: He has aſcribed to Ariſtides what belongs to Phocion. It was Phocion who was condemned to die: it was he who was ſpit upon when he was led to the priſon where he was to drink the hemlock juice; and it was he who turning to the magiſtrates that accompanied him, aſked if there was not any one that would curb the inſolence of that foul-mouth'd fellow (13). Seneca has turned the words in his own manner: he has made a conceit: *Verba noſter etiam per argutiolam invertit* (14). This is evidently not the firſt time that he has changed, both things and words: It were to be wiſhed that he was the only perſon who has taken that liberty. People are too fond of ſaying a ſmart thing, not in ſuch a manner as it was ſaid at firſt, but after ſuch a form as they think better. That he was abſolutely miſtaken, is plain, from what Plutarch relates. That Hiſtorian owns, that ſomebody had ſaid that Ariſtides died in baniſhment; but he reſutes that (15). For a much ſtronger reaſon ought we to reject as a fable, what Seneca ſays. Note, that Lancello de Perugia has not corrected this fault: perhaps he knew it; but choſe rather to take it for a certain fact, in order to have room to maintain that injuſtice was at that time greater than juſtice, ſince the Senate of Athens put to death a perſon whoſe virtue was ſo very illuſtrious (16).

(12) Seneca, *Conſol. ad Helviam*, cap. 13. pag. 785.

(13) Plut. *in Phocione.*

(14) Lipſius *in Senecæ Conſolat. ad Helviam*, pag. 785.

(15) Plut. *in Ariſtide*, pag. 335.

(16) *See the* Hegidi of Father *Secondo Lancello da Perugia*, tom. 2. pag. 399, *& ſeq.*

☞ ARISTIDES, an Athenian Philoſopher of the 2d Century of great eloquence, became a convert to the Chriſtian Religion, tho' he did not change his habit or profeſſion as a Philoſopher [*A*]. He preſented to the Emperor Hadrian, at the ſame time with Quadratus, that is, about the year 124, an Apology for the Chriſtian Faith (*a*), in which he repreſented the proofs of it; and which, as St. Jerom informs us (*b*), was extant in his time, and was a convincing teſtimony to the men of learning of the great genius and abilities of the Author. The ſame Father likewiſe obſerves in another paſſage of his writings (*c*), that this Apology was full of the ſentences and opinions of the Philoſophers, and that Juſtin Martyr afterwards imitated him. Guilletiere in his *Deſcription of Athens* publiſhed in French, and quoted by Fabricius in his Notes upon St. Jerom *de Viris Illuſtribus* tells us, that there is a manuſcript of this Apology of Ariſtides extant in a Monaſtery not far from Athens. So early a defence of Chriſtianity as this, and by a perſon of Ariſtides's character, would undoubtedly be of great advantage to us, if it could be recovered. Mr. le Clerc in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (*d*) obſerves, that ſome Writers place the Apologies of our Author and Quadratus under the year 136, when the *Decennalia* of the Emperor Hadrian were celebrated [*B*].

(*a*) Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 4. cap. 3.

(*b*) *De Viris Illuſtrib.* cap. 20.

(*c*) Epiſt. 84. *ad Magn. Orater.* pag. 327. *apud* Cave, *Hiſt. Literar. in Ariſtide.*

(*d*) Pag. 590. edit. Amſtelod. 1716.

[*A*] *Became a convert to the Chriſtian Religion, tho' he did not change his habit or profeſſion as a Philoſopher.*] St. Jerom's words in his Book *de Viris Illuſtribus*, *c.* 20, are as follows: *Ariſtides, Athenienſis Philoſophus eloquentiſſimus, & ſub priſtino habitu diſcipulus Chriſti.* Euſebius in the IVth Book of his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (1), expreſſes himſelf to the ſame purpoſe concerning Juſtin Martyr, where he tells us, that *he preached the Word of God in the habit of a Philoſopher*; ἐν Φιλοσόφου σχήματι πρεσβεύων τὸν θεῖον λόγον: *ſub habitu Philoſophi verbum Dei prædicans*, as Valeſius renders it. Fabricius in his notes upon the paſſage of St. Jerom quoted above, obſerves, that as Ariſtides was a Philoſopher before he became a Chriſtian, he ſtill retained his former habit, that is the Cloak or *Pallium*, which was the peculiar dreſs of the Philoſophers. This ſhews evidently that the Chriſtians in general did not uſe that kind of garment. *Itaque & Ariſtides, cum Philoſophus eſſet antequam Chriſtianus, poſtquam Chriſtianus factus eſt, etiam in priſtino habitu permanſit, nec veſtem Philoſophicam (Pallium) mutavit. Qui locus etiam manifeſto indicio eſt, vulgus Chriſtianorum non fuiſſe palliatum.* The Reader may conſult Salmaſius upon Tertullian's Book *de Pallio*, *p.* 19.

(1) Chap. 2.

[*B*] *Place the apologies of our Author and Quadratus under the year* 136, *when the Decennalia of the Emperor Hadrian were celebrated.*] Father Pagi is of this opinion, in his *Diſſertatio Hypatica*, *cap.* 3. in which he aſſerts, that moſt of the perſecutions happened during the *Decennalia* of the Emperors, and therefore he concludes, that theſe two apologies were publiſhed during the *Decennalia* of Hadrian. Mr. Le Clerc acknowledges, that this was very frequently the caſe, but cannot allow, that it was always ſo; and conſequently, that Father Pagi's reaſoning is not abſolutely concluſive. T.

☞ ARISTIPPUS, the Founder of the Cyrenaic Sect of Philoſophy [*A*], was the ſon of Aretades (*a*), and born at Cyrene in Lybia. He flouriſhed about the 96th Olympiad. The great reputation of Socrates induced him to leave his own country, and remove to Athens, that he might have the ſatisfaction of hearing his diſcourſes (*b*). Plutarch tells us (*c*), that he received this advantageous character of Socrates from Iſchomachus, whom he met with accidentally at the Olympic Games. He enquired of him by what

(*a*) Suidas.

(*b*) Diogenes Laertius *in Vitis Philoſ.* lib. 2. *in Vitâ Ariſtippi.*

(*c*) *De Curioſit.*

[*A*] *The Founder of the Cyrenaic Sect of Philoſophy.*] The ſucceſſion of the Ionic Philoſophy, which before Socrates was ſingle, was after his death divided into many ſchools, ſome of which continued but a ſhort time, while others had a longer ſucceſſion. The Cyrenaic Sect was one of thoſe of the ſhorteſt duration. We ſhall give ſome account of their opinions. They rejected natural Philoſophy, imagining ſuch diſquiſitions to be abſolutely incomprehenſible. They made uſe of Logic, which they conſidered as a very uſeful art. But Meleager and Clitomachus aſſerted, that they had an equal contempt both for Natural Philoſophy and Dialectic, which they repreſented as entirely unneceſſary, ſince without theſe, a man may be able to underſtand what things are good, and what evil, and to diſcourſe well, and to diveſt himſelf of ſuperſtition and the fear of death (1). They maintained, that the ſenſes do not always inform us truly; that nothing extrinſecal can be perceived; and that only thoſe things are the objects of our preception, which are felt by an inward ſenſation, as grief and pleaſure. That we do not know the colour or ſound of any thing, but only that we feel ourſelves affected in ſuch a manner (2). Sextus Empiricus (3) repreſents this doctrine more fully and perſpicuouſly as follows. The paſſions or affections are the judges and only faculties, which are

(1) Laert. *in Vitâ Ariſtippi.*

(2) Cicero *Academ. Quæſt.* l. 4.

(3) *Adverſ. Mathemat.*

what manner of diſputes that Philoſopher made ſo great an impreſſion upon the youth; and from the imperfect account which Ichomachus gave him of them, he was ſo paſſionately affected, that he grew pale and lean, till he took a voyage to Athens in order fully to gratify his curioſity. He was chiefly delighted with thoſe diſcourſes of Socrates, that related the moſt to pleaſure (*d*); which he aſſerted to be the ultimate end, in which all happineſs conſiſts. His manner of life was agreeable to his opinion; for he indulged himſelf extremely in all the luxuries of dreſs, wine, and women (*e*). Tho' he had a good eſtate, and three country ſeats, yet he was the only one of the diſciples of Socrates, who took money for teaching; which being obſerved by that Philoſopher, he aſked Ariſtippus,

(*d*) Cicero *de Orat.* lib. 3.

(*e*) Athen. *Deipnoſ.* lib. 12.

are capable of comprehending, and are not fallacious. But with regard to thoſe objects, which affect the paſſions, there is nothing, which is comprehenſible, or exempt from fallacy. We may ſay indeed, that we are made white, or affected with what is ſweet; but we cannot aſſert, that what cauſes this affection, is white or ſweet. For it is poſſible, that we may be affected with whiteneſs from an object, which is not white, and with ſweetneſs from a thing, which is not ſweet. Thus to a man, who has weak or jaundic'd eyes, all things ſeem either darkiſh and obſcure or yellow. And by preſſing our eyes, we imagine we ſee things double. A madman fancies that he ſees two ſuns or two cities of Thebes. It is reaſonable therefore to conclude, that we comprehend nothing but the paſſions and ſenſations of our minds. For we muſt aſſert, that the things ſeen are either the paſſions themſelves, or the cauſes of thoſe paſſions. If we ſay, that our paſſions are the things ſeen, we muſt likewiſe affirm all things ſeen to be true and comprehenſible. If we ſay, that the things ſeen are the cauſes of thoſe paſſions, we muſt confeſs all things ſeen to be falſe and incomprehenſible. For that paſſion, which we feel, ſhews us itſelf and nothing more. So that to ſpeak with propriety, the paſſion or affection it ſelf is the only thing apparent to us; and for that reaſon no perſon is miſtaken in his own affection, or ſenſations of mind, but every one in the external objects of them. Hence they aſſert, that there is not any one common principle in mankind, by which they judge; but they impoſe common names upon their particular judgments. All promiſcuouſly uſe the words white and ſweet; but they have no common principle of white and ſweet; for every man is only ſenſible of his own affections. Now whether the ſame affection happens to any two perſons from an object, which is white, neither of them is able to determine, becauſe they are not capable of receiving each other's affection. As there is no common affection in us, it would be raſh to aſſert, that whatever ſeems thus to me, ſeems ſo to another perſon; for our different conſtitutions may occaſion different ſenſations in us. It is evident that we are differently affected by the different conſtitutions of our ſenſes from the caſe of thoſe, who are defective in their ſight, troubled with the jaundice, or who have their faculties of ſight entire and in their natural ſtate; ſince the ſame object may appear of different colours to different perſons. Of the affections of the mind ſome are agreeable, others harſh and troubleſome; and a third kind of a middle nature. Laertius obſerves, that they aſſert two paſſions or affections of the mind, pain and pleaſure; the former a ſmooth motion, the latter an harſh and rough one. There is no difference between one pleaſure and another, nor is one more agreeable than another. But pleaſure is the object, which all creatures deſire; and pain what they all avoid. With regard to the pleaſure of the body, which they aſſert to be the ultimate end of mankind, according to Panætius in his treatiſe of the Sects, quoted by Laertius, they do not allow it to be that calm, ſedate pleaſure, reſulting from the privation of pain, and a freedom from all diſturbance, which Epicurus maintained to be our proper end. For they affirmed that there is a difference between the end and happineſs. The end is only ſome particular pleaſure; but happineſs conſiſts of the aggregate of all pleaſures, wherein are included both the paſt and future. Beſides, particular pleaſure is deſirable in itſelf; Happineſs, not for itſelf, but for the ſake of all the particular pleaſures. That pleaſure is our chief end, is evident from hence, that we are determined to it from our earlieſt infancy, without any inſtruction of others, by the mere impulſe of nature; and that when we have attained it, we ſeek nothing farther. On the other hand, we avoid nothing ſo much as the reverſe of it, which is pain. They affirmed, that pleaſure is good, tho' proceeding from the vileſt actions, as Hippobatus relates in his Book of the Sects (4). For tho' the action be diſhoneſt, yet the pleaſure ariſing from it is deſirable and good. Exemption from pain was not eſteemed pleaſure by them, as it was by Epicurus; nor was the ceſſation of pleaſure accounted pain, ſince both of them conſiſt in motion; whereas, neither ceſſation of pain nor privation of pleaſure are motions, becauſe the former is like the ſtate of a man in a profound ſleep. They affirmed, that ſome men thro' perverſeneſs of mind, are incapable of chooſing pleaſure; and that all the pleaſures and pains of the mind do not proceed from the pains and pleaſures of the body; ſince we feel in our minds a ſatisfaction on account of the proſperity of our country, beſides the pleaſure which we take in our own private happineſs. They did not believe the remembrance of paſt, or the expectation of future enjoyments to be pleaſure, as Epicurus thought; ſince time puts a ſtop to the motion of the ſoul. Pleaſure, according to Ariſtippus (5), is μονόχρονος, that is, conſiſts only in one part of time, the preſent; for the recollection of paſt pleaſure, or the expectation of future is vain and trifling; ſince that only is good, which we experience at preſent. He declared, that he was not at all affected with either the paſt or the future, the former being already gone, and the latter not yet come, and what it will prove when it comes, is abſolutely uncertain. From hence he argued, according to Ælian (6), that men ought not to be ſollicitous either about things paſt or future; ſince it was the ſign of a firm and well conſtituted mind not to be at all troubled about them. He adviſed men likewiſe to take care only for the preſent day, and in that day only for the preſent part of it, in which ſomething was done or thought of. For, he ſaid, the preſent was only in our power, not the paſt nor future, the one being gone, the other uncertain whether it will come. Μόνον γὰρ ἴφασκεν ἡμέτερον εἶναι τὸ παρὸν, μήτε δὲ τὸ φθάσαν, μήτε τὸ προσδοκώμενον· τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἀπολωλέναι, τὸ δὲ ἄδηλον εἶναι, εἴπερ ἔσται. The Cyrenaics would not allow, that pleaſure conſiſted in ſeeing or hearing only; for we hear with delight thoſe, who counterfeit lamentation; but thoſe, who really mourn, we hear with diſpleaſure. They called the privation of pain and pleaſure the middle ſtate. They aſſerted, that the pleaſures of the body are much ſuperior to thoſe of the mind; and therefore the pains of the body are more grievous. Hence it happens, that offenders are more tormented with corporeal puniſhment. Pain is unnatural to us, and pleaſure natural. They thought it ſufficient for a man to enjoy the ſatisfaction of one ſingle pleaſure at a time. They conſidered riches, as the efficient cauſes of pleaſures; but not as deſirable of themſelves. They maintain'd that all good conſiſts in pleaſure; and virtue itſelf is only commendable, as being a cauſe of pleaſure (7). That there is nothing juſt, honeſt, or diſhoneſt by nature, but only by law and cuſtom. However that a good man will do nothing abſurd or evil, by reaſon of the cenſures of the world, and the puniſhments, which offenders are obnoxious to. That wiſdom is a good, but not to be deſired in itſelf, but only for the ſake of thoſe things, which proceed from it. That a friend is to be loved for the uſe we make of him, as the body cheriſhes every part of itſelf, as long as it continues ſound. That ſome virtues are common to fools, as well as to wiſe men. That the exerciſe of the body contributes to the attainment of virtue. That a wiſe man will never give way to envy, intemperance, or ſuperſtition; for all theſe proceed from want of judgment. But they allowed him to grieve and fear, as being natural to mankind (8).

(4) *Apud* Laertium, *ubi ſupra.*

(5) *Apud* Athenæum, *Deipnoſ.* lib. 12.

(6) *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 14. cap. 6.

(7) Cicero, *de Officiis*, lib. 3.

(8) Laertius, *ubi ſupra.*

pus, How he came to have ſo much? Who in reply aſked him, How he came to have ſo little? Socrates likewiſe expreſſed his diſapprobation of this upon another occaſion; for when Ariſtippus ſent him part of the money, which he had received, he returned it, ſaying, that his Demon would not ſuffer him to take it (*f*). Upon his leaving Socrates, he went to Ægina, as Athenæus informs us (*g*), where he lived with more freedom and luxury than before. Socrates ſent frequent exhortations to him, in order to reclaim him, but all in vain. And with the ſame view he publiſhed that Diſcourſe, which we find in Xenophon. Here Ariſtippus became acquainted with Lais, the famous Courtezan of Corinth; for whoſe ſake he took a voyage to that city [*B*]. He continued at Ægina till the death of Socrates, as appears from Plato's *Phædo*, and the Epiſtle, which he wrote upon that occaſion [*C*]. He returned at laſt into his own country, Cyrene, where he profeſſed Philoſophy, and inſtituted a Sect, which, as we obſerv'd above, was called the *Cyrenaic*, from the place, and by ſome Writers (*h*) the *Hedonic* or voluptuous, from its doctrines, which we have given an account of in the note [*A*]. During the height of the grandeur of Dionyſius, the Sicilian Tyrant, a great many Philoſophers reſorted to him; and among the reſt Ariſtippus, who was tempted thither by the magnificence of that court (*i*). Dionyſius aſking him the reaſon of his coming, he replied, that it was in order to give what he had, and to receive what he had not; or, as others repreſent it, that when he wanted wiſdom, he went to Socrates, but now as he wanted money, he was come to him (*k*). He very ſoon inſinuated himſelf into the favour of Dionyſius; for being a man of a ſoft eaſy temper, he conformed himſelf exactly to every place, time and perſon, and was a compleat maſter of the moſt refined complaiſance. We have ſeveral remarkable paſſages concerning him during his reſidence at that court mentioned by Diogenes Laertius [*D*]. The great ſhare of favour which he enjoyed at the court of Dionyſius, was perhaps the

(*f*) Laertius, *ubi ſupra*, and Stanley's *Lives of the Philoſophers*, Part 4. p. 132. edit. 2. 1087.

(*g*) *Deipnoſ. ubi ſupra.*

(*h*) Galen. *Hiſt. Phil. apud* Stanley, p. 133.

(*i*) Philoſtrat. *in Vitâ Apollon. apud* Stanley, pag. 134.

(*k*) Laert. *ubi ſupra.*

[*B*] *For whoſe ſake he took a voyage to that city.*] He contracted an acquaintance with her at Ægina, whither ſhe came every year at the feaſt of Neptune. His paſſion for her induced him to take a voyage to Corinth; in which being ſurprized by a violent ſtorm, he was extremely uneaſy. Upon this one of the paſſengers ſaying to him, *We ordinary people are not afraid, but you Philoſophers are ſubject to fear* (9); or, as Ælian repreſents it (10), *Are you afraid like other people?* He replied, *Our ſouls are not of equal value* (11): *you hazard a wicked and unhappy life: I riſque happineſs* (12). Ὑμῖν μὲν γὰρ περὶ κακοδαίμονος ἴσως ἐστὶν ἡ σπουδὴ, ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν κίνδυνος; ἐμοὶ δὲ περὶ ἐυδαιμονίας. When he was reproved for frequenting Lais, he ſaid, that he poſſeſſed her, and not ſhe him. *For pleaſure*, added he, *is no crime; but the crime is for a man to be a ſlave to his pleaſures* (13). Lais in emulation of Phryne, gave admittance to all ſorts of people, both rich and poor; upon which Ariſtippus being reprehended by his ſervant for beſtowing ſo much on her, ſince ſhe had entertained Diogenes the Cynic without any reward; he anſwered, That he gave her money, that he might enjoy her, and not that others might not have the ſame liberty. Diogenes reproached him for his freedom with Lais, telling him, that he converſed with the ſame woman himſelf; and therefore he ought to abandon her, or become a Cynic like himſelf. Ariſtippus aſked him by way of reply, whether he thought it abſurd to live in the ſame houſe, in which others had lived before, or to ſail in a ſhip, which had carried other paſſengers. And therefore it was not more abſurd to have an affection for a woman, whom others had enjoyed (14).

(9) Idem, ibid.
(10) *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 9. cap. 20.
(11) Aul. Gell. lib. 19. cap. 1.
(12) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt. ubi ſupra.*
(13) Laert. *ubi ſupra.*
(14) Athen. *Deipnoſ.* lib. 13.

[*C*] *The epiſtle, which he wrote upon that occaſion.*] It is the ſixteenth among the Socratic Epiſtles, and is as follows, according to Mr. Stanley's tranſlation (15). *Of the death of Socrates, I and Cleombrotus have received information; and that when he might have eſcaped from the eleven Officers, he ſaid he would not, unleſs he was acquitted by law; for that were as much as in him lay to betray his country. My opinion is, that being unjuſtly committed, he might have got his liberty any way, conceiving that all, which he could do ill or inconſiderately, muſt be juſt. From whence again I blame him not, as if he had done ill even in this. You write me word that all the friends and diſciples of Socrates, have left Athens out of fear the like ſhould befall any of you. It is well done; and we being preſent at Ægina will continue here a while, then come to you, and, wherein we are able, ſerve you.*

(15) *Lives of the Philoſophers*, Part 4. p. 132, 133.

[*D*] *Several remarkable paſſages concerning him, during his reſidence at that court, mentioned by Diogenes Laertius.*] Dionyſius at a feaſt, commanded that all ſhould put on women's purple habits, and dance in them. But Plato refuſed, repeating theſe lines;

I cannot in this gay effeminate dreſs
Diſgrace my manhood, or my ſex betray.

But Ariſtippus readily ſubmitted to the command, and made this reply immediately:

——— *At feaſts, where mirth is free,*
A ſober mind can never be corrupted.

At another time interceding with Dionyſius in behalf of a friend, but not prevailing, he caſt himſelf at his feet; and being reproved for that exceſs of humility, he replied, that it was not he, who was the cauſe of that ſubmiſſion, but Dionyſius, whoſe ears were in his feet. Dionyſius ſhewed him three beautiful Courtezans, and ordered him to take his choice. Upon which he took them all three away with him, alledging that Paris was puniſhed for preferring one to the other two. But when he had brought them to his door, he diſmiſſed them, in order to ſhew, that he could either enjoy or reject with the ſame indifference. This was the reaſon, that Strabo, or, as others ſay, Plato told him, that he was the only perſon, who cared not whether he wore purple or rags. He was likewiſe admired, becauſe he could wear a threadbare or a rich Mileſian cloak with equal decorum, accommodating himſelf to both. When Dionyſius ſpit upon him, he took it patiently; and being reproved for it, he anſwered, that the Fiſhermen will ſuffer themſelves to be waſhed by the ſea, that they may catch a gudgeon (κάβιον); and therefore it was not unreaſonable in him to endure to be ſprinkled with a little ſpittle to catch a fool; as the Engliſh tranſlation of Diogenes Laertius has render'd this paſſage. But Mr. Stanley obſerves (16), that the word βλίνος, when pronounced, is equivocal: for βλίνος ſignifies a Fiſh like a gudgeon, and βλήνος a Tyrant. He deſired money of Dionyſius, who obſerved to him, that he had aſſured him a wiſe man wanted nothing. *Give me*, ſays he, *what I aſk, and we will talk of that afterwards.* When Dionyſius had given it him, *Now*, ſays he, *you ſee I do not want.* By this complaiſance, he gained ſo much upon Dionyſius, that he had a greater regard for him, than for all the reſt of the Philoſophers, tho' he ſometimes ſpoke with ſuch freedom to that King, that he incurred his diſpleaſure. When Dionyſius aſked, Why Philoſophers haunted the gates of rich men; but not rich men thoſe of Philoſophers? he replied, Becauſe the latter know what they want, and the others not. Another time, when Dionyſius urged him to diſcourſe upon a point of Philoſophy; he replied, That it was abſurd, that he, who was but a learner, ſhould inſiſt upon his ſpeaking, and yet teach him when he ſhould ſpeak. The King being offended at this, commanded him to retire to the

(16) Pag. 135.

the reaſon, as Mr. Stanley obſerves (*l*), that he was envied by the reſt of the Philoſophers, among whom was Xenophon, who out of reſentment to him publiſhed the diſcourſe between him and Socrates concerning pleaſure (*m*). Plato likewiſe animadverts upon him very ſeverely in his *Phædo*, for being at Ægina at the time of Socrates's death. While Plato was at Dionyſius's court at the ſame time as Ariſtippus, he reproved him for his ſumptuous manner of life. Upon this Ariſtippus aſked him, whether he thought Dionyſius a good man or not? and Plato affirming, that he thought him ſo, he replied, that Dionyſius lived more ſumptuouſly; and therefore it was not incompatible with goodneſs (*n*). Phœdo aſked him, by way of raillery, who it was that ſmelt ſo ſtrong of Unguents? *It is I, unhappy man as I am*, anſwered Ariſtippus, *and the Perſian King, who is more unhappy than me. But as other things are not the worſe for this, ſo neither is man* (*o*). He had a conteſt alſo with Antiſthenes the Cynic Philoſopher, as appears by an Epiſtle of the latter among the Socratic Epiſtles, and Ariſtippus's anſwer to it [*E*]. However notwithſtanding this diſpute between them, Ariſtippus was very ready to employ his intereſt at court for ſome friends of Antiſthenes, to preſerve them from death, as we find by a letter of his to that Philoſopher (*p*). Diogenes followed the example of his maſter Antiſthenes in ridiculing Ariſtippus, and called him the *Court-Spaniel* (*q*). We have many Apophthegms of his preſerved [*F*]. He wrote a great many books, and particularly the *Hiſtory of Libya* in three books dedicated to Dionyſius, and ſeveral Dialogues, with four books of the luxury of the Antients (*r*). There are four Epiſtles of his extant in the Socratic Collection publiſhed by Leo Allatius. After he had lived a long time with Dionyſius, his daughter Arete ſent to him, to deſire his preſence at Cyrene, in order to take care of her affairs, ſince ſhe was in danger of being oppreſſed by the Magiſtrates. But

(l) Pag. 135.

(m) Laert. *ubi ſupra*; *and* Xenophon. *Memorabil. Socrat.* lib. 2.

(n) Laert. *ubi ſupra.*

(o) *See* Stanley, pag. 135.

(p) Socratic. Epiſt. 2.

(q) Laert. *ubi ſupra.*

(r) Idem, ibid.

the lower end of the table; which he readily ſubmitted to, ſaying, that he perceived his deſign was to make it a place of honour (17). The next day the Tyrant aſk'd him, what he thought of that place in which he ſat then, in reſpect of that, wherein he ſat the night before? He anſwered, That they were alike to him: *To day*, ſays he, *becauſe I left it, it is contemned, tho' yeſterday it was eſteemed the moſt honourable. That, where I ſit to day, is accounted moſt honourable, which yeſterday, without me, was eſteemed the loweſt* (18). Being aſk'd, Why Dionyſius was angry with him? He replied, *For the ſame reaſon that other men are angry*; or, as Mr. Stanley renders this paſſage of Laertius, *For the ſame reaſon he falls out with others.* Another time Dionyſius repeating (out of Sophocles, as Plutarch affirms, who aſcribes this to Zeno) theſe verſes,

He, that with Tyrants ſeeks for bare ſupport,
Enſlaves himſelf, tho' free he came to court.

He immediately anſwered;

He is no ſlave, if he be free to come.

Diocles, as Laertius informs us, related this in his *Lives of the Philoſophers*; tho' others aſcribe this ſaying to Plato. Dionyſius offering Plato a great ſum of money, which he refuſed, Ariſtippus being at the ſame time at court, ſaid, that Dionyſius beſtowed his liberality upon ſure grounds, ſince he gave little to thoſe, who aſked much; but he offered a conſiderable ſum to Plato, who required nothing. Another time Helicon of Cyzicus, one of Plato's friends, having foretold an Eclipſe of the Sun, which happened accordingly, he was much honoured for it. Ariſtippus jeſting with other Philoſophers, ſaid, that he could foretell a ſtranger thing than that. They demanding what it was, he ſaid, that he could prognoſticate, that Plato and Dionyſius would ſoon be at variance; which accordingly happened (19).

(17) Laert. *ubi ſupra.*

(18) Athenæus, *Deipnoſ.* lib. 12.

(19) Plutarch. *in Vit. Dion.*

[*E*] *As appears by an Epiſtle of the latter among the Socratic Epiſtles, and Ariſtippus's anſwer to it.*] Ariſtippus's Letter to Antiſthenes, who was diſpleaſed at his manner of life, is written in an ironical ſtyle. We ſhall give it in Mr. Stanley's tranſlation. *We are unhappy beyond meaſure. How can we be otherwiſe, living with a tyrant, daily eating and drinking deliciouſly, perfum'd with choiceſt unguents, attired in rich looſe garments brought from Tarentum. And none will deliver me from the cruelty of Dionyſius, who detains me, not as a rude perſon, but one that is verſed in Socratic learning; ſupplying me, as I ſaid, with meat, unguents, garments, and the like; fearing neither the judgments of Gods nor men. And now the misfortune is much encreaſed. He hath beſtowed on me three Sicilian Virgins of extraordinary beauty, and many utenſils of ſilver. And when this man will give over doing ſuch things I know not, you do well therefore to be concerned for the miſeries of others. In requital whereof I rejoice in your happineſs, and return you thanks. Farewel.* "The figs, which you "have, lay up againſt Winter and the Cretan Meal; "for theſe things ſeem to be better than riches. "Waſh and drink of the fountain of *Enneacrunus*. "Wear the ſame garment in Winter as in Summer, "and that ſordid, as becomes a free perſon living "under the Athenian Democracy. As for me, I "knew as ſoon as I came into a city and iſland go"verned by a Monarch, I ſhould ſuffer thoſe ills, of "which you write to me. Now the Syracuſians, Agri"gentines, Geloans, and the reſt of the Sicilians com"paſſionately admire me (20). But for my madneſs "in coming inconſiderately to theſe unſeemly things, "I wiſh this curſe to fall upon me, that I never be "quit of theſe evils; becauſe being of years of diſ"cretion, and pretending to wiſdom, I would not "undergo hunger and cold, nor contemn glory, nor "wear a long beard. I will ſend you ſome great "white lupines to eat, after you have acted Hercu"les to the boys; of which things you eſteem it not "abſurd to diſcourſe and write. But if any man "ſhould ſpeak of lupines to Dionyſius, I think it "were againſt the rules of tyranny. Of the reſt go, "and diſcourſe with Simon the Leather-dreſſer, than "whom you eſteem nothing more wiſe; for I am "allowed familiarity with Artificers, becauſe I live "under obedience to others."

(20) Mr. Stanley reads νῦν δὲ ἐλεοῦντες με περιβλέποντα in Doric, which is an acute irony; for περιβλέπειν ſignifies to look on a thing with admiration; which is not proper to compaſſion.

[*F*] *We have many Apophthegms of his ſtill preſerved.*] Suidas obſerves, that he ſurpaſſed all the Philoſophers in the acuteneſs of his Apophthegms. He once ordered fifty drachmas to be given for a partridge; and being reproved by a certain perſon for his extravagance, he replied, *Would not you have bought the fowl, if you could have had it for a farthing?* To which the other aſſenting: *Well then*, ſaid he, *fifty drachma's are no more to me than your ſingle farthing to you.* Being demanded, what was the greateſt benefit, which he had received by Philoſophy, he anſwered, to converſe freely with all men. Being reproached with his expenſive manner of living; *Certainly*, ſaid he, *if this were ſuch a criminal thing, the Gods would never be ſo laviſh at their banquets*; *or*, as Mr. Stanley renders this paſſage of Laertius, *It would not be practiſed upon days of feſtival to the Gods.* To one, who aſked him in what reſpect the Philoſophers excelled other men, he replied, *In this, that they would live uprightly and juſtly, if there were no Laws in the world.* Being aſked what was the difference between the learned and the ignorant; he made anſwer, *The ſame, that is between a wild horſe, and one that is managed.* As he was going one time into a Courtezan's lodging, and

But he fell ſick in his return home, and died at Lipara, an Æolian Iſland, as we may collect

and perceived one of the young men, who were with him, bluſh, he told him, that the ſhame did not lie in going in thither, but in not being able to get out again. To one, who deſired him to reſolve a riddle, he replied, that it was abſurd to reſolve that, which unreſolved affords ſo much entertainment. Being railed at, he left the room; and the perſon who abuſed him, following him, and aſking him why he went away; he anſwered, *Becauſe it is in your power to rail, but it is not in my power not to hear you.* He uſed to ſay, That it was better to be a beggar than an illiterate man; ſince one wants only money, but the other humanity. A perſon obſerving, that the Philoſophers frequented the houſes of rich men; *Why*, ſaid he, *the Phyſicians frequent the chambers of the ſick, yet that is no reaſon, why a man ſhould rather chuſe to lie ſick than be cured.* To one, who boaſted of his great reading, he ſaid, that as they, who feed and exerciſe moſt, are not always more healthy than they, who only eat and exerciſe to ſatisfy nature; ſo neither they, who read much, but they, who read no more than is uſeful, are truly learned. To his Lawyer, who having pleaded his cauſe for him, and gained it, aſked him, what good Socrates had done him: *Very much*, ſaid he, *for he made all your words good, which you have ſpoken to day in my behalf.* Among other uſeful inſtructions, which he gave to his daughter Arete, he adviſed her particularly to deſpiſe ſuperfluity. To one, who aſked him what his ſon would be the better for being a Scholar; *If for nothing elſe*, ſaid he, *yet for this alone, that when he comes into the Theatre, one ſtone will not ſit upon another.* When a certain perſon recommended his ſon to him, he demanded five hundred drachma's; and upon the father's replying, that he could buy a ſlave for that ſum; *Do ſo*, ſaid he, *and then you'll be maſter of a couple* (21). He uſed to ſay, that he took money of his friends, not ſo much for his own uſe, as that they might know what money was good for, or how to beſtow it; Being reproached, becauſe having a ſuit of law depending, he feed a Lawyer to plead for him; *Juſt ſo*, ſaid he, *when I have a great ſupper to make I always hire a cook.* To one, who extolled himſelf for his excellent ſkill in ſwimming; *Are not you aſhamed*, ſays he, *to boaſt of that which every Dolphin can do better?* Being aſked what was the difference between a wiſe man and a fool; he replied, *Send both of them together naked to thoſe, who are acquainted with neither of them, and then you'll know.* To one, who valued himſelf upon his being able to drink a prodigious quantity without being intoxicated; *'Tis no more*, ſaid he, *than a mule can do.* Being reproved for taking money, as he had been the diſciple of Socrates; *So much the rather*, ſaid he, *for Socrates, when they ſent him proviſion and wine, took what he wanted, and returned the reſt; and there was good reaſon for it, becauſe the chiefeſt of the Athenians were his purveyors; but I have none but Eutuchidas, a ſervant, whom I bought.* Being reproved by a certain perſon, (who according to Mr. Stanley was Plato,) for his coſtly and voluptuous feaſts; *I warrant you*, ſaid he, *that you would not have beſtowed three farthings upon ſuch a dinner*; which the other confeſſing, *Why then*, ſaid he, *I find myſelf leſs indulgent to my palate, than you are to your covetous humour*; or, as it is otherwiſe repreſented, *I find, that I love my belly, and you love your money.* When Simus, Treaſurer to Dionyſius, ſhewed him his houſe magnificently furniſhed, and paved with coſtly marble, for he was a Phrygian, and conſequently profuſe; Ariſtippus ſpit in his face, upon which the other growing angry, *Why truly*, ſaid he, *I could not find a fitter place.* Being aſked, how Socrates died? *I wiſh*, ſaid he, *that I may but die in the ſame manner.* Polyxenus the Sophiſt coming to his houſe, but ſeeing a company of Ladies richly dreſt, and great preparations for a banquet, began a long diſcourſe againſt luxury; which when Ariſtippus had patiently liſtened to for ſome time, he aſked him to dine with him. Polyxenus agreeing to this, Ariſtippus aſked him, why he had reproved him with ſuch ſeverity; ſince he found, that he did not condemn the feaſt, but the expence of it? His ſervant carrying after him a great weight of money, and being ready to ſink upon the road under his burden, he bid him throw away all what was too much for him to carry. Horace mentions this fact in his third Satyr of the ſecond Book:

Quid ſimile iſti
Græcus Ariſtippus? qui ſervos projicere aurum
In mediâ juſſit Lybiâ, quia tardius irent
Propter onus ſegnes.

Being at Sea, and underſtanding that the owners of the veſſel were Pirates, he took out his money, and after he had told it before their faces, let it drop into the water; and then, as if he had done it againſt his will, fell into a great agony of grief for his loſs. Some report, that he made uſe of theſe expreſſions at the ſame time; *It is better, that this ſhould be thrown away by Ariſtippus, than that Ariſtippus ſhould periſh for the ſake of his money.* He condemned men for examining the goods, which were brought to market, and yet never making any inſpection into their lives and converſations, or, as Mr. Stanley tranſlates it, *taking no care to furniſh their minds.* Others aſcribe this to Diogenes. While he lived in Aſia, he was ſeized by Artaphernes, the King's Lieutenant; upon which a perſon coming to him, and aſking him, where his confidence was now? He replied, *When had I more occaſion to be confident than now, when I am going to diſcourſe with Artaphernes?* With regard to thoſe perſons, who forſook Philoſophy, to apply themſelves to mechanical Sciences, or, as it is render'd in the Engliſh Tranſlation of Diogenes Laertius with leſs propriety, who had a generous education, and neglected the ſtudy of Philoſophy; he compared them to Penelope's Suitors: For tho' they might have the liberty of courting Melantho, Polydora, and the reſt of her Waiting-Gentlewomen, yet they could never hope to marry the Miſtreſs. Ariſto had a ſaying to the ſame purpoſe, who obſerved, that Ulyſſes, when he went to the infernal Regions, ſaw all the dead, and diſcourſed with ſeveral of them, but he was never permitted to ſee the Queen herſelf. Being aſked, what things were moſt proper for children to be inſtructed in? He anſwered, Thoſe, which might prove of the greateſt advantage to them, when they came to be men. Being reproached for going from Socrates to Dionyſius; he replied, That he went to Socrates, when he wanted ſerious inſtructions (παιδεία); and to Dionyſius for diverſion (παιδιά). To a Courtezan, who told him, that ſhe was with child by him, *You can no more tell me that*, ſays he, *than you can ſay, that you are hurt by a particular thorn, when you have paſſed thro' a field of brambles.* Having received money of Dionyſius at the ſame time that Plato accepted a Book only, and being reproached for it; *The reaſon is plain*, ſays he, *I want money, and Plato wants books* (22). Having loſt a conſiderable farm, he ſaid to one, who ſeemed exceſſively to compaſſionate his loſs, *You have but one field; I have three left: why ſhould not I rather grieve for you?* Plutarch, who relates this in his Book *De Tranquillitate Animi*, obſerves upon it, that it is very abſurd to lament for what is loſt, and not to rejoice for what is left. When a perſon told him, That the land for his ſake was loſt; he replied, That it was better ſo, than that he ſhould be loſt for the land (23). Seeing a perſon vent his anger in words, he adviſed him not to ſuit his words to his paſſion, but to appeaſe his paſſion with words (24). Obſerving a little woman extremely beautiful, *This*, ſays he, *is a little evil, but a great beauty* (25). Thoſe, who invert theſe words, and read, *a little beauty, and a great evil*, miſtake the meaning of Ariſtippus, who plays upon this common ſaying. To one, who aſked his advice, whether he ſhould marry or not, he ſaid *No, for if you take a beautiful wife, ſhe will be common; if an ugly one, a fury* (26). He uſed to adviſe young men to carry ſuch proviſion with them, as in a ſhipwreck they might ſwim away with (27). He obſerved, that as a ſhoe too big is unfit for uſe; ſo is a great eſtate. The largeneſs of the ſhoe is uneaſy to the wearer. Riches may be uſed upon occaſion either wholly or in part (28). Being caſt by ſhipwreck aſhore on the Iſland of Rhodes, and perceiving mathematical

(21) Laert. *and* Plutarch. *de Educat. pueror.*

(22) Laert. *ubi ſupra.*

(23) Stob. *Eth.* 46. *apud* Stanley, pag. 137.

(24) Stob. *Eth.* 99.

(25) Idem, *Eth.* 128.

(26) Idem, *Eth.* 185.

(27) Idem, *Eth.* 210.

(28) Idem, *Eth.* 229.

lect from his letter to his daughter publiſhed among the Socratic Epiſtles [G]. Beſides Arete his daughter, whom he educated in Philoſophy, he had alſo a ſon, whom he diſinherited for his ſtupidity; and being reproved by his wife on that account, who alledged that he came from himſelf, he ſpitting, replied, *This comes from me too, but is not of the leaſt advantage to me* (s). Arete had a ſon, who was named Ariſtippus from his grandfather, and had the ſurname of Μητροδίδακτος from his mother's inſtructing him in Philoſophy. Among his auditors, beſides his daughter Arete, we have an account of Æthiops of Ptolemais, and Antipater of Cyrene. Arete communicated the Philoſophy, which ſhe received from her father, to her ſon Ariſtippus, who tranſmitted it to Theodorus *the Atheiſt*, who inſtituted the Sect called *Theodorean*. Antipater communicated the Philoſophy of Ariſtippus to Epitimedes his diſciple; Epitimedes to Paræbates; Paræbates to Hegeſias and Anniceris; and theſe two laſt improving it by ſome additions of their own, obtained the honour each of them of giving a name to the *Hegeſiac* and *Annicerian* Sect (t). Laertius mentions two other perſons of the name of Ariſtippus; one, who wrote the Hiſtory of Arcadia; the other, a Philoſopher of the new Academy.

(s) Stob. *Eth.* 195. *apud* Stanley, pag. 139.

(t) Laert. *ubi ſupra*, pag. 139.

thematical ſchemes and diagrams drawn upon the ground, he ſaid, Courage, friends; for I ſee the footſteps of men (24).

(29) Vitruvii *Præfat. in lib.* 2.

. [G] *His letter to his daughter Arete publiſhed among the Socratic Epiſtles.*] It is the twenty ſeventh in that collection, and was written juſt before his death. It is as follows. *I received your letter by Teleus, in which you deſire me to make all poſſible haſte to Cyrene, becauſe your buſineſs with the Magiſtrates is not conducted in a proper manner, and your huſband is unfit to manage your domeſtic affairs, by reaſon of his exceſſive modeſty, and his having been accuſtomed to a retired life. As ſoon therefore as I obtained leave of Dionyſius, I entered upon my voyage towards you; but fell ſick at Lipara, where the friends of Sonicus provide carefully for me, with ſuch humanity, as is proper for a perſon near his death. As for your demand, what regard you ſhould pay to thoſe, whom I manumitted, and who profeſs that they will never deſert Ariſtippus whilſt they have any ſtrength, but ever ſerve him and you, truſt them in all things; for they have learned from me not to be falſe. For your ſelf I adviſe you to apply to the Magiſtrates, which advice will be of advantage to you, if you affect not rather to have much. You will live moſt at eaſe, if you contemn exceſs; for they cannot be ſo unjuſt as to leave you in want. You have two orchards left, ſufficient to maintain you plentifully; and that eſtate in Bernicia, if you had nothing elſe left you, would be enough to ſupport you. I do not adviſe you to neglect ſmall things; but not to be troubled for them, ſince vexation is not good even for great. If when I am dead you want my advice for the education of young Ariſtippus, go to Athens, and above all eſteem Xantippe and Myrto, who have often ſpoken to me to bring you to the Eleuſinian feſtivals. Whilſt you lead this pleaſant life with them, let the Magiſtrates of Cyrene be as unjuſt as they pleaſe; they cannot prejudice you in your natural end* (25). *Endeavour to live with Xantippe and Mynto, as I did formerly with Socrates, compoſing your ſelf to their converſation; for pride is not proper in that place. If Tyrocles* (26), *the ſon of Socrates, who lived with me at Megara, come to Cyrene, it will be very proper to ſupply him with what he wants, and to reſpect him as your own ſon.* " If you will not nurſe a daughter, " becauſe of the great trouble it may give you, ſend " for the daughter of Eubois, to whom you have formerly expreſſed much kindneſs, and named after " my mother; and I alſo have often called her my " friend. Above all take care of little Ariſtippus, that " he may be worthy of us and of Philoſophy; but for " this I leave him as his true inheritance; the reſt " of his eſtate is ſubject to the enmity of the Magiſtrates " of Cyrene. But you did not write me word, that any " perſon offered to take that away from you. Rejoice, " dear daughter, in the poſſeſſion of thoſe riches, which " are in your power, and make your ſon poſſeſs them " likewiſe. I wiſh he were my ſon; but being diſappointed of that hope, I depart with aſſurance, that " you will lead him in the paths trodden by good " men. Farewell, and grieve not for us." T.

(25) Pleaſure.

(26) Leo Allatius, as Mr. Stanley obſerves, reads *Lamprocles*; but this cannot poſſibly be; for Lamprocles was dead long before.

ARISTO, a native of the Iſland of Chios; differed a little from the ſentiments of his maſter Zeno the chief of the Stoicks, as may be ſeen in Moreri's Dictionary, with ſome of his tenets. Not to repeat what is to be found there, I ſhall content my ſelf with obſerving, that the reaſon, why he rejected Logick and Natural Philoſophy, was that he judged that Logick is of no uſe, and that Natural Philoſophy is above the reach of the human mind (a). I add to this, that having at firſt kept to Morality he afterwards retrenched a good deal from it; for he would not have any thing be taught upon the particular duties of the huſband towards his wife, or of the father towards his children, or of the maſter towards his ſervants; and would have reſtrained the maſters to teach only what wiſdom is in general. Seneca juſtly blames him for it [A], and ſhews that particular precepts and ſentences may be of wonderful uſe [B]. Ariſto ſaid that the Nature

(a) Λέγων τοὺ μὴν εἶναι ὑπὲρ ἡμᾶς, τοὺ δ' ἀδὺν πρὸς ἡμᾶς. Diogen. Laert. lib. 7. num. 161.

[A] *He retrenched a good deal from Morality, ... Seneca juſtly blames him for it.*] Read theſe words: *Ariſto Chius non tantum ſupervacuas eſſe dixit naturalem, & rationalem, ſed etiam contrarias: moralem quoque quam ſolam reliquerat, circumcidit. Nam eum locum qui monitiones continet, ſuſtulit, & pædagogi eſſe dixit, non Philoſophi: tanquam quidquam aliud ſit ſapiens quam humani generis pædagogus* (1). i. e. " Ariſto the Chian " ſaid that the diſcourſing of nature and reaſoning " were not only unneceſſary, but abſurd: he retrenched " Morality alſo, which was the only ſcience he was " willing to leave. For he took away that part, " which contains admonitions, and ſaid it belonged " to a Schoolmaſter, and not to a Philoſopher: and " yet what is a Philoſopher, but a Schoolmaſter " of mankind?" He refutes him at large in another place (2).

(1) Seneca, *Ep.* 89. p. 366. *See alſo* Epiſt. 94. *and* Sextus Empiricus, *adverſus Mathematicos*, lib. 7.

(2) Seneca, Epiſt. 94.

[B] *The ſentences according to Seneca, may be of wonderful uſe.*] He ſays, that whether they are delivered in verſe, or in ſententious proſe, they make a lively impreſſion on the mind, and kindle in us the ſparks of virtue, which are natural to the human ſoul. *Ipſa quæ præcipiuntur, per ſe multum habent ponderis; utique ſi aut carmini intexta ſunt, aut proſa oratione in ſententiam coarctata. Sicut illa Catoniana:* Emas, non quod opus eſt, ſed quod neceſſe eſt. Quod non opus eſt aſſe carum eſt. *Qualia ſunt illa, aut reddita oraculo, aut ſimilia.* Tempori parce; Te noſce. *Numquid rationem exiges, cum tibi aliquis hos dixerit verſus?*

Injuriarum remedium eſt oblivio.
Audentes fortuna juvat.
Piger ſibi ipſe obſtat.

Advocatum iſta non quærunt: affectus ipſos tangunt, & natura vim ſuam exercente proficiunt. Omnium honeſtarum rerum ſemina animi gerunt, quæ admonitione excitantur; non aliter quam ſcintilla flatu levi adjuta ignem ſuum explicat (3). i. e. " Precepts have great " weight with them, whether they are woven into " verſe,

(3) Seneca, Ep. 94. pag. 387.

Nature of God was not intelligible; which makes us think that he abſolutely neglected the contemplation of divine things [C]. He was the Antagoniſt of Arceſilaus upon the hypotheſis of Uncertainty; but if we could give credit to Diogenes Laertius, we ſhould believe that Scepticiſm was at that time both ill oppoſed and ill defended [D]. It is ſaid that Ariſto was very bald, which cauſed his death, the Sun having burnt his head (b). He became voluptuous in his old age: Eratoſthenes and Apollophanes his diſciples, tell us

(b) Diogen. Laert. lib. 7. num. 164.

" verſe, or contracted into ſentences in proſe. As " for example, thoſe of Cato. *Buy, not what is need-* " *ful, but what is neceſſary. That which is not need-* " *ful is dear at a penny.* Of which ſort are thoſe " given by the oracle, or ſuch like. *Be ſparing of* " *time: Know thyſelf.* Can one require a reaſon of " any perſon who ſhould quote theſe verſes?

" Forgetfulneſs is the remedy for injuries,
" Fortune favours the bold.
" The ſlothful man is his own hindrance.

" Theſe do not want a voucher; they touch the very " affections, and operate by a natural influence. The " ſeeds of all virtues are implanted in the mind, and " are raiſed by admonition; like as a ſpark gently " blown upon, brightens into a flame." He adds, that ſometimes they work upon the moſt ſtupid minds; and that Agrippa, the favourite of Auguſtus, owned himſelf very much indebted to an apothegm upon concord. *Quis negaverit feriri quibuſdam præceptis efficaciter etiam imperitiſſimos? velut his breviſſimis vocibus, ſed multum habentibus ponderis:*

Nihil nimis.
Avarus animus nullo ſatiatur lucro.
Ab alio expectes alteri quod feceris.

Hæc cum ictu quodam audimus, nec ulli licet dubitare aut interrogare.... M. Agrippa, vir ingentis animi, qui ſolus ex his, quos civilia bella claros potenteſque fecerunt, felix in publicum fuit, dicere ſolebat multum ſe huic debere ſententiæ: Nam concordia parvæ res creſcunt, diſcordia maximæ dilabuntur. Hac ſe aiebat & fratrem & amicum optimum factum (4). i. e. " Who can de- " ny but that the moſt ignorant are powerfully af- " fected by ſome precepts, as for inſtance ſuch as theſe " ſhort, but pithy ſayings.

(4) Idem, ibid. pag. 388.

" Too much of one thing is good for nothing.
" The covetous mind is never ſatisfy'd.
" Expect to be done to, as you do to others.

" Theſe ſentences ſeem to carry conviction with them " at the firſt hearing, and leave us no room to doubt " or queſtion them.... M. Agrippa a man of a great " mind, and the only one of thoſe who ſignalized " and aggrandized themſelves in the civil wars, that " promoted the publick good, uſed to ſay, that he " ſtood much indebted to this ſentence. *For by con-* " *cord little ſtates become powerful, and by diſcord the* " *greateſt come to ruin.* To this maxim, he ſaid it " was owing, that he became a loving brother, and " a faithful friend." This confirms an obſervation I made in the plan of this Dictionary (5). I obſerved that a ſentence taken from Livy, or Tacitus, and urged as having formerly ſerved to determine the Roman Senate to any one particular ſide, is capable of ſaving the State, &c.

(5) See paragraph 9. at the end of vol. 4. of this edition.

[C] *Ariſto ſaid that the nature of God was not intelligible; which makes us think that he abſolutely neglected the contemplation of divine things.*] For as he abandoned the ſtudy of natural Philoſophy, by reaſon he could come to no certainty in it, ſo for the ſame reaſon it is probable he abandoned that of Theology. *Divinarum rerum parum ſtudioſus videtur fuiſſe, cum iſtud ſæpe jactaret*, Quæ ſupra nos, nihil ad nos, *ut mirum ſit Ariſtonem Theologos inter hic a Velleio aſcribi.* i. e. " He ſeems to have been little diſpoſed to the " ſtudy of Divinity, ſeeing this was his favourite " proverb, *Thoſe things which are above us, do not* " *concern us*, for which reaſon I wonder that Velleius " ſhould here place Ariſto among the Theologiſts." Theſe are the words of a Jeſuit who commented on Cicero's work *de Natura Deorum* (6). He very unjuſtly makes it a matter of wonder that Velleius, one of the Interlocutors, has placed Ariſto amongſt the Theologiſts; ſeeing this Philoſopher was no leſs worthy of that place, than the reſt whoſe ſentiments Velleius has given us. See here a ſpecimen of his doctrine. *Cujus* (Zenonis) *diſcipuli Ariſtonis non minus magno in errore ſententia eſt; qui neque formam Dei intelligi poſſe cenſeat, neque in Diis ſenſum eſſe dicat, dubitetque omnino Deus animans necne ſit* (7). i. e. " The opinion " of whoſe (Zeno's) ſcholar Ariſto is no leſs erro- " neous; who imagines that neither the form of God " can be known, nor that the Gods have any ſenſe, " nay, even doubts whether God is an animated be- " ing or not." Minucius Felix, ſpeaking of the ſame opinion, has theſe words. *Socraticus Xenophon formam Dei veri negat videri poſſe, & ideo quæri non oportere; Ariſto Chius comprehendi omnino non poſſe: uterque majeſtatem Dei intelligendi deſperatione ſenſerunt* (8). i. e. " Xenophon the diſciple of Socrates, denies that the " form of the true God can be ſeen, and therefore " that it ought not to be inquired into; Ariſto of " Chios affirms, that it can in no wiſe be com- " prehended: both of them ſhewed a ſenſe of the " majeſty of God, by deſpairing to underſtand it." A certain Commentator has committed here a childiſh miſtake; he is of opinion that the perſon mentioned in Cicero is not the ſame with that ſpoken of in this paſſage of Minucius, ſuppoſing that Minucius ſpeaks of one Ariſtus. *Quod Minucius Ariſto Chio, id Cicero de Natura Deorum lib.* 1. *tribuit Ariſtoni* (9). i. e. " That which Minucius fathers upon Ariſtus of Chios, " Cicero in his Book *de Natura Deorum lib.* 1. fathers " upon Ariſto." Elmenhorſt thro' want of attention, thought that the *Ariſto* of Minucius was the dative or ablative caſe, whereas it is the nominative: beſides, it is not impoſſible but Father Leſcalopier might aſcribe to Ariſto what is due to Socrates. *Celebre hoc proverbium Socrates habuit:* " *Quod ſupra nos, nihil ad* " *nos* (10)." i. e. " Socrates uſed to urge this fa- " mous proverb, *What is above us does not concern us.*" Thence Lactantius infers that he deſpiſed religion. *Ejus viri (Socratis) quoties de cæleſtibus rogabatur nota reſponſio eſt,* " *Quod ſupra nos, nihil ad nos* (11)." i. e. " Every body knows the anſwer that man (*Socrates*) " uſed to make, when he was aſked any queſtions " concerning heavenly ſubjects, *What is above us, does* " *not concern us.*" Let it be obſerved, that generally ſpeaking we ought not to ſuſpect thoſe of a neglect of divine ſervice, who look upon the nature of God as inexplicable, ſeeing there are a great many people who make this a reaſon for worſhipping God with more humility and reverence; ſo that this remark upon Ariſto is a perſonal thing, and founded upon its being known beſides, that incomprehenſibility was in him a motive to neglect. I will not take upon me to affirm that he was no obſerver of religion, but only confine my ſelf to the probability of the conjecture; for, with ſubmiſſion to Lactantius, the maxim of Socrates, which I have been ſpeaking of (12), was no inducement to that Philoſopher to neglect the ſtudy of Divinity; his doctrine upon that ſubject was as noble as could be expected from a Heathen (13), and he ſeems to have had no other deſign than that of ſetting bounds to the curioſity of mankind, for reaſons which our moſt pious Doctors have thought fit to make uſe of, as that we ought to reſt ſatisfied with being ignorant of thoſe things which God has thought proper to conceal from us, and that there is danger in deep reſearches. " In a word, he diſapproved of mak- " ing too curious an enquiry into the wonderful art " and contrivance which the Gods had diſplayed " in the ordering of the univerſe &c. (14)." You will find the ſequel of this paſſage in the remark [S], on the article ANAXAGORAS (15), and there you will eaſily ſee, that by the heavenly things which Socrates did not approve the ſtudy of, we are not to underſtand matters of religion but Aſtronomy.

(6) Leſcalopier *in Ciceron. de Nat. Deor.* lib. 1. pag. 60.

(7) Cicero, ibid. cap. 14.

(8) Minucius Felix, pag. 154.

(9) Elmenhorſt *in Minucium Felicem*, pag. 154.

(10) Lactant. *Divin. Inſtit.* lib. 3. cap. 19.

(11) Minucius Felix, pag. 112.

(12) Above, citation (10).

(13) *See* Xenophon, book 1 of the memorable things of Socrates.

(14) Idem, book 4. p. 386.

(15) Quotation (22).

[D] *According to Diogenes Laertius, ſcepticiſm was at that time both ill oppoſed and ill defended.*] Ariſto maintained

us this particular in Athenæus (*c*). I do not know whether it was in that time that he flattered a Philoſopher (*d*), who was in great favour at the court of Antigonus (*e*). His Sect remained but a little time [*E*]. He ſaid one thing, which might render the doctrine of Ariſtippus leſs odious than it ordinarily is [*F*]. They aſcribe to him ſome works, which belong to ARISTO of Cea a Peripatetick Philoſopher [*G*]. We

(*c*) Athen. lib. 7. cap. 6. pag. 281.

(*d*) His name was Perſeus.

(*e*) Athen. lib. 6. pag. 251.

tained againſt Arceſilaus the doctrine of certainty; and one day ſeeing a monſter, which was a bull that had a matrix, he thought his adverſary would draw a good argument from thence in favour of incomprehenſibility. *Wretch that I am*, cries he, *what a ſtrong proof is there in behalf of Arceſilaus* (16). From this we may learn that the Dogmatiſts, in order to prove that the nature of animals was clearly known, affirmed, that we may diſtinguiſh with certainty betwixt the male and female of every ſpecies, there being certain diſtinct parts peculiarly adapted to either ſex. If they reaſoned after this manner, it is certain that the bull I have been ſpeaking of, ſerved to refute them, but then we muſt agree that they went upon a very weak argument; for the Scepticks did not deny but that according to appearance there was a diſtinction betwixt the males and females, they only argued that we could not know for certain, whether or no their nature was really ſuch as it appeared to be. Now it is of no weight to urge, in anſwer to this, the exiſtence of this bull. Might not they have replied, *We know not whether it has in reality a matrix or not; it may be only an appearance*. Ariſto one day ſaid to an Acataleptick, *You don't then ſee that rich man who ſits next to you?* The other made anſwer, *No. Who has put out your eyes then*, reply'd Ariſto (17)? This was but a childiſh argument, ſeeing that the dogma of incomprehenſibility does not ſuppoſe that we are deprived of the uſe of ſight; he ſhould have made anſwer to Arceſilaus, *The appearance of a rich man ſitting next to me ſtrikes my eye, but yet I am not certain whether this man exiſts or not, or what is his nature*. It has been obſerved, that of all the dogma's of the Stoicks, Ariſto chiefly eſpouſed this, *The wiſe man is never doubtful*. There was a Philoſopher named Perſeus, who in order to confute him on this head, brought him twins, one of whom depoſited ſomething in the hands of Ariſto, and the other demanded it again, and becauſe Ariſto was put to a non-plus, he was ſaid to have been confuted by Perſeus (18). For my part I can't comprehend the meaning of this: were theſe twins ſo extremely alike, that it was impoſſible to diſtinguiſh them, or were they in ſome things unlike as twins generally are? This is what Diogenes Laertius does not obſerve, who is ſometimes ſo inſufferably ſhort, that one might ſay that we have only ſome ill-digeſted extracts of his hiſtory of the Philoſophers. If theſe twins were eaſy to be diſtinguiſhed, whence could ariſe the uncertainty of Ariſto? If it were ſcarce poſſible to diſtinguiſh them, the ſuſpence he was in could not be cenſured or be made uſe of to confute him, for the very act of ſuſpending his judgment was a proof of his regard to that maxim, *The wiſe man is never in ſuſpence*.

(16) Diog. Laert. lib. 7. num. 162.

(17) Idem, ibid. num. 163.

(18) Idem, ibid. num. 162.

[*E*] *His Sect exiſted but a little time.*] Cicero ſpeaks of it as of a Sect whoſe doctrines had diſappeared: *Sententiæ.... Ariſtonis, Pyrrhonis, Herilli nonnullorumque aliorum evanuerunt* (19). *Sive Ariſtotelem & Theophraſtum ... ſequuti ſunt, ſive .... etiam Ariſtonis difficilem atque arduam, ſed jam tamen fractam & convictam Sectam ſequuti ſunt* (20). i. e. "The opinions "of Ariſto, Pyrrho, Herillus and ſome others are va"niſhed. Whether, *ſays he in another place*, they fol"lowed Ariſtotle and Theophraſtus, or the hard and "crabbed, tho' now exploded and confuted Sect of A"riſto." Indeed it was a difficult matter for ſentiments ſo extravagant as his were to gain credit; for he allowed no difference in things excepting in vice and virtue: "other things, ſays he, are neither bet"ter or more deſireable the one than the other." *His contrarius Ariſto Chius præfractus, ferreus, nihil bonum niſi quod rectum & honeſtum eſt* (21). i. e. "Ariſto "of Chios, that crabbed, hard Philoſopher, was of a "different opinion, alledging that nothing was good "but what was right and honeſt." He went farther than his maſter Zeno; who did not deny but that there were ſome things diſtinct from virtue which were deſireable, altho' they did not contribute to the acquiſition of the ſovereign good. This poſition is ſcarce reconcileable to truth, however, it is leſs ſhocking than that of Ariſto; for who can conceive that health ſhould not be more eligible than ſickneſs? *Ut Ariſtonis eſſet explosa ſententia dicentis, nihil differre aliud ab alio, nec eſſe res ullas præter virtutes & vitia, inter quas quicquam omnino intereſſet, ſic errare Zenonem, qui nulla in re niſi in virtute aut vitio propenſionem, ne minimi quidem momenti ad ſummum bonum adipiſcendum eſſe diceret. Et quum ad beatam vitam nullum momentum ea res haberet, ad appetitionem autem rerum, eſſe in his momenta diceret: quaſi verò hæc appetitio non ad ſummi boni adeptionem pertineret* (22). i. e. "As the opinion "of Ariſto was exploded, who affirmed that there was "no difference betwixt any thing except virtue and "vice; ſo Zeno was alſo in an error, who held that "nothing but virtue and vice had the leaſt relation "towards the attaining the chiefeſt good; and that "altho' other things were not conducive to the happineſs of life, yet theſe were deſireable: as if a "thing's being deſireable did not make it a part of "the chief good." Where is the wonder that this Sect was ſo ſhort liv'd, when Ariſto himſelf fell off from his principles at an age that moſt favoured his maxims, and became a lover of pleaſures in his old age (23), when it moſt ſuited him to be rigid and ſevere, *præfractus & ferreus?*

(19) Cicero, *Tuſcul.* lib. 5. cap. 30.

(20) Lib. *de Legibus*, cap. 13.

(21) Idem *in Hortenſio, apud* Nonnium, *voce* præfractum.

(22) Cicero, lib. 4. *de Finib.* cap. 17.

(23) Athen. lib. 7. pag. 281.

[*F*] *He ſaid one thing which might render the doctrine of Ariſtippus leſs odious than it ordinarily is.*] "He uſed to ſay that a Philoſopher might do thoſe "of his hearers a prejudice, who put a wrong inter"pretation upon good meanings; as for example, "that the ſchool of Ariſtippus might ſend out de"bauchees, and that of Zeno Cynicks." *Ariſto Chius dicere ſolebat, nocere audientibus philoſophos iis, qui benè dicta malè interpretarentur; poſſe enim aſotos ex Ariſtippi, acerbos è Zenonis ſchola exire* (24). Is not this declaring that the doctrine of this Philoſopher never produced this effect but when it was miſunderſtood? He ſhould alſo have added, that every Teacher is therefore obliged to forbear laying down ambiguous maxims, or to prevent falſe gloſſes being put upon them.

(24) Cicero *de Naturâ Deorum*, lib. 3. cap. 31.

[*G*] *They aſcribed to him ſome works which belonged to ARISTO of Cea a Peripatetick Philoſopher.*] Diogenes Laertius after having mentioned the titles of ſeveral works of our Ariſto, adds that Panætius and Soſicrates aſcribed them all, except one, to Ariſto the Peripatetick (25). He does not ſay, that this Peripatetick was a native of the Iſland Cea; but I conjecture, that this muſt have been his country, ſince we cannot underſtand this as meant of ARISTO the Alexandrian, another Philoſopher of the Peripatetick Sect, who lived under the reign of Auguſtus, and of whom conſequently Panætius could make no mention; for it may be proved that in the year of Rome 650 he was not living (26). Moreri therefore was miſtaken, when he ſaid that Ariſto of Alexandria is the Author to whom ſeveral Writers aſcribe ſome treatiſes of Ariſto the Chian. This laſt wrote a diſcourſe *de Senectute* (on old Age), which is not taken notice of by Diogenes Laertius, probably becauſe it made only part of ſome other book. *Hunc librum de Senectute ad te miſimus: omnem autem ſermonem tribuimus non Tithono, ut Ariſto Chius, parum enim eſſet auctoritatis in fabula, ſed M. Catoni ſeni, quo majorem auctoritatem haberet ratio* (27). i. e. "I have ſent "you my Diſcourſe of old Age, in which I have "not, as Ariſto the Chian did, made Tithonus the "Speaker, for then there would have been but little "authority in ſuch a fiction; but Cato the elder, that "it might carry with it more authority." Aldobrandinus quotes this paſſage of Cicero, as if it ought to be read *Ariſto Ceus* (28), but the beſt editions have it *Ariſto Chius*. He is therefore in the wrong, to pretend that Ariſto of Cea, the Peripatetick Philoſopher, is the Author of the treatiſe *de Senectute:* he might with more reaſon have applied to him this other paſſage

(25) Diogen. Laert. lib. 7. num. 163.

(26) *See* Jonſius *de Scriptor. Hiſt. Philoſ.* pag. 179, 180.

(27) Cicero *de Senect.* cap. 1.

(28) Aldobrand. *in Diogen. Laert.* lib. 7. num. 163.

We have ſome miſtakes of Voſſius to take notice of [*H*].

ſage of Cicero: *Hujus* (Stratonis) *Lyſias & oratione locuples, rebus ipſis jejunior. Concinnus deinde & elegans hujus Ariſto; ſed ea, quæ deſideratur à magno Philoſopho, gravitas in eo non fuit. Scripta ſanè & multa & polita, ſed neſcio quo pacto autoritatem oratio non habet* (29). i. e. "His ſcholar (*Strato's*) Lyſias "was copious in his ſtyle, but ſomewhat jejune in "his matter: and as for his ſcholar Ariſto, he was "both neat and elegant, but had not that gravity "which is expected from a great Philoſopher; he "wrote indeed ſeveral things, and thoſe polite enough, "but thro' ſome defect or other his writings do not "carry authority with them." This can only be meant of one Ariſto a Peripatetick, and therefore Mr. Menage deſerves cenſure for giving it as his opinion, that it was ſpoken of our Ariſto (30).

(29) Cicero, *de Fin.* lib. 5. c. 5.

(30) Menag. *in Diogen. Laert.* lib. 7. num. 163. This Note of Mr. Menage is approved of in the Commentary on Cicero *de Senectute*, of Grævius's edition.

[*H*] *See ſome miſtakes of Voſſius.*] He ſays, that Ariſto of Alexandria, a Peripatetick, in the time of Auguſtus, is Author of a treatiſe on the Nile (31). His reaſon is, becauſe Strabo obſerves, that he had ſeen in his time two Books upon this River, the one compoſed by Eudorus, and the other by Ariſto the the Peripatetick (32). *But*, Voſſius goes on, *there having been two Ariſto's of the Peripatetick Sect, the one of Alexandria, the other of the Iſland Cea; wherefore do I inſiſt upon its having been that of Alexandria, who compoſed the treatiſe on the Nile? Why, becauſe it is more likely that an Egyptian ſhould write of this River, than an Iſlander of the Ægean Sea.* He preſently after confutes this reaſon, for he confeſſes it is probable that either Ariſto of Chios, or that Ariſto of Cea wrote a Book upon the Nile, ſeeing that the Scholiaſt of Apollonius relates the opinion of Ariſto of Chios upon the riſe of this river (33). But he has confounded *Chius* and *Ceus*, adds Voſſius. We perceive therefore a manifeſt defect of exactneſs in the argument. But further, this learned man juſtly incurrs cenſure for not having known the true reaſon why the treatiſe of the Nile, referred to by Strabo, ought rather to be aſcribed to Ariſto the Alexandrian, than to Ariſto of the Iſland of Cea. Now the reaſon is this; becauſe Strabo ſpeaks of a book that was publiſhed in his own time: but Ariſto of Cea flouriſhed a long time before Strabo, as Voſſius himſelf allows; for he tells us, as Diogenes Laertius had done before him, that Panætius and Socrates (34) have aſcribed to this Ariſto almoſt all the books which were aſcribed to Ariſto the Stoick. Lloyd and Hoffman have copied this long paſſage of Voſſius word for word, and have not forgot to put *Socrates* inſtead of *Soſicrates*.

(31) Voſſius, *de Hiſtoric. Græc.* lib. 2. cap. 4. pag. 179.

(32) Strabo, lib. 17. pag. 544.

(33) Schol. Apollonii *in* 4. *Argonaut.*

(34) Voſſius has it *Socrates*.

ARISTO (TITUS) a Roman Lawyer, under the Empire of Trajan, was ſo worthy and ſo learned a man, that he deſerved not to have been forgotten in Moreri. He was a perfect maſter of the Public and Civil Law; of Hiſtory, and Antiquity [*A*]. If he did not readily anſwer the queſtions that were aſked him, it was becauſe by the ſtrength of his judgment he went to the very ſprings of the reaſons for and againſt, that he might compare them together. He was a man otherwiſe an enemy to luxury, and without any pride, and looked for the recompence of a good action only, in the action it ſelf, and not in the applauſes of the multitude (*a*). He did not profeſs being a Philoſopher [*B*], but not any of them, who did profeſs it, ſurpaſſed him in the practice of virtue. He ſhewed an incomparable ſteadineſs of mind during a long illneſs [*C*], and at laſt he deſired his friends to aſk the Phyſicians if he could recover, and declared to them, that in caſe he was judged incurable, he would kill himſelf; but if he could be well again,

(*a*) See the proof of all this in the note [*A*].

[*A*] *He was a perfect Maſter of the Law, . . . of Hiſtory, and Antiquity.*] What Pliny ſays upon this head, and upon the virtue of Ariſto, is ſo noble, that I cannot forbear giving his words at full length. *Nihil eſt illo* (Tito Ariſtone) ſays he (1), *gravius, ſanctius, doctius: ut mihi non unus homo, ſed literæ ipſæ omneſque bonæ artes in uno homine ſummum periculum adire videantur, Quam peritus ille & privati juris & publici* (2)*! quantum rerum! quantum exemplorum! quantum antiquitatis tenet! nihil eſt quod dicere velis, quod ille docere non poſſit. Mihi certè, quoties aliquid abditum quæro, ille theſaurus eſt. Jam quanta ſermonibus ejus fides: quanta authoritas: quam preſſa & decora cunctatio? quid eſt quod non ſtatim ſciat? & tamen plerumque hæſitat. Dubitat diverſitate rationum, quas acri magnoque judicio ab origine cauſiſque primis repetit, diſcernit, expendit. Ad hoc quam parcus in victu! quam modicus in cultu! Soleo ipſum cubiculum ejus ipſumque lectum, ut imaginem quamquam priſcæ frugalitatis, aſpicere. Ornat hæ magnitudo animi, quæ nihil ad oſtentationem, omnia ad conſcientiam refert; rectèque facti, non ex populi ſermone mercedem, ſed ex facto petit.* i. e. "Nothing is more grave, nothing more venerable, nothing more learned than him (Titus Ariſto): "ſo that in my opinion we are not only in danger "of loſing a ſingle man in him, but even all learning and all the liberal arts. How well ſkilled is "he both in the public and civil Law! what a "fund of things, of examples, of antiquity is he poſſeſſed of! There is nothing that you want to know "which he can't inſtruct you in. As for my part, "whenever I am at a loſs for any thing, he is to "me a treaſure of intelligence. Then what perſuaſion, what authority is there in his words; how "weighty and graceful are his deliberations? What "thing is there that he does not immediately apprehend? and yet he commonly heſitates. He is in doubt, "thro' multiplicity of reaſons, which he ſhould give "firſt, which reaſons he traces from the fountain "and firſt cauſes of things with great accuracy "and judgment, and diſtinguiſhes, and conſiders "them. And then again, how ſparing in his diet! "how plain his dreſs! Whenever I go into his bed-chamber, or look at his bed, methinks I ſee a picture of the ancient frugality. Theſe qualifications "are adorned with a greatneſs of mind, that whatever "he does proceeds, not from oſtentation, but from a "principle of goodneſs, while he ſeeks for the reward of his good deeds, not in the breath of the "people, but in the merit of the action."

(1) Plin. Epiſt. 22. lib. 1. p. 65, 66.

(2) Add to this thoſe words of Epiſt. 14. book 8. which Pliny wrote to Ariſto. *Cum ſis peritiſſimus & privati juris & publici peto ut medearis ſcientiâ tuâ, cui ſuperfuit curæ ſic jura publica ut privata, ſic antiqua ut recentia, ſic rara ut aſſidua tractare.*

[*B*] *He did not profeſs being a Philoſopher.*] His Philoſophy was practical in two reſpects; for his morals were the ſame with thoſe of a true Philoſopher, and he did not paſs his life in the retirement of a cloſet or the walls of a College, but in the buſineſs of the Bar. Let us hear what Pliny ſays of him. *In ſumma, non facile quis quenquam ex iſtis qui ſapientiæ ſtudium habitu corporis præferunt, huic viro comparârit. Non quidem gymnaſia ſectatur, aut porticus, nec diſputationibus longis aliorum ocium ſuumque delectat, ſed in togâ negociiſque verſatur: multos advocatione, plures conſilio juvat. Nemini tamen iſtorum caſtitate, pietate, juſtitia, fortitudine, etiam primo loco ceſſerit* (3). i. e. "In ſhort, none of thoſe pretenders, who take upon "them the air and garb of Philoſophy, are to be "compared to this man. It is true he does not frequent the ſchools, or portico's, nor entertain his "own and other peoples leiſure-hours with tedious "diſputations; but then he is converſant at the Bar "and in the buſineſs of the Forum; he befriends "many in the capacity of an Advocate, and more "in that of a Counſellor; and is not the leaſt inferior to any of thoſe pretenders to wiſdom in conti-"nence, piety, juſtice, or fortitude."

(3) Plin. Epiſt. 20. lib. 1. pag. 66, 67.

[*C*] *He ſhewed an incomparable ſteadineſs of mind during the time of a long illneſs* (4).] *Mirares, ſi interceſſes; quâ patientiâ hanc ipſam valetudinem toleret, ut dolori reſiſtat, ut incredibilem febrilem ardorem immotus opertuſque tranſmittat* (5). i. e. "You would have "been ſurprized, had you been preſent, to have "ſeen with what patience he bore his ſickneſs, how "manfully he ſtood the ſhock of pain, and with what "unſhaken reſolution he bore the raging heat of a "fever."

(4) See the remark [*E*].

(5) Plin. Epiſt. 22. lib. 1. pag. 67.

again, tho' he ſuffered a long time, yet he would live, in compliance with the entreaties of his wife, and the tears of his daughter, and the deſire of thoſe to whom he ſpoke (*b*). Pliny the younger, one of them, makes a fine reflection upon it [*D*], and admirably expreſſes the tenderneſs of his friendſhip [*E*]. The Phyſicians gave pretty good hopes (*c*). Some aſſure us, that Ariſto lived to an extream old age [*F*]; but the proof they have of it is very weak. He was the Author of ſome Books [*G*].

(*b*) Plinius, *Ep.* 22. lib. 1. p. 67.

(*c*) Plinius, *Ep.* 22. lib. 1. p. 67.

[*D*] *Pliny . . . . has a fine reflection upon his greatneſs of ſoul.*] "It is a common thing, ſays he, to "be hurried into the arms of death by an impetuoſity of ſpirit; but nothing leſs than a great ſoul, "after having deliberated upon the expediency of "living or dying, weighs exactly the motives on "either ſide, and determines itſelf by the ſtrength "of reaſon, either to keep life or to lay it down." *Id ego arduum in primis, & præcipuâ laude dignum puto. Nam impetu quodam & inſtinctu procurrere ad mortem, commune cum multis; deliberare vero, & cauſas ejus expendere, utque ſuaſerit ratio, vitæ mortiſque conſilium ſuſcipere vel ponere, ingentis eſt animi* (6).

(6) Idem, ibid.

[*E*] *Pliny expreſſes his friendſhip for Ariſto in terms of the greateſt tenderneſs.*] He had a very great deſire of retiring to his country ſeat, and of ſpending his leiſure time there in his ſtudies; but he denied himſelf this pleaſure, becauſe he would not leave Ariſto who had laboured under a tedious indiſpoſition; this melancholy object gave him a thouſand inquietudes, and not only robb'd him of his time, but even of the leaſt inclination of beſtowing any part of it upon his ſtudies. Let us hear him ſpeak himſelf: *Diu jam in urbe hæreo, & quidem attonitus. Perturbat me longa & pertinax fortitudo Titi Ariſtonis, quem ſingulariter & miror & diligo* (7). i. e. "I have now "lingered a long time in the city, and indeed with "great uneaſineſs of mind; for I am very much af"flicted at the long malignant diſtemper of Titus "Ariſto, for whom I bear a ſingular veneration and "love." Thus he begins his Letter: "The Phyſi"cians, ſays he in the ſequel of it, give us hopes of "his recovery. May God verify their promiſes, and "once deliver me from this uneaſineſs, after which "I will go to my country-ſeat at Laurentum, that is "to my books, my papers, and philoſophical retire"ment; for at preſent I cannot find time to ſit down to "write or read, nor indeed will the anxiety of my mind "permit me. I have given you here my fears, my "wiſhes, and what I deſign hereafter." *Et medici quidem ſecunda nobis pollicentur: Supereſt, ut promiſſis Deus adnuat, tandemque me hac ſolicitudine exolvat; qua liberatus Laurentinum meum, hoc eſt libellos & pugillares, ſtudioſumque otium repetam. Nunc enim nihil legere, nihil ſcribere aut aſſidenti vacat, aut anxio libet. Habes quid timeam, quid optem, quid etiam in poſterum deſtinem* (8). I have ſet down this paſſage at full length, as well to do honour to Ariſto, as to Pliny the younger; for it gives us the picture of a noble ſoul, and is a proof that virtue has always found a ſanctuary in ſome generous breaſt even in cities that have been moſt corrupted by a long ſeries of proſperity, and that ſucceeded by the continued rage and fury of civil wars, and the government of Tyrants, which may very well be ſaid of Rome at that time.

(7) Idem, ibid.

(8) Plin. *Epiſt.* 22. lib. 1. p. 67.

[*F*] *Some aſſure us that Ariſto lived to an extream old age; but the proof they have of it is very weak.*] The proof made uſe of for this purpoſe is, that Ariſto was one of the Council for Caſſius, that is to ſay, Caius Caſſius Longinus, who was Conſul in the reign of Tiberius. Now betwixt Tiberius and Trajan they reckon ſixty years, and it is well known that Ariſto was conſulted by Trajan upon a point of Law. Thus Bertrand (9). But this argument vaniſhes by conſidering that Caſſius lived till the reign of Veſpaſian (10), and that betwixt the beginning of his reign and that of Trajan there intervened but about twenty eight years (11).

(9) *Vide* Bertrand, *in vitis Juriſperitor.* lib. 2. p. 295, 297.

(10) Pomponius aſſerts this. *Vide* Guillielm. Grotium *in vitis Juriſconſultor.* lib. 2. cap. 3. p. 123.

(11) Guillielmi Grotii *vitæ Juriſconſultorum*, pag. 123.

[*G*] *He was Author of ſome Books.*] The Pandects make mention of them, and the two Authors whom I have referred to (12), give us the titles of them. See alſo Aulus Gellius, who tells us, that he had read in one of Ariſto's pieces, that all ſorts of theft were allowed of among the ancient Egyptians. *Id etiam memini legere me in libro Ariſtonis Juriſconſulti haudquaquam indocti viri, apud veteres Ægyptios, quod genus hominum conſtat & in artibus reperiendis ſolertes extitiſſe, & in cognitione rerum indaganda ſagaces, furta omnia fuiſſe licita & impunita* (13). i. e. "I remem"ber alſo myſelf to have read in a book of Ariſto "the Lawyer, a man of no mean learning, that a"mong the ancient Egyptians, (who by all accounts "were a people very ingenious in the invention of "arts, and ſagacious in their ſearches after the nature "of things) all kinds of theft were tolerated with "licence and impunity." Bertrand conjectures, that this was a treatiſe on Theft, becauſe Aulus Gellius quotes it by itſelf, and ſince he was a perſon that knew that Ariſto was Author of ſeveral Books (14).

(12) Bertrand and Will. Grotius.

(13) Aulus Gellius, lib. 11. cap. 18. pag. 302.

(14) Bertrand *de Vitis Juriſconſultor.* p. 299.

☞ARISTOMENES, a General of the Meſſenians, eminent for his incomparable valour, conduct and virtue, as well as for the various and aſtoniſhing events of his fortune, was the ſon of Nicomedes and Nicotelea, private perſons of Meſſenia in Peloponneſus [*A*], but of a family which was royal before the ruin of their country, and the undoubted deſcendents of Hercules (*a*). Meſſenia had been conquered by the Spartans, and reduced to the loweſt terms of ſlavery under them, when Ariſtomenes reſolved in conjunction with others, who preferred the liberty of their country to all the conſiderations of their own intereſt and ſafety, to reſcue it from this diſtreſs. He procured the aſſiſtance of the Argives and Arcadians (*b*), and immediately broke out into open hoſtilities againſt the Spartans. He came to an action the firſt year of the war at Deræ, a ſmall Meſſenian village, where he diſtinguiſhed himſelf to ſuch advantage in the battle, that he was ſaluted King by his little army. But in order to impreſs a ſtronger apprehenſion of his courage upon the enemy, he went himſelf by night to Sparta, and fixed with his own hand a ſhield in the temple of *Minerva Chalciæcus*, with an inſcription, that Ariſtomenes gave it to the Goddeſs out of the Spartan ſpoils (*c*). It is uncertain, whether he had any ſhare in another action, which though

(*a*) Pauſan. *Meſſen.* ch. 14, 15. *See Mr.* Tho. Rowe's *Lives of ſeveral antient and illuſtrious Men omitted by Plutarch*, printed at London in 1728, pag. 72.

(*b*) Pauſan. *Meſſen.* ch. 15.

(*c*) Idem, ibid. and Rowe, pag. 74.

[*A*] *Was the ſon of Nicomedes and Nicotolea private perſons of Meſſenia in Peloponneſus.*] Mr. Thomas Rowe, the author of *The Lives of ſeveral ancient and illuſtrious men omitted by Plutarch*, obſerves (1), that tho' the age, in which Ariſtomenes lived, was not much removed from that, which was juſtly called fabulous, and tho' the account which we have of his life, is almoſt entirely owing to his countrymen, yet they have in general paid a ſtrict regard to truth; and in one reſpect particularly their conduct is very extraordinary. They were not at all pleaſed to have it thought, according to the uſual cuſtom, that their deliverer was the ſon of ſome God or Dæmon (2). They diſcouraged a fable of his mother's being honoured with the embraces of a God under the ſhape of a Dragon; and in thoſe religious reſpects, which they paid to his memory, they conſidered him only as the ſon of private Meſſenians. Mr. Rowe remarks very juſtly, that *there is a great deal of good ſenſe in this pretended humility. The compliment is ſtronger to their country, nor can it be reaſonably reckoned a reflection on their Hero, that being all mortal, he performed ſuch actions, for which others were generally believed the offspring of Deities.*

(1) Pag. 71, 72.

(2) Pauſan. *Meſſen.* c. 14.

though admired for the reſolution ſhewn in it, was cenſured as impious [B]. Soon after this, the Lacedæmonians had Tyrtæus a ſchoolmaſter ſent them for their General by the Athenians, who inſpired them by his verſes with an uncommon ardour and courage (d); ſo that the war was now carried on with vigour. The Meſſenians received troops from Argos, Sicyon, Elis and Arcadia, together with ſome of their countrymen, whoſe anceſtors had fled upon the ill ſucceſs of the former war (e). Ariſtomenes engaged the Spartans under Alexander, one of their Kings, at a village called the Monument of the Goat, and defeated them. This victory raiſed his reputation very high [C], and poſſeſſed him with new reſolution, ſo that he attacked Pheræ a town in Laconia, which he plundered. He ſeized likewiſe upon ſome of the nobleſt virgins at Caryæ [D], who were afterwards ranſomed for conſiderable ſums of money. But he met with ill ſucceſs in his attempt upon the Matrons of Sparta, who were ſacrificing to Ceres at Ægila in Laconia [E]. However the Spartans found means to corrupt Ariſtocrates, who was King and General of the Arcadians, and commanded a large body of troops ſent by them to the aid of the Meſſenians. When the two armies were ready to engage, Ariſtocrates took his officers aſide, and with a pretended concern aſſured them, that upon conſulting the entrails, he found the battle would inevitably prove unſucceſsful, and therefore adviſed them to retire without engaging. The Meſſenians adjur'd them by every thing dear and ſacred not to abandon them in ſuch an exigence, but all in vain. Ariſtomenes with his little guard made a noble ſtand, but at laſt the ſuperior force of the enemy obliged him to retreat. This defeat obliged the Meſſenians to abandon Andania and all the inland country, and to retire to Ira,

(d) Pauſan. *Meſſen.* Juſtin. lib. 3. cap. 5. Strabo, lib. 8. Heſych. Illuſt. *de vit. Pbiloſ.* and Rowe, pag. 76, 77.

(e) Pauſan. *Meſſen.*

[B] *An action, which, tho' admired for the reſolution ſhewn in it, was cenſured as impious.*] Panormus and Gonippus, two young Meſſenians of Andania, the town where the revolt from the Spartans began, and where Ariſtomenes himſelf was born and educated, Men of a vigorous conſtitution, and yet of a beauty uncommon in their ſex, uſed to make excurſions into the Spartan territories. Upon a day ſacred to Caſtor and Pollux, all the Spartan army having performed their ſacrifices to the Gods, were engaged in feaſts and ſports proper to the ſolemnity. The young Meſſenians putting on white coats and purple upper garments, and holding ſpears in their hands, rid on two very fine horſes into the midſt of Sparta. The people of the city received them with adoration as the Deities themſelves, who condeſcended to be preſent at the rites, which they were paying to them. But the young men immediately ſtriking thoſe who ſtood near them, with their lances, ſlew and wounded ſeveral; and having violated the ſacred ſolemnities, before the Spartans were recovered from their ſurprize, broke out from among them, and returned ſafe to Andania (3). Polyænus relates this ſtory in a different manner, and tells us (4), that Ariſtomenes and a friend of his were the perſons, who performed this action; and that having both mounted white horſes, and fixed golden ſtars upon their heads, in the evening they approached the Lacedæmonians and their wives and children, who were engaged in the ſolemnity, in honour of the *Dioſcuri*, at a little diſtance from the city. They imagining that Caſtor and Pollux had honoured them with their preſence, gave themſelves up with the more freedom to drinking and joy. But Ariſtomenes and his companion diſmounted, and killed ſeveral of them, and immediately made their eſcape on horſeback. But Polyænus is ſuppoſed to be miſtaken in this point, tho' it is not improbable, that Ariſtomenes might have encouraged this deſign. *The boldneſs of it*, ſays Mr. Rowe, *muſt be agreeable to his genius; and the want of reſpect to the Spartan Deities ſhewn in it, perhaps would hardly have been a ſufficient reaſon for his diſapproving it.*

(3) Pauſan. *Meſſen.* and Rowe, p. 75.
(4) *Stratagem.* lib. 2. cap. 31. pag. 205, 206. edit. Lugdun. Batav. 1690.

[C] *This victory raiſed his reputation very high.*] It is ſaid, that he purſued the enemy to a wild pear-tree, which grew in the middle of the plain; and that Theoclus, a ſoothſayer, whom he kept always with him, charged him not to proceed any further, becauſe Caſtor and Pollux, guardians of Sparta, their native city, were ſitting on the tree. After this victory, he entered into Andania in a kind of triumph. He was met by the matrons and virgins, who ſtrew'd flowers where he was to paſs, and ſung to his glory the following verſes:

O'er Stonyclerus' glorious plain,
Strew'd over with the mighty ſlain,
To the tall hill, that crown'd with wood,
High to the ſkies erects its head,
Great Ariſtomenes purſu'd;
The trembling Spartans round him fled (5).

(5) Pauſan. cap. 16. and Rowe, pag. 78, 79.

Tyrtæus, the General of the Spartans, on the other hand had occaſion for all his Poetry to keep them from deſpairing. He was obliged to make new elogies, which at laſt had their uſual ſucceſs. And to ſhew that he could do other things beſides making verſes, he ſupplied the loſs of his troops by liſting ſome of the Helotæ, making them citizens of Sparta, and promiſing them that they ſhould marry the widows of thoſe, who periſhed in the battle. *Qui tribus præliis fuſos eo uſque deſperationis Spartanos adduxit, ut ad ſupplementum exercitus ſervos ſuos manumitterent, hiſque interfectorum matrimonia pollicerentur, ut non numero tantum amiſſorum civium, ſed & dignitati ſuccederent* (6).

(6) Juſtin. lib. 3. cap. 5.

[D] *He ſeized likewiſe upon ſome of the nobleſt virgins at Caryæ.*] He deſigned to have attacked Sparta it ſelf; but it is ſaid, that a viſion of Helena and the Dioſcuri deterred him from that enterprize. He then undertook one of greater conſequence than hazard. He ſeized on ſome of the richeſt and nobleſt virgins of Caryæ, while they were performing ſome religious ſolemnities to *Diana*. As he carried them off, he was obliged to reſt one night in a Meſſenian village. While he was aſleep ſome of his young men, heated with wine, attempted the chaſtity of the virgins. Ariſtomenes awakened by the noiſe and confuſion came among them immediately; but neither his preſence, nor all the perſuaſions, which he could make uſe of, were ſo powerful as the luſt, which urged them to theſe extravagancies. He was enraged at this, and killing ſome of the moſt furious with his own hand, put a ſtop to the madneſs of the reſt, and brought all the women ſafe to Andania; who were afterwards redeemed (7).

(7) Pauſan. *Meſſen.* and Rowe, pag. 80.

[E] *Met with ill ſucceſs in his attempt upon the matrons of Sparta, who were ſacrificing to Ceres at Ægila in Laconia.*] The Temple of that Goddeſs at Ægila was of great antiquity, and much reſorted to. Some matrons were ſacrificing there to Ceres on a ſolemn occaſion, when Ariſtomenes, who had been informed of their meeting, came upon them of a ſudden. The matrons invoking the Goddeſs to their aſſiſtance, took the weapons which they uſed for their ſacrifice, and the ſpits on which the victims were roaſted, and with them made ſo vigorous a defence, that they wounded ſeveral of the Meſſenians, and forced the reſt to retire. Ariſtomenes himſelf being wounded and beat down with their torches was taken priſoner. The liberties of Meſſenia had been loſt with his life, if the Prieſteſs Archidamia had not had more tenderneſs for him than her companions. It is ſaid, that love enter'd into her compaſſion. She freed him that very night, pretending to the other Ladies, that he had unbound himſelf, by burning the cords which he was tied with, and after that eaſily found a way for his eſcape (8). The ſtory was believed, and Pliny tells us, that he eſcaped in that manner. *Iterum captus, ſopitis cuſtodibus ſomno, ad ignem advolutus lora cum corpore exuſſit* (9). Polyænus likewiſe in the ſecond Book of his *Stratagems* (10) affirms the ſame.

(8) Pauſan. *Meſſen.* cap. 17. and Rowe, p. 81.
(9) Plin. *Hiſt. Natur.* lib. 2. cap. 37. and not cap. 70. as Mr. Rowe ſays, pag. 81.
(10) Cap. 33.

Ira, a caſtle of great ſtrength, which the Spartans beſieged for above eleven years together. Ariſtomenes with a body of three hundred men ravaged all the country, as well his own as that of Sparta (*f*). But he was ſurprized in one of his excurſions, and carried priſoner to Sparta [*F*], from whence he eſcaped by the moſt aſtoniſhing accident imaginable [*G*]. Soon after this he attacked the forces of the Corinthians, which they had ſent to aſſiſt the Spartans in the ſiege of Ira, and deſtroyed the greateſt part of them (*g*). He then offered to Jupiter Ithomates ſacrifices called *Hecatomphonia* [*H*], becauſe no perſon had a right to offer them till after he had ſlain an hundred of his country's enemies with his own hand. The Spartans being engaged in the celebration of ſome religious rites, made a truce with the Meſſenians for thirty days. But during this time ſome archers, auxiliaries from Crete, continued their incurſions into the country of the Meſſenians. Ariſtomenes walking out alone upon the ſecurity of the truce, was on a ſudden ſeized and bound by ſeven of them. But he eſcaped from them in a very unexpected manner by means of a young maid, who delivered him in conſequence of a dream, which ſhe had the night before [*I*].

(*f*) Idem, cap. 18.

(*g*) Idem, cap. 19.

[*F*] *Surprized in one of his excurſions, and carried priſoner to Sparta.*] He drew out his troops one evening, and by haſty marches reached Amyclæ before the break of day. He ſurpriſed the town, plundered it, and returned home with his prey before the Spartans, who were ſent in purſuit of him, could overtake him. But he continued theſe excurſions too long to be able to practiſe them always with the like ſucceſs. In one of them he fell into a body of troops, that lay in ambuſh. It was above half the Lacedæmonian army, and commanded by both the Kings. Notwithſtanding the ſurprize, and the prodigious diſparity between them, he made a brave defence, and was very near forcing his way thro' them, when, after having received ſeveral other wounds, he was knocked down with a ſtone. Before he recovered his ſenſes, the Spartans ruſhed in upon him and took him priſoner. Fifty of his band were taken with him, and they were carried to Sparta, where they were doomed to death (11).

(11) Pauſan. *Meſſen.* and Rowe pag. 84.

[*G*] *From whence he eſcaped by the moſt aſtoniſhing accident imaginable.*] After ſome deliberation, it was reſolved, that he and the fifty men, who were taken with him, ſhould be thrown into Ceada, which was the name of a Cave, into which ſuch criminals, as were condemned to death for crimes of the blackeſt nature, uſed to be thrown. This puniſhment reſembled that of the Tarpeian rock among the Romans. The other Meſſenians were daſhed to pieces, or at leaſt deſtroyed by the fall; and nothing leſs than a miracle could preſerve Ariſtomenes from ſharing the ſame fate. Some Authors have reported (12), that an Eagle receiving his body, bore it gently down on its wings. Others, as particularly Polyænus (13), tell us, that he was thrown down armed, his companions being all diſarmed; and that his ſhield gathered air, and made the fall ſlow and gentle. This is ſuppoſed to have given occaſion for the former ſtory, becauſe it is certain that this ſhield had an Eagle engraven on it (14). But whatever broke his fall, it is agreed he came to the bottom without receiving any injury. He lay among the dead bodies of his companions, wrapping himſelf up in his garments, and waiting for death with all the conſtancy of an Hero. The third night of his being there, he heard a noiſe, and looking out, ſaw by the glimmering light a fox coming to the carcaſſes. He waited till it was within his reach, and then haſtily ſeized upon it. He kept his hold with one hand, and with the other held his cloak to its mouth, whenever it attempted to bite him. He ran after it where the way was broad enough; and where it was too narrow, he let the beaſt drag him after it. He came at laſt ſo far, that the paſſage was only large enough for the fox; and finding by the light coming in, that he was not far from an open place, he ventured to let his guide go, and making way for himſelf with his hands, got out of his dungeon, and quickly came ſafe to Ira, where the Meſſenians received him with inexpreſſible tranſports of joy (15). Pliny relates the ſtory in the following manner; that Ariſtomenes having been wounded and taken priſoner, made his eſcape out of a cave, into which he was thrown, by following the narrow paſſages which the fox had made in the earth. *Ipſe convulneratus & captus ſemel per cavernam latomiarum evaſit, anguſtos vulpium aditus ſecutus* (16). Polyænus in the paſſage quoted above, places this eſcape of Ariſtomenes after his offering the ſacrifice called *Hecatomphonia* three times on account of his victories over the Lacedæmonians; and tells us, that when he was caſt down into the cavern, he did not reſign himſelf up to deſpair, but ſearched all about for a paſſage in order to eſcape, which he diſcovered by means of a fox, which came in thro' it. Upon this he took one of the bones of the dead bodies, and caught hold of the tail of the fox; and notwithſtanding the beaſt bit him, he followed it, and opened a way with the bone till he got out. He went immediately to the Meſſenians, who were juſt going out to battle, and put himſelf at the head of their Phalanx. The Lacedæmonians ſeeing Ariſtomenes in arms, whom they imagined to have been deſtroyed by being thrown down the precipice, which no perſon had ever eſcaped with life, immediately betook themſelves to flight, preſuming, that he was of a rank ſuperior to human nature.

(12) Pauſan. *Meſſen.*

(13) *Stratag.* lib. 2. cap. 31.

(14) Pauſan. *Meſſen. ubi ſupra.* See likewiſe the note (5) upon Maaſvicius's edition of *Polyænus* lib. 2. cap. 31. pag. 203. Lugd. Bat. 1690.

(15) *See* Rowe, p. 85, 86.

(16) Plin. *ubi ſupra.*

[*H*] *He then offered to Jupiter Ithomates ſacrifices called* Hecatomphonia.] Pliny tells us (17), that he had killed three hundred Lacedæmonians with his own hand; and we are informed, that he made theſe oblations three different times. The firſt after the battle at the Monument of the Goat; the ſecond after this defeat of the Corinthians; and the third after ſeveral excurſions, which he made with great ſucceſs. Plutarch in his *Life of Romulus*, after having oppoſed the Roman Authors, who to heighten the glory of that Prince, tell us, that in an engagement, wherein fourteen thouſand of the *Veientes* periſhed, he killed himſelf above half that number, obſerves, that the Meſſenians are a little extravagant likewiſe in reporting, that their General Ariſtomenes killed three hundred Lacedæmonians with his own hand at three different times; upon which account he thrice offered up a man as a victim. Xylander's tranſlation of this paſſage of Plutarch is as follows: *Sed quod nonnulli aiunt quatuordecim millibus Veientium cæſis, amplius dimidiâ parte eorum Romuli manibus interfectos fuiſſe, id planè fabuloſum omninoque incredibile eſt; quando & Meſſenios inflatiùs Ariſtomenem ſuum prædicare arbitrantur, qui* TER HOMINEM IMMOLAVERIT *(quæ* Hecatomphonia *vocantur,) quod tertium centum de Lacedæmoniis hoſtibus viros in pugnâ interfeciſſet.* This verſion of Plutarch is a juſt repreſentation of the Author's ſenſe, who only tells us, that Ariſtomenes thrice offered up a ſingle man as a victim. But the Engliſh tranſlation of that paſſage is undoubtedly wrong, where it informs us, that *he offered three hundred victims for as many Lacedæmonians whom he himſelf ſlew* (18). Mr. Rowe (19) is not convinced of the juſtice of Plutarch's remark, with regard to the falſity of Ariſtomenes's having killed three hundred men. He obſerves, that the glory of Romulus is compleatly fabulous; but he cannot ſee the leaſt reſemblance between it and the account, which the Meſſenians give of their Hero. That a man of Ariſtomenes's valour and boldneſs ſhould in a war of near twenty years, full of actions, kill himſelf three hundred enemies, has nothing that ſeems to carry an air of improbability in it. A man, that doubts of ſuch facts as theſe, muſt believe little certain in Hiſtory. It may be ſaid too, that Ariſtomenes's offering ſuch ſacrifices, as intimated that he had killed three hundred Spartans, tho' he really had not compleated that number, might be the action of a good Politician and prudent General, to ſtrike a terror upon his enemies, and raiſe the courage of his own men, in a war ſo very unequal. But as the thing

(17) Ibid.

(18) See the Engliſh tranſlation of Plutarch's Lives by ſeveral hands, Vol. 1. p. 112. edit. London 1716.

(19) Pag. 87.

before [*I*]. Ira had now been eleven years beſieged; and Ariſtomenes having with Theoclus before conſulted the Oracle at Delphi about the fate of their country, and received an obſcure anſwer, was alarmed by an accidental obſervation, which was conſidered as the accompliſhment of that prediction [*K*], and prepared for a fate, which ſeemed to him inevitable [*L*]. The Meſſenians were not very cloſely beſieged in Ira, and appeared to be in little danger from the Spartans, when the city was ſurprized by the enemy by means of an intrigue, which one of the Citizen's wives had with one of the Spartan ſervants [*M*]. Ariſtomenes with his troops fought his way through them, and took refuge among the Arcadians. He reſolved with five hundred choſen men to attack Sparta itſelf; but

is not incredible, we are not obliged to ſuppoſe ſuch artifices. Clemens Alexandrinus has improved this ſtory into the ſacrificing of three hundred Spartans by Ariſtomenes; one of whom was Theopompus, King of Sparta, a Prince, who, unluckily for that Author, was dead before Ariſtomenes was born. This Romance is faithfully copied by Euſebius and other Apologiſts for Chriſtianity, antient and modern (20).

(20) Rowe, pag. 87, 88.

[*I*] *By means of a young maid, who delivered him in conſequence of a dream, which ſhe had the night before.*] When he was ſeized, the Cretans diſpatched two of their number to Sparta with the good news; the reſt carried him to a Meſſenian cottage; for it was almoſt evening when they took him, and they were not near enough to the territories of Sparta to reach them that night. The cottage was inhabited only by an old widow and her daughter. The young maid had dreamt the night before, that ſome wolves had brought into the houſe a lion bound, with his nails pluck'd off; that ſhe had unbound the lion, and given him nails, which he immediately employed to tear his keepers to pieces. She recollected the dream upon Ariſtomenes's being brought in, and as ſoon as ſhe heard his name, did not doubt of its being prophetical, and reſolved to do all that ſhe could in order to the fulfilling of it. She plied the Cretans largely with drink, till they fell faſt aſleep; then taking the ſword of one, that ſeemed to ſleep ſoundeſt, ſhe cut Ariſtomenes's bonds, and gave him the ſword, with which he immediately ſtabbed the wretches that ſeized him. The maid he took with him to Ira, and married her to his ſon Gorgus, a young man about eighteen years of age (21).

(21) Pauſan. *Meſſen.* and Rowe, pag. 88, 89.

[*K*] *Alarmed by an accidental obſervation, which was conſidered as the accompliſhment of that prediction.*] The anſwer, which the Oracle had given them, was as follows:

Ἕς τι τράγος πίηται Νέδης ἁλικοῤῥόου ὕδατι,
Οὐκ ἔτι Μεσσήνη ῥῶμα· σχεδόθεν γὰρ ὄλεθρος.

That is,

" Of thy Meſſenia conſtant care
" The Gods ſhall take, till at the brink
" Of Neda's ſtream a goat ſhall drink;
" Thence date her ruin and deſpair.

The river Neda has its ſprings in Mount Lycæus; it runs thro' Arcadia, then turning back towards Meſſenia divides it from Elis. The Meſſenians took a great deal of care to prevent goats from drinking at the river. But about this time Theoclus the Soothſayer walking by the river-ſide, ſaw a wild fig-tree, which inſtead of growing upwards bent to the water, and juſt touched it with ſome branches. That tree the people of the country called τράγος, and as that was the word made uſe of by the Oracle, Theoclus began to think, that the prediction was now fulfilled, and the ruin of Meſſenia very near. He carried Ariſtomenes to the place, and acquainted him with his opinions. The General entered into his ſentiments, and from that time waited for their impending ruin (22).

(22) Pauſan. *Meſſen.* cap. 20. and Rowe, pag. 89, 90.

[*L*] *Prepared for a fate which ſeemed to him inevitable.*] The Meſſenians had ſome ſacred myſtical pledges delivered down to them from a very remote antiquity, on the preſervation of which their country's final ruin or ſafety was believed to depend. If theſe were loſt, they were to be deſtroyed without any hopes of recovery; if preſerved, however low they might be reduced, they ſhould certainly flouriſh out of their ruins. Ariſtomenes took theſe one night, and going to Ithome, a city, once the capital of the Meſſenians, but ruined in the firſt Spartan war, buried them in the moſt deſolate place, which he could find there, and invoking Jupiter Ithomates and all the Meſſenian Deities, ſolemnly committed to their truſt the laſt hopes of his ſinking countrey (23).

(23) Pauſan. *Meſſen.* cap. 26. and Rowe, pag. 90, 91.

[*M*] *The city was ſurprized by the enemy by means of an intrigue, which one of the citizen's wives had with one of the Spartan ſervants.*] The Meſſenians were ſtill maſters of the valley between the foot of the mountain and the river Neda, and ſeveral of them lived in houſes without the walls of the city. A ſervant of Emperamus, a noble Spartan, who uſed to water his maſter's herds at the river, ſaw and lik'd the wife of a Meſſenian, who lived without the walls, as ſhe came to fetch water over-againſt him. He entered into a familiar converſation with her, and uſed his opportunities ſo well, that at laſt he engaged her to admit his viſits on ſuch nights, as her huſband watched; for all the citizens took their turns in guarding the caſtle, where there was ſome danger of a ſurprize from the enemy. The fortifications had been built up haſtily, and there was no guard-houſe, nor indeed ſhelter for thoſe, that were upon the ground. One night there aroſe a great ſtorm and ſhower of rain, and the General's abſence made the guard negligent in performing their duty. Ariſtomenes had made an agreement with a Cephallenian Merchant, his friend, to furniſh the Meſſenians with ſome corn and other proviſions. The man coming to Ira fell into the hands of the Lacedæmonians, and Ariſtomenes being informed of his misfortune, attacked the party, that had made him priſoner, freed him, and carried him with all the proviſions, which he was bringing with him, ſafe to Ira; but he was himſelf wounded in the action. His wound confined him to his houſe, and prevented his walking the rounds, as he generally did every night. The Centinels ſecure on this account forſook their poſts, and retired every one to his own houſe. The huſband, whoſe wife had the intrigue with the Spartan, was one of them that night, and the Gallant as uſual ſupplied his abſence. The wife was ſurprized at his return, but found time to hide her adulterer, and then received her huſband with a well diſſembled tenderneſs, and expreſſed her wonder what happy accident had brought him home ſo much ſooner than ſhe expected. He told her the whole ſtory, and as ſoon as ever the Spartan heard, that the caſtle was left unguarded, he made all haſte he could to the camp before the town, which in the abſence of both the Kings was at that time commanded by his maſter. He acquainted him with the negligence of the beſieged, and convinced him how imprudent it would be to neglect an opportunity that might never offer itſelf again. The darkneſs of the night, and the terrible ſtorm that ſtill continued, favoured the Spartans ſo much, that with ſcaling ladders they were got within the caſtle, without meeting any oppoſition from the Meſſenians. Gorgus the ſon of Ariſtomenes was the firſt man, who perceived, that they were in the town. His father, wounded as he was, came out, and endeavoured to encourage the citizens. They were ſo confounded, that there was not any poſſibility of forming them into any conſiderable body. He went about all night with a little troop, which he had collected out of the ſtraglers to call up ſuch from their houſes as were yet ignorant of the confuſion. But it was in vain to attempt any thing, ſince his orders could not be heard nor obeyed. As ſoon as they had lighted any torches, the wind and rain immediately extinguiſhed them. The Spartans on their ſide thought it was ſufficient, if they could maintain the poſts they were in till the morning. When it was day, Ariſtomenes preſſed his ſoldiers to make their laſt

efforts

but his design was prevented by the treachery of Aristocrates, who was punished with death [*N*]. The inhabitants of Pylus and Mothone, and some other sea-port towns of Messenia, upon the taking of Ira, sailed to Cyllene, a port of Elis, from whence they sent to Aristomenes, and the other Messenians in Arcadia, to assist them in their design of seeking out some new country. He informed them, that he determined to spend the remainder of his life in disturbing the tyrants of his country, but gave them Mantiolus, the son of Theoclus, and Gorgus his own son to be their Generals. About the same time his brother-in-law Euergetidas joined him, and having learned with a great deal of regret that Aristomenes's design upon Sparta, had been prevented by treachery, he took fifty Messenians, and attacked the Spartans, who were still employed in plundering Ira; and after a prodigious slaughter fell himself with his companions. The rest of the Messenians went to their countrymen at Cyllene (*b*). While they were doubtful what course to steer, Anaxilas, Monarch of Rhegium, whose ancestors were Messenians, desired their assistance in the war which he was engaged in against the Zanclæi, a people of Sicily, and promised them whatever they should gain from the Zanclæi. This they immediately agreed to, and executed it with great success [*O*]. Aristomenes, after the departure of his countrymen,

(*b*) Paus. *Mess.* cap. 23. *and* Rowe, pag. 98.

efforts for their country, and yet force the enemy out of the town. They were moved with what he said, and despair itself encreasing their courage, they prepared to attack the Spartans. The women got to the tops of the houses to throw down tiles and stones on the enemy; but the violence of the storm was so great, that they could not stand against it themselves. They came down, they took arms, and encouraged the men, as well by their example as by words. But the storm increasing and becoming yet more dreadful by the day, all their attempts were ineffectual. The rain was accompanied with peals of thunder, and the lightning flashed directly in the Messenians faces. The Spartans took new courage from its thundering on their right hand; they were besides that much more numerous; yet they thought it greater prudence to weary out the enemy, than to attack them. They rested by turns, and had fresh supplies from their camp continually; while the Messenians had neither repose nor refreshment. They were half dead with cold, hunger, and thirst; and the women, who were still in arms, could not possibly bear up any longer. They had held out thus till the third day, when Theoclus took Aristomenes aside, and said to him, *To what purpose are all these pains? You see the fate of your country; and it were a sort of impiety to oppose the Decrees of Heaven any longer. For me I am resolved to give up a life, which is no longer necessary nor useful to Messenia. Be it your care to preserve yours for her. Watch over your country's ruins; and while you live, let not Sparta have a sure and easy conquest.* Having said this he rushed headlong with a few followers upon the enemy, and after a great slaughter fell himself. Aristomenes putting the women and children in the middle of his troops, giving his son Gorgus the rear, and leading the body himself, forced a passage out of the town. The Lacedæmonians readily made a way for him, and thought it safer to make a bridge for an enemy, than by too obstinate a resistance to provoke him to attempts, that might yet prove fatal to them (24).

(24) Paus. *Messen.* cap. 22. *and* Rowe, pag. 91-95.

[*N*] *His design was prevented by the treachery of Aristocrates, who was punished with death.*] This King had before given an instance of his treachery towards the Messenians; for when the Arcadians heard of the taking of Ira, they enjoyned him to lead them against the Spartans, that they might prevent the ruin of their confederates, or share themselves in it. But Aristocrates, who was still in the interest of Sparta, instead of bringing any forces to the assistance of the Messenians, assured his countrymen, that they had no friends to succour, all of them having perished with the town. They were soon after better informed, and sending their principal Nobility before, they went out themselves in a large body to meet the exiles at Mount Lycæus. They received them with the utmost hospitality (25). They offered to distribute them all among their cities, and to give them some part of the country (26); and they actually gave their daughters in marriage to some young Messenians, that were unmarried. Aristomenes, who could not sit tamely, and see his country ruined, chose out of all his army five hundred men, whom he knew to be of a valour proper for desperate actions. He then assembled the Arcadians with their King, whom he had not all this while suspected of any other crime but cowardice, and laid before them the design, which he had projected. It was this, that while the Spartans were busied in their new conquest, and all taken up in plundering Ira, he intended to march in the evening, and attack Sparta itself. Three hundred Arcadians voluntarily offered their assistance in this design. But the sacrifices not promising a favourable success in the enterprize, it was delayed till the next day, and by that time Aristocrates had discovered it to the Spartans. The servant, whom he sent to Anaxander, in his return fell into the hands of the Arcadians, who began to entertain some suspicions of their King. They searched him, and found upon him a letter of Anaxander's, which was examined in an Assembly of the Nation. The Spartan King had in that letter made a grateful mention of the ancient services of the Arcadian, and assured him that he might depend on suitable returns for all his merits. The importance of the last discovery was at large insisted upon, and the treachery of the unhappy Prince exposed in the clearest terms. The justice of the Arcadians was very expeditious. Without much deliberation they resolved to stone the King, and desired the Messenians to assist them in the execution. They look'd upon Aristomenes, as expecting orders from him. He turned his eyes on the ground, and burst out into tears. The Arcadians then were the executioners of their own sentence; and after the King was dead, and thrown out of their territories unburied, they erected a pillar in the temple of Jupiter Lycæus, with this inscription (27):

(25) Paus. *Mess.* cap. 22. *and* Rowe, pag. 95.
(26) Polyb. lib. 4. cap. 33.

(27) Paus. *Mess.* *and* Polybius, lib. 4. pag. 418; 419. Vol. 1. ed. Amstelod. 1670.

Πάντως ὁ χρόνος ἦρε δίκην ἀδίκῳ Βασιλῆι;
Εὗρε δὲ Μεσσήνη σὺν Διὶ τὸν προδότην
Ῥηιδίως· Χαλεπὸν δὲ λαθεῖν Θεὸν ἄνδρ' ἐπίορκον.
Χαῖρε Ζεῦ Βασιλεῦ, καὶ σάου' Ἀρκαδίαν.

That is,

" Sure vengeance waits on Monarch's perjuries;
" In vain they hide their guilt from mortals eyes,
" While there are Gods, and Justice rules the skies.
" The traitor, by whose arts Messenia fell,
" The thunderer found, reveal'd, and sent to hell.
" Great Jove! Abhorrer of a guilty reign!
" All hail! and ever guard Arcadia's plain."

Plutarch in his Book *De serâ Numinis vindictâ* relates this story in a different manner, and only tells us, that Aristocrates having betrayed the Messenians in the Cyprian War, tho' he was not detected for above twenty years after, and was King of the Arcadians, yet had at last his guilt discovered, and was capitally punished for it. *Such*, says Mr. Rowe (28), *was the end of Aristocrates, and such the principles of a generous race, undebauched by slavish Sophistry, and justly ignorant of any power that was not guided by the Laws, and accountable to them. However, if what Polybius relates be true, that they put all Aristocrates's family to death with him, their vengeance perhaps was a little too severe.*

(28) Pag. 97, 98.

[*O*] *This they immediately agreed to, and executed with great success.*] They sailed to Rhegium, took Anaxilas and his forces on board, and landed them in Sicily;

trymen, married his ſiſter and two of his daughters to the moſt eminent men of the country, where he ſtaid, and his third daughter to Demagetus King of Jalyſus, a city in Rhodes [*P*], which induced him to remove thither. He reſolved upon a voyage to Sardis, the capital of Lydia, and intended to have travelled from thence to Ecbatana to the court of Phraortes King of Medea. But his death prevented this deſign [*Q*]. His character in moſt reſpects was very great and valuable [*R*]; and his conduct was of ſuch importance to the Meſſenians, that his death was the only ſecurity of the Lacedæmonians conqueſt. At laſt Epaminondas recalled the exiles from all parts, and built a city for them, which he called Meſſene. Ariſtomenes's bones were by an order of the Oracle returned to his country, and buried in the new city. The Meſſenians ſacrificed a bull to him, which they bound to a pillar, and if the beaſt ſtruggled ſo as to move the pillar, the omen was eſteemed propitious; but if the pillar remained unmoved, it was conſidered as a ſign of ſome approaching calamity (*i*).

(*i*) Pauſan. *Meſſ.* cap. 32. *and* Rowe, p. 103, 104.

Sicily; where he fought the Zanclæi by land, while the Meſſenians engaged their fleet. The Zanclæi were defeated in both the battles, and were immediately beſieged in their city both by ſea and land. After a ſhort ſiege, a great part of their walls being battered down, they fled to the Temples and Altars, and ſat as ſuppliants there. Anaxilas was for putting ſome of them to the ſword, and ſelling the reſt with their wives and children; but the Meſſenian Generals oppoſed his barbarity. They promiſed a compleat pardon to all; they entered into a treaty with them, and permitted all that pleaſed, to remain in the city under their Government. They altered the name of the city, and called it Meſſene, in remembrance of their own country (29).

(29) Pauſan. *Meſſ.* and Rowe, pag. 100.

[*P*] *Married . . . . his third daughter to Demagetus King of Jalyſus, a city in Rhodes.*] This King had conſulted in perſon the Oracle of Delphi about the choice of a wife. The Prieſteſs ordered him to marry the daughter of the moſt valiant man of Greece. Ariſtomenes was at that time at Delphi about his own private affairs; and the Rhodian Prince having heard of his character was eaſily ſatisfied that he had no occaſion to ſeek any farther. He aſked his daughter of him, and upon his conſent took her and his father-in-law with him to Rhodes (30).

(30) Pauſan. *Meſſen.* cap. 24. *and* Rowe, pag. 100, 101.

[*Q*] *Death prevented his deſign.*] Mr. Rowe is of opinion, that it is moſt probable, that he died of ſickneſs. But Pliny tells us (31), that after having ſeveral times eſcaped the Lacedæmonians hands miraculouſly, he was at laſt taken by them, and put to death; that he was then cut open, and his heart found all over hairy. *Tertio capto Lacedæmonii pectus diſſecuere cauſa videndi* (or as other copies read it, *diſſecuere viventi*), that is, cut him open alive,) *hirſutumque cor repertum eſt.* Valerius Maximus aſſerts (32), that the Athenians having cut out his heart, out of curioſity to ſee of what kind it was, ſince he was ſo remarkable for his craftineſs, having ſeveral times eſcaped them, they found it hairy. *Oculis ejus admirabilius Ariſtomenis Meſſenii cor; quod Athenienſes ob eximiam calliditatem exutum, pilis refertum invenerunt; cum eum aliquoties captum, & aſtutiâ elapſum, cepiſſent.* It is evident here, that Valerius Maximus has miſtaken the Athenians for the Lacedæmonians, ſince we do not find that Ariſtomenes was ever engaged in a war, or taken by the Athenians. Stephanus Byzantinus likewiſe in his Book *de Urbibus* (33) relates the ſame ſtory of Ariſtomenes's being taken by the Lacedæmonians during the Meſſenian war, and that when his heart was taken out, to ſee whether there was any thing peculiar in it, it was found hairy. But tho' we cannot, as Mr. Rowe obſerves (34), give an account of the firſt Authors of this ſtory, we have a great deal of reaſon to diſbelieve it. Thoſe Writers, that have been moſt accurate in their relations of the Meſſenian Wars and Life of Ariſtomenes, make no mention of it. Thoſe, that do, are of a much inferior reputation; they commit intolerable errors in what they ſay, and ſeem to have been induced to relate it by the ſtrangeneſs of it, without giving themſelves any pains to examine into its truth. The quoting of the authority of ſome Writers for the proof of this ſtory, in whoſe works we have good aſſurance that it never was told, would make us even apt to ſuſpect, that ſome of thoſe, in whom we find it, were ſenſible themſelves that they were relating a fable. Thus Stephanus, for inſtance quotes Herodotus, who never names Ariſtomenes; together with Plutarch, in whoſe works there is no account of this ſtory; and Rhianus, whom Pauſanias expreſly follows, but without hinting at this ſtory. Ariſtomenes was the Hero of Rhianus's Poem, and it is highly incredible that he ſhould bring him to ſuch a wretched end (35).

(31) *Natur. Hiſt.* lib. 2. cap. 37.

(32) Lib. 1. cap. 8. *Exemp. Extern.* 15.

(33) *Verbo* Ἀνδανία.

(34) Pag. 101.

(35) Rowe, pag. 102.

[*R*] *His character in moſt reſpects was very great and valuable.*] He was a man, ſays Mr. Rowe (36), of the greateſt perſonal valour, of a body and mind well match'd, fit to contrive and execute the moſt arduous enterprizes, and bear the greateſt fatigues. He was bold and daring, perhaps to a fault; but the prodigious inequality of the war that he was engaged in, made the boldeſt of attempts excuſeable. This muſt defend his expoſing ſo much and ſo often a life, on which ſo much depended. This alone muſt be the apology for the meanneſs of his making war with women, and plundering the country, which he was reduced to do for ſeveral years. He does not ſeem to have been very religious; and tho' we ſhould free him from any concern in aſſuming the form of Caſtor and Pollux, his attacking Prieſteſſes and Matrons, engaged in the ſervice of the Deities, has ſomething of an air of impiety. His generous love for Meſſenia and liberty, which was the conſtant motive of his actions, which never abandoned him to his laſt moments, ſhould cover his failings. And upon the whole, if the repreſentations we have of him, and the account of his actions, are not extremely flattered, we may ſay, that if there were many of the ancient Heroes more ſucceſsful in their wars, there were few that deſerved ſucceſs more. If others have attempted the deliverance of their countries with better fortune, hardly any ſtruggled thro' ſo many difficulties, or fell more greatly. T.

(36) Ibid. and pag. 103.

☞ARISTOPHANES, the celebrated Comic Poet, was a citizen of Athens, of the town which was called Cydathenæum, and of the Tribe Pandionis (*a*). His father's name was Philip (*b*). The diſtinguiſhed merit of our Poet excited ſo much envy againſt him, that his right of being a citizen of Athens was conteſted, and his enemies endeavoured to repreſent him as a ſtranger [*A*]. But he effectually confuted this ſuggeſtion, and

(*a*) *See* Madam Dacier's Preface to her French Tranſlation of the *Plutus* and the *Clouds* of Ariſtophanes, printed at Paris 1692. Friſchlin in his Life of that Poet ſays that he was *ex tribu Cythadethenienſi, curiâ Pandionidâ.*

(*b*) Friſchlin. *Vita Ariſtophan.*

[*A*] *His right of being a citizen of Athens was conteſted, and his enemies endeavoured to repreſent him as a ſtranger.*] He did not make uſe of his eloquence to anſwer his enemies, but only repeated the two verſes of Telemachus in the Odyſſey;

Μήτηρ μὲν τ' ἐμὲ φησὶ τῦ ἔμμεναι, αὐτὰρ ἔγωγε
Οὐκ οἶδ', ὃ γὰρ δὴ τις ἑὸν γόνον ἄυτὸς ἀνίγνω.

That is,

" I take my mother's word: my mother vows
" 'Twas he; I know not. Who can ſwear he
" knows?

The occaſion of this charge againſt him, was, that he had an eſtate at Ægina, as he intimates in his comedy of the *Acharnenſes*, where he ſays to the Athenians;

and ſurmounted the calumnies of his enemies. We cannot be in the leaſt uncertainty concerning the time when he flouriſhed, ſince he was contemporary with Plato, Socrates, Euripides, and the Generals Lamachus and Demoſthenes, and moſt of his plays were written during the Peloponneſian war. He expoſed the deſigns of the Magiſtrates and Generals of the Athenians with a great deal of wit and ſeverity upon the Theatre; and at the ſame time took care to defend the Commonwealth againſt its enemies abroad. Lacedæmon and other cities, which were jealous of the grandeur of Athens, experienced very frequently that Ariſtophanes alone was worth an army to that city, and that it was impoſſible to ſucceed while they followed the advice of this Poet, who had made the ſtage a kind of ſchool for the Art of War, and all other virtues, which can render a city formidable to its enemies [*B*]. In ſhort, as Mr. Rymer in his *Short View of Tragedy* (*c*), tells us, this Author *appears in his function a man of wonderful zeal for virtue and the good of his country, and laid about him with an undaunted reſolution, as it were ſome Chriſtian Martyr, for his faith and religion.* "He plainly run a muck, *as that Critic* "*expreſſes himſelf*, at all manner of vice, wherever he ſaw it, be it in the greateſt Philo- "ſophers, the greateſt Poets, the Generals, or the Miniſters of State." This greatneſs of mind in our Poet raiſed him ſo noble a character, and ſpread his fame ſo far, that Lilius Giraldus tells us, that the Great King, or King of Perſia coming to Greece, and deſiring to ſee every thing remarkable at Athens, aſked where the Comic Poet was. But Madam

(*c*) Pag. 22. edit. London 1693.

nians; *the Lacedemonians demand of you the iſland of Ægina, not becauſe they have any great regard for it, but becauſe they want to revenge themſelves upon me, and deprive me of my eſtate.* This probably gave occaſion to his enemies to repreſent him as a native of Ægina. Thoſe, who have affirmed him to be an Egyptian, Rhodian, Melian (1), or Lindian (2), had no foundation for their aſſertions. A man of his temper could not fail of procuring himſelf enemies in the commonwealth. He had a lively and warm diſpoſition, and his genius particularly carried him to raillery; and as he had a great deal of ſpirit and reſolution, and was a declared enemy to ſlavery and to all thoſe who wanted to oppreſs their country, he found ſufficient matter to exert his talents upon, and to ſhew the ſtrong love, which he had for liberty. The Athenians ſuffered themſelves at that time to be governed by men, who had no other views than to make themſelves maſters of the commonwealth. Ariſtophanes, who was too ſagacious not to perceive their deſigns, was the only man who ventured to oppoſe them, and went upon the ſtage in perſon, where he diſcovered to his countrymen the pernicious practices of their Generals and chief Magiſtrates. He ſhewed them the proper methods to prevent theſe attempts, and preſerved them by that means from the greateſt misfortunes imaginable. Cleo was the firſt, whom he attacked and expoſed upon the ſtage, in his comedy of the *Equites*; and as there was not one of the Comedians, who would venture to act the character of a man of his great authority, Ariſtophanes repreſented it himſelf with ſuch ſucceſs, that the Athenians obliged Cleo to pay a fine of five talents, which were given to the Poet (3). He afterwards directed his ſatyr againſt Lamachus, and did not ſpare even Pericles and Alcibiades (4).

(1) *See* Madam Dacier's Preface to her French Tranſlation of Ariſtophanes.
(2) Nicodem. Friſchlin. *in Vita Ariſtophan.*
(3) Dacier *and* Friſchlin. *ubi ſupra.*
(4) Dacier, *ubi ſupra.*

[*B*] *A kind of ſchool for the art of war and all virtues, which can render a city formidable to its enemies.*] He aſſembled the ſpectators, not with a view to flatter them with low and deceitful praiſes, or to divert them by mean and groſs buffoonry, but to give them the moſt ſolid inſtructions, which he render'd agreeable by a thouſand pleaſant fictions, which no other perſon could ever have invented. He was not contented with reminding them of their duty, but he likewiſe reproached them with their faults, and told them that they reaſoned like children, and that when their reſolutions were attended with any ſucceſs, it was merely from the kindneſs of the Gods, who took pleaſure in working of miracles; but that theſe Gods would at laſt be weary of protecting fools. This freedom of his, which would now appear very extravagant, was ſo well received by the Athenians, that they caſt handfuls of flowers upon the head of the Poet, and carried him in triumph thro' the city with the greateſt acclamations, and paid him the higheſt compliments imaginable. To reward him likewiſe for the love which he ſhewed to the commonwealth, they made a public decree, that he ſhould be honour'd with a crown of the ſacred Olive-tree in the citadel, which was the greateſt honour that could be paid to a citizen (5). In ſhort, he followed the affairs of the Athenians in ſo exact a manner, that his Comedies are a faithful hiſtory of that people. For which reaſon, when Dionyſius, King of Syracuſe, deſired to learn the ſtate and language of that city, from the beſt Author, Plato ſent him the Comedies of Ariſtophanes, and told him that they were the beſt repreſentation of the ſtate of Athens. *Itaque Platonem memorant Dionyſio Regi Syracuſano ſtatum reipublicæ Athenienſis & linguam ex optimo autore perdiſcere cupienti, hunc autorem miſiſſe, hortatumque eſſe, ut fabulas hujus poetæ diligenter tractaret, ſi quidem reipublicæ Athenienſis ſtatum perfecte vellet cognoſcere* (6). Mr. Rymer in the paſſage above quoted in the text of this article, obſerves, that in the days of Ariſtophanes, it was on all hands agreed, that the beſt Poet was he, who had done the moſt to make men virtuous and ſerviceable to the public. In his Comedy *of the Frogs* (7), he introduces Æſchylus diſputing with Euripides for precedence, and ſpeaking to him in this manner:

(5) Ibid.
(6) Friſchlin. *ubi ſupra.*
(7) Act. 4. Scena 2.

Conſider what ſort of men I left you;
Men generous, four cubits high, not ſuch as now-a-days,
That ſlip the collar, when they ſhould ſerve their country;
Indifferent, looſe, prudential (8), *tricking fellows* (9);
Nought did they breath but broad ſwords, battle-axes, axes,
The helmet's lofty pride, jack-boots (10). *Habergeons,*
With true beef-courage (11).

(8) Κοβάλους.
(9) Πανούργους.
(10) Κνημῖδας.
(11) Θυμὸς ἱππόβοιος.

"So when his *Princes at Thebes*, continues that Critic, "and when his *Perſians* were acted, not a ſpectator "but bit his thumbs with impatience for the field "to give the enemy battle. So his *Patroclus*, his "*Teucer*, and his *Thimalcon* were repreſented only to "ſpur on his countrymen to virtue, and provoke them "to a generous emulation. And here Ariſtophanes "declares another rule (which Plato takes from him) "that if any things look with an ill face, the Poet "muſt hide it, nor ſuffer it by any means to be "ſhewn or repreſented in a play. Becauſe as the "ſchools are for teaching children, the ſtage ſhould be "for men of riper years and judgment. So that a "Poet muſt be ſure that his doctrine be good and "wholſome." . . . . . *The Perſian Embaſſador, who was Leiger there,* . . . . . *ſeeing the town all at his beck, and the government taking aim, turning out, diſgracing, impeaching, baniſhing, outlawing, and attainting the great men, according as he hinted, or held up his finger, the Embaſſador, not underſtanding the Athenian temper, was aſtoniſhed at the man. And for all the Democracy, no leſs bold was he with his Sovereign, legiſlative people; repreſenting* (12) *them taking bribes, and ſelling their votes, bought off; nay, the* whole houſe led away for (13) a diſh of ſprats or pennyworth of Coriander.

(12) Ariſtoph. *Equites.*
(13) Περὶ ἀφύων.

. . . . . ὥσπερ βυλὴν ὅλην
Ὀβολῷ κοριάννους ἀναλαβόντα ἐληλυθώς.

He tells 'em (as the practice amongſt them) that the

government

Madam Dacier has ſhewn, that this Author was miſtaken in the repreſentation of that fact [C]. He wrote above fifty Comedies, of which there are but eleven now extant, that are perfect, and without chaſms; and theſe are intitled *Plutus*, the *Clouds*, the *Frogs*, the *Equites*, the *Acharnenſes*, the *Waſps*, *Peace*, the *Birds*, the *Eccleſiazuſæ*, or *Female Orators*, the *Theſmophoriazuſæ*, or *Prieſteſſes of Ceres*, and *Lyſiſtrata*. The Lady abovementioned obſerves, that there are but two of them, *Plutus* and the *Clouds*, which, with regard to decency, will admit of a tranſlation into the modern languages. He was the firſt who brought the old Comedy to any degree of perfection [D]. His modeſty would not permit him for a conſiderable time to act upon the ſtage himſelf. The *Clouds*, which

government had no occaſion for men of wit or honeſty. The moſt ignorant, the moſt impudent, and the greateſt rogue ſtood faireſt always for a place, and the beſt qualified to be their chief Miniſter. He tells them, nothing ſhall fright him; Truth and honeſty are on his ſide; he has the heart of Hercules, *will ſpeak what is juſt and generous, tho' Cerberus and all the kennel of hell-hounds were loo'd upon him.* "But then, concludes "Mr. Rymer, his addreſs was admirable. He would "make the truth viſible and palpable, and every way "ſenſible to them. The art and the application; "his ſtrange fetches, his lucky ſtarts, his odd inven- "tions, the wild turns, returns, and counter-turns "were never matched, nor are never to be reached "again..... Amongſt the moderns our *Rehearſal* is "ſome reſemblance of his *Frogs*. The *Virtuoſo*'s cha- "racter, and Ben Johnſon's *Alchymiſt* give ſome ſha- "dow of his *Clouds*; but no where peradventure wan- "ders ſo much of his Spirit as in the French *Rabe- "lais*."

[C] *That this Author was miſtaken in the repreſentation of that fact.*] The queſtion is, who this King of Perſia was, who came to Greece. It could not poſſibly be the firſt Darius or Xerxes; for Ariſtophanes was not born perhaps, when Xerxes made war upon the Athenians; and Darius Nothus and Artaxerxes never came to Greece. Giraldus, as Madam Dacier obſerves, is inexcuſable for having given the air of a fable to a fact ſo very honourable to the memory of Ariſtophanes. He would not have committed ſuch a miſtake, if he would have given himſelf the pains of extracting all the particulars of this great man's life from his own works, and by that means confirmed what he had advanced. But very few writers value themſelves upon this exactneſs, which is the nobleſt qualification of an Hiſtorian. The real ſtate of that fact is as follows. The King of Perſia enquired of the Embaſſadors ſent from Greece concerning Ariſtophanes. The Reader perhaps will be pleaſed to ſee in what manner he relates this ſtory, in the chorus of the ſecond act of his Comedy intitled *Acharnenſes*.

Οὕτω δ' αὐτῷ περὶ τὴς πόλεως ἔδη πόῤῥω κλέος ἦκεν,
Ὅτε γὰ βασιλεὺς Λακεδαιμονίων πρεσβεῖαι βασανίζων,
Ἠρώτησε πρώτα μὲν αὐτὺς πότεροι ταῖς ναυσὶ κρατοῦσιν,
Εἶτα δὲ τοῦτον τ' ποιητὴν ποτέροις ἥκει κακὰ πολλά.
Τότης γὰ ἴφη τὺς ἀνθρώπυς πολὺ βελτίως γεγενῆθαι,
Καὶ τῷ πολέμῳ πολὺ νικήσειν, τοῦτον σύμβουλον ἔχοντας.

That is,

The glory of this Poet and the reputation of his courage have extended ſo far, that the great King diſcourſing one day with the Embaſſadors of the Lacedæmonians, aſked them in the firſt place what people of Greece were the ſtrongeſt at ſea, and then who they were, whom this Poet ſatyrized in his Comedies; for, ſays he, *it is his inſtructions, that make men better, and qualify them to triumph over their enemies.* Friſchlin in his life of our Poet, has not repreſented this ſtory in its full light, tho' he refers us to the paſſage juſt quoted from Ariſtophanes. He only tells us, that the King of Perſia enquired among what people he lived, *Certè adhuc vivus Ariſtophanes tam illuſtre nomen ſuis Comœdiis eſt adeptos ut fama illius etiam ad Perſas pervenerit; & Rex ipſe Perſarum, facta Poetæ hujus mentione, de eo percontatus ſit, quibuſnam cum hominibus iſte comicus viveret; ſicut ipſe teſtatur in Acharnenſibus.*

[D] *The firſt, who brought the old Comedy to any degree of perfection.*] Friſchlin informs us, that he reduced it to a better and more uſeful form; whereas it had before been rude and unconnected. Cratinus and Eupolis had taken a greater liberty in abuſing thoſe, who were obnoxious to them, than was proper. And Ariſtophanes himſelf in his firſt Comedies made uſe of great ſeverity in his expreſſions, which he afterwards moderated in his latter performances. *Primus autem hic veterem comœdiam, rudem adhuc & diſperſam collegit, eamque in meliorem atque utiliorem formam traduxit. Nam Cratinus & Eupolis multo acerbius & turpius alios infectati fuerant, quam decebat. Sed & ipſe Ariſtophanes initio eandem verborum amariciem in ſuis uſurpabat fabulis, quam tamen in poſtremis comœdiis, juſta moderatione adhibitâ, plurimum mitigavit* (14). (14) Idem, ibid.

Horace mentions this liberty of the old Comedy in his fourth Satyr of the firſt Book;

Eupolis atque Cratinus, Ariſtophaneſque Poetæ,
Atque alii, quorum Comœdia priſca virorum eſt,
Si quis erat dignus deſcribi, quod malus, aut fur,
Quod mœchus foret, aut ſicarius, aut alioqui
Famoſus, multâ cum libertate notabant.

That is,

"Cratin and Eupolis, that laſh'd the Age,
"Thoſe old Comedian Furies of the Stage,
"If they were to deſcribe a vile, unjuſt,
"And cheating knave, or ſcourge a lawleſs luſt;
"Or other crimes, regardleſs of his fame,
"They ſhew'd the man, and boldly told his name."
Creech.

The ſame Poet likewiſe tells us in his *Art of Poetry* (15), that after Tragedies were brought to perfection, the *Old Comedy* ſucceeded them with great applauſe; (15) Ver.

Succeſſit vetus his Comœdia, non ſine multâ
Laude.

That is,

"Next theſe old Comedy did pleaſe the Age."

Suſarion, or, as ſome Writers call him, Sannyrion, was the Author of the *Old Comedy*, the deſign of which was only to excite laughter, without any regard to order and decency. For the Chorus ſometimes walking, and at other times dancing about the altars ſung verſes, *ſimplex carmen*, as Donatus terms it (16). This was regulated by Cratinus, who appointed three Actors, and mixed inſtruction with entertainment. For it was lawful under the Democracy to expoſe thoſe by name upon the ſtage, who were obnoxious on account of their ill conduct, and the Actors made uſe of maſks, to reſemble the perſons, who were thus intended to be ridiculed. But as the State grew to an Oligarchy, that licence was removed, and Eupolis was thrown into the ſea, and drowned by thoſe, againſt whom he had written his Comedy called *Baptæ*. Nay there was a Law enacted (17), againſt naming (ὀνομαστὶ κωμῳδεῖν) any perſon, of whom they wrote a Comedy. Horace mentions this in the paſſage above quoted; (16) *See* Rous's *Archæolog. Attic.* lib. 2. cap. 11. (17) Hermogen. *Partit.* pag. 76.

——— *Sed in vitium libertas excidit, & vim*
Dignam lege regi. Lex eſt accepta, Choruſque
Turpiter obticuit ſublato jure nocendi.

That is,

"But ſoon their liberty was turn'd to rage;
"Such rage as civil pow'r was forc'd to tame,
"And by good laws ſecur'd men's injur'd fame.
"Thus was the Chorus loſt, their railing Muſe
"Grew ſilent, when forbidden to abuſe." Creech.

This induced Ariſtophanes to attempt the *Middle Comedy*, which he gave a ſpecimen of in his *Cocalus*, that is now loſt, in which he did not introduce real perſons, as in his *Equites*, *Clouds*, and *Frogs*, but fictitious ones. Madam Dacier in the Preface to her *Tranſlation of Plautus* obſerves, that our Poet was one of the firſt Writers of the *Old Comedy*, and that we ſee in his latter works ſome inſtances of the *Middle Comedy*.

which he wrote in order to expoſe Socrates to the ridicule of the Athenians [E], is the moſt

Comedy. She tells us likewiſe in her Preface to Ariſtophanes, that the Learned in general are of opinion, that his *Plutus* is of this latter kind; but this does not appear ſo evident to her. In the *Middle Comedy* fictitious names were made uſe of, becauſe it was unlawful to expoſe perſons by their real names. Now Ariſtophanes in his *Plutus* names all thoſe expreſly, whom he attacks. It is true, his ſubject is feigned; and this, as that ingenious Lady remarks, might perhaps overthrow the diſtinction, which is made between the middle and the new Comedy; for it is very probable, that the Poets had the liberty of inventing their ſubjects in the middle as well as in the new Comedy. However that be, it is certain, that the Satyr is a little more diſguiſed in that piece, than in others, which we have of this Poet: but tho' it is more artful and delicate, yet it is not at all the leſs ſevere and poignant. The time, when the old Comedy flouriſhed, was during the Peloponneſian War, and a little before it, when Theopompus, Pherecrates, Crates, Eupolis, Cratinus, our Poet, and others exhibited their performances (18). But when Alexander King of Macedonia grew formidable to Greece, the Poets being apprehenſive of offending him, changed the argument of their Plays, and inſtead of abuſing States and People, ridiculed the vices of private men; and this was called the *New Comedy*. Menander, Philemon, Poſidippus, Diphilus, and Apollodorus were eminent in this kind among the Greeks; and were imitated by Plautus and Terence among the Latins. The new Comedy likewiſe differed from the old with regard to the ſtyle of it, for that of the latter was more lofty and unequal; whereas that of the former more pure, equal, and elegant. The old Comedy was divided into Acts and Chorus; the parts of the new were the Argument, Prologue, and Acts; and what was performed by the Chorus in the former was done by the Prologue in the latter. The new Comedy was never extended beyond five Acts; the old had frequently more; and therefore Friſchlin tells us (19), that he found it difficult to diſtinguiſh the Comedies of Ariſtophanes into Acts, and the Acts into Scenes, after the manner of the Romans; and he mentions ſeveral other differences between the old and new Comedy.

(18) Friſchlin. *de Veteri Comœdiâ & ejus partibus.*

(19) Ibid.

[E] *The clouds, which he wrote in order to expoſe Socrates to the ridicule of the Athenians*] The Athenians were ſo prodigiouſly charmed with this Play, that they decreed, that the name of Ariſtophanes ſhould be written above thoſe of his competitors; and it is ſaid to have made ſo great an impreſſion upon their minds, that it coſt Socrates his life. But it will be neceſſary for the underſtanding of this piece to trace the Hiſtory a little higher. After that great Philoſopher had been declared the wiſeſt of mankind by the Oracle of Delphi, he being ſurprized at ſo ſolemn and unexpected a compliment to him, was a long while in doubt in what ſenſe that Oracle ſhould be underſtood. "The God cannot poſſibly be guilty "of a falſity, ſaid he to himſelf; but what then muſt be "his meaning? I am not maſter of any eminent ſhare "of wiſdom." In this perplexity he went to viſit a perſon who had the greateſt reputation at that time; and after he had diſcourſed with him for ſome time, and propoſed ſeveral queſtions in his uſual manner, he found that all his wiſdom conſiſted in the great opinion, which he had in himſelf, and which he knew how to poſſeſs others with. This diſcovery engaged him to endeavour to examine the affair with the utmoſt accuracy, and to make new trials in order to penetrate into the meaning of the Deity. He took the pains therefore to confer with all thoſe, who were thought moſt ſkilful in their particular art or profeſſion, from the Magiſtrate down to the loweſt Artificer; but he found them as ignorant as the former perſon, whom he converſed with; and by examining himſelf afterwards, he diſcovered that he was wiſer than the reſt upon no other account but becauſe while he knew nothing, he had that opinion of himſelf that he knew nothing; whereas others imagined that they knew every thing, while in reality they were abſolutely ignorant. Upon this he concluded, that he had found the true ſenſe of the Oracle; and that the wiſdom of mankind conſiſts in acknowledging their ignorance; while true and abſolute wiſdom is to be found only in the Deity. This humility of his did not abate the reſentments or jealouſy, which the Athenians bore towards him. On the contrary they gave ſuch a malicious turn to his curioſity in this point, that they repreſented, that he had made this enquiry only with a view to triumph over them more effectually, and to ſhew them the advantage, which he had over them. It was this render'd him odious to the people; and as the hatred, which men have for virtue, always urges them to exceſs, a deſign was ſoon formed to deſtroy him. Their next taſk was to find means to effect this. Socrates was always attended by the chief men of Athens, who went to hear him every day, and to learn from his converſation rules to direct their conduct. And as he ſpake very frequently of the Immortality of the Soul and of the Deity in a manner not ſuitable to the conceptions of the vulgar, this gave occaſion to the forming of two heads of accuſation againſt him. The former was, that he corrupted the youth by teaching them the principles of injuſtice for the ſake of his own profit. The ſecond was, that he indulged himſelf in curious enquiries concerning what paſſed in heaven and in the ſubterraneous regions; and that he did not acknowledge the Exiſtence of the Gods. This ſcheme being concerted, it was found ſomewhat difficult to put it in execution on account of the great intereſt and reputation of Socrates; and therefore it was thought proper to ſound the inclinations of the people. For this purpoſe Melitus, Anytus and Lycon went to Ariſtophanes; who readily promiſed to write a Comedy upon that ſubject (20). Ælian in his *Various Hiſtory* (21) tells us, that the Poet was hired for a ſum of money by Anytus and Melitus; which opinion is likewiſe adopted by Eunapius in his Life of Ædeſius (22), and by Thomas Magiſter in his Argument of this Comedy, and other Scholiaſts, who ſuppoſe, that this Comedy was acted juſt before the accuſation and condemnation of Socrates. But Palmerius in his *Exercitations* (23) is of a contrary opinion, and obſerves that this Comedy was written while Cleon was ſtill living, who was killed, according to Thucydides, in the tenth year of the Peloponneſian war, at which time Aminias was Archon, and according to Diodorus, in the ſecond year of the 89th Olympiad. But the accuſation and death of Socrates happened under Lachetes the Archon in the firſt year of the 95th Olympiad, twenty three years after the death of Cleon. So that this Comedy was compoſed four or five and twenty years before that Philoſopher was accuſed, which renders Ælian's account very abſurd. Palmerius therefore thinks, that the account of an old Scholiaſt in his *Protheoria* prefixed to this Comedy is more probable, that Ariſtophanes wrote it upon occaſion of the conteſts, which frequently aroſe between the Philoſophers and Comic Writers; Τῶν κωμικῶν πρὸς τοὺς φιλοσόφους ἐχόντων τινὰ ἀντιλογίαν; which is likewiſe confirmed by another ancient Scholiaſt upon theſe words in the firſt Scene of the firſt Act, Οἱ τὸν ἀέρα λέγοντες ἀνακίθωνα ὡς ἐφ' πτερωτὸν; where he ſays, that Crates the Comic Writer ridiculed Hippo the Philoſopher in a much more ſevere manner, and that Diphilus did the ſame to Bœda another Philoſopher; and that Eupolis expoſed Socrates himſelf with a great deal of vivacity and wit. From all which conſiderations Palmerius concludes, that the reaſon of Ariſtophanes's ſatyrizing of Socrates was not that he had received money of Anytus and Melitus for that purpoſe, or had any particular prejudice againſt him, but only on account of the party, which was formed, and the diſputes, which ſubſiſted between the Philoſophers and dramatic Poets. *Ergo Ariſtophanis in Socratem maledicentiæ cauſa non fuit corruptela & pecuniarum acceptio ab Anyto & Melito, vel denique odium; ſed ſtudium partium & diſſidia philoſophorum cum poetis dramaticis; quod notare non erit inutile.* Kuſter in his Notes upon this Comedy is of the ſame opinion with Palmerius. But Baron Spanheim in his Notes and Emendations upon the ſame Comedy obſerves, that tho' the remarks of the latter are of ſome importance, yet his zeal againſt Ælian for charging Ariſtophanes with bribery from Anytus and Melitus has occaſioned him to forget the true cauſe of that Poet's hatred againſt Socrates;

(20) Dacier, *ubi ſupra.*

(21) Lib. 2. cap. 13.

(22) Pag. 35[illegible]

(23) Pag. 72[illegible]

most admired of all his Comedies. He had a peculiar averſion to Euripides, the Tragic Writer,

Socrates, alledged by Ælian in the ſame paſſage, where he tells us, that this Philoſopher never went to the theatre, except to ſee the Tragedies of Euripides, who was his intimate friend, and whom he had a great regard for on account of his wiſdom and probity, as well as for the excellence of his Poetry. But he had a contempt for the Comic Poets, and never went to ſee their Plays, except when Alcibiades the ſon of Clinias, or Critias the ſon of Callæſchrus obliged him to go thither. He was ſhock'd at the great licentiouſneſs of the old Comedy; and as he was a man of piety, probity, candour, and wiſdom, he could not bear that the characters of his fellow-citizens ſhould be abuſed, and that a chief article of their Laws ſhould be violated with impunity, which appointed, that men ſhould be reproved for their faults in private, and all the proper endeavours be uſed to reform them, before their crimes were made publick. This gave Ariſtophanes an occaſion of reſentment againſt Socrates and Euripides, and he was very glad of this opportunity of revenging himſelf upon them; for, as Madam Dacier obſerves, the contempt, which is ſhewn to the writings of men of wit, is ſuch an affront to the Authors as they never pardon; and this is particularly the caſe of the Poets, who are naturally diſpoſed to idolize their own performances, and expect every perſon ſhould pay adoration to them as well as themſelves. Ælian aſſures us, that this contempt, which Socrates expreſſed to the Comic Poets, was the ground of their averſion to him, and the motive of Ariſtophanes's writing *the Clouds* againſt him; and not merely the ſollicitation of Anytus and Melitus. Ὁ δὲ αὐτοῖς οὐκ ἐρέσκετο, ἀλλὰ δικαίως κατεφρόνει (ἦτε ἀνὴρ σώφρων, καὶ δίκαιος, καὶ ἀγαθὸς, καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις σοφὸς) ἀνοσίων κερτόμων καὶ ὑβρισῶν καὶ ὑγιὲς λεγόντων οὐδέν. Ἅπερ ἐλύπει δικαίως αὐτούς. Καὶ ταῦτα οὐ τὰς κωμῳδίας ἦν αὐτῷ τὰ σπέρματα. ἀλλ' οὐ μόνον ἃ παρὰ Ἀνύτου καὶ Μελίτου ὡμολόγηται. Some learned men have been of opinion, that our Poet was an intimate friend of Socrates, and that he wrote this Comedy merely for diverſion without any deſign to offend him. It is probable that they aſſerted this, becauſe Socrates went to ſee this Play, and roſe up at it before all the ſpectators, that the ſtrangers might know him; and becauſe Plato has given Ariſtophanes a place in his *Sympoſium*, which they imagine he would not have done, if that Poet had compoſed this Comedy in order to ruin Socrates. But this manner of reaſoning is abſurd; for that Philoſopher went to this Play to ſhew the contempt, which he had for it; and Plato's Dialogue was written long before Socrates was accuſed (24). Mr. Rymer in his *Short View of Tragedy* (25) obſerves, that many have been offended with Ariſtophanes as acceſſary to the death of Socrates: but he tells us, that whoever conſiders the ſtate of affairs at that juncture, when *the Clouds* was acted, might ſooner believe the Poet's deſign was rather previous, to try the ſtrength of a party by the countenance of the people; and by the ſucceſs of this Play they diſcovered how far the intereſt of Alcibiades prevailed. "Alcibiades, continues he, was the dangerous man to the Government, too big for the Republick and for Ariſtophanes himſelf. Socrates came not to be judicially arraigned in twenty years after the Comedy. They firſt had made ſure of his Protector, and got him out of the way. Upon which the Common-wealth party took heart, and would make the Philoſopher anſwer for the rare accompliſhments, which Alcibiades had drawn from him, and ſo ill employed. Socrates ſhould not have mocked at the old Religion, till ſure of ſome means to introduce a better. Socrates had not the gift of miracles. Alcibiades with his companions could learn from Socrates to blaſpheme the eſtabliſhed worſhip; but were too ſenſual for a purer faith and divine ſpeculations. Thereupon followed ſo many mad pranks amongſt them. As that for example, when the Gods of the town (ſet at every man's door) were, as, they had been ſo many ſign-poſts, all in one night broken down. How would the people look after this outrage? What could they expect but hell to ſwallow them up all quick the next morning?" *Ariſtophanes*, ſays the ſame Critic, *in a ſober way, was not againſt a reformation. He attempted an alteration, and wrought it effectually. As particularly; the Athenians, wanting a true calculation of the courſe of the Moon, were often in great confuſion about their holy-days. They kept faſt often when they ſhould have feaſted; and other times had their feſtival on a work-day; and many times the feaſt and faſt came a-pick a-pack.* To rectify this in that very Play (*the Clouds*) againſt Socrates, there the Chorus returns, and addreſſes to the ſpectators in this manner:

As we were departing, the Moon (our Lady) met us,
And bid us tell ye,
Firſt that ſhe gives her love to you, and your confederates.
In the next place, that ſhe is angry with you, as ill dealt withal by you,
For her good turns to all of you, not in words, but effectually:
In particular, every month ſhe ſaves you two pence half-penny in lanthorn and candle-light:
And then going abroad a-nights you cry, Hold, boy, there needs no link, 'tis Moon-ſhine.
In other reſpects ſhe likes you well,
Saving that you are out in your accounts moſt ſhamefully,
Jumbling all things hand over head confoundedly;
Inſomuch that the Gods threaten her immoderately;
When their appetite is baulk'd, and they go home with hungry noſtrils, becauſe you want a good Almanac.
For when you ſhould be ſacrificing,
Then you are at the Seſſions, trying felons and pick-pockets.
On the other hand, when 'tis Ember-Week in heaven,
And all are faſting, with an a-lack and well a-day,
For the death of Memnon or Sarpedon,
Then ſmoak your hecatombs. . . . .

"By this every body was convinc'd, that the form by "Law publiſhed wanted amendment. The Prieſts "from all parts were gathered together. They were "aſhamed of their Calendar. Reform, reform, was "the only cry amongſt them. Not one *nolumus* in "all the convocation. And thereupon Meton the "Mathematician was ſent for, and ſet to work; "and from thence our Chronographers had a new "Epocha. . . . . This ſmall ſally or ſtart out from "the Play is of greater moment, is of more weight "and importance, than all the Tragedies on our "Stage could pretend to. And yet for modern "Comedy, doubtleſs our Engliſh are the beſt in the "world." Thus far Mr. Rymer. But let us now examine the ſcheme of this Comedy, in which our Poet has endeavoured to repreſent the moſt ſolid merit and virtue under all the colours and appearance of vice. His deſign appears to have been, according to Madam Dacier, to perſuade the Athenians, that Socrates corrupted the youth, and that he acknowledged other Gods than thoſe of the city. It was a difficult taſk to raiſe a good Comedy upon this, and Ariſtophanes was perhaps the only perſon, who could have ſucceeded in it. He feigns therefore, that Strepſiades a countryman being deeply involved in debt, went to enter himſelf into Socrates's ſchool, in order to learn how to cheat his creditors; but as he was too old himſelf, he put his ſon there in his room. The ſon profited ſo well by the lectures of this Philoſopher, that he began with beating his father, and then proved by his eloquence, that it was reaſonable to do ſo. This action introduces the unravelling of the plot, which ends with the burning of Socrates's houſe. There is nothing more ingenious than the whole texture of this ſubject; but what is moſt agreeable, is, that the Poet has ſo exactly imitated the air and manner of Socrates in ridiculing him, that the Philoſopher himſelf ſeems to ſpeak in the part he acts. Madam Dacier tells us, that ſhe was ſo highly charmed with this play, that after ſhe had tranſlated and read it over two hundred times, it did not become the leaſt tedious to her, tho' ſhe never found the ſame in any other work; and that the pleaſure, which ſhe received from it, was ſo exquiſite, that ſhe forgot all the averſion and horror, which Ariſtophanes deſerved for abuſing his wit ſo far as to repreſent truth under the blackeſt colours

(24) Dacier, *ubi ſupra*.
(25) Pag. 164, *& ſeq.* edit. London 1693.

Writer, whom he ſatyrizes in ſeveral of his Plays [*F*]. A great part of his Comedies were compoſed in the time of the Peloponneſian war. He wrote that which is intitled *Peace* in the thirteenth year of that war, when upon the death of Cleon and Braſidas, who were killed in the battle at Amphipolis, a treaty of peace for fifty years was concluded between the Athenians and Lacedæmonians, though it continued but ſeven years, as appears from the fifth book of Thucydides. The *Acharnenſes* was written after the death of Pericles and the loſs of the battle in Sicily, in order to deter the people from intruſting the ſafety of the Commonwealth to ſuch imprudent Generals as Lamachus. Soon after this he repreſented his *Aves* or *Birds*, by which he admoniſhed the Athenians to fortify Decelæa, which he calls by a fictitious name *Nephelococcygia*. The *Veſpæ* or *Waſps* was written after another loſs in Sicily, which the Athenians ſuffered from the miſconduct of Chares. The *Lyſiſtrata* was compoſed, when all Greece was involved in a war; in which Comedy the women are introduced debating upon the affairs of the Commonwealth and Peace, and at laſt agree not to ſuffer their huſbands to enjoy the liberty of their beds, till they ſhould conſent to make peace. His *Plutus* [*G*] and other Comedies of that kind were written after the Magiſtrates had given orders, that no perſon ſhould be expoſed by name upon the ſtage (*d*). Athenæus in his *Deipnoſophiſts* has given us the names of thirty ſix of his Comedies, which are now loſt. He invented a peculiar kind of verſe, which was called by his name, and is mentioned by Cicero in his *Brutus*. Suidas tells us that he likewiſe invented the *Tetrameter* and *Octameter* verſe. The merit of his works is not perhaps ſo obvious to the generality of modern readers, as it was among the Antients [*H*]. But he is univerſally admired on account of the true Attic elegance of his ſtyle. We are told

(*d*) Idem, ibid.

of impoſture, and to ruin a man, who was wiſdom itſelf, and the greateſt ornament of the city of Athens. We may obſerve here, that Ariſtophanes wrote two Comedies of the *Clouds*, as well as two intitled *Plutus*. Several learned men, and particularly Samuel Petitus, aſſert that they were the ſame plays a little changed; and that the former was called, *the firſt* and *ſecond Clouds*, and the latter the *firſt* and *ſecond Plutus*, becauſe they were acted twice. But the ingenious Lady quoted above is of opinion, that theſe Comedies were entirely different, and upon different ſubjects. She founds this opinion upon what Ariſtophanes himſelf tells us in the prologue to his *Clouds*: *I have no deſign*, ſays he, *to impoſe upon you by preſenting you twice or thrice the ſame thing a little diſguiſed. I always exhibit upon the ſtage not only new ſubjects; but even thoſe which have no reſemblance to each other, and which are always equally beautiful and entertaining:*

Οὐδ' ὑμᾶς ζητῶ ξαπατᾶν, ὃς ἓν τρὶς ταὐτ' ἰσάγων;
Ἀλλ' ἀεὶ καινὰς ἰδέας εἰς φέρων, σοφιζόμαι,
Οὐδ' ἀλλήλαισιν ὁμοίας κ' πάσας δεξιάς.

Other writers have imagined, that *Plutus* and *the Clouds* are only a collection of the fragments, which remain of the two *Plutus's* and the two *Clouds*. But this is very improbable; ſince every thing appears to be uniform and conſiſtent in them.

[*F*] *He had likewiſe a peculiar averſion to Euripides, the tragic writer, whom he ſatyrizes in ſeveral of his plays.*] He has done this particularly in his *Frogs*, his *Acharnenſes*, and *Theſmophoriazuſæ*, that he might deſtroy the eſteem, which men had of that Poet, as the beſt writer of Tragedies in that age. In his *Frogs*, he introduces Bacchus enquiring very anxiouſly upon the earth for a tragic Poet, and becauſe he could not meet with any there, deſcending into the infernal regions, in order to bring up Euripides again from the Elyſian fields. But Æſchylus and Socrates diſputing the ſuperiority with Euripides with regard to the ſublimity of their performances, there aroſe a warm conteſt, in which Æſchylus had the advantage over Euripides. By this means that Poet was brought into great contempt, and conſidered as much inferior to the reſt of the tragic Writers. Ariſtophanes likewiſe, that he might expoſe him ſtill more, wrote his *Theſmophoriazuſæ*, in which Euripides is accuſed by the women, who celebrated the ſacred rites of Ceres, for ſhewing an unreaſonable prejudice againſt the fair ſex, and treating them with great ſeverity in his Tragedies; upon which account they threaten him with the utmoſt vengeance (25).

(25) Friſchlin. *in Vitâ Ariſtophan.*

[*G*] *His Plutus.*] The deſign of Ariſtophanes in this Comedy, was to reproach the Athenians with their avarice, which had occaſioned them to commit very great errors in the moſt important affairs. He introduces Chremylus an old countryman, of great probity, but very poor, going with a ſervant of his to conſult Apollo concerning his ſon, whether he ſhould leave an honeſt courſe of life, and apply himſelf to methods of injuſtice, after the example of the reſt of the world, ſince the diſhoneſt raiſe themſelves vaſt fortunes, while the lovers of virtue are ſunk in poverty, as himſelf was. The oracle directs him to follow that perſon, whom he ſhould firſt meet with after he went out of the Temple. Happening therefore upon a blind old man who was Plutus, he followed him, agreeably to the advice of the oracle, tho' he was ignorant who Plutus was. But his ſervant being uneaſy at this, aſked his maſter at laſt why he followed that perſon; upon which Chremylus declared the oracle to him. Plutus then informs them who he was, and the reaſon of his being ſtruck blind by Jupiter. This induced them to conduct him to the Temple of Æſculapius, in order that his ſight might be reſtored. Poverty upon this interpoſes to prevent it; and expoſtulates with them for endeavouring to remove Plutus's blindneſs, and to expell her out of Greece, tho' ſhe conferred greater advantages upon them, than Plutus could poſſibly do with all his riches. However, poverty was obliged to retire, and they carried Plutus home upon the recovery of his ſight; by which means they all became rich of a ſudden, and even thoſe, who had before lived in poverty by purſuing a courſe of honeſty and virtue, were now raiſed to wealth and affluence. Petitus (26) is of opinion, that this Comedy was acted in the fourth year of the 92d Olympiad, when Diocles was Archon of Athens.

(26) *Miſcellan.* lib. 1. cap. 2.

[*H*] *The merit of his works is not perhaps ſo obvious to the generality of Readers now, as it was among the Ancients.*] Madam Dacier obſerves, that all kinds of writing paſs thro' the hands of three ſorts of Readers; thoſe of a very good taſte, thoſe of an indifferent one, and thoſe, (who are much the largeſt number,) who have no manner of taſte or judgment at all. The firſt judge as truly of every thing as if they had lived in each particular age; the moſt ſecret beauties and defects make the moſt lively impreſſion upon them, and they are ſenſible of thoſe delicate ſtrokes, which eſcape the eyes of others. The ſecond ſpecies of Readers do not form any judgment of themſelves; they are confined within certain bounds, which they cannot paſs; they have a faint perception ſometimes of a beauty or defect; but the minuteſt circumſtance imaginable, is capable of making them miſtake the one for the other. And even thoſe paſſages, which affect them in the moſt forcible manner, give them only a languid and imperfect ſenſation. The laſt kind of Readers are perpetually in the wrong; they imagine, that there is nothing beyond their own conceptions of things; they judge only from themſelves, and abſolutely condemn every thing, which does not reſemble their own ideas. The firſt of theſe will be charmed with the beauty and delicacy of Ariſtophanes's ideas, the

told that St. Chryſoſtom, the Patriarch of Conſtantinople, had ſo great a fondneſs for his writings (*e*), that he always placed them under his pillow when he went to bed. Friſchlin obſerves, that Julius Cæſar Scaliger (*f*) compares Horace to our Poet; but he is of opinion, that Plautus has a greater affinity to him in his manner of writing, and has imitated him in a great many parts of his Plays. He remarks likewiſe, that though Ælian ſtiles him (*g*) *a Trifler and Buffoon*, and one who deſired to be conſidered as ſuch; and tho' Plutarch reproaches him with a turgid and inelegant manner of writing, yet as the former of theſe writers was prejudiced in favour of Socrates, and the latter of Menander, their judgment is not to be depended upon. Friſchlin has written an expreſs vindication of our Poet in anſwer to the objections urged againſt him by Plutarch. How great an opinion Plato had of Ariſtophanes is evident even from Plutarch's acknowledgment, who tells us, that this Poet's diſcourſe upon Love was inſerted by that Philoſopher in his *Sympoſium*. Cicero likewiſe in his firſt book *De Legibus*, ſtiles him *the moſt witty Poet of the old Comedy*, and commends him highly for endeavouring to expel the new Deities out of the city, and to prevent the admiſſion of ſcandalous forms of religion. There have been ſeveral tranſlations and editions of this Poet [*I*]. Athenæus (*h*) informs us, that he wrote his Comedies when he was drunk, as Alcæus likewiſe did his Poems. But this ſeems very improbable to ſome writers (*i*). It appears from his Comedy called *Peace*, that he was bald. The

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

(*f*) *De Poet.* lib. 3. cap. 7.

(*g*) *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 2. cap. 13. Βωμολόχον ἄνδρα καὶ γελοῖον ὄντα, καὶ ἰδίᾳ σπουδάζοντα.

(*h*) *Deipnoſ.* lib. 10. cap. 9.

(*i*) Friſchlin. *ubi ſupra.*

the ſublimity and boldneſs of his inventions, the vivacity of his imagination, and the copiouſneſs of his wit, which could turn to ridicule things of the moſt real merit and importance. In ſhort, they will admire Ariſtophanes in the ſame manner as the greateſt men of the former ages have admired him, who have unanimouſly given him the ſuperiority in Comedy. Perſons of the ſecond diviſion will not be ſo much ſtruck with the beauties which they will obſerve, as with the defects, that they will imagine they diſcover in him. They will not abſolutely condemn him; but they will read him with a certain languor and indifference, which is no leſs injurious to him than even contempt itſelf. The Readers of the laſt order will be ſurprized at the regard ſhewn to plays, in which we find no intrigues, no tricks of ſervants, no old men made dupes of, or any of the other common ſubjects, which are the ſoul of our modern Comedies. They will undoubtedly applaud the excellency of their own critical taſte, and make no ſcruple of contradicting the ſenſe of all antiquity; they will imagine themſelves to be alone poſſeſſed of politeneſs and good ſenſe, and accuſe every one of want of taſte and delicacy, who is of a different opinion from themſelves. Madam Dacier profeſſes, that if ſhe had a deſign to pleaſe theſe three kinds of judges, ſhe would not attempt to preſent them with perfect pieces; for it is a conſtant maxim with her, that a moderate beauty will pleaſe much more generally than a faultleſs one; and this point might be proved by inconteſtable reaſons. The reaſon that prevents the greateſt part of men from having a true reliſh of the works of the ancients, is, that they do not remove the conſideration of their own age out of the queſtion, but judge of every thing by the genius of the times in which they live; whereas nothing is more unreaſonable than this. For there is a prodigious difference between the ſeveral ages; and if men continue always under this prejudice, that there is nothing valuable, but what has the peculiar characteriſtics of their own times, it will be found, that the beſt works will neceſſarily have a very limited duration; and the greateſt writers being thus diſcouraged by ſo mortifying an apprehenſion, will never have the reſolution to labour for immortality, which they ſee it is in vain to expect. The prepoſſeſſion which prevailed in Auguſtus's time in favour of the writings of the Antients, tho' very exceptionable, yet is more tolerable than the contrary extreme. While every thing, that had the character of antiquity, was thought good of courſe, an Author might at leaſt hope, that time would give him the privilege, which was granted to every production, that had received the ſanction of age; and to comfort himſelf for the contempt he met with during his life, he might anticipate the honour which would be paid him after death. Whereas the contrary prejudice damps the mind, and deprives it of all thoſe pleaſing hopes of future honour, which animate it to the nobleſt attempts. The ingenious Lady proceeds then to conſider what it is, which forms a true taſte, and to account for the variety of judgments amongſt mankind with regard to the productions of wit and genius; and laſtly to ſhew the reaſons, why many perſons cannot perceive that elegance and beauty in Ariſtophanes's Comedies, which were ſo much admired by the beſt judges among the Ancients.

[*I*] *There have been ſeveral tranſlations and editions of this Poet.*] Nicodemus Friſchlin, a German diſtinguiſhed in the XVIth Century by his ſkill in the Latin and Greek tongues, tranſlated *Plutus*, the *Clouds*, the *Frogs*, the *Equites*, and the *Acharnenſes*, into Latin verſe; but his tranſlation would undoubtedly have been more uſeful and exact, if it had been in proſe. He divided likewiſe theſe five Comedies into five acts each, and every one of thoſe acts into ſeveral ſcenes, after the manner of Plautus and Terence. But this diſtinction was never uſed in the old and middle Comedy, and therefore injudiciouſly applied to Ariſtophanes. However Kuſter has retained it in his edition, becauſe many learned men have quoted that part according to acts and ſcenes. Quintus Septimius Florens rendered into Latin verſe, the *Waſps*, the *Peace*, and *Lyſiſtrata*; but his tranſlation is very obſcure on account of the obſolete words and phraſes, which he has made uſe of. The *Birds*, the *Eccleſiazuſæ* and *Theſmophoriazuſæ* were publiſhed in Æmilius Portus's edition with a Latin verſion of Divus Juſtinopolitanus, which is very erroneous and abſurd; upon which account Kuſter rejected it in his Edition, and ſubſtituted in the room of it Tanaquil Faber's elegant tranſlation of the *Eccleſiazuſæ*, Tiberius Hemſterhuiſius's verſion of the *Birds*, and his own tranſlation of the *Theſmophoriazuſæ*. Mr. Stanley in his *Lives of the Philoſophers* (27), has given us an Engliſh tranſlation of *the Clouds*. And Madam Dacier publiſhed at Paris 1692, a French verſion of Plutus and the *Clouds*, with critical Notes, and an examination of both thoſe plays according to the rules of the theatre. Mr. Lewis Theobald likewiſe tranſlated thoſe two Comedies into Engliſh, and publiſhed them with remarks. Monſieur Boivin the younger, publiſhed a French verſion of *the Birds* at Paris 1729. With regard to the ſeveral editions of this Poet, the Reader will find an accurate catalogue of them in Fabricius's *Bibliotheca Græca*. But we ſhall ſpeak more particularly of the noble Edition, publiſhed by Ludolfus Kuſter at Amſterdam in Folio 1710, and dedicated to Charles Montague late Earl of Halifax. The Greek text was compared with ſeveral manuſcripts, for which the Editor was obliged to Laurence Alexander Zacagni, Library keeper of the Vatican; to Mr. Joſeph Waſſe, the Reverend Mr. Charles Daubuz, Dr. John Potter, then Profeſſor of Divinity and now Biſhop of Oxford, and Dr. Richard Bentley Maſter of Trinity College at Cambridge. He made uſe likewiſe of the old Editions of that Poet, particularly that publiſhed by Aldus at Venice in 1498 in Fol. and another at Florence by the heirs of Philip Junta in 1425 in 4to. but the *Theſmophoriazuſæ* and *Lyſiſtrata* were not printed in theſe two Editions. Kuſter has ſubjoined to the text the ancient and modern Greek *Scholia*; the former of which were collected by Marcus Muſurus, and publiſhed by Aldus upon the nine firſt Comedies; to which Kuſter has added the *Scholia* upon the *Lyſiſtrata*. The Scholia collected by Muſurus, were written partly by the ancient and celebrated Gram-

(27) Part 3. pag. 99. 2d edit. London 1687.

The time of his death is unknown; but it is certain, that he was living after the expulſion of the Tyrants by Thraſybulus, who is mentioned by him in his *Plutus* and other Comedies. He left two ſons, Philip and Arator, to whom Suidas adds a third, Philaretus, and other writers a fourth, named Nicoſtratus (*k*).

(*i*) Idem, ibid.

marians Apollonius, Didymus, Symmachus, Ariſtarchus, and others, who are mentioned in them; and the reſt by Thomas Magiſter and John Tzetzes, and other Greeks of that age; and they ſeem to have been interpolated by Muſurus himſelf in ſeveral places. To theſe Scholia, collected by Muſurus, the Editors of the Florence Edition abovementioned have a great many obſervations upon ſeveral of the firſt Comedies, from common Writers, and very often without any judgment. But Kuſter has diſtinguiſhed theſe from the genuine Scholia. We have likewiſe Greek Scholia written by Odoardus Biſetus upon all the Comedies of Ariſtophanes, and by Ægidius Bourdinus upon the *Theſmophoriazuſæ* only; and theſe Scholia are publiſhed in Kuſter's Edition, tho' they are not of any great importance. He has given us likewiſe the Latin Notes of Carolus Giraldus upon the *Plutus*; of Florens Chriſtianus upon *the Waſps*, *Peace*, and *Lyſiſtrata*; of Iſaac Caſaubon upon the *Equites*, which were never publiſhed before, and were ſent him from Paris by Nicholas Franciſcus Rémondus; of Tanaquil Faber upon *the Eccleſiazuſæ*; of Palmerius upon *Lyſiſtrata*; of Baron Spanheim upon the three firſt Comedies; and of Dr. Bentley upon *Plutus* and the *Clouds*. To theſe Kuſter has added his own Notes upon all the Comedies, except the *Waſps* and *Peace*. He obſerves, that Dr. Bentley's obſervations, tho' written *ex tempore*, ſhew his incomparable judgment and ſagacity, and will raiſe in the learned an impatient curioſity to ſee thoſe, which he promiſed upon all the works of Ariſtophanes. Kuſter has ſubjoined to his Edition four Indexes, which he compiled himſelf; the firſt containing the Greek Words and Phraſes in the text of Ariſtophanes; the ſecond of the things contained in the old Scholiaſts; the third of the words and glaſſes, which are occaſionally explained by the Scholiaſts; and the fourth of the Authors quoted in the old Scholiaſts. T.

☞ARISTOTIMUS, the ſon of Damaretus, and grandſon of Etymon, made himſelf Tyrant of Elis (*a*), by the aſſiſtance of Antigonus, the ſon of Demetrius, King of Macedonia [*A*] (*b*). But his cruelty and perfidiouſneſs ſoon made him loſe his new Sovereignty, together with his life. He had put to death a great number of the chief Citizens of Elis, and baniſhed ſtill a greater number; whereupon the Ætolians ſent an embaſſy to him, deſiring him to ſet at liberty the wives and children of thoſe who had been baniſhed. Ariſtotimus refuſed it at firſt; but afterwards, as though he had changed his mind, he promiſed to grant the Ætolians their requeſt, and appointed a day on which the relations of the exiles ſhould be at liberty to retire out of Elis. Theſe unhappy women, thinking they ſhould paſs the remaining part of their lives with their baniſhed huſbands, took with them all that they had moſt valuable, and went in a body to the gates of the city; but there, by Ariſtotimus's command, they were ſtopped, all their goods plundered, themſelves put into priſon, their young children murthered before their eyes, and the virgins raviſhed. Such a barbarous treatment exaſperated all the people againſt Ariſtotimus, and a conſpiracy was formed againſt him [*B*] with ſo happy a ſucceſs, that he was killed (*c*) before the altar of Jupiter *Salvator* (the Saviour), where he had taken ſanctuary. This happened about the latter end of the fifth month of his reign, or the beginning of the ſixth (*d*). Thus were the Citizens of Elis reſtored to their antient liberty. The public Council of the Ætolians decreed that a ſtatue ſhould be erected to the honour of Cylon, who killed the Tyrant (*e*). We may obſerve that Juſtin calls Ariſtotimus Tyrant of Epirus [*C*], inſtead of Elis.

(*a*) The capital city of a country in Peloponneſus, alſo called Elis, in which ſtood Olympia, where the famous Olympic Games were celebrated.

(*b*) Pauſan. *in Eliac. Prior.* p. m. 294.

(*c*) Juſtinus, lib. 26. cap. 1.

(*d*) Idem, ibid. *and* Pauſan. *ubi ſupra.*

(*e*) Pauſan. *in Eliac. Poſter.* p. m. 370. where the Tranſcriber by miſtake wrote Κύδωνα for Κύλωνα.

[*A*] *By the aſſiſtance of Antigonus — King of Macedonia.*] This was Antigonus ſurnamed *Gonatas*, who reigned thirty four years in Macedonia, and died in the year 243 before the Chriſtian Æra, according to Archbiſhop Uſher (1). But this does not acquaint us with the exact time, in which Ariſtotimus invaded the ſovereign power at Elis. It cannot be preciſely determined. Juſtin relates it immediately after he has given an account of the death of King Pyrrhus, which happened in the year 272 before Chriſt (2). So that all that we can affirm poſitively is, that Ariſtotimus's tyranny muſt be placed between the two years we have mentioned.

(1) Uſſer. *Annal. ad b. Ann.*

(2) Idem, ibid. *ad b. Ann.*

[*B*] *A conſpiracy was formed againſt him.*] The fact, as related by Juſtin (3), is as follows: Hellanicus, one of the chief Citizens of Elis, who was not afraid of death on his own account, he being already advanced in years, and having no family to leave in the Tyrant's power, aſſembled his moſt particular friends at his houſe, and exhorted them earneſtly to avenge their country. They ſcrupled at firſt to expoſe themſelves to danger for the publick good, and deſired time to conſider. Whereupon Hellanicus ordered his ſervants to lock the doors, and to go immediately and acquaint Ariſtotimus, that he had a fair opportunity to apprehend the conſpirators. And addreſſing himſelf to his timorous friends, *Since I could not perſuade you*, ſaid he, *to reſtore the liberty of your Country, I will be revenged of you for having deſerted its cauſe.* They, ſeeing what danger threatened their lives on every ſide, reſolved at laſt to expoſe themſelves to that, which was the moſt honourable, and immediately went to attack the Tyrant. Pauſanias tells us (4) the names of theſe conſpirators, who beſides Hellanicus, were Chilon, Lampis, and Cylon, the laſt of whom had the honour of deſtroying the Tyrant with his own hands.

(3) Lib. 26. cap. 1.

(4) *In Eliac. Prior.* p. m. 294.

[*C*] *Juſtin calls Ariſtotimus Tyrant of Epirus.*] It is not eaſy to determine, whether Juſtin or Pauſanias is miſtaken. One may ſay in favour of Juſtin's opinion, that Epirus bordering upon Macedonia, of which Antigonus was King, it was not difficult for him to aſſiſt Ariſtotimus in the invaſion of Epirus. But it muſt alſo be obſerved on the other hand, that Epirus might be conſidered as belonging to the Kingdom of Macedonia, ſince Pyrrhus was King of Epirus (5), before he invaded Macedonia: ſo that Antigonus might claim Epirus as part of his eſtate. However that be, it was, no doubt, too conſiderable a Province, to be reſigned by Antigonus to an Uſurper. What might lead Juſtin into an error is, that there was in Epirus a city called Elæus, which name does not differ much from Elis. We may obſerve, that Juſtin himſelf tells us, that Peloponneſus (6) had been ſurrendred by treachery to Antigonus, who could thus eaſily aſſiſt Ariſtotimus in his expedition againſt Elis, which is ſituated in the Peloponneſus. P.

(5) Juſtin. lib. 16. cap. 2.

(6) Except the Kingdom of Lacedæmon, and ſome other places.

ARISTOTLE, commonly called the Prince of Philoſophers, or the Philoſopher, by way of eminence, the founder of a Sect which ſurpaſſed, and at laſt ſwallowed up all the

the others (*a*). Not but that it has had its reverſes, and its misfortunes, and in this ſeventeenth Century above all has been violently ſhaken (*b*); but the Catholick Divines on one ſide, and the Proteſtant Divines on the other, have run to its help as to a fire, and have fortified themſelves ſo well with the ſecular arm againſt the new Philoſophers, that there is no probability that it will long loſe its dominion. Moreri found ſo many fine materials in a work of Father Rapin (*c*), that he gave a very long article of Ariſtotle, and very capable of excuſing me from putting my hand to this work. I have no deſign alſo to ſay as much as it will bear, and I ſhall content my ſelf with producing in the Notes only one part of the errors I have collected concerning this Philoſopher. I think I have found ſome in the narration of Father Rapin [*A*]. It is not certain that Ariſtotle followed Pharmacy in Athens, whilſt he was a diſciple of Plato (*d*); but we have no more certainty that he did not follow it. There is but little credit to be given to the tradition that

(*a*) *Ariſtoteles more Ottomanorum regnare ſe haud tuto poſſe putabat, niſi fratres ſuos omnes contruci-daſſet.* i. e. "Ariſtotle, like "the Ottomans, "thought he "could not reign "ſafely, unleſs "he killed all "his brethren. Bacon, *de Augment. Scientiar.* lib. 3. cap. 4.

(*b*) *See* Mr. de Lannoie's book, *de variâ Ariſtotelis Fortunâ.*

(*c*) The compariſon of Plato and Ariſtotle.

(*d*) See the note [*A*], num. 11.

[*A*] *I think I have found ſome errors in the account that Father Rapin gives us of Ariſtotle.*] As this remark will be pretty long, I will divide it into ſeveral heads.

I. To ſay, that altho' Ariſtotle had *deſerted his ſtudies out of pure libertiniſm, and had for ſome time abuſed the indulgence of his tutor, yet that nevertheleſs he made a proficiency in Poetry; witneſs the Poem he compoſed on the Death of the Warriors ſlain at the ſiege of Troy* (1), is by no means a juſt way of reaſoning; for ſince Euſtathius and Porphyry, who make mention of this Poem, do not expreſly ſay, that he compoſed it in his youth (2), we have reaſon to think that he wrote it after he applied himſelf again to ſtudy: and if ſo, this Poem can never be made uſe of as a proof of the progreſs he made in Poetry, notwithſtanding his licentiouſneſs.

(1) Rapin, *Compariſon of Plato and Ariſtotle*, p. 303.

(2) Father Rapin no where ſays that they made this remark.

II. To ſay, that *after having ſquandered away in his debauches part of the inheritance left him by his father, he entered himſelf a ſoldier in the troops of the Republick* (3), is an improper and a very looſe expreſſion: if it had been ſaid of a man born at Athens or Lacedæmon, one might eaſily have underſtood the meaning of it, but we are ſpeaking of a native of Macedonia. Athenæus tells us, that he knew but one Author, who ſaid that Ariſtotle, after having ſpent his patrimony, liſted himſelf a ſoldier, and afterwards took to ſelling druggs, when he found that the army did not ſuit him (4). The only Author of this Hiſtory was Epicurus, and it is probable that Ælian is indebted to him alone for this particular (5). Ariſtocles, who rejected it, only quotes Epicurus (6). However this caſe ſtands, no one of the Authors, which Father Rapin quotes, ſpecifies in what troops Ariſtotle ſerved; and they all agree in ranging the facts in this manner. Firſt of all, Ariſtotle ſpent his ſubſtance; then he went into the army; after that he kept ſhop; and laſt of all attended the Lectures of Plato. Father Rapin will have it, that he was a diſciple of Plato at the ſame time that he ſold druggs: The Authors he refers to (7) ſay nothing of his doing both theſe things at the ſame time; but I am not therefore of opinion that we ought to cenſure him for this notion, for it is very reaſonable to ſuppoſe that, *as Ariſtotle had waſted his ſubſtance, he was conſtrained to ſupport himſelf for ſome time, by carrying on a little trade of perfumes and medicines, which he retailed at Athens.* This is what Father Rapin ſays with relation to the time when Ariſtotle began the ſtudy of Philoſophy. Francis Patricius goes ſtill a great way further: he is of opinion, that Ariſtotle was a hearer of Plato, till the age of forty, and that he practiſed Pharmacy and Phyſick till that time, in order to get a livelihood. *Satis conſtat inter omnes ad quadrageſimum uſque ætatis annum Platonis fuiſſe auditorem; quo univerſo tempore Pharmacopolii arte, nec non etiam Medica, victum quæritaſſe ſatis eſt & hiſtoriæ & rationi conſonum* (8). He adds, that formerly Phyſicians were alſo Apothecaries, and that we have three reaſons to make us believe that Ariſtotle was a Phyſician. He was of a race of Phyſicians: he compoſed a book *on Health and Diſeaſes*; and he trained up Alexander to the ſtudy of Phyſick more than any other, into which that Monarch gained a great inſight, as well in the theory as in the practice of it (9): and laſt of all Patricius brings Timæus to confirm it. This Hiſtorian has ſpoke very diſreſpectfully of Ariſtotle; and openly reproached him with ſhutting up a very famous Apothecary's ſhop. Τὸ πολυτίμητον ἰατρεῖον ἀποκεκλεικότα (10). If it may be permitted me, I would offer it as my opinion, that Timæus only uſes this epithet, πολυτίμητον, out of ſneer and irony; otherwiſe I cannot ſee how we can reconcile this paſſage of Suidas with that which Euſebius gives us of the ſame Timæus. He gives us a fragment where a Peripatetick anſwers ſeveral aſperſions publickly caſt upon Ariſtotle, and particularly that of the Hiſtorian Timæus, who had given out, that Ariſtotle in his old age ſhut up his phyſick-ſhop which was a very deſpicable one. Ἦ πῶς ἄν τις ἀποδέξαιτο Τιμαίου ἢ Ταυρομενίτην λέγοντος ἐν ταῖς ἱστορίαις, ἀδόξῳ θύρᾳ ἀντὶ ἰατρείου τὰς τυχούσας, ἐψὶ τῆς ἡλικίας, κλεῖσαι (11); i. e. "Who "can have patience to hear Timæus of Tauromeni-"um, who ſays in his Hiſtory, that in his advanced "years he ſhut up the doors of an obſcure phyſick-"ſhop?" This paſſage has been very ill tranſlated; for the Latin Tranſlation makes Timæus ſay that Ariſtotle in his old age was Porter to the ſhop of a Phyſician of no note. *Quis Timæum Tauromenitanum audiat, dum ſuis in Hiſtoriis illum ait affectâ jam ætate, neglectis obſcuri cujuſdam medici officinæ claudendis foribus præfuiſſe.* Was not here a very worthy employment for Ariſtotle in his old age? What an honour was it to be Porter to an Apothecary or ſome obſcure Phyſician?

(3) Idem.

(4) Athen. lib. 8. pag. 354.

(5) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 5. c. 9.

(6) *Apud* Euſebium, *Præp.* lib. 15. cap. 2. pag. 791.

(7) Ariſtocles Meſſen. *ex Epiſtolâ* Epicuri, Ælian. lib. 5. cap. 9. Athenæus, lib. 8.

(8) Fr. Patricius, *Diſcuſſ. Peripat.* tom. 1. pag. 3.

(9) Plutarc. *in Alexandro.*

(10) Timæus, *apud* Suidam *in* Ἀριστοτέλης.

(11) Ariſtocles *apud* Euſebium, *Præparat. Evangel.* lib. 15. cap. 2. pag. 791.

III. *Clemens Alexandrinus aſſures us*, (theſe are the words of Father Rapin (12),) *that Ariſtotle had ſome conferences at Athens with a Jew, in order to inform himſelf of the Religion of the Ægyptians. Euſebius ſays the ſame, and both build their belief of it upon the credit of Clearchus a Peripatetick.* Theſe words will bear a great deal of abatement; for, I. all that Clemens Alexandrinus aſſerts may be reduced to this, that "Clearchus the Peripatetick ſaid, that he knew "a Jew who had had ſome converſation with Ari-"ſtotle." Κλέαρχος ὁ Περιπατητικὸς ἱστόρηκε φησὶ τινὰ Ἰουδαῖον, ὃς Ἀριστοτέλει συνεγένετο (13). As to the place and ſubject of theſe conferences, any one elſe is more likely to inform you than Clemens Alexandrinus. II. It is entirely falſe that Euſebius affirms any thing upon this point: he only gives us the words of Clemens Alexandrinus. III. Clearchus, to whom we muſt aſcend as to the firſt ſource, does not ſay that Ariſtotle uſed to converſe with a Jew at Athens, but on the contrary that it was in Aſia (14), nor does he ſay whether their diſcourſe turned upon the Religion of the Egyptians, or any other particular ſubject; but expreſſes himſelf in very general terms. I am inclined to think that if we had his book, we ſhould therein find a particular account; but we have only one paſſage of it, which was quoted by Joſephus in the firſt book againſt Apion, to prove that the Jewiſh Nation was not unknown to the Greeks. Had Father Rapin conſulted the originals, would he have ſaid, *that it was probable that Ariſtotle, inſtead of making a voyage into Egypt (which at that time of day was thought neceſſary in order to be a compleat ſcholar) was content to inſtruct himſelf particularly in the myſteries and religion of the Egyptians, that he might ſave that time which is ſo liable to be loſt in making voyages?* Is it not paſt all doubt that he was upon his travels in Aſia, when he had theſe conferences, if we are to believe what Clearchus ſays of the matter? We ſhall ſee in the note [*B*], whether any credit is to be given to his authority.

(12) *Compariſon of Plato and Ariſtotle*, pag. 304.

(13) Clem. Alexand. *Stromat.* lib. 1. pag. 304.

(14) Τότε διατριβόντων ἡμῶν περὶ τὴν Ἀσίαν. i. e. "At the "time we ſojourned in "Aſia." It is Ariſtotle who ſpeaks in this book of *Clearchus de Somno*, *apud* Joſeph. lib. 1. *contra Apion.* & *apud* Euſeb. *Præparat. Evangel.* lib. 9. cap. 5. pag. 410.

IV. It is not true that Hermias gave his ſiſter Pythias in marriage to Ariſtotle (15). See the note [*F*], towards the end.

(15) Rapin, *Compariſon of Plato and Ariſtotle*, pag. 306.

V. The other faults of Father Rapin, which I have taken notice of, are interſperſed in the following notes.

that he learned many things of a Jew, and ſtill leſs to the ſtory of his pretended Judaiſm [B]. Thoſe who pretend that he was a Jew himſelf, are much more groſly miſtaken [C]. The wrong pointing of a paſſage has been the cauſe of their miſtake (e). They [C].

(e) See the note

[B] *There is but little credit to be given to the tradition that he learned many things from a Jew, and ſtill leſs to the ſtory of his pretended Judaiſm.*] This tradition has no other foundation than that paſſage of Clearchus, which I have been mentioning; and indeed this would have been ſufficient authority, had it been taken from that Clearchus, who was one of the moſt celebrated Diſciples of Ariſtotle; but in all likelihood this is another Clearchus; for, I, the Author quoted by Joſephus ſays, that Ariſtotle, during his travels in Aſia, met with a Jew, who had afterwards frequent converſation with him and ſome other men of letters; ἡμῶν τε καί τισιν ἑτέροις τῶν σχολαστικῶν. Now ſome learned men pretend, that in Ariſtotle's time the word σχολαστικὸς was never made uſe of to ſignify a ſcholar, a diſciple, or ſtudent (16). However this be, ſince this voyage into Aſia is not reconcileable with the Hiſtory of Ariſtotle, it is not probable that one of his own diſciples could have any thoughts of feigning in a Dialogue ſuch a tranſaction as this, which both himſelf and others knew to be falſe. It muſt of conſequence have been ſome more modern Clearchus, who has ſuppoſed that he made this journey; and indeed he might very innocently be led into this miſtake, ſince it is well known that Solinus aſſures us, that Ariſtotle accompanied Alexander in his expedition againſt Darius (17). The anonymous Author of the Life of Ariſtotle (18) mentions the ſame fact. II. If it is true, that Ariſtotle had ſeveral conferences with ſo learned a Jew as that mentioned in the paſſage of Clearchus, could he have believed what he ſays of the origin of the Jews? or would he have ſaid that the Jews are deſcended from the Calani, a people of India, and that they took upon them the name of Jews in Syria from a province they were poſſeſſed of named Judea? This is what Ariſtotle pretends in the paſſage of Clearchus quoted by Joſephus. Now is it to be imagined, that his Jew would have left him under ſo childiſh an error? and might we not have expected to find more traces of Judea, and of the Jewiſh Nation in all the writings of Ariſtotle, after ſo many diſcoveries as the Jew would have communicated to him? III. We read in Diogenes Laertius, that the Gymnoſophiſts were deſcended from the Magi, and that there were ſome who derived the Jews from the ſame ſtock (19). We ſee here two ſuppoſitions: as to the former, they ſupport it by the authority of Clearchus, the diſciple of Ariſtotle; but as to the ſecond, they bring no proof for it from any Author: but is it not plain that here was the moſt favourable opportunity in the world, nay the moſt manifeſt neceſſity for citing Clearchus, concerning this pretended Indian origin of the Jewiſh Nation ſpoken of in Joſephus? If the Book *de Somno*, wherein Ariſtotle ſpeaks of this Indian deſcent, had been wrote by the ſame Clearchus referred to by Diogenes Laertius (20), can it be ſuppoſed they would have failed quoting him? I paſs over the other reaſons given by Jonſius (21); theſe three are ſufficient to convince me that Ariſtotle never ſaid thoſe words which the Clearchus of Joſephus puts in his mouth; and I am partly of their opinion, who blame Cunæus for reproaching Ariſtotle with an abſurdity he never was guilty of. *Petrus Canæus lib. 1. de Repub. Hebr. c. 4. Ariſtotelem falſe nimis & temere perſtringit, quod hic apud Clearchum ſtatuat Judæus ab Indiæ ſapientibus eſſe propagatos; verba Cunæi hæc ſunt:* " *Portentoſum eſt* " *& cum ſumma inſcitia conjunctum quod Ariſtoteles* " *apud Clearchum autumavit, Judæos eſſe ab Indiæ* " *ſapientibus propagatos ſed nomen mutaviſſe. Quippe* " *philoſophos illos, qui apud Indos Callani appellantur,* " *in cava Syria Judæos dici. . Pudet me anilitatis,* " *adeo hoc nihil eſt* (22)." i. e. " Petrus Cunæus lib. 1. " de Repub. Hebr. c. 4. laſhes Ariſtotle ſomewhat too " ſmartly and haſtily, becauſe that in Clearchus he is " ſaid to have maintained that the Jews were originally " deſcended from the wiſe men of India: the words " of Cunæus are as follow: " It is a ſurprizing in- " ſtance of the moſt unpardonable ignorance, that A- " riſtotle, in Clearchus, ſhould fancy that the Jews " were deſcendants of the Indian Magi, but that they " only changed their name: for example, that thoſe " Philoſophers, who among the Indians were called " Calani, in Cava Syria ſhould be called Jews. I " am aſhamed of ſo idle a notion, which is mere " nonſenſe." It may be objected to me, that Clearchus knew the Jew who diſcourſed with Ariſtotle, and that therefore he muſt have lived at the ſame time; but I deny that he knew him, and Joſephus does not ſay it. It was Clemens Alexandrinus who added this clauſe, probably truſting to his memory for it, which is almoſt an infallible way to pervert the ſenſe of a paſſage with regard even to the eſſential circumſtances of it. See an inſtance of the inadvertency of Tranſlators. That of Euſebius (23) tranſlates εἰδέναι by *vidiſſe*, i. e. " to have ſeen;" that of Clemens Alexandrinus is content to render it by *noſſe*, i. e. " to have known." Now it is no neceſſary conſequence, that a man muſt have lived at the ſame time with another, becauſe he ſhould ſay he knew a man who ſaid or did this or that; for he might mean no more, than that he knew the books wherein this man has ſaid ſuch or ſuch words; but when it is ſaid that an Author ſaw this or that man, the conſequence is certain, that they muſt have been contemporaries (24). This thing will admit of no difficulty, and conſequently, the Tranſlator of Euſebius has taken a liberty which together with that of Clemens Alexandrinus ſtrangely falſifies the inferences that might be drawn from this paſſage of Clearchus, as it ſtands quoted by Joſephus. There are ſome Jews who would perſuade us, not only that Ariſtotle had copied the works of Solomon; but alſo that he became a proſelyte of righteouſneſs (25).

Not content with this, they have produced a letter, which they ſuppoſe him to have written to Alexander to acquaint him with the news of his converſion. You will find this letter in a work of Rabbi Gedalia Ben Jachija, and in the *Moderna Theologia Judaica* of Mr. Lent, Profeſſor in Theology at Herborn (26). Read likewiſe this paſſage of Mr. Couſin. Father Bartolocci, in page 471 of Tome I. of his *Bibliotheca magna Rabbinica* " relates a moſt improbable ſtory, which the " Rabbies tell of Ariſtotle. Some of them pretend, " that he was born of the ſeed of Iſrael, and deſ- " cended of the children of Coha, of the tribe of " Benjamin. Others of them ſay, that he was not " originally a Jew, but that he embraced their religion " in the latter part of his life. They add, that he " took all his Philoſophy from the Books of Solomon, " found in the city of Jeruſalem at the time of its " being taken by Alexander, and that he afterwards " burnt them, to have the credit and reputation of " the wiſdom contained in them. They add further, " that in order to juſtify his changing his religion, " he wrote a letter to Alexander, which is tranſcribed " at full length in this place of the *magna Bibliotheca*, " in which the Rabbies make him to ſay, that Lo- " gick is a cheat, and that Philoſophy is lying and " deceitful, and that evil falls upon the head of " thoſe who learn it, becauſe they go to hell by " the way of diſputation (27)." Selden quotes ſome Jewiſh Authors who affirm, 1, that Ariſtotle a little before he died, communicated to his diſciples the doctrine that he had learned from the Hebrews concerning the immortality of the ſoul, and that of future puniſhments and rewards: 2, that with regard to all thoſe points wherein his doctrine contradicted the law of the Jews, he was converted and made a quite new man by the High Prieſt Simeon the Juſt (28).

[C] *Thoſe who pretend that he was a Jew . . . are guilty of a . . . . groſs miſtake.*] See what gave riſe to this error. The ancient verſion of Joſephus, by George of Trebizond, has it thus, *Atque ille, inquit, Ariſtoteles Judæus erat:* i. e. " And he ſays, Ariſtotle " was a Jew." Whereas it ſhould have been pointed in this manner, *Atque ille, inquit Ariſtoteles, Judæus erat.* i. e. " And he, ſays Ariſtotle, was a Jew." Upon that Marſilius Ficinus takes upon him to ſay, that Ariſtotle, according to the report of Clearchus, was a Jew. *Clearchus Peripateticus ſcripſit Ariſtotelem fuiſſe Judæum* (29). Genebrard has alſo given into the ſame

(16) Jonſius, *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſ.* pag. 99.

(17) Solinus, cap. 14. *apud* Jonſium *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſ.* pag. 100.

(18) *Ammonius*, according to ſome, *Philoponus* according to others. See the notes of Nunneſius upon this life, num. 44.

(19) Diog. Laert. *in proœmio*, num. 9.

(20) That is to ſay by him that was a diſciple of Ariſtotle.

(21) Note that Schoockius, *Fabulæ Hamelenſis* Part 2. chap. 12, copies almoſt word for word the very beſt obſervations of Jonſius, without naming his name.

(22) Jonſius, *de Scriptor. Hiſt. Philoſ.* pag. 98.

(23) *De Præparat.* lib. 15. pag. 410.

(24) It being underſtood that the credit of the author is inconteſtable.

(25) *Apud* Buxtorfium, *citante* Konigio, *Bibliath.* pag. 61.

(26) This book was printed at Herborn in 1694

(27) *Journal des Savans* of July 14, 1692, pag. 463. Holland edit.

(28) *See* Seldenus *de Jure Natur. & Gentium*, lib. 1. cap. 1. pag. 14, 15. edit. Lipſ. 1695.

(29) Marſil. Ficin. *de Chriſt. Religion.* cap. 26.

They are deceived who have ſaid that he was the diſciple of Socrates three years ſucceſſively [D]; for when he was born, Socrates had been dead twelve or fifteen years. They ſpeak variouſly of Ariſtotle's conduct towards his maſter Plato [E]. Some will have it that through vanity and a prodigious ingratitude, he ſet up altar againſt altar, by erecting a ſchool at Athens, during Plato's life, on purpoſe to make him uneaſy; others ſay, that he did not ſet up for a Profeſſor till after the death of his maſter. Very diſadvantageous things are ſaid concerning his amours [F]. It is pretended that he had idolatry in his conjugal paſſion, and that if he had not retired from Athens, the proceſs of irreligion, which

ſame blunder. *Eâ de causâ fortaſſe Clearchus Peripateticus ſcripſit Ariſtotelem fuiſſe Judæum* (30) I am indebted to Jonſius for this remark (31), it not being my deſign to imitate Schoockius, who dreſſes himſelf in borrowed feathers, without ſaying who he is obliged to for them (32). But if in this place we are to underſtand a *Jew by religion*, and not a *Jew by nation*, we muſt go higher up to trace the fountain of this falſhood.

(30) Genebrardi *Chronologia, ad ann.* 2670.
(31) Jonſius, *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſ.* pag. 100.
(32) Schoockii, *Tabula Hamelenſis.* See above, citation (21).

[D] *They are deceived, who have ſaid, that he was the diſciple of Socrates three years ſucceſſively.*] The life of Ariſtotle, aſcribed to Ammonius, or John Philoponus, contains this error. The learned Nunneſius, who made remarks upon this life, ſays, that he has found none amongſt the ancients, except Olympiodorus, who has affirmed that Ariſtotle was a diſciple of Socrates †. He adds, that Cardinal Beſſarion * has committed the ſame miſtake; and that Leonard Aretin, in Book VI of his letters, and Octavian Ferrarius, in his work *de Sermonibus exotericis*, have pointed out this anachroniſm.

† Praxi xlii *in Gorgiam Platonis.*
* Lib. 1. *adverſ. Calumniator. Platonis.*

[E] *They ſpeak variouſly of Ariſtotle's conduct towards his maſter Plato.*] Diogenes Laertius ſays, that Plato, when he ſaw that Ariſtotle had ſeparated from him, uſed to ſay, *He has kicked at us, as colts do againſt their dam* (33). Ælian explains at large this expreſſion of Plato. *The colt*, ſays he (34), *kicks at its dam, after it has filled itſelf with her milk. In like manner Ariſtotle, after he had imbibed from Plato the milk and nouriſhment of Philoſophy, finding himſelf well fed and luſty with the excellent food that his maſter had ſupplied him with, ſpurn'd at him with his heels, and opened a ſchool in oppoſition to that of Plato.* Conſult Helladius, who varies the images a little, and turns the compariſon to that of a horſe which takes delight in biting its father. Ἀριστοτέλης ὁ τῆς περιπατητικῆς προεστὼς ὑπὸ Πλάτωνος ἵππος ἐπωνομάζετο, ἐναντιοῦσθαι δοκῶν τῷ διδασκάλῳ· ἡδὺ γὰρ ὁ ἵππος τὸν ἑαυτοῦ φιλεῖ πατέρα δάκνειν (35). i. e. "Ariſtotle, the Prince of the Peripatetick ſchool, was "called a horſe by Plato, becauſe he ſet up in oppoſition "to his maſter, for the horſe takes a pleaſure in biting "his own father." See ſomething ſtill worſe of him. Ælian relates in another place (36), that Ariſtotle diſpleaſed Plato by going too gayly apparell'd, by his air of raillery, and by his over-talkativeneſs; ſo that Plato fixed his affections on ſome others of his ſcholars. Ariſtotle now having ſet up againſt his maſter, embraced the opportunity which the abſence of Xenocrates, and the ill ſtate of health of Speuſippus afforded him. Theſe were, if I may be allowed the expreſſion, the ſword and ſhield of Plato, and therefore it was an eaſy matter at that time to inſult him. Ariſtotle took hold of this ſeaſon to go with a great tribe of ſcholars into the ſchool of Plato: this good old man was then eighty years old, and had almoſt loſt his memory: Ariſtotle taking advantage of the infirmity of his maſter, put a hundred enſnaring queſtions to him, purſued him through all the turnings and windings of his Logick, and proudly triumphed in his victory. After this affront, the good old man did not teach in publick, but confined himſelf at home with his ſcholars, and Ariſtotle poſſeſſed himſelf of his place; but Xenocrates upon his return to Athens, hearing how matters had been carried on, gave a very ſmart rebuke to Speuſippus, for letting Ariſtotle take poſſeſſion of the ſchool, and made ſo vigorous an oppoſition againſt the uſurper, that he made him quit his place, and reinſtated the former maſter. If Ariſtotle did really uſe him in this manner he ought to be deteſted, but I cannot give credit to this relation. His followers have maintained that he was not wanting either in reſpect or gratitude in his behaviour towards his maſter, and indeed his being the author of another Philoſophy was no proof of it: the other Platonicks would be in the wrong to expect that he ſhould exactly follow the ſteps of Plato in every thing; for did not Plato himſelf improve upon the lights, which Socrates had given him? Whether this be ſo or not, it is aſſerted in the life of Ariſtotle, that he did not ſet up any ſchool in the Lyceum, during the life of his maſter, and they prove it from this reaſon, that Chabrias and Timotheus, who were relations of Plato, and at that time men of great power in Athens, would never have ſuffered it. They add, that Ariſtotle dedicated an altar to Plato with an honourable inſcription; and that he did not teach in Athens till after the death of Speuſippus, who ſucceeded Plato. Laſt of all, they remark that he did not undertake this employment of himſelf, but by the ſollicitations of the Athenians, who deputed meſſengers to him upon that account. The old Latin verſion of this life of Ariſtotle is in ſome places more full than the original. For example, in that place where the Author denies that Ariſtotle ſet up a ſchool in the life-time of Plato, the tranſlation remarks that this was a piece of calumny of Ariſtoxenus and Ariſtocles; whereas the Greek has not a word about it. See what Euſebius quotes from Book VII of this Ariſtocles, where you will find a paſſage of Ariſtoxenus, which ſeems to compriſe under general and pretty obſcure terms this accuſation againſt Ariſtotle; and then you will ſee that Ariſtocles, after having refuted ſeveral other accuſations, deſerts his cauſe with regard to the ingratitude of this diſciple (37). Therefore F. Rapin was miſtaken in his aſſertion (38) when he ſaid that Euſebius *entirely clears him of this aſperſion* (39). I cannot imagine the reaſon why this Jeſuit joins with Euſebius as two different Apologiſts, Ammonius and Philoponus; for the life of Ariſtotle which he cites has but one Author; who according to ſome is Ammonius, according to others Philoponus.

(33) Diog. Laert. lib. 5. num. 2. *in vitâ Ariſtotelis.*
(34) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 4. cap. 9.
(35) Helladius, *apud* Photium, *Biblioth.* pag. 1589.
(36) Ælian. *Var. Hiſt.* lib. 3. cap. 19.
(37) Euſebii, *Præparat. Evangel.* lib. 15. c. 2.
(38) Rapin, in his *Compariſon of Plato and Ariſtotle*, pag. 305.
(39) It would not have been Euſebius who cleared him but Ariſtocles; but neither the one nor the other does it.

[F] *There were ſome very diſadvantageous reports ſpread of him concerning his amours.*] We are preſented here with a complication of obſcenities. The calumniators of Ariſtotle gave out that he uſed to retire to the houſe of Hermias, who was commander of Atarne, a little city of Myſia, near the Helleſpont, and that Hermias indulged him in criminal gratifications: Ὃν οἱ μὲν φασὶ παιδικὰ γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ (40). i. e. "Whom "ſome uſed to call his darling." That he gave him his daughter or niece to wife; and that ſeeing him ſmitten with his concubine, he gave her up to him (41); that Ariſtotle was ſo doatingly fond of this woman, that after having married her, he offered up to her the ſame ſacrifice that the Athenians did to Ceres; and that he moreover made an acknowledgment of his obligations to Hermias in an Hymn which he compoſed in honour of him. I need not acquaint my readers, ſince they will plainly diſcover without it, that all theſe ſlanders came not from the ſame pen, but were deviſed by different Authors. One of the apologiſts of Ariſtotle has obſerved, that they did not agree in levelling againſt him the ſame accuſations; but that every one of his accuſers laid diſtinct crimes to his charge (42). It may be anſwered indeed, that this is a mark there was no confederacy and colluſion in the caſe; but give me leave alſo to reply, that it is a mark that they had no good proof for any thing they ſaid; for when a formal accuſation has been once proved, all thoſe who write againſt the accuſed are perpetually reproaching him with it. The ſame Apologiſt obſerves, that if of ſo great a number of crimes, which all the particular accuſations laid together would have amounted to, any one had been true, he would have ſuffered for it a thouſand times over, if poſſible, by the judges of thoſe times. Amongſt other things laid to his charge, his enemies gave out that he was a traitor to his country, and that letters of his had been intercepted which were written againſt the intereſts of the Athenians (43). But to return to the wife of Ariſtotle; ſome ſay that

(40) Diog. Laert. *in Vitâ Ariſtot.* num. 3.
(41) Ariſtippus *in primo* de antiquis Deliciis *Libro, apud* Laertium *in Vitâ Ariſtot.* num. 3.
(42) Ariſtocles, *apud* Euſebium, *Præparat.* lib. 15. cap. 2.
(43) Ariſtocles, ibid.

which the Prieſts had made againſt him [G], might have had the ſame conſequences with that againſt Socrates. Though one may very juſtly give him great praiſes, yet it is certain that moſt part of the lies or errors concerning him ought to be ſought for in the encomiums that have been heaped on him: as for example, is it not a falſity only to ſay, *that if in his Phyſicks Ariſtotle has ſpoken like a man, in his Ethicks he has ſpoken like a God* (f); *and that there is room to doubt whether in his Ethicks he was more of the Lawyer than of the Prieſt, more of the Prieſt than of the Prophet, more of the Prophet than of God* (g)? I ſhall mention in the notes ſome ſtronger praiſes than thoſe [H]. Cardinal Pallavicini

(f) Father Pardies in the *Lettre d'un Philoſophe à un Carteſian*, ſays it is the ſentiment of a fine genius, and quotes in the margin Cornel. à Lapide, *Præfat. in Eccleſ.*

(g) It is the ſentiment of another fine genius according to Father Pardies, ibid.

it was not till after her death that her husband offered to her the ſacrifices, which the Athenians uſed to offer to Ceres. Φασὶ (Lycon Pythagoræus) θύειν Ἀριστοτέλη θυσίαν τετελεσμένην τῇ γυναικὶ τοιαύτῃ, ἱερεῖον Ἀθηναῖς τῇ Δήμητρι (44). Ariſtocles makes the following reply to theſe accuſations, I, that the Books of Apellicon concerning the commerce of Hermias and Ariſtotle were an ample defence of theſe two friends: II, that Ariſtotle had ſufficiently juſtified his marriage with Pythias in his letters to Antipater. This Pythias was ſiſter to Hermias and his daughter by adoption. Ariſtotle made it appear, that he did not marry her till after the death of Hermias; that ſhe was a woman of a good life, but reduced to ſuch diſtreſt circumſtances after the death of her brother, that he thought himſelf under an obligation to marry her out of the regard he bore to Hermias.

(44) Idem, ibid.

[G] *The Athenian Prieſts carried on a proceſs of irreligion againſt him.*] The particular circumſtances of this affair are unknown. Diogenes Laertius is content with barely telling us (45), that the Prieſt Eurymedon charged Ariſtotle with impiety on account of the Hymn compoſed in honour of Hermias, as alſo of an inſcription engraved on the ſtatue of the ſame Hermias in the temple of Delphi. Phavorinus makes Demophilus the Author of this accuſation (46). It is impoſſible to be imagined by what artifice they could find any ſhadow of proof in the inſcription of Hermias, ſince it only conſiſted of four verſes, and thoſe not bearing the leaſt alluſion to things of a ſacred nature, but only to the perfidiouſneſs of the King of Perſia towards this unhappy friend of Ariſtotle. Athenæus tells us, that the other foundation of the accuſation, namely, the Hymn compoſed in honour of Hermias, was unjuſt, ſince it was not a religious Poem, nor any ſacred performance, as Demophilus pretended (47). Athenæus ſays further, that Eurymedon had ſuborned this Demophilus to give more weight to the accuſation (48). Demophilus in all probability was ſome man of quality and great authority in Athens, and perhaps did not ſee into the depth of Prieſt-craft, nor underſtand that the Prieſt Eurymedon only meant to make uſe of him as an inſtrument to render poor Ariſtotle more ſuſpected. The argument they went upon was this: *If*, ſay they, *the Prieſts ſhould be the only perſons, who arraigned Ariſtotle, his caſe might appear leſs criminal, for their great piety is alarmed at the ſlighteſt matters, which ſeem to have any tendency to the diſhonouring of Religion: but behold! here is one Demophilus, who is ſo ſcandalized at the blaſphemies of Ariſtotle, that he demands publick juſtice on him: conſequently the crime muſt be very flagrant.* The Hymn in queſtion is ſtill in being, and may be found in Athenæus and Diogenes Laertius; nor is there to be diſcovered in it the leaſt ſtroke of impiety. But his accuſers urged that Ariſtotle did manifeſtly profane divine Songs, by proſtituting them to the honour of a mortal man; and they further alledged, that he uſed to ſing this Hymn every day at dinner (49). Ariſtotle not thinking it ſafe to truſt to the interpretation that his little Poem might meet with, made his retreat very privately to Chalcis, in the Iſland Eubœa, and pleaded his cauſe at a diſtance by writing. Athenæus mentions ſome ſentences of this defence, but does not vouch for its being the genuine one of Ariſtotle (50). Phavorinus, in Diogenes Laertius, aſſures us, that Ariſtotle wrote an Harangue in the judicial kind, and that he was not only the firſt, who made any harangues of that kind in his own cauſe, but alſo that this was the firſt time he ever made any for himſelf (51). Nunneſius tells us, that Seneca *de Vitâ beatâ* obſerves, that this was the only one Ariſtotle ever made in his life (52). However that be, it is certain that the ſafeſt way he could take was to plead at a diſtance; for his accuſers were a ſett of people, who would never have let him been at reſt, and who would have employed ſo many engines againſt him, till at laſt they would have found one which would do his buſineſs effectually. It was ſcarce poſſible, ſo great a Wit as he was, for him to forbear, upon ſome occaſions, turning into jeſt the ridiculous manner of publick worſhip among the Athenians, and ſpeaking his mind a little too freely on the impoſtures of the Prieſts. They would, no doubt, have ſearched into all his private converſations, have ſuborned witneſſes; and, in a word, have cruſhed him ſo that he never would have been able to riſe again. How do we know but that he might have been taxed with uttering horrid blaſphemies when he intended to ſpeak only of the immutable Power of the all-perfect Being? Origen ſays that the indictment lodged againſt Ariſtotle for profaneneſs, was founded upon ſome particular doctrines of his (53): he ſays in another place, that one doctrine of the Peripateticks was, that prayers and ſacrifices were of no ſignification (54). Probably that notion was founded upon this falſe principle, that infinite Wiſdom knows at all times what is beſt for it to do, and that it never changes its rule of acting at the deſires or intereſts of mankind, as if it ſtood in need of being directed or prevailed upon by our prayers and interceſſions not to do what we think it has already determined to do. Such a principle as this, when not qualified by the doctrines of Religion, is impiety with a witneſs, and had the Athenian Prieſts once faſtened on this handle, Ariſtotle would never have eſcaped them. The anſwer which he made to thoſe who aſked him the reaſon of his retiring, ſhews that he was apprehenſive of their reſolution, right or wrong, to find out proofs againſt him. Πρὸς τὸν ἐρόμενον διὰ τί ἀπέλιπε τὰς Ἀθήνας, ἀπεκρίνατο ὅτι ἐβούλετο Ἀθηναίους δὶς ἁμαρτεῖν εἰς Φιλοσοφίαν· τὸ περὶ Σωκράτην πάθος αἰνιττόμενος, καὶ τὸν κατ' αὐτὸν κίνδυνον (55). i. e. "When one aſked him why he fled "from Athens, he made this anſwer; becauſe he "would not give occaſion to the Athenians to offend "a ſecond time againſt Philoſophy, alluding to the "ſuffering of Socrates, and his own danger." He uſed to quote a verſe of Homer, to ſignify that he could have no thoughts of living in a city, where the tribe of informers was ſo far from decreaſing, that ſome were no ſooner gone but others immediately ſtarted up in their room. One would be apt to imagine, that he knew himſelf to be guilty of having by ſome ſtroke of raillery perſonally affronted Eurymedon the Prieſt of Ceres (56), and that this was what rouzed the zeal of the man, who had for twenty years before paſſed over unmoleſted this pretended impious Hymn; for it was more dangerous to offend this ſort of Gentlemen in their own perſons, than in the perſons of their Gods. See the remark [R], where we will ſhew what were the ſentiments of ſome Authors about the cauſe of Ariſtotle's flight. I have mentioned towards the end of the article, how that Heſychius aſſures us, that he was actually condemned and executed at Athens; nor have I uſed any hyperbole in ſaying *twenty years*, ſince Ariſtotle had taught at Athens thirty years when the proceſs againſt him for irreligion obliged him to fly to Chalcis (57): nor did he return to Athens till after he had been Tutor to Alexander, which charge he did not undertake till after Hermias was dead.

(45) *In Vita Ariſtotelis*, lib. 5. num. 5.

(46) Phavorin. *in omnimodâ Hiſtoriâ, apud* Laertium, *in vitâ Ariſtotelis*, num. 5.

(47) Athen. lib. 15. cap. 16. pag. 696.

(48) See the notes of Caſaubon upon Athenæus, pag. 984.

Why Ariſtotle had reaſon to fear the Prieſts his accuſers.

(49) Athen. pag. 626. B.

(50) Idem, pag. 697, A.

(51) Diog. Laert. *in vitâ Ariſtot.* num. 9.

(52) Nunneſii *Notæ in Vitam Ariſtot.* pag. 147.

(53) Origen. *contra Celſum*, lib. 1.

(54) Idem, ibid. lib. 2.

(55) Ælian. lib. 3. cap. 36. *Videtiam* Ammonium, *in Vitâ Ariſtot.* Origen. *contra Celſum*, lib. 1. Diog. Laert. *in Ariſtot.* num. 9.

(56) Diog. Laert. *in Vitâ Ariſtot.* num. 8.

(57) Ammonius *in ejus Vitâ.*

[H] *They have given him ſome ſtronger praiſes, &c.*] "Averroes has ſaid, that before the birth of Ari- "ſtotle, nature was yet imperfect; that in him ſhe "received the finiſhing ſtroke, and attained to that "pitch of perfection, which ſhe could never go be- "yond; that this was the utmoſt extent of her pow- "er, and the furtheſt limits of human underſtanding." Another

Pallavicini makes no difficulty of owning in a manner, that without Ariſtotle, the church would have been deficient in ſome articles of faith [I]. The Chriſtians are not alone in authorizing his Philoſophy; the Mahometans are no leſs fond of him (b); and they ſay, that

(b) See Father Rapin, Compar. de Platon & de Ariſtote, p. 403.

Another Philoſopher has out-done Averroes, and ſaid, "that Ariſtotle was a ſecond nature." Theſe are the words of Balzac, in page 459 of the Diſcourſes printed at the end of his *Chriſtian Socrates*. This puts me in mind of the ſcruples of a certain Author, who ſeeing that nature herſelf ſet her ſignet to what Ariſtotle invented, durſt not doubt the truth of what he ſaid. *Recte & hoc Ariſtoteles, ut cætera; nec poſſum non aſſentiri viro, cujus inventis nec ipſa natura diſſentit* (58). i. e. "Ariſtotle wiſely ſaid this, as he does "every thing elſe; nor can I but aſſent to a man "from whoſe inventions nature herſelf does not dif-"fer." A Spaniſh Divine pretends, that it is impoſſible for the utmoſt ſtretch of human underſtanding, without the particular aſſiſtance of a genius, to penetrate into the ſecrets of nature ſo far as Ariſtotle has done (59). He muſt therefore of conſequence believe that Ariſtotle had a good or evil genius, which inviſibly inſtructed him in a thouſand things, the knowledge of which human underſtanding cannot attain to. William Biſhop of Paris affirms, in ſeveral places of his works (60), "that this Philoſopher, in all his un-"dertakings, uſed to adviſe with a Spirit, which he "had brought down from the ſphere of Venus, by "the ſacrifice of a haltered lamb, and ſome other "ceremonies." Others ſay, that he had no need of ſuch aſſiſtance; and it was the opinion of a famous Divine, Henry of Aſſia (61), "that Ariſtotle was able, "by the mere ſtrength of his natural genius, to arrive "at as perfect a knowledge in Divinity, as that which "was communicated to our firſt father when he was "aſleep in Paradiſe (62), or to Saint Paul in his ec-"ſtacy." A Council held in France, under Philip Auguſtus, made an order to burn Ariſtotle's Metaphyſicks. *An Engliſh Doctor, of the Order of St. Auguſtin* (63), *has left behind him in writing, that it was believed at that time, that no other than Antichriſt was to underſtand thoroughly the Books of Ariſtotle, which he would make uſe of to confute all thoſe who entered into diſpute with him.* Let us put an end to this little collection with a paſſage of Agrippa, who tells us that the Divines of Cologne maintained, that Ariſtotle was the fore-runner of the Meſſias in the myſteries of nature, as John the Baptiſt was in the myſteries of grace. *Digniſſimus profectò hodie Latinorum Gymnaſiorum Doctor, & quem Colonienſes mei Theologi etiam Divis adnumerarent, librumque ſub prælo evulgatum ederent, cui titulum facerent* de Salute Ariſtotelis (64), *ſed & alium verſu & metro* de Vitâ & Morte Ariſtotelis, *quem theologicâ inſuper gloſſâ illuſtrarunt, in cujus calce concludunt, Ariſtotelem ſic fuiſſe Chriſti præcurſorem in naturalibus, quemadmodum Joannes Baptiſta in gratuitis* (65). i. e. "That moſt worthy Teacher, even at "this time of the Latin Schools, whom my Divines "of Cologne would have canonized, and publiſh'd a "book with this title, *de Salute Ariſtotelis*, as alſo "another in verſe and metre, *de Vita & Morte Ari-"ſtotelis*, which they have moreover illuſtrated with "a theological Comment, at the end of which they "conclude, that Ariſtotle was in the ſame manner "the fore-runner of Chriſt in natural things, as John "the Baptiſt was in ſpiritual." To ſpeak without prejudice in favour of one ſide or the other, one may venture to ſay, that theſe extravagant Panegyricks have heaped more diſhonour than reputation on the memory of Ariſtotle: and one may apply to them in ſome reſpects that expreſſion of Tacitus, *peſſimum inimicorum genus laudantes* (66), i. e. "flatterers, thoſe "worſt of enemies." One may beſtow on Ariſtotle ſo many praiſes that are juſtly due to him, that there is no manner of excuſe to be made in behalf of thoſe, who not content with giving him ſuch, have run into the moſt fulſome hyperboles (67). Why would it not have been ſufficient to have ſaid that he dipt his pen in good ſenſe (68)? This is what all Philoſophers ought to do, if we will take the word of the Prince of the Stoicks for it. Ὁ Ζήνων ἔλεγεν, ὅτι δεῖ τὸν φιλόσοφον εἰς νοῦν ἀποβάπτοντα προφέρειν τὸν λόγον (69). i. e. "Zeno "ſaid, that a Philoſopher ought to advance nothing "but what was tinctured with good ſenſe." Thoſe who have a mind to ſee the collections of praiſes, which have been heaped upon Ariſtotle, will do well to read George of Trebizonde (70), Pererius in chap. 1. of his fifth Book *de Principiis*, Juſtus Lipſius in Diſſertation iv of Book 1 *Munuductionis ad Philoſophiam Stoicam*, Theodore Angelutius in his Anſwers to Francis Patricius, &c.

(70) *De Comparat. Platonis & Ariſtotelis.*

[I] *Cardinal Pallavicini . . . confeſſes . . . that without Ariſtotle the Church would have been deficient in ſome articles of faith.*] The author of Cardinal Pallavicini's new Goſpel did not fail to lay hold of (71) theſe words of Chap. XIX, Book VIII, Num. 13. *Di ciò ſi doveva in gran parte l' obligazione ad Ariſtotele, il quale ſe non ſi foſſe adoperato in diſtinguer accuratamente i generi delle ragioni, noi mancavamo di molti articoli di Fede.* i. e. "In which reſpect ſhe is under great ob-"ligations to Ariſtotle, for if he had not been ſo em-"ployed in the accurate diſtinction of all ſorts of "reaſonings, we ſhould have wanted many articles of "faith." This encomium puts me in mind of a paſſage of Nicius Erythræus, as great a flatterer of Ariſtotle as was poſſible. This Author pretends that in vain the ſubtle and learned Patricius attacked with all his might the doctrine of the Lyceum, a doctrine impregnable to all attacks, and which will ever triumph in the deſtruction of its rivals. *Altius Ariſtotelis auctoritas radices egit, quam ut cujuſquam vim impetumque pertimeſcat: viget ſemperque vigebit hominis diſciplina; tantumque quis exiſtimabitur ſcire, quantum ex doctrinæ ejuſdem fontibus hauſtum, intelligentiâ comprehenſum habuerit; ac nemo, cui cor ſapiat, non ſatius eſſe ducet in iis, quæ ad Philoſophiam pertinent, cum Deo, ut ita dicam, Philoſophorum errare, quam cum aliis rectè ſapere, minorum gentium magiſtris. Itaque ille, omnibus in gymnaſiis ad ſapientiam properantibus dux ſemper habebitur: ille Theologorum quaſi militiæ, adverſus religionis noſtræ hoſtes, definitiones, argumentorum copiam, & alia præclarè dicta multa, tanquam amentatas haſtas elargietur, quas illa theologicis lacertis, ac viribus de cælo ſuppeditatis, torqueat ac vibret* (72). i. e. "The authority "of Ariſtotle has taken too deep root to be afraid "of the power of any man: his doctrine does and "will flouriſh, and the meaſure of every ones under-"ſtanding will be rated by what proportions of know-"ledge he has imbibed from his fountain of learn-"ing; nor will any one who has a grain of ſenſe, "not chooſe, in matters relating to Philoſophy, to "err with the God, if I may ſo ſay, of Philoſophers, "than to think right with any other petty retailers "of literature. He will ever be followed as a guide "in all ſchools, which take the ready road to wiſdom: "He will never be wanting to ſupply our Divines "militant with a ſufficient ſtore of definitions, ar-"guments, and excellent ſayings, which like ſo ma-"ny javelins they will hurl, with more than human "force, upon the adverſaries of our religion." I think myſelf obliged in juſtice to declare that Cardinal Pallavicini does not advance this maxim as his own, nor does he lay it down as an obſervation that he would recommend to the world: he only mentions it as an ill-natured piece of raillery of Father Paul: he in very plain terms calls it an impertinent banter, and pretends that the councils which made that ſubtle diſtinction betwixt *the ſubſtance*, *the perſon*, and *the hypoſtaſis*, were no leſs liable to be the ſubjects of it. In ſhort he does not deny the charge, but is content with laughing at thoſe who laugh at him for it (73). Father Paul, after having given us the decree of the VIth Seſſion, mentions what matters were canvaſſed in it; and among other expreſſions, ſays, that thoſe who were verſed in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory remarked, that all the other councils taken together, had decided fewer articles than this one Seſſion, in which Ariſtotle had a great ſhare: *In che haveva una gran parte Ariſtotele, coll' haver diſtinto effatamente tutti i generi di cauſe, a che, ſe egli non ſi foſſe adoperato, noi mancavamo di molti articoli de Fede* (74). i. e. "In which Ariſtotle had a great ſhare, by having "well diſtinguiſhed all ſorts of reaſons, in which if "he had not employed himſelf, we ſhould have want-"ed many articles of faith." In the remonſtrances of the Sorbonne, upon which the Parliament of Paris granted

(71) Chap. 6. Art. 6. p. 253.

(72) Nic. Erythræi *Pinacoth.* 1. pag. 204.

(73) *Ma quale ſtoltizia è quella ſcherno, che di cio ſi doveva in gran parte l'obligatione ad Ariſtotele, &c.* See Father Rapin, *Reflex. ſur la Philoſop.* p. 449.

(74) Father Paul's *Hiſtory of the Council of Trent* book 2, under the year 1547, pag. 234. edit. 1629. We meet with this in page 211 of Amelot's verſion, edit. 1686.

(58) Macrobius, *Saturn.* lib. 7. cap. 6.

(59) Medina *in Thom. Aquin.* 1 *Secundæ Quæſt.* cix. Art. 1. cited by Naude, *Apolog. des Grands Hommes*, p. 327.

(60) *De Univerſo Spiritu*, Part 1. cap. 92, 153; and Part 2. cap. 6. cited by Naude, *Apolog. des Grands Hommes*, pag. 328.

(61) *Apud* Sibillam 1, *Decade. Peregrin. Quæſt.* cap. 8. Qu. 1. *Quæſtiuncula* 4. cited by Naude, *Apolog. des Grands Hommes*, pag. 319.

(62) See above, citation (11), of the article ADAM.

(63) Alexander. Neccam. lib. *de Nat. rerum*, cited by la Mothe le Vayer, *de la vertu des Paiens*, tom. 5. pag. 102 of his works edit. in 12°.

(64) See the note [R].

(65) Agrippa, *de Vanitat. Scientiarum*, cap. 54. pag. 95. Balæus has copied this Cent. 14. pag. 220. See below the note (U).

(66) Tacit. *in Vita Agricolæ*, cap. 41.

(67) You'll find ſeveral of that kind in Conringius's Orations, intitled *Ariſtotelis Laudatio.*

(68) See the words of Suidas under the remark [Z] at the beginning.

(69) Plutarch. *in Vita Phocionis*, pag. 743. E.

that now at this time, notwithſtanding the ignorance that they ſuffer to reign among them, they have ſchools for this ſect [*K*]. This will be an eternal ſubject of ſurpriſe for thoſe who know well what Philoſophy is, to ſee that the authority of Ariſtotle has been ſo reſpected in the ſchools for ſeveral ages, that when a diſputant quoted a paſſage of this Philoſopher, he who maintained the Theſis durſt not ſay *tranſeat*, he was obliged to deny the paſſage, or to explain it after his manner [*L*]. It is thus that they uſe to act in the ſchools of Divinity, with regard to the holy Scripture. The Parliaments, who have forbid all other Philoſophies but that of Ariſtotle (*i*), may be better excuſed than the Doctors; for whether the Members of Parliament were perſuaded, as it is very probable that this Philoſophy was the beſt of all, or whether they did not believe it, the publick good was ſufficient to make them forbid new doctrines, for fear the Academical diviſions ſhould ſpread their malicious influences upon the tranquillity of the State. What then ought to aſtoniſh wiſe men the moſt is, that the Profeſſors were ſo furiouſly bigotted to the philoſophical hypotheſes of Ariſtotle. If they had been thus prejudiced in favour of his Poetry, and his Rhetorick, there would have been leſs room to be ſurpriſed; but they have been fond of the weakeſt of his works, I mean his Logick and his Phyſicks [*M*]. This

(*i*) See the note [*I*] at the end.

granted a decree againſt the Chymiſts in the year 1629, it was aſſerted, *that it was impoſſible to renounce the principles of Ariſtotle's Philoſophy without giving up thoſe of the School Divinity as received in the Church* (75). In the year 1624, the Parliament of Paris baniſhed out of its juriſdiction three men who had undertaken to oppoſe in publick Theſes the doctrine of Ariſtotle; forbad all perſons to publiſh, ſell, or even any propoſitions advanced in the ſaid Theſes on pain of corporal puniſhment, and to teach any maxims contrary to the ancient and approved Authors, on pain of death (76).

(75) Rapin, *Comparison of Plato and Ariſtotle*, pag. 413.

(76) *French Mercury*, tom. 10. pag. 504.

[*K*] *Even to this day the Mahometans .... have ſchools for his Sect.*] "The Peripatetick Philoſophy is "ſo firmly eſtabliſhed in every place, that now ſcarce "any other is taught in any of the Univerſities of "Chriſtendom; even thoſe which are conſtrained to "receive the impoſtures of Mahomet teach the ſci"ences no otherwiſe than as they are comformable "to the principles of the Lyceum, to which they are "ſo ſtrongly attached, that Averroes, Alfarabius, Al"mubaſſar (77), and ſeveral other Arabian Philoſo"phers have often deviated from the ſenſe of their "Prophet, to avoid contradicting thoſe of Ariſtotle, "whom the Turks have in their Turkiſh dialect and "in Arabic, as Belon * relates (78)." The Author from whom I have taken theſe words, ſays in another volume (79), that according to the account of Olearius, the Perſians have all Ariſtotle's works expounded by a great many Arabian Commentaries, which generally call his Philoſophy the goblet of the world. *Bergeron*, ſays he, *in his treatiſe of the Tartars, remarks, that they have in their poſſeſſion the Books of Ariſtotle tranſlated into their own language, teaching his doctrine, with as much deference as can be paid him here, at Samarcand the Univerſity of the Great Mogul, and at preſent the capital city of the Kingdom of Usbec.*

(77) He ſhould have ſaid *Albumaſſar* or *Albumaſar*.

* Lib. 3. cap. 14.

(78) La Mothe le Vayer of the *Virtue of the Pagans*, tom. 5. pag. 101.

(79) Vol. 12. pag. 245.

[*L*] *When any diſputant quoted a paſſage from this Philoſopher, he who maintained the Theſis durſt not ſay tranſeat, he was obliged to deny the paſſage, or to explain it after his manner.*] If any one dare diſpute the truth of this, I would recommend to his peruſal ſeveral courſes of Philoſophy printed in the XVIth Century, which will inform us that the following method was then practiſed. Firſt of all the reſpondent proved his Theſis by authorities, and then by arguments; the proofs of authorities were paſſages taken out of Ariſtotle. The anſwer to the objections conſiſted alſo of two parts, in the firſt he reconciled with his Theſis ſuch paſſages of Ariſtotle as ſeemed to make againſt it, and which ſerved his antagoniſt for proofs of authority, and in the ſecond part he took off the arguments drawn from reaſon, but never uſed to ſay, *I confeſs that Ariſtotle was of this opinion, and yet I deny my Theſis to be falſe, or I aſſert the contrary*, but uſed to employ all his ſkill in finding out ſuch a ſenſe for the paſſages objected to him, as might quadrate with his ſide of the queſtion. And the ſame method is ſtill obſerved in the Divinity Schools, amongſt thoſe of the Romiſh Church with regard to the writings of St. Auſtin and Thomas Aquinas.

[*M*] *They have been fond of the weakeſt of his works; I mean his Logick and his Phyſicks.*] To be convinced of the meanneſs of theſe performances, we need only read Gaſſendus's *Exercitationes paradoxicæ adverſus Ariſtoteleos* (80). He has there ſaid enough in general, againſt the Philoſophy of Ariſtotle, to convince every impartial reader how defective it is; but he overthrows in particular the Dialecticks of this Philoſopher. He applied himſelf in like manner to take to pieces his Phyſicks, Metaphyſicks, and Ethicks, but being apprized of the formidable reſentment conceived againſt him by the Peripateticks, he thought it better to drop his undertaking, than to expoſe himſelf to troubleſome perſecutions.

(80) They are in Vol. 3. of his works.

Let it be noted by the way, that we don't pretend to deny, but that there are many things both in the Logick and Phyſicks of Ariſtotle, which ſhew an exalted and profound genius: but granting this, we muſt at the ſame time allow that Caſaubon in the praiſes he gives him, runs very much into the hyperbole: *Ego pueros puto fuiſſe*, (Stoicos in Logica) *præ divino Ariſtotele, & eorum in hoc genere ſcripta* ὕδλον ἐ φλύναφον *præ Ariſtotelis Organo: quo opere omnia mortalium ingenia (divina aut de rebus divinis ſemper excipio) longè ſuperavit* (81): i. e. "In my opinion, they (*the Stoicks "in regard to their knowledge in Logick*) were mere "children in compariſon of the divine Ariſtotle, and "all their writings of this kind trifling and nonſenſe "in compariſon of Ariſtotle's Organum, in which work "he has ſhewn a genius far ſuperior to all mankind. "(I would be underſtood to except inſpired Authors, "and thoſe who have wrote upon divine ſubjects.") Nor is Rapin more moderate in his praiſes of him, as appears by this paſſage: "There was nothing like "any regular or eſtabliſhed ſyſtem of Logick before "Ariſtotle †. This great genius did with ſo much "reaſon and learning fathom the depth of the hu"man mind, that he penetrated into the moſt ſecret "receſſes of it, as appears by the exact diſtinction "he made of its operations. No one had hitherto "unlock'd the ſtore-houſe of human ideas, or ex"plored its dimenſions. Ariſtotle was the firſt who "invented the method of attaining to ſcience by the "evidence of demonſtration, and of coming geome"trically to that demonſtration, by the infallible rule "of Syllogiſm, a work ſure the moſt accompliſhed, "an undertaking the moſt ſurprizing that the mind "of man was capable of. This is a ſhort account of "Ariſtotle's art of Logick, which is the ſureſt and "only method of coming at certainty in argumenta"tion, and which will ſerve as an unerring rule "whereby to think juſtly, and reaſon truly (82)." One might do juſtice to this Philoſopher's treatiſe on Syllogiſm, without running into ſuch extravagant commendations of it. There are indeed in his Phyſicks ſome very ſublime queſtions, which he diſcuſſes and illuſtrates in a very maſterly way; but notwithſtanding the whole work if taken all together is a very mean performance: *infelix operis ſumma.* The chief occaſion of this defect is, that Ariſtotle forſook the path that the moſt eminent Natural Philoſophers before him had troden: they uſed to account for all the changes in nature from a new modification of the particles of matter, and never allowed of generation properly ſo called; which doctrine he rejected (83), and by that rejection he loſt and bewilder'd himſelf. He was obliged to teach, that new entities were produced, and the former ones annihilated; he abſtracted them from matter,

(81) Caſaub. *in Perſium*, Sat. 5. ver. 86. p. 415.

† *Ariſtoteles utriuſque partis Dialecticæ princeps*, Ciceron. *Topic.* cap. 2. i. e. "Ariſtotle, "compleat maſter of both "the parts of "Logick.

(82) Rapin's *Reflections on Logick*, num. 4, pag. 374, 375.

(83) *See* Ariſtotle's 1ſt book, *de Generatione & Corruptione.*

This juſtice muſt be done his blindeſt followers, that they have forſaken him in the things where he has claſhed with Chriſtianity [*N*]. Theſe things are of the utmoſt conſequence, ſeeing he maintained the eternity of the Univerſe, and did not believe that Providence extended to ſublunary beings. As for the immortality of the ſoul it is not certain whether he admitted it [*O*]. We ſhall relate in another place the long diſputes which have reigned in Italy upon that point. The celebrated Capuchin Valerian Magni publiſhed a book of the Atheiſm of Ariſtotle in the year 1647. It was then a hundred and thirty years ſince Mark Anthony Venerius had publiſhed a Philoſophy, which ſhews many contradictions between the precepts of Ariſtotle, and the truth of religion. Campanella maintained the ſame thing in his book *de Reductione ad Religionem*, which was approved at Rome, in the year 1630. It has been maintained in Holland lately, in the Prefaces of ſome books, that the doctrine of this Philoſopher does not differ much from Spinoziſm (*k*). However if we will believe ſome Peripateticks, he was not ignorant of the myſtery of the Trinity [*P*], he made a good end [*Q*], and enjoys everlaſting felicity [*R*].

(*k*) Haſſel, in the Preface to the *Anti-Spinoza* of Wittichius, printed in 1690, and the Preface of the *Inveſtigatio Epiſtolæ ad Hebræos*, of the ſame author, printed in 1691.

ter, and gave them names never before heard of, affirming or ſuppoſing things of which he had no clear and diſtinct idea. Now to pretend to philoſophize truly without ſuch evidence of ideas, is as abſurd as to think of ſteering a ſhip exactly without ſeeing the polar ſtar, or without a compaſs. It is like ſtriving to ſail without the wind, or travelling in a ſtrange country without a guide; 'tis like roaming in the dark in a houſe, wherein we do not know a ſingle apartment. Every one knows what an infinite number of forms and qualities diſtinct from ſubſtance the followers of Ariſtotle have introduced, bewildring themſelves in that intricate maze, into which he firſt ſhewed them the way; and if in the XVIIth Century Natural Philoſophy appeared again with new luſtre, it was only owing to a re-eſtabliſhment of thoſe ancient principles which he firſt deſerted, to the cultivating of evidence, and in a word, to the excluding from the doctrine of generation, that great number of entities of which our minds have not any idea, to their adhering to figure, motion, and the ſituation of the particles of matter, all which things we have a clear and diſtinct conception of.

[*N*] *This juſtice muſt be done his blindeſt followers, that they have forſaken him where he has claſhed with Chriſtianity.*] However, I will not take up the argument againſt Luther in defence of the Divines of Cologne. He reproaches both them, and alſo thoſe of Louvain for patronizing, or at leaſt qualifying with forc'd interpretations the moſt groſs and impious abſurdities of Ariſtotle. *Ariſtotelem ipſis in ſummo eſſe pretio, & nihil ab eo dictum eſſe tam abſurde vel alienè à noſtrâ religione quod non defendant, quod non aliquâ interpretatione quantumvis longè petitâ circumveſtiant, quo ſuus illi conſtet bonos atque nominis exiſtimatio* (84). What is not implicit faith and prejudice capable of doing!

(84) *Apud* Sleidanum, *de Statu Relig. & Reipub.* lib. 2. fol. 33.

[*O*] *It is not certain whether he admitted the immortality of the ſoul.*] Pomponatius and Niphus engaged in a very warm diſpute upon this ſubject. The former inſiſted that the doctrine of the immortality of the ſoul, was inconſiſtent with the principles of Ariſtotle; the latter as vigorouſly maintained the contrary. See the diſcourſe of la Mothe le Vayer upon the immortality of the ſoul (85); and Bodin in page 15 of the preface to his *Demonomany*.

(85) It is in tom. 4. of the 12° edition of his works.

[*P*] *According to ſome Peripateticks, he was not ignorant of the myſtery of the Trinity.*] Emanuel de Moura diſputing with thoſe, who accuſed Ariſtotle of Atheiſm, ſays, I, that a certain woman wheedled him ſo artfully, that ſhe prevailed with him to conſult the Oracle of Apollo (86): II, that he ordered in his will, that the images of certain animals, which he had vowed for the ſafety of Nicanor (87), ſhould be dedicated to Jupiter and Minerva: III, that he confeſſes in his firſt Book *de Cælo & Mundo* (88), *ſe cum aliis obtuliſſe Diis trina ſacrificia in recognitionem trinæ perfectionis in iis inventæ* (89). i. e. "That he together "with others offered a threefold ſacrifice to the Gods, "in acknowledgment of the threefold perfection diſ"covered in them." From theſe paſſages they conclude, that he not only believed the exiſtence of Dæmons, and was ſcrupulouſly religious, but alſo that he acknowledged *the Trinity of perſons in the unity of eſſence, according to the opinion of Salmeron* (90), *and of George of Trapezonde before him* (91), *who wrote an entire book of the Conformity of Ariſtotle's Doctrine, with that of the Holy Scripture.* Naudé, from whom I have taken this, remarks, that *Emanuel de Moura manifeſtly miſrepreſented Philoponus, who, following the Greek text and the old tranſlation, which is conformable to that of Nunneſius, only ſays that Ariſtotle, having attained to the age of ſixteen years* (92), *was counſelled by the Pythian Oracle to apply himſelf chiefly to the ſtudy of Philoſophy.... As for the three ſacrifices which he offered to the Gods*, theſe are the words of Naudé, *or the acknowledging the Trinity, which ſeveral Catholick Doctors have aſcribed to him*, "they are all chimera's, which "were originally founded on what he ſays in his firſt "Book of the Heavens, ſpeaking of the number three, "Διὸ πάντα τῆς φύσεως ἐληφότις ὥσπερ νόμους ἔκλινε καὶ "πρὸς τὰς ἀγιστείας τῶν Θεῶν χρώμενα τῷ ἀριθμῷ τούτῳ, i. e. "Therefore we make uſe of this number in celebrat"ing the ſacrifices of the Gods, nature itſelf ſeem"ing to have pointed it out to us as the moſt per"fect of all. From which paſſage no other con"cluſion can be drawn, than that Ariſtotle aſſerts it to "have been the cuſtom in his time to make uſe of the "number Three in their ſacrifices; which is alſo at"teſted by Theocritus." After this, Naudé obſerves, that *Cardinal Beſſarion* (93) *ridicules George of Trapezonde for having taken ſo much pains to prove from this paſſage, that Ariſtotle was fully perſuaded of the Trinity*; nor do the modern School-men abate any thing of this ſuppoſition. See Piccinardi, Profeſſor at Padua, in his *Dogmata Philoſophiæ Peripateticæ*. It is mentioned in the Italian Journal of Auguſt 31, 1674.

(86) He quotes Philoponus in the *Life of Ariſtotle*.

(87) He cites Plutarch and Diogenes.

(88) Sect. 2. cap. 2. num. 10. cited by Naude, *Apolog. des Grands Hommes*, pag. 328.

(89) Eman. *de Moura*, lib. *de Enſal.* Sect. 2. cap. 3. num. 19. cited by Naude, ibid.

(90) Tom. 2. Tract. 23. cited by Naude, ibid.

(91) Lib. 2. *de Comparat. Ariſt. & Plat.* cited by Naude, ibid. pag. 329.

(92) The circumſtance of age would invalidate the whole proof of Moura; for thoſe who would pretend that Ariſtotle denied the exiſtence of ſpirits ought not to take him at the age of ſeventeen years.

(93) Cap. 15. lib. 3. *adverſus Calumniat. Platonis.*

[*Q*] *He made a good end.*] Finding himſelf drawing near his latter end, he burſt out into a flood of tears, and betwixt anguiſh and hope implored the mercy of the ſovereign Being and firſt Cauſe of all things: and alſo very much approved of a ſaying in Homer's Odyſſey, in which it is ſaid, that it is not any ways unbecoming the dignity of the immortal Gods to take upon them the nature of man, thereby to enlighten and improve them. Which by ſome that are devoted to him is interpreted as a foreſight he had of the coming of Chriſt in the fleſh. *Proditum & illud monumentis eſt, quum Philoſophus hic extrema ſibi ingruere præſenſiſſet, dolore ac ſpe in lachrymas amplius profuſum primæ cauſæ miſericordiam intentius imploraſſe. Quin & Homeri ſententiam ex Odyſſea vehementer approbaſſe, qua non eſſe immortalibus Diis indecorum pronunciatur hominis induere naturam, quo ab erroribus ſevocentur mortales. Quâ in re CHRISTI præſenſiſſe adventum augurantur nonnulli ejus viri gloriæ in primis addicti.* Theſe are the words of Cælius Rhodiginus (94), whoſe authority in a matter of this nature is little or nothing to be depended upon. Others ſpeak differently of the laſt hours of Ariſtotle. They ſay that "he died of grief for not "being able to comprehend the cauſe of the flux and "reflux of the Euripus. Upon which ſome moderns "have invented a ſtory, which has ſince been pretty "current, that this Philoſopher caſt himſelf into the "Euripus, ſaying theſe words, *Since I can't compre*"*hend the Euripus, let me be ſwallowed up by the Eu*"*ripus* (95)." Diogenes Laertius quotes an Author named Eumelus, who gave out that Ariſtotle having retired to Chalcis, poiſoned himſelf at ſeventy years of age (96). Apollodorus, who ſeems to me more worthy of credit, ſays that this great man died of a diſtemper, when he was ſixty three years of age (97).

(94) *Antiq. Lection.* lib. 17. cap. 34.

(95) Father Rapin, *Compariſon of Ariſtotle and Plato*, pag. 310, who quotes Juſtin *in Adm. ad Gentes*. Greg. Naz. *contra Jul.* *See alſo* Rhodigin. lib. 29. cap. 8. As to the quotations of F. Rapin, ſee the remark [*Z*].

(96) Diog. Laert. *in Ariſt.* num. 6.

(97) Apollod. *apud* Diog. Laert. *in Ariſt.* num. 10.

felicity [R]. He compoſed a great number of books, of which a good part is come down to us. It is true that ſome Criticks form a thouſand doubts hereupon. We ſhall ſpeak of the adventures of theſe books in the notes upon the article TYRANNIO (*l*). He was extreamly honoured in his own country [S]; and there have been ſome Hereticks who adored his image jointly with that of Jeſus Chriſt. I have not found that the Antinomians *bore more reſpect towards this Heathen than to the uncreated Wiſdom* [T], nor that the *Aetians were excommunicated, becauſe they gave to their diſciples the Categories of Ariſtotle for a Catechiſm* (*m*); but I have read ſomewhere, that before the Reformation, there were ſome churches in Germany, where they read every Sunday the Ethicks of Ariſtotle inſtead of the Goſpel [U]. There are hardly any marks of zeal for religion that have not been ſhewn for Peripateticiſm. Paul de Foix celebrated for his Embaſſies and his Learning, would not ſee Francis Patricius at Ferrara, becauſe he heard that this learned Man taught another Philoſophy

(*l*) See above the notes [B], [C], [D] of the article ANDRONICUS.

(*m*) Rapin, *Compar. de Platon & d'Ariſtote*, pag. 392.

[R] . . . . *He enjoys everlaſting felicity.*] Sepulveda, one of the moſt learned men of the 16th Century, has made no ſcruple of ranking him amongſt the Bleſſed, and has even defended his opinion publickly, and in print (98). The Jeſuit Gretſerus reprimands him for his too great confidence, but nevertheleſs confeſſes, that he is inclined in favour of Ariſtotle as well as Sepulveda, *whom he only finds fault with for expreſſing himſelf in ſuch poſitive terms* (99). Add to this my citation from Cælius Rhodiginus (100), and what ſome perſons of credit have remarked touching the reaſons which obliged Ariſtotle to quit Athens. Albertus Magnus has affirmed, that he was driven thence for the goodneſs of his morals, *propter morum rectitudinem pulſus Athenis* (101). Gretſerus in his Diſpute with Sepulveda relating to the ſalvation of Ariſtotle, *makes no queſtion but that Ariſtotle underwent this voluntary exile in order to avoid that compulſion, which they intended to lay on him of paying worſhip to Idols, which he look'd upon as due to God alone* (102). What a noble Refugee have we here for the ſake of the true Religion! Origen has put a very favourable conſtruction on this flight of Ariſtotle (103), who, explaining that precept our Lord gave his Diſciples, *to flee from one city, when they were perſecuted, to another* (104), tells Celſus, who ridiculed this according to his uſual profaneneſs, *that the abſconding of Ariſtotle, whom we are ſpeaking of, was agreeable to the moral rule of the Goſpel, and that being perſecuted wrongfully, he took the ſame method that Jeſus Chriſt recommended to his Diſciples* (105). I quoted a paſſage of Agrippa (106), where mention is made of a Book *de Salute Ariſtotelis*. Voetius, who was ſo largely acquainted with books, had never ſeen this, but knew almoſt the very year it was printed in: he ſays in a Theſis held December 15, 1638, that 140 years before it was printed at Oppenheim, and that Francis Junius had ſeen a copy of it (107). He adds, that one Lambertus de Monte, Author of a Commentary on Ariſtotle's Phyſicks, in which book he was ſtiled Doctor of Divinity, had written of the Salvation of this Philoſopher: *Quæſtionem magiſtralem ſatis acutam ſcripſiſſe, oſtendentem per autoritates Scripturæ divinæ, quid juxta ſaniorem doctorum ſententiam probabilius dici poſſit de ſalvatione Ariſtotelis Stagiritæ* (108). i. e. "That he "wrote on a ſcholaſtic and nice queſtion, ſhew- "ing by authorities from the Holy Scriptures, what, "according to the beſt opinion of the learned, might "probably be determined concerning the Salvation of "Ariſtotle the Stagyrite." You will find in a work, *de Pietate Ariſtotelis erga Deum & hominem*, which Fortunius Licetus dedicated to Innocent X, and which was approved of by two Inquiſitors General, ſeveral reaſons, by which he endeavours to evince that Ariſtotle is not damn'd.

(98) Sepulveda, lib. *de Anim.* quoted by la Mothe le Vayer, tom. 5. p. 114.
(99) Gretſerus quoted by la Mothe le Vayer, ibid.
(100) Above, quotation 94.
(101) Albertus Mag. *Ethic.* lib. 5. cap. 1. quoted by Rapin, pag. 310.
(102) Gretſerus *de variis cæl. Lath.* cap. 13. quoted by la Mothe le Vayer, tom. 5. p. 109.
(103) Orig. *contra Celſum*, lib. 2. quoted by the ſame.
(104) Matth. x. 23.
(105) La Mothe le Vayer, tom. 5. pag. 109.
(106) In the remark [H] citation (65).
(107) Giſb. Voetius, *Diſputat. Theol.* tom. 2. pag. 602.
(108) Giſb. Voetii, *Diſput. Theol.* tom. 2. p. 602. *ex Append.* 2. *ad* Trithem. *de Script. Eccleſ.* edit. Colon. anni 1546.

[S] *He was extremely honoured in his own country.*] It had been laid waſte by King Philip, but Alexander, at the requeſt of Ariſtotle, cauſed its towns to be rebuilt. The inhabitants out of gratitude for this kindneſs, dedicated a holy-day to this Philoſopher; and after he was dead at Chalcis in the Iſland Eubœa, they fetched away his bones, built an altar upon his tomb, call'd the place by the name of Ariſtotle, and held their aſſemblies there afterwards (109). Mandeville in his fabulous Account of his Voyages, ſays, that this was ſtill in being in his time (110), that is, in the 14th Century.

(109) Ammonius *in Vita Ariſtotelis.*
(110) Mandevil. *Itinerar.* cap. 2. *apud* Hornium, *Hiſt. Phil.* lib. 3. cap. 15. p. 197.

[T] *There have been hereticks who adored his image jointly with that of Jeſus Chriſt. I have not found, that the Antinomians bore more reſpect to him than to the uncreated wiſdom.*] See the following paſſage of Father Rapin (111). "The Carpocratians were con- "demn'd for having plac'd the image of this Philo- "ſopher with that of Jeſus Chriſt, and for having "paid adoration to it, out of an extravagant zeal "they bore to his doctrine †. The Aetians were ex- "communicated by the Church, and even by the "Arians, from whom they took their original, be- "cauſe they gave to their ſcholars the Categories of "Ariſtotle inſtead of Catechiſms *. The Antino- "mians run even into that exceſs of impiety, as to "pay more reſpect to this wiſe Heathen than to the "uncreated Wiſdom ‡." I never diſcovered ſo much as by this place, that this agreeable Writer did not give himſelf the trouble of conſulting the originals. I allow that Baronius, under the year which Father Rapin refers to, ſays, that the Carpocratians had images, and among others that of Jeſus Chriſt (which they ſaid was made by Pilate,) as alſo that of Pythagoras, that of Plato and that of Ariſtotle, and that they paid them the ſame adoration that the Pagans paid to their Idols: but to alledge this was of no ſervice to him; for beſides that Baronius does not ſay a word of this being the reaſon why they condemned theſe hereticks, it does not appear that they were one jot more zealous for the doctrine of Ariſtotle than for that of any other of the Philoſophers, whoſe images they worſhip'd. My edition of Baronius (112) does not mention a ſingle word under the year 208, of what Father Rapin ſpeaks of; nor is it poſſible that any Sect, which ſprang from the Arians, could be excluded from the communion of the Church in the beginning of the third Century. It is under the year 356, that Baronius ſpeaks of Aetius; and he gives us a long paſſage out of Suidas, which informs us, not that this heretick gave his followers the Categories of Ariſtotle inſtead of a Catechiſm, but that he expounded things to them according to the method of Ariſtotle's Categories; which ſhews that he was well verſed in logical ſubtilties and diſputes. Juſt in the ſame manner a modern Spaniſh School-Divine, who undertook to explain a point of faith, formed it upon the plan of the ſchools: ſhall we therefore ſay that he ſubſtituted the works of Ariſtotle in the room of our Books of Religion? And then again to quote Euſebius in the 27th chapter of his Hiſtory, is a moſt unwarrantable way of proceeding, which Author, it is my opinion, does not ſay one word concerning the Antinomians.

(111) *Compar. of Plat. and Ariſtot.* p. 392.
† Baronius, *Ann. Eccleſ. ad ann.* 120.
* Idem, ibid. *ad ann.* 208.
‡ Euſeb. *Hiſt.* cap. 27.
(112) That of Antwerp printed 1597.

[U] *In ſome churches of Germany . . . . it was the cuſtom to read Ariſtotle's Ethicks inſtead of the Goſpel.*] My Author for this is Spanheim the Father, in his ſecular Harangue, which he ſpoke at Geneva, 1635 (113). *Quin & Philippus Melanctbon*, ſays he (114), *vir candidiſſimus, teſtatur diebus dominicis variis in locis pro thematibus dominicalibus, inde à Karoli M. ætate operâ P. Guarenfridi ſeculo octavo in Cathedras Eccleſiaſticas introductis, Ethica Ariſtotelis publicè populo prælecta, & à ſe Tubingæ in agro Wirtenburgico audita.* i. e. "Moreover Philip Melancthon, a man "of great credit, records that in ſeveral places on "ſabbath-days, inſtead of Sunday Lectures, (after- "wards introduced in the eighth Century in the time "of Charles the Great by the means of P. Guaren- "fridus, into the churches,) Ariſtotle's Ethicks were "publickly read to the people, and which he heard "himſelf at Tubing in the country of Wirtemburg." If it be required, I can produce another authority, if that of Magirus will be admitted. *Tubingæ quondam Monachus*, ſays he (115), *pro concione Ariſtotelis librum Ethicorum*

(113) Intitled *Geneva reſtituta.*
(114) Pag. 17, 18.
(15) Magirus *in Eponymologio Critico*, pag. 81, 82.

Philoſophy than the Peripatetic (*n*). This was practiſing towards the enemies of Ariſtotle what the Zealots would have one do towards Hereticks. After all, it is no wonder that Peripateticiſm, as they taught it many ages ago, finds ſo many protectors]*X*], and the intereſts of it are thought inſeparable from thoſe of Divinity (*o*), for it accuſtoms the mind to acquieſce without evidence. This reunion of intereſts ought to be to the Peripaticks, a pledge of the immortality of their Sect, and to the new Philoſophers a ſubject of diminiſhing their hopes. Beſides, there are ſome Doctrines of Ariſtotle which the Moderns have rejected, but muſt at laſt receive (*p*). The Proteſtant Divines have thoroughly changed their maxims, if it is true that the firſt reformers cried ſo much againſt Peripateticiſm [*Y*]. That manner of death, which may in ſome reſpect do moſt honour to the memory of Ariſtotle, is, that the concern for not being able to diſcover the cauſe of the ebbing and flowing of the Euripus was the occaſion of his death [*Z*]. Some ſay that having taken refuge in the Iſland of Eubœa, on account of a proceſs of irreligion that was carried on againſt him at Athens, he poiſoned himſelf (*q*). But he need only have gone out of the city, to deliver himſelf from that perſecution by that means. Heſychius aſſures us, not only that there was a ſentence of death againſt him, becauſe of a Hymn he

(*n*) Thuanus, *de vitâ ſuâ*, lib. 1.

(*o*) See the note [*I*].

(*p*) Such is the hypotheſis of the *Intelligentiæ motrices*; for the doctrine of Voetius under ſome general laws, and without any particular direction to each Planet cannot ſatisfy the mind.

(*q*) Eumelus, *apud* D. Laertium, lib. 5. num. 6.

Ethicorum explicavit, ita vulgo dicebat, Quemadmodum Johannes Baptiſta Chriſti præcurſor fuit in Theologicalibus, ita Ariſtoteles fuit præcurſor Chriſti in Phyſicalibus (116). i. e. "Formerly a Monk at "Tubing uſed to explain Ariſtotle's Book of Ethicks "inſtead of a Sermon, uſing frequently this expreſ- "ſion, *That as John the Baptiſt was the fore-runner "of Chriſt in Divine things, ſo was Ariſtotle in Na- "tural things.*"

(116) He quotes Greg. Michael, *in Not. ad Jac. Gaffarelli Curioſitat. inaudit.* pag. 109.

[*X*] *It is no wonder that Peripateticiſm . . . . has found ſo many protectors.*] If all thoſe, who have embraced the Philoſophy of Mr. Des Cartes, had ſhewn that prudence and modeſty, as to ſtop when they were come to a certain length, if they had rightly judged what was proper to ſpeak and what to ſuppreſs (117), they would not have raiſed ſuch an outcry againſt the Sect in general. The method of the ancient maſters was founded upon good reaſons; they had doctrines for the world, and doctrines for the diſciples initiated into their myſteries: however it is certain that the application they endeavoured to make of the Carteſian principles to thoſe of Religion was very prejudicial to that Sect, and greatly hinder'd the progreſs of it; and indeed this is almoſt a neceſſary conſequence. The ancient Fathers complained heavily of the Sect of Ariſtotle (118), and it is almoſt a general complaint that Philoſophy is injurious to Theology; but on the other ſide, it is alſo as certain that Theology is as injurious to Philoſophy: they are two faculties, which could never juſtly ſettle their limits, did not the ballance of authority, which is always intereſted on the ſide of the former, make the regulation.

(117) *Finita poteſtas denique cuique, quanam ſit ratione, utque altè terminus hærens.* Lucret. lib. 1. ver. 77. i. e. "Let each "man know his "proper bounds "and force, Both "how to ſteer, "and when to "ſtop his courſe.

(118) See a long liſt of paſſages taken from them in Mr. de Launoi, *de variâ Ariſtotelis Fortuna*, cap. 1.

[*Y*] *The firſt Reformers cried out ſtrongly againſt Peripateticiſm.*] See the following paſſage from Father Rapin (119). "Nothing did more honour to the "doctrine of this great man (120) in the laſt Age, "than the bitter invectives of Luther, Melancthon, "Bucer, Calvin, Poſtel, Paul Sarpi (121), and of all "thoſe who wrote againſt the Romiſh Church at "that time; for they only cry down Ariſtotle, be- "cauſe the ſolidity of his method gives the Catho- "licks a great advantage in diſcovering the tricks "and artifices of falſe reaſoning, which hereſy uſes "to diſguiſe falſhood and deſtroy the truth." In another Book this Author talks with more ſolidity and judgment. "St. Thomas, ſays he (122), purſued Ari- "ſtotle's method ſo ſucceſsfully in explaining the "doctrine of the Romiſh Church, that Bucer, one of "the greateſt enemies that our Religion ever had, "uſed to ſay, *Let the works of St. Thomas be ſup- "preſſed, and I will overthrow the Church of Rome* *. It was this method of diſputing, taken from Ariſtotle, "which rendered the doctrine of our Religion ſo "formidable to all the innovators of the laſt ages, "which they being unable to withſtand endeavoured "to decry it, by declaiming againſt the School-men, "and particularly againſt Ariſtotle, from whom they "firſt borrowed this method, which has been eſtabliſh- "ed in the Schools ſince the times of St. Thomas. "The Anabaptiſts were the firſt who began to make "the univerſal ſtudy of this Philoſophy ſuſpected by "thoſe of their Sect, thro' all the Northern King- "doms, where they had any authority, and they "preached up the words of St. Paul to the Coloſſians, "to forbid it in their Schools †. Luther declared "himſelf ſo zealous an enemy to the Philoſophy of "Ariſtotle, that he publickly maintained in ſome "Theſes, at Heidelberg in 1518, that to reaſon agree- "ably to the principles of this Pagan, was to abandon "the maxims of the wiſdom of Jeſus Chriſt ‡; and he "never ſlipt any occaſion of furiouſly inveighing againſt "this Philoſopher in his writings; in which he was "imitated by Zuinglius, Peter Martyr, Zanchius, "Melancthon (123), and in ſhort by all thoſe who "oppoſed the doctrine of the Roman Church; which "made Melchior Canus, Biſhop of the Canaries, and "the moſt eloquent of all the School-men, ſay, that "the Lutherans had a great contempt for the Philo- "ſophy, taught at that time in the Schools ‡. Cal- "vin never mentions the name of Ariſtotle, but with "all the ſharpneſs and bitterneſs of ſtyle, that a tem- "per ſo waſpiſh and ill-natured as his could inſpire "him with. And in this manner was he treated by "all thoſe, who in the laſt Ages employed their pens "againſt the Church of Rome."

(119) *Compariſon of Plato and Ariſtotle*, pag. 412.

(120) Speaking of Ariſtotle.

(121) How can it be ſaid with any truth, that he wrote againſt the Church of Rome in the 16th Century?

(122) *Reflections on Philoſophy*, pag. 450.

* *Tolle Thomam, & Eccleſiam Romanam ſubvertam.* Bucer. Father Rapin would have done well to have quoted the book and page of Bucer.

† *Ex* Nicolao Bleſdikio, *in Hiſtoria Davidis Georgii. Ex* Hornii *Hiſtor. Philoſophicâ.*

‡ *Qui in Ariſtotele vult philoſophari, prius oportet in Chriſto ſtultificari.*

(123) We will make appear in its proper place, that Melancthon was a favourer of Ariſtotle.

‡ *Nullo apud Lutheranos Philoſophiam eſſe in pretio.* Loc. Theolog. lib. 9. cap. 3.

[*Z*] *That manner of death, which may do moſt honour to the memory of Ariſtotle, is, that the concern for not being able to diſcover the cauſe of the ebbing and flowing of the Euripus was the occaſion of his death.*] To die by this means would be a convincing proof of that inſatiable curioſity which put him upon ſearching into the hidden ſecrets of nature; and would argue a moſt extraordinary ſenſe of glory in that ambition of diſcovering to mankind the moſt abſtruſe myſteries. Would not this be truly to die in the bed of honour? Would not this look like ſetting to his work with a firm reſolution either to compaſs his enterprize or periſh in the attempt? Thoſe who have ſaid, that the genius of Ariſtotle knew no other bounds than thoſe of Nature, or that he was admitted to her moſt privy counſels, and to be her Secretary (124), ought to allow of no other account touching his death than this I am ſpeaking of; for a confident who ſees himſelf diſgraced, and excluded in his old age from the participation of a ſecret, ought not to ſurvive ſuch a degradation as this. But to ſpeak ſeriouſly, I cannot be of opinion that Ariſtotle could be ſo weak as to die with grief for ſuch a diſappointment. *What likelihood that ſo wiſe a man as he was could ever take it in his head . . . . to give himſelf up to melancholy and deſpair, becauſe he was not able to conceive the reaſon of the ebb and flow of the Euripus, one who found his underſtanding limited by ſo many other things, of which he could be ignorant without any uneaſineſs* (125)?

(124) Ἀριστοτέλης τῆς φύσεως γραμματεὺς ἦν. Τὸν κάλαμον ἀποβρίχειν ἐις νοῦν. i. e. "Ariſtotle "was Nature's "ſcribe, and "dipped his pen "in the ink of "underſtand- "ing." Suidas. See above the note [*H*] at the end.

(125) Rapin, *Compar. of Plato and Ariſt.* pag. 310.

Juſtin Martyr and Gregory Nazianzen are often charged with things they never ſaid, relating to the death of Ariſtotle: they have no where ſaid that he caſt himſelf into the Euripus: Juſtin Martyr only ſays, that the ſhame of not being able to diſcover the cauſe of that Phænomenon made him die with grief. Οὐδὲ τὴν τῆ Εὐρίπυ φύσιν τῆ ὄντος ἐν Χαλκίδι γνῶναι δυνηθὶς διὰ πολλὴν ἀδοξίαν ᾗ αἰχύνῃ λυπηθὶς μετέτη τῆ βίυ (126). St. Gregory Nazianzen, ſtrictly ſpeaking, does not ſay ſo much; he contents himſelf with not contradicting Julian, who inſtanced Ariſtotle as an example of ſo great thirſt after knowledge as to die a martyr to it. Ἢ δ' τὴν Ὁμήρυ φιλομάθειαν περὶ τὰ Ἀρκαδικὸν ζήτημα· δ' τὴν Ἀριστοτέλυς φιλοσοφίαν δ' προσιδρίαν ἐπὶ ταῖς τῆ Εὐρίπυ μεταβολαῖς· ὑφ' ὧν τεθνήκασι (127). i. e. "You extoll "the love of learning which appeared in Homer, "and

(126) Juſtini *Cohort. ad Græcos*, pag. 34.

(127) Greg. Nazianz. *Orat.* 3. pag. 78.

he had made to the honour of his father-in-law; but alſo that he ſwallowed Aconite, in execution of that ſentence (*r*). If the thing were true, it would be related by more Authors. See the Notes [*G*] and [*Z*].

(*r*) Heſychius, *in Vitâ Ariſtot.*

The number of ancient and modern writers, which have laboured upon Ariſtotle, either to comment upon him, or to tranſlate him, is infinite. There is a liſt of them, but not a compleat one, in ſome of the editions of all his works (*s*). See alſo a treatiſe of Father Labbe which is intitled, *Ariſtotelis & Platonis Græcorum interpretum typis hactenus editorum brevis Conſpectus*, printed at Paris in 1657, in 4to. Mr. Teiſſier names four Authors who have compoſed the life of Ariſtotle, namely Ammonius, Guarini of Verona, John James Beurerus, and Leonard Aretin (*t*). He has forgotten Jerome Gemuſeus, Phyſician and Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Baſil, the author of a book, *de Vita Ariſtotelis, & ejus operum Cenſura.*

(*s*) In that of Geneva in 1605, and in that of Paris in 1629, under the care of William du Val, and which is the beſt of all.

(*t*) Teiſſier, *Catal. Aut. Bibliotb. &c.* p. 367.

" and of which the Arcadian queſtion is a memora-
" ble proof; as alſo Ariſtotle's love of wiſdom, and
" his aſſiduous watching the ebb and flow of the Eu-
" ripus, which two things occaſioned the death of
" both theſe great men." This is ſomewhat remarkable, and perhaps what never any body took notice of. It is notorious that ſeveral perſons who have not that due regard for the Fathers of the Church they ought to have, take a pleaſure in charging them with a blind credulity; and expreſly accuſe them of having ſcandalized Ariſtotle on account of the Euripus; tho' there is ſome probability that Julian the Apoſtate himſelf allowed the fact which Juſtin Martyr ſpeaks of; for it appears by the anſwer of Gregory Nazianzen, that this Emperor joined Homer with Ariſtotle as two examples, where an eager thirſt after knowledge had occaſioned even the loſs of life; for they uſed to tell an old ſtory, how that Homer died for vexation, becauſe he was not able to anſwer a queſtion which ſome Fiſher-men put to him: now it is not incredible that Julian took up with ſome ſuch like tradition concerning Ariſtotle and the Euripus. I allow however, that he would ſcarce have mentioned it, if Ariſtotle had not ſo diligently watched the motions of the Euripus, and ſtudied ſo intenſely the reaſon of that Phænomenon, as by ſuch an application both of mind and body to deſtroy his health, and by that means bring upon himſelf that illneſs which proved mortal to him; and this ſeems to me more probable than any thing elſe. Euſtathius ſeems to have meant no more, when he ſpoke of the Euripus in the following manner: Ἐπτάκις τὸ ὅλον νυχθήμερον μεταβάλλει ὁ περὶ Εὔβοιαν Εὔριπος, περὶ ὃν φασὶ διατρίψαντα τὸν Ἀριστοτέλην καταλῦσαι τὸν Βίον. i. e. " The Euripus near Eubœa ebbs and
" flows ſeven times in one natural day, in obſerving
" and ſearching out the cauſe of which Ariſtotle is
" ſaid to have loſt his life." See the following long paſſage taken from Mr. le Fevre, in which, after having by the way given the Preachers a ſide-ſtroke, he fathers upon Juſtin Martyr, and ſtill more upon Gregory Nazianzen, words which they never ſpoke. *Videlicet in Græciâ, quemadmodum hodieque fit, Oratores ſacri, ſi tamen tanto nomine illa pulpitorum crepitacula, & plebeculæ cymbala, cohoneſtari oporteat, vulgo dictitabant Ariſtotelem, cum illius ſeptenæ in dies ſingulos reciprocationis cauſam non potuiſſet cognoſcere, ibi tum miſellum ſeſe in Euripum dediſſe præcipitem, & in maximam malam crucem abiiſſe. Juſtinus cognomento Martyr, & Gregorius Nazianzenus, qui primi aut inter primos, hanc fabulam olim in ſcripta ſua retulerunt, id vel ſtudio Philoſophiæ Chriſtianæ (ita enim iſti Græculi Chriſtianiſmum vocare ſolent) fecere; dum videlicet inſanientem veterum Græcorum ſapientiam, obſcurandam & premendam exiſtimârunt; vel fortaſſe etiam, (quidni enim veris locus ſit?) priſcæ hiſtoriæ ignoratione. Nam ex Eumolpi, Apollodori, Favorinique ſcriptis, quæ illâ etiam tempeſtate ſuperfuiſſe ſcimus, facile dediciſſe boni viri poterant, rem longè ſe ſecùs habuiſſe, quàm prodiderunt* (128). i. e. " It was a common thing in
" Greece, as it is alſo the cuſtom to this day, for
" the ſacred Orators, if thoſe pulpit drums and trum-
" peters to the mob deſerve ſo honourable a name,
" to give out that Ariſtotle, becauſe he could not diſ-
" cover the reaſon of its ebbing and flowing ſeven
" times a day, flung himſelf headlong into the Eu-
" ripus, and ſo poor wretch ended his life. Juſtin
" ſurnamed the Martyr and Gregory Nazianzen, who
" were the firſt, or ſome of the firſt, who adopted
" this fiction in their writings, either did it out of
" zeal to the Chriſtian Philoſophy, (for ſo thoſe petty
" Grecians are uſed to call Chriſtianity,) thinking it
" beſt eſtabliſhed by depreciating and ſuppreſſing the
" Philoſophy of the ancient Greeks; or elſe probably
" (for why ſhould we ſtifle the truth?) from their ig-
" norance of ancient hiſtory; for thoſe good men
" might eaſily have informed themſelves from the
" writings of Eumolpus, Apollodorus, and Favorinus,
" which we are ſure were extant at that time, that
" the thing was quite otherwiſe than they repreſent-
" ed it.

(128) Tanaquil. Fabri *Epiſtolar.* Part 1. pag. 49, 50.

Giraldus had before laid the ſame thing to the charge of theſe Fathers, and from theſe facts has drawn a very pious concluſion. He ſays, I, that Juſtin Martyr aſſures us that Ariſtotle died for grief, becauſe he could not diſcover the flux and reflux of the Euripus: II, that Procopius has ſaid the ſame in the fourth Book of his Hiſtory: III, that Gregory Nazianzen having remarked, that it was a misfortune of Homer not to have been able to reſolve a queſtion, immediately deſpiſes the Philoſophy of Ariſtotle, with regard to the viciſſitudes of the Euripus, which occaſioned his death: IV, that the Greek Commentator on this Father ſays that this Philoſopher caſt himſelf into an arm of the ſea, ſaying theſe words, Ἐπειδὴ Ἀριστοτέλης οὐκ εἶλε τὸν Εὔριπον, Εὔριπος ἑλέτω τὸν Ἀριστοτέλην. i. e. " Since Ariſtotle cannot maſter the Euripus, let
" the Euripus maſter Ariſtotle (129). V, That we
" may gather from hence, that fortune has been adverſe
" to the impious, as well of the falſe as of the true re-
" ligion.

(129) Lilius Gregor. Gyraldus, *Dialogiſmo* 50. pag. 912. tom. 2. *Oper.* edit. 1696.

ARISTOTLE, a celebrated Architect in the fifteenth Century, was of Bologna, and of the family of the Alberti (*a*). One of the moſt remarkable things related of him is that he could tranſport a tower of ſtone from one place to another entire [*A*]. John Baſilides, Great Duke of Muſcovy, ſent for him, and made uſe of his induſtry in the building

(*a*) Leand. Albertus, *in Deſcript. Italiæ*, pag. 516.

[*A*] *He could tranſport . . . . a tower of ſtone entire.*] Jonſius brings two witneſſes for it, Beroaldus and Matthew Palmerius (1). The former has theſe words: *Non diu eſt quod Ariſtoteles civis noſter, Mechanicus longè omnium præſtantiſſimus, turrim ex ſede ſua movit, motamque arte mechanicâ in alium haud longè diſſitum locum tranſportavit. Non eſt mendacio locus, cum adhuc ſuperſint qui videre* (2). i. e. " It is not long ſince
" Ariſtotle, our fellow-citizen, and by far the moſt
" ſkillful Mechanick of the age, removed by his art
" a tower from its place to another at ſome diſtance
" from it. There is no room for ſuſpecting the truth
" of it, ſeeing there are ſome now alive who ſaw it."
See alſo Palmerius: *Ariſtoteles Bononienſis Architecturæ inſignis habetur, qui lapideas turres integras illæſas ſubjectis fundamento lapidibus ad alium traduxit locum* (3). i. e. " Ariſtotle of Bologna was reckoned a famous
" Architect, who removed whole towers of ſtone, to-
" gether with their foundation, from one place to an-
" other, without any damage to them.

(1) Jonſius, *de Scriptor. Hiſt. Philoſ.* pag. 68.

(2) Beroald. *in Sueton. Veſpaſ.* cap. 18.

(3) Matth. Palmer. *Chron. ad ann.* 1455.

ing of ſeveral churches (*b*). There are ſome names difficult to be born; that of Ariſtotle is of this number; yet there are above thirty Ariſtotles [*B*].

(*b*) *See* Hercules Zani's relation of Muſcovy, in the *Leipſic Journal of* 1691. p. 476.

[*B*] *There are more than thirty Ariſtotles.*] See the diſſertations of Jonſius *de Hiſtoriâ Peripateticâ*, in the firſt of which you will find one and twenty of that name mentioned. The Author at that time thought he had compleated his catalogue of them, and had left nothing unſaid on that ſubject (4); but he proved by his own example that knowledge increaſes with age, for he had eleven more to produce, when he publiſhed his treatiſe *de Scriptoribus Hiſtoriæ Philoſophiæ*; and had alſo ſome new additions to make to what he had before related of ſome of the one and twenty. The preceding remark is one of theſe additions.

(4) See ch. 12. of the Treatiſe of Jonſius *de Hiſtoria Peripateticâ.*

ARIUS, the head and founder of ARIANISM, a Sect which denied the eternal Divinity and Conſubſtantiality of the Word, lived in the fourth Century. He was born in Lybia near Egypt. Euſebius Biſhop of Nicomedia, a great favourite of Conſtantia, ſiſter of the Emperor Conſtantine and wife of Licinius, contributed extreamly to the propagating this hereſy (*a*). He was of a ſubtle genius, a true court Biſhop, in a word, the moſt capable man in the world of making a new doctrine received. He took ARIUS under his protection, and introduced him into the favour of Conſtantia; for it is always imagined that unleſs the women engage in the intereſts of a Sect, the progreſs of it cannot be very conſiderable. Arius's party immediately grew ſtrong, and ſeveral Biſhops embraced it openly. There was nothing but diſputes in the cities: ſometimes they went from words to blows; ſo that it became abſolutely neceſſary for the Emperor to remedy theſe diſorders, which he did, in aſſembling the Council of Nice, which condemned the doctrine of Arius, in the year 325. This Hereſiarch was baniſhed by the Emperor; who commanded moreover that all his books ſhould be burnt, and that whoever dared to keep them, ſhould be puniſhed with death [*A*]. Some pretend that Arius, having abjured his hereſy in preſence of the Council, eſcaped baniſhment [*B*]; but others maintain that he was baniſhed [*C*], and that the Emperor did not recal him till ten years were expired (*b*) [*D*]. They ſay the Prince was made to believe that Arius was Orthodox at the bottom: and add, that Conſtantine being confirmed in this belief by the profeſſion of faith which this man preſented to him, wrote in his favour to the Biſhops who were aſſembled at Jeruſalem for the dedication of the Temple; that the Biſhops who remained in that city, when Arius arrived there with Conſtantine's letter, were for the moſt part concealed Arians, who therefore

(*a*) Hieron. *ad Cteſiphont.*

(*b*) *See* F. Maimbourg's *Arianiſm*, Book 1 and 2.

[*A*] *Conſtantine commanded that all the Books of Arius ſhould be burnt, and that whoſoever dar'd to keep them ſhould be puniſhed with death.*] Socrates gives us the very letter in which Conſtantine gave orders that all thoſe who found any Book compos'd by Arius, and did not burn it, ſhould inevitably be puniſhed with death, as ſoon as ever they were diſcovered. Ἐκεῖνο μέντοι προαγορέυω, ὡς εἴ τις σύγγραμμα ὑπὸ Ἀρείου συνταγὲν φαρμακείῃ κρύψας, μὴ εὐθέως προσανεγκὼν πυρὶ καταναλώσῃ, τοῦτο θάνατος ἔσαι ἡ ζημία. παραχρῆμα γὰρ ἁλοὺς ἐπὶ τούτῳ κεφαλικὴν ὑποσήσεται τιμωρίαν (1). I don't remember to have read any author who has taken notice of this unaccountable and extravagant piece of conduct of Conſtantine. He was pleaſed only to baniſh the Hereſiarch, without denouncing death on his followers, and at the ſame time threatened to inflict it on ſuch as ſhould conceal any work of Arius. Who ever heard of a more enormous diſproportion betwixt faults and puniſhments? Might not a man be very orthodox, and yet have a curioſity to ſee what theſe Hereticks had to ſay for themſelves, and to keep their Books as a rarity, as ſuch commonly come to be that are comdemned to the flames? If therefore it had happened that ſome orthodox perſon ſhould have kept a Book of Arius, with ſome ſuch innocent deſign as this, and had been catched with it in his poſſeſſion, he muſt have been hang'd upon the ſpot, while a man that made a profeſſion of Arianiſm was ſuffered to live. What can be more fantaſtical, not to ſay abſurd, than to let Hereticks live, and at the ſame time to forbid them on pain of death to have in their keeping any of their founder's Books? We may alſo remark this, that tho' Arius, and ſome Biſhops his adherents were baniſhed, yet their converſation was ſtill more dangerous than the reading of their Books. Why then were not all ſuch, as ſhould reſort to theſe exiles, menaced with the ſevereſt puniſhment?

(1) Socrat. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 1. cap. 9. pag. 32.

[*B*] *Some pretend that Arius ... eſcaped baniſhment.*] Baronius affirms upon the credit of St. Jerom, that Arius pretended to repent, and that after having ſubſcribed to the council of Nice, he was received by that council into the peace of the church, and his baniſhment remitted. It is not to be denied that St. Jerom ſays, that Arius made his peace with the council of Nice (2); but we ought to give infinitely more credit to the letter of that very council, than to the private opinion of a ſingle man who lived after that time. In this letter it is ſhewn how the opinions of Arius were canvaſſed and condemned; but as to what was determined againſt his perſon, and what became of him they forbear to mention, that they might not ſeem to take a pleaſure in inſulting over his diſgrace. Now is it likely they would ſpeak in this manner of a man, in whoſe recantation they had acquieſced? The learned Henry Valeſius reaſoning on the ſubject of this letter, takes occaſion to extol the moderation of this council, for not having expreſly thundered out its anathema's againſt the perſon of Arius, but only againſt thoſe in general, who ſhould teach ſuch and ſuch hereſies, and becauſe that, inſtead of ſolliciting the Emperor to baniſh the Hereticks, they ſhewed a concern at their baniſhment (3).

(2) Hieron. *in Dialogo contra Luciferianos.*

(3) Valeſius *in Sozomenum*, lib. 2. cap. 16. pag. 108.

[*C*] *Others maintain that he was baniſhed.*] It appears that Sozomen was one of this number, ſince he aſſures us that Arius was recalled a little after the ſeſſion of this Synod. Οὐ πολλῷ ὕ ὕςερον τῆς ἐν Νικαίᾳ Συνόδου, Ἄρειος ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξορίαν ἀπαγόμενος, ἀνεκλήθη (4). The ſubmiſſion of the two Biſhops, who were expelled their Churches, and ſent into baniſhment, afford us a proof of the baniſhment of Arius. I mean thoſe two prelates Euſebius and Theognis, who were exiled by Conſtantine three months after the breaking up of the council, as Philoſtorgius informs us (5), and obtained a repeal three years after the council, according to the ſame Author, which they obtained by ſigning their ſubmiſſion in writing to its deciſions, which they ſent to the Biſhops; in which they obſerved, that he who was the chief cauſe of theſe diſputes, had been recalled from his baniſhment; and that it would be unreaſonable, after his being admitted to terms of reconciliation, that they ſhould be debarred the privilege of making their innocency appear (6). We ſee here two facts proved, one that Arius was baniſhed, the other that he made his peace with the Biſhops, and obtained his liberty before Euſebius and Theognis obtained theirs: They obtained it in 328, according to Philoſtorgius, whoſe opinion exactly tallies with the Hiſtory of that time; whence it is manifeſt that the opinion of Arius's, not being recalled till 335, is falſe.

(4) Sozomenus, lib. 2. cap. 16. Valeſius obſerves that from the ſenſe of theſe words ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξορίαν, we are to underſtand that Arius was recalled as he was going to the place of his exile.

(5) *Apud* Valeſium *in Hiſtor. Eccleſiaſt.* Socrat. lib. 1. cap. 14. pag. 10.

(6) Sozomen. lib. 2. cap. 16.

[*D*] .... *that the Emperor did not recall him till ten years were expired.*] Father Maimbourg has followed this falſe Chronology, the error of which has been clearly proved in the foregoing Remark.

therefore made no difficulty to pronounce his doctrine orthodox, and receive him into the communion of the church, that to gain a compleat triumph, they imagined that Arius muſt be re-eſtabliſhed in Alexandria, where he had received the firſt ſhock of excommunication; and that, as St. Athanaſius, who was Patriarch there, and was the grand adverſary of Arius, had been baniſhed, they thought that in his abſence it would be eaſy to re-eſtabliſh Arius in the communion of the church of Alexandria; but in that they were miſtaken; that the people would never admit him to it; that Conſtantine being informed of the continuation of the troubles, ſent for Arius to Conſtantinople, and obtained of him, without any difficulty, to ſubſcribe to the Council of Nice; that afterwards he ſent him to the Biſhops, which were then aſſembled at Conſtantinople, in order to have him received into the communion of this Imperial city; that he who was at that time Biſhop of it would never conſent to it, although it was repreſented to him that Arius had ſigned all was deſired of him; that Euſebius had notwithſtanding gotten the Eccleſiaſtical Communion to be given him in the great church of Conſtantinople; that he brought him thither as in triumph, accompanied with a great troop of his Partizans; but as they approach'd near the great ſquare, Arius being preſſed with a natural neceſſity, retired in haſte to a publick houſe of office, and died there upon the ſpot, all his entrails burſting out with his liver and ſpleen, in the year 336 (*c*). Some very learned men reject this Chronology [*E*]. Arius's Sect did not die with him, it has ſubſiſted a long while, and had reputation in ſeveral parts of the world. It cannot be enough admired at, that a Miniſter, who paſſes for a very learned man, was ignorant of ſo notorious a fact [*F*]. He was alſo ignorant of another, which is no leſs evident; for he has ſaid, that penal Laws were not put in execution

(*c*) Taken from F. Maimbourg's *Arianiſm*, Book 1 and 2.

[*E*] . . . . *And that he died in the year* 336. *Some very learned men reject this Chronology.*] Henry Valeſius proves that Arius was not alive at the time of the Synod of Jeruſalem, which received letters from Conſtantine touching the reconciliation of ſome principal members of the Arian Sect. *Arius Hereſiarches diu ante Synodum Hieroſolymitanam è vivis exceſſerat, ut certiſſimis argumentis probavi in libro ſecundo obſervationum Eccleſiaſticarum, Capite II* (7). i. e. "Arius "the Hereſiarch died long before the Synod of Je- "ruſalem, as I have proved by undeniable arguments "in the ſecond book of my Eccleſiaſtical Obſervati- "ons, Chap. II." So that it could not be Arius the Hereſiarch, who was recommended to his Council by Conſtantine, and who found the Biſhops aſſembled at Jeruſalem. But notwithſtanding this, Socrates ſays in expreſs words, that the Council tranſlated from Tyre to Jeruſalem for the dedication of the temple, received Arius and his adherents into the communion of the Church in obedience to the letters of Conſtantine, in which he certified, that he was perſuaded both of the orthodoxy of Arius and Euzoius. Ἄρειον μὲν καὶ τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν ἐδέξατο, τοῖς βασιλέως γράμμασι πειθαρχεῖν λέγοντας, δι' ὧν δεδήλωκει αὐτοῖς πεπεῖσθαι περὶ τῆς πίστεως Ἀρείου καὶ Εὐζοΐου (8). Conſtantine had ſent to the Biſhops aſſembled at Jeruſalem the profeſſion of their faith, which Arius and Euzoius had preſented to him (9), and St. Athanaſius ſays poſitively, that the Synod of Jeruſalem received Arius and his followers into its communion. Γράφοντες δεῖν δέχεσθαι Ἄρειον καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ (10). i. e. "Writing that Arius and his com- "panions ought to be received." Valeſius clears up this difficulty by ſaying, that there were two Arius's, one the hereſiarch, the other his follower; and that they were both excommunicated by Alexander Biſhop of Alexandria. He that preſented a profeſſion of his faith to Conſtantine, along with Euzoius, and who was reconciled to the Church by the Synod of Jeruſalem, was not the Hereſiarch but another Arius. Valeſius proves it not only by the reaſons, which he has produced to ſhew that the Hereſiarch died long before the year 335; but alſo by the petition of the two Biſhops, Euſebius and Theognis, who ſued for an Act of Grace, and made a proteſtation of their innocency in 328, alledging that the firſt cauſe and author of theſe controverſies had been reconciled and reſtored; which could not be meant of this Arius, who was re-united to the Church in the Synod of Jeruſalem; for the petition or profeſſion of their faith, which he and Euzoius preſented to Conſtantine a little before this Synod, that is to ſay about the year 335, ſhews that they were ſtill under a ſtate of baniſhment and excommunication. This ſudden death of Arius, in which the orthodox have diſcovered ſo many myſteries, happened after the Council of Jeruſalem. We muſt conclude threfore, that the Arius who died in this manner, was not the Hereſiarch, and that they have dated at one time what happened at another. It is ſurprizing that there ſhould be ſo little exactneſs and regularity in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, that one cannot be poſitive of the baniſhment of Arius, the duration of that baniſhment, and things of the like nature, without arguing from different facts as atteſted by different Authors. One good Hiſtorian, tho' all the others were loſt, would be ſufficient to direct us in the order and ſeries of the moſt remarkable events.

(7) Valeſii *Notæ in Socrat.* lib. 1. cap. 33.

(8) Socrat. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 1. cap. 33.

(9) It is all at length in Sozomen, in book 2. chap. 28.

(10) Athanaſ. in lib. *de Synodis*, *apud* Valeſium *in Socrat.* lib. 1. cap. 33. pag. 16.

[*F*] *The Sect of Arius . . . . ſubſiſted a long while . . . . a Miniſter who paſſes for a very learned man, was ignorant of ſo notorious a fact.*] Take his own words: *I am alſo perſuaded, that the Arian Sect never formed any conſiderable body in the world. It is true that there have been ſeveral Biſhops, who were of this profeſſion; but the groſs of the people were never infected with this hereſy* (11). What he ſays in another place is much more ſtrong; for he aſſures us, that Arianiſm run off like a torrent. We can't ſay in excuſe for him, that this was an error proceeding from careleſsneſs and want of attention, ſince he advances this fact as an eſſential and fundamental remark, on which he builds his Syſtem. His opinion on one hand is, that hereſies againſt the Trinity are fundamental and mortal; and on the other, that God has never ſuffered the Sects, which have fallen into this kind of hereſies, to be of any long continuance, or to make any figure in the world. *God cannot permit*, ſays he (12), *that* GREAT *Societies of Chriſtians ſhould be immerſed in mortal errors, or that they ſhould perſevere any* LONG TIME *in them: at leaſt to judge by experience we ought not to think this poſſible, ſince it never yet happened.* Mr. Nicolle was the firſt that reprimanded him for what he ſays in page 142; which he has done without any ſeverity or inſolence in the following manner: "What Mr. Jurieu ſays is very "true, if underſtood of the progreſs of Arianiſm, "which darted out all at once like a flaſh of lightning; "but not ſo exact as to the times, which ſucceed- "ed; for tho' the Church had recovered her full "luſtre in the greateſt part of the world, yet there "were ſome conſiderable bodies, as the Vandals in "Africa, the Goths in Aſia, in Italy, and a great "part of France and Spain, which entirely profeſ- "ſed Arianiſm, and where things were carried on "too openly for the common people not to bear a "part (13)." Some time after Mr. Peliſſon takes him to taſk, in theſe words: "The Arians were "nevertheleſs a thorn in his ſide, as well as the mo- "dern fanaticks, the Socinians, and thoſe whom he "ſtyles the Photinians of Poland and Tranſilvania. "A ſpark of modeſty would not let him aſſociate "himſelf with theſe in the ſame Church; however "he found out a way to get rid of them, without "entring into the diſpute, or applying himſelf to the "learned for information whether or no the founda- "dation they went upon was overthrown; and if "ſo,

(11) Jurieu, *vrai Syſtême de l'Egliſe*, p. 149.

(12) Idem, pag. 236.

(13) Nicolle, pag. 15 and 16 of the Preface to the *Unity of the Church*.

execution againſt this Sect [*G*]. Another thing that he has ſaid, has not a little embarraſſed him; for great advantage has been taken of what he has ſaid of the belief of the Fathers, who preceded Arianiſm [*H*]. This Sect has been by turns perſecuting

" ſo, whether totally or partially. His meaning is, " ſays he, that he admits into the pale of the Church, " which is one and catholick, but ſuch Societies as " make a body. As for the Arians they have not " formed a body, at leaſt not any conſiderable one; " (this contradicts the evidence of all Hiſtory, which " in many places tells us of their Communion, their " Aſſemblies, and their Baſilica's or Churches, en- " tirely diſtinct from thoſe of the orthodox.) As " for the modern Fanaticks, the Socinians and Pho- " tinians, they have neither regular aſſemblies, po- " lity, nor union, and therefore ought to be look'd " upon as out of the queſtion. But if, according to " his own principles, God, to puniſh our faults and " unhappy diviſions, ſhould permit theſe common " enemies to multiply, and to form themſelves into " one regular body, then they are to be conſidered in " the ſame rank with others: ſo that take it which way " you pleaſe, he has a ſpecifick againſt all difficulties " (14)." The Author in his Reply to Mr. Nicolle, allows that the Arians *compoſed a* GREAT *Body*, but he inſiſted, that *they enjoyed but a very ſhort reign in the world*, and that *God deſtroyed their Communion, becauſe it was not founded upon fundamental truths* (15). A third Critick alſo ſtarted up againſt him, who maintained, as the two others had done, that Arianiſm had not only ſpread its infection to a very great extent, but alſo had been of a very long continuance, and that this hereſy had inſtilled its poiſon into the common people. See the Book intitled *Janua Cælorum reſerata* (16). There you will find (17), that Arianiſm kept its ground with great glory for above the ſpace of three hundred years; that for almoſt two Ages it was the prevailing Religion in Spain; that it even aſcended the throne both in the Eaſt and in the Weſt, and that it reigned in Italy, France, Pannonia, and Africa. Sure never Author was ſo banded about, and driven from one unlucky conſequence to another ſtill worſe, as was the Author of the *Syſtem* by the feigned Carus Larebonius (18). They have proved to him, that if God never permitted *any great Societies of Chriſtians to be immers'd in mortal errors, or to continue in them any long time*; and that if God *has occaſioned the deſtruction of Arianiſm, becauſe it did not adhere to the fundamental truths*; then it neceſſarily follows, I, that the errors of the Roman Church are not mortal; II, that Mahometaniſm has adhered to the fundamental truths. The Author of the *Syſtem*, to evade his conſequence, pretends that Mahometaniſm is a Sect, that took its growth from Chriſtianity, and can diſpute neither the extent nor duration of it. Theſe are objections which the moſt ſubtil caviller cannot anſwer with all his ſophiſtry. The Synods could not any ways pretend ignorance of this Book; and notwithſtanding they never paſſed cenſure on this doctrine of the Syſtem, tho' the ſcope of it is a full juſtification of the Roman Church, and conſequently to convict the Reformed of ſchiſm.

(14) *Reflect. on the Differences of Religion*, Part 2. pag. 429, 430.

(15) Jurieu, *l'Unité de l'Egliſe*, pag. 564.

(16) Printed at Amſterd. 1692.

(17) Pag. 87.

(18) The name which the Author of *Janua Cælorum reſerata* aſſumed.

[*G*] . . . . *He has ſaid that penal laws were not put in execution againſt this Sect.*] We ſhall here give the reader a famous paſſage out of his *Preſervative againſt change of Religion*. The Miniſter I am ſpeaking of publiſhed this Book during his abode in France (19), in oppoſition to the Catholick Expoſition of the Biſhop of Condom. Take his own words in page 11 (20): *The Church has ſuffered perſecutions, but never exerciſed any. It has got the aſcendant over Paganiſm, as Paganiſm had over it; but never tyrannized in the ſame manner. It never made uſe of the authority of the Conſtantines and Theodoſius's to bath the Temples of their falſe Gods with the blood of their worſhippers, as the Pagans employed the ſwords of their Nero's, Maximinus's, Decius's, and Dioclefian's, to ſpill the blood of the Chriſtians. A man muſt be very little vers'd in the Hiſtory of the Church not to know that in the war, wherein it was engaged with the Arians, Eutychians, and other Hereticks, it never armed itſelf with any other weapons than Exhortations, Arguments, Councils and the like.* The Author of the *Philoſophical Commentary* had juſt reaſon to be amazed, that a Profeſſor in Divinity, and one who was look'd upon in France as a man very knowing in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, ſhould betray ſuch a piece of ignorance as this (21). But he was ſtill more amazed that, after this thing had been ſet in ſo clear a light by Father Thomaſſin, another French Writer, in his addreſs to the Biſhop of Meaux, ſhould have theſe words: *I muſt beg leave, my Lord, to obſerve to you, that whatever acts of violence we read of, either in ancient or modern Hiſtory, to have been exerciſed by Princes on account of Religion, have always been look'd upon as ſpectacles of the utmoſt horror, and the very names of thoſe Princes are never mentioned but with infamy and deteſtation.* See the reflection which the Commentator makes upon this paſſage: *What! the Conſtantines, the Theodoſius's, the Honorius's, the Marcianus's, and the Juſtinians, who put ſo many penal laws in execution againſt the Sectaries, who condemned to death thoſe who perſevered in the Pagan idolatry, in Manicheiſm, &c.; and even ſuch as read or kept any heretical Books; as theſe names which are never mentioned but with infamy and deteſtation? How will he go about to prove this* (22)? The Divine which publiſhed the *Preſervative*, has made a greater improvement in the ſtudy of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory ſince his tranſlation into Holland. He has learned to refute the doctrine of Toleration by the authority of the Conſtantines, the Theodoſius's, and the Charlemagne's. *Paganiſm*, ſays he (23), *would ſtill have kept its ground, and three quarters of Europe have been Pagans at this day, if Conſtantine and his ſucceſſors had not employed their authority in the extirpation of it.* In France he thought it unlawful to have recourſe to the ſecular arm; and in Holland he looks upon it as impious to ſay, that the ſecular authority ought not to interpoſe. Now who will be perſuaded to believe that maxim, that a change of climates does not cauſe a change of ſentiments?

(19) I think the firſt edition is the Roan in 1680; there were other editions came out in Holland.

(20) Of the Hague edition 1682.

(21) *Comment. Philoſoph.* p. 354. of the Supplement.

(22) Ibid. pag. 355.

(23) *Droits des deux Souverains*, pag. 280.

Cælum, non animum mutant qui trans mare currunt (24).

That is,

" They change their climate only, not their mind."
Creech.

(24) Horat. Epiſt. 11. lib. 1. ver. 27.

There is a local faith, and a temporary faith, which never once was thought of in all the diviſions of genus and ſpecies. See the note [*H*] of the article of St. AUGUSTIN.

[*H*] . . . . *Great advantage has been taken of what he has ſaid of the belief of the Fathers who preceded Arianiſm.*] He has aſſerted in his *Paſtoral Letters*, that theſe Fathers did not believe an equality of perſons in the Trinity, and that they admitted a temporal generation of the world, which conferred upon the ſecond Perſon his compleat and perfect exiſtence. It is plain, that this opinion is very near the ſame with that of Arius, and entirely overthrows the eternal Trinity of Perſons. The Biſhop of Meaux has purſued Mr. Jurieu ſo cloſe (25) on this head, that he made him break ſilence, which he had all along obſerved with regard to other articles, and provoked him to a reply, which however did him more diſkindneſs than his former ſilence; for he was forced to contradict himſelf, and diſown ſeveral things, and after all made no advantage by it. The Biſhop of Meaux took him to taſk again, and handled his antagoniſt ſo dextrouſly, that he never durſt enter the liſts with him again: ſo that amongſt the higheſt encomiums, that were paid this Prelate, they did not forget to mention his having put to ſilence the moſt formidable of Criticks (26). Mr. Jurieu was no ſooner out of the hands of the Biſhop of Meaux, but he fell into thoſe of Carus Larebonius, who demonſtrated to him, that if the Fathers of the three firſt Centuries had entertained ſuch a notion of the Trinity, and of the generation of the Word, as he charges them with, then it neceſſarily followed, that neither the hereſies of the Arians, nor that of the Socinians were mortal and fundamental (27). By the way we muſt take care that the victories gained over this Miniſter do not ſeem any ways to affect the doctrine of his Church, but only his private opinions. This is a caution, which *the Hiſtory of the works of the learned* (28) has given to

(25) In his Advertiſements.

(26) See the Diſcourſe ſpoke by Mr. de la Bruyere at his admiſſion into the French Academy.

(27) See *Janua Cælorum reſerata*, pag. 119, & *ſeq.*

(28) For the month of May 1692, Article 9. pag. 391, & *ſeq.*

perſecuting and perſecuted [*I*]; and at laſt it periſhed by the means of authority [*K*]. I find hardly any Author, who does not impute it as a crime to Arius, that he put his ſentiments in verſe, that they might be ſung by his diſciples. They condemn both the matter and form of the Poem, which he entitled *Thalia* [*L*]. There might be ſome prejudice in all this. A modern Author, who agreed in ſentiments with this Heretick,

to the publick. Nor is this uſurping a Province, that does not belong to me, ſince it has a juſt title to a place in my Critical Dictionary, as it is falſly alledged to be a matter of fact, that the hereſy of Arius was implicitly taught by the Fathers of the three firſt Centuries. It is very ſtrange that Mr. Jurieu, after having conſidered Arianiſm in ſo many different lights, ſhould always happen to be of the wrong ſide. This one would think ſhould be more difficult than to find a Gladiator, who could never hit a bull. *Taurum toties non ferire difficile eſt* (29). i. e. "It is a hard matter not to be able to hit the mark once in ſo many "trials." I muſt not omit obſerving by the way, that in the diſpute of the matter of fact relating to the penal laws of Conſtantine, and the duration and extent of Arianiſm, the Authors I have ſpoken of above, pointed out to him his error in a very candid manner, and without having recourſe to inſult and invective, as is too often uſed againſt an adverſary in a caſe of the like nature.

(29) *See* Trebellius Pollio in the *Life of Gallienus*.

[*I*] *This Sect has by turns been perſecuting and perſecuted.*] It is not to be denied that the Orthodox were the firſt aggreſſors; for we have ſeen above, that Conſtantine inflicted baniſhment on ſome of the principal leaders of Arianiſm; and that he threatened with death all thoſe, who did not commit to the flames the writings of this Hereſiarch: but it is alſo certain, that Conſtantius his ſon, and Valens, who advanced Arianiſm to the Throne, treated the Orthodox with more rigour aud ſeverity than ever Conſtantine did the Arians. Tho' generally ſpeaking, the latter ſeem to have indulged toleration and liberty of conſcience more than the former; and this is a poſition, that the *Philoſophical Commentator* has undertaken to prove in the Supplement of his Work (30). Among other arguments he makes uſe of this, that at the time when Recaredus exſtirpated Arianiſm out of Spain, the number of Catholick Biſhops was far ſuperior to that of the Arian Biſhops, notwithſtanding that the Arian religion had prevailed in that Kingdom near the ſpace of two hundred years. This affords a very ſtrong preſumption, that they gave the Catholicks very little moleſtation.

(30) See chap. 30 and 31.

[*K*] *It periſhed by the means of ſecular authority.*] Mariana paſſes very gently over the rigours which Recaredus was obliged to exerciſe, and excuſes them from the neceſſity there was for them, and becauſe they were not diſpleaſing to the people. *Contigit autem Recaredo, quod haud ſcio an regum ulli, ut religione permutanda, quod propemodum neceſſe erat, motus exiſterent, ſed neque diuturni admodum neque graves; & ſeveritas animadverſionis non modo invidioſa non eſſet, quia neceſſario ſuſcipiebatur, ſed etiam popularis & cum bonis omnibus, tum infimo cuique gratiſſima* (31). i. e. "Recaredus "was more fortunate in this reſpect, than perhaps "any other Monarch whatever, that thoſe commo- "tions, which are almoſt the neceſſary effect of in- "troducing a general change of religion, were nei- "ther laſting nor grievous; and the ſeverity of his "laws not only unattended with any odium, ſeeing "there was a neceſſity which enforced the making "and execution of them, but even popular and grate- "ful to perſons of all ranks." The Author referred to above, remarks, that if we did but know all the complaints, which the Arians had to make, we ſhould probably ſee a very long catalogue of acts of violence and oppreſſion; and that at beſt it was owing to accident, if Arianiſm happened to be ſuppreſſed without rigorous perſecutions; for altho', according to Mariana, ſeverities never were exerciſed, but when neceſſity required, yet we muſt conclude, 1, that if they were not exerciſed oftner, it was becauſe the Arians were not refractory: 2, that if they had been obſtinate and ſtubborn, they would have reduced them to the limits of obedience, either by fair means or foul (32). This Author ſhews us by the way (33) a very groſs contradiction, which thoſe writers, that make it their buſineſs to diſcourſe of converſions, generally fall into. They lay it down for a general maxim that obſtinacy is the characteriſtick of Hereſy; and nevertheleſs, the better to draw a veil over thoſe acts of violence committed by the proſelyte-makers, they give out that theſe converſions were brought about with a great deal of eaſe; and then from the eaſineſs of effecting them, they draw an argument to prove the Hereſy of the converted. True believers, ſay they, would never have ſo tamely deſerted their church; but the reſiſtance which the Arians made againſt King Recaredus *was ſo feeble and ſhort, that one might very truly judge from thence, that it was the cauſe of falſehood which they fought in, not of truth, which is of itſelf capable to animate reaſonable ſouls, and inſpire them with bravery and reſolution* (34).

(31) Mariana, *Hiſt. Hiſpan.* lib. 5. cap. 14. Conſult the Supplement of the *Philoſ. Comment.* pag. 373.]

(32) Supplement of the *Philoſoph. Comment.* pag. 375, 376.

(33) Idem, pag. 377.

(34) Thomaſſin, *de l'Unité de l'Egliſe*, p. 449.

[*L*] *They condemn both the matter and form of the Poem that he had intitled* Thalia.] We have a great deal of reaſon to condemn Hereſies, to pity thoſe who are ſincere profeſſors of them, and to hold in abomination ſuch as teach them to others, without believing them themſelves; for ſuch teachers are monſters of ambition and wickedneſs. But I cannot conceive how it comes to be our duty to accuſe Heretical Teachers, as of particular crimes for their obſerving a method adapted to the underſtanding of the ſimple, and for inſtructing them in a manner ſuitable to their groſs conceptions. *After Arius left the boſom of the Church, he took it into his head to compoſe various ſongs for Mariners, Travellers, Millers &c. and he alſo ſet to muſick ſome others, which he looked upon as proper to affect his followers, according to their different diſpoſitions; endeavouring to infuſe the venom of his impiety into the moſt rude and ignorant by the ſweetneſs of his ſongs. . . . . But his Thalia was by far the moſt famous of all his compoſitions. He had borrowed the name and model of it from an ancient Poet named Sotades. . . . . This burleſque Poet affected ſo much ſoftneſs in the ſtyle of his ſong, and the cadence of it was ſo effeminate, that even the Pagans themſelves treated him with the utmoſt contempt and ridicule: nor is there any exaggeration of this in St. Athanaſius's account of it, ſince the very leaſt of the Poets and ſuch as wrote with the greateſt ſpirit of libertiniſm, even bluſhed at the immodeſty of the ſongs of this infamous Poet of antiquity. It was in imitation of this Author, that Arius gave his work the name of Thalia, which properly ſignifies a feaſt and aſſembly of young people, or a ſong made on purpoſe to be ſung at ſuch ſort of feaſts* (35). After this Mr. Hermant tranſcribes a very long paſſage from St. Athanaſius (36), in which Arius is called *a ſort of Sotades which would be thought ridiculous even by Pagans* . . . . and a Heretick *who had no other emulation but that of excelling in ſuch ridiculous diſcourſes as were thoſe of Sotades.* In the ſame paſſage we have the beginning of the Thalia, and another fragment, which contains the heretical notion of Arius touching Jeſus Chriſt. One cannot forbear condemning the ridiculous and inſupportable pride, which appears in this exordium of the Thalia. But once more let us blame Arius for having been a Heretick, and not when this is ſuppoſed, for having drawn up a form of his belief in verſe, for then we ſhould give a handle to Hereticks and Infidels to condemn true Chriſtians, not only becauſe they profeſs their belief of the true Goſpel, but alſo becauſe they ſing, not only the Pſalms of David, but alſo ſeveral hymns and ſongs, the meaſure and tunes of which may be very like thoſe of the moſt profane and wanton ſongs of an Opera. Generally ſpeaking it is more commendable for any one, whatever his particular profeſſion be, to chant pious and religious Poems, than to ſing wanton ſonnets and lampoons; and the Sailor and Miller in their unhappy ſtate of Arianiſm, ſhewed a better diſpoſition in chanting their Catechiſm than in ſinging their amours. It is a very weak argument to alledge that the ſongs of the Arians were held in contempt by the very Heathens; for I do not ſuppoſe that they made any great difference betwixt the Arians and orthodox Chriſtians, but equally hated them both; nor were

(35) Hermant, in his *Life of St. Athanaſius*, lib. 1. cap. 13. p. 61.

(36) *Ex Orat. 2. contra Arianos.*

WHETHER or no we ought to condemn ſpiritual Songs, which are ſet to the ſame Tunes as profane Songs.

tick, has written ſome works to ſhew that the Fathers of the three firſt Centuries have had the ſame opinion [*M*]. He had not much trouble in collecting paſſages, for he found them all together in the *Dogmata Theologica* of Father Petavius. Two Engliſh (*d*), and one French Divine (*e*) have made apologies for the antient Fathers againſt him.

(*d*) Gardiner *and* Bull.

(*e*) Mr. le Moyne Profeſſor at Leyden.

were the former more favourably diſpoſed to the worſhip of the Pagan Idols than the latter. But neither am I of opinion that Mr. Hermant had any good grounds to ſay, *that even the very Pagans looked upon* Arius *as a very contemptible and ridiculous man*; for the words which he ſets down a little afterwards make it plainly appear that it was Sotades and not Arius, whom St. Athanaſius ſpoke of as a perſon, that was ridiculed by the very Pagans. I have ſaid it before, and I ſay it again, that very pious and religious verſes may be ſet to the ſame ſort of rhimes, and meaſure with the Opera-ſongs; and conſequently why not alſo to the ſame with the verſes of Sotades? For the harm does not conſiſt in the ſimilitude they bear to them in theſe reſpects, but rather in the handle they give to cavillers to ſpeak contemptibly of ſuch verſes. It is not my deſign to be thought to have ſaid any thing in this obſervation, which may any ways juſtify or extenuate, what is contained in the ſubſtance and matter of the Poem. Now to let Proteſtants in particular ſee, what judgment they ought to form of the invectives againſt the Thalia of Arius, it will be proper to acquaint them with what Father Maimbourg publiſhed againſt the Pſalms tranſlated by Clement Marot, which he does not treat with leſs ſeverity than he does the Thalia of Arius. What he ſays of the Thalia may be ſeen in his Hiſtory of Arianiſm (37); and what he ſays of the Pſalms in that of his Calviniſm (38). *Theſe are the Pſalms which were ſung at that time; to which Beza afterwards added the remainder of the Pſalter, which were ſet to muſick and ſung to the moſt ſoft and effeminate tunes, and without any thing of that devout and ſolemn air, which is in the muſick of the Catholic Church.* What Varillas ſays is not altogether falſe, *that the tunes were choſen and from among the fineſt ſongs of that time* (39). See the *divine Melody* of Jeremy de Pours (40). It was not without deſign, that I inſtanced the example of Opera-ſongs, ſince I would intimate thereby, that we ought to be more cautious how we imitate common ſongs in ſpiritual hymns, otherwiſe we ſhall but too much expoſe religion to contempt and ridicule, as appears by the Book which the Author of the *Evêque de Cour* has ſo bantered (41). It is a collection of ſpiritual ſongs compoſed by a Jeſuit and F. Martial de Brive, a Capuchin, which were ſet to the moſt burleſque tunes that were ever ſung in the ſtreet; as for example to the tune of *Daye d'en Daye*, and *Vous y perdez vos pas Nicolas*, &c. I very much queſtion whether the *Thalia* of Arius could equal the impertinence of this collection, tho' printed with the approbation of two Doctors in Divinity.

(37) Tom. 1. pap. 81. edit. Holland.

(38) Pag. 99.

(39) Varillas, *Hiſtory of Hereſy*. book 21. pag. 49. under the year 1559.

(40) Book 2. pag. 577.

(41) See his 3d *Diſcourſe*, p. 86, *& ſeq.* edit. Holland in 1674, in 12mo.

[*M*] *A modern Author has written ſome works to ſhew that the Fathers of the three firſt centuries have had the ſame opinion with Arius.*] The Author's name is Sandius, and his treatiſe on this ſubject is called, *Nucleus Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ, printed in* 1668, *in* 8*vo*. The ſame Book was very much augmented in 1676, *in* 4*to*. *Appendix addendorum, confirmandorum, & emendandorum ad Nucleum Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ, cum reſponſionibus ad Gardinerum*, in 1678, *in* 4*to*.

ARMINIUS (JAMES) Profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden was born at Oude-Water (*a*) in Holland, in 1560 [*A*]. He was an infant when his father died, and he was beholden for his firſt inſtructions to an honeſt Prieſt, who had entertained ſome liking of the opinions of the reformed, and to avoid being obliged to ſay Maſs, often changed his habitation. Arminius was a Student at Utrecht, when death deprived him of this Patron. This loſs would have troubled him greatly, if he had not had the happineſs to be aſſiſted by Rodolphus Snellius his countryman, who carried him with him to Marpurg, in 1575. He was hardly arrived there, when he heard that his country had been ſacked by the Spaniards. This news plunged him into a dreadful affliction, and he could not forbear returning to Holland to be an eye-witneſs of the ſtate that things were reduced to; but having found that his mother, his ſiſter, his brothers, his relations, and almoſt all the inhabitants of Oude-Water had been murdered, he returned to Marpurg, and went this whole journey on foot. He did not ſtay long before he returned to Holland, being acquainted with the foundation of the Univerſity of Leyden, and he ſtudied in this new Academy, with ſo much application and ſucceſs, that he acquired a very particular eſteem. He was ſent to Geneva in 1582 at the expence of the Magiſtrates of Amſterdam, that he might perfect his ſtudies; and he applied himſelf chiefly to the Lectures of Theodore Beza, who at that time was explaining the Epiſtle to the Romans. He had the misfortune to diſpleaſe ſome leading men of the Univerſity, becauſe he maintained the Philoſophy of Ramus in publick with much heat, and taught it in private: He was obliged therefore to retire, and ſo went to Baſil, where he was received with applauſe. He read publick Lectures there [*B*], and gained ſo great a reputation, that the faculty of Divinity was pleaſed

(*a*) This word ſignifies in Dutch *Old Water*, whence it comes that Arminius is intitled in his book, *Veteraquinas*.

[*A*] *He was born . . . . in the year* 1560.] Bertius takes a great deal of pains to ſhew, that this year in which Arminius was born, was famous for two remarkable circumſtances, from which, no doubt, he would have us draw ſome reflexions. He obſerves, that Melanchthon died this year, as alſo that it was the ſame in which was held the conference of Poiſſi, where the Proteſtant deputies pleaded the cauſe of two thouſand one hundred and ninety Churches, which humbly requeſted of the King to be indulged in liberty of conſcience (1). We ſhall paſs over this calculation of his, which perhaps is not very exact, but miſtaken in the year; for the conference of Poiſſi began in the month of September 1561; but begin the year either at Eaſter, or the firſt of January, you will never acquit Bertius.

(1) Bertius *in Orat. Funebri Jacobi Arminii.*

[*B*] *He read publick lectures at Baſil.*] Profeſſor James Grynæus, was ſometimes preſent at them, and paid him very handſome compliments: and when he was engaged in diſputing on any queſtion, he made no ſcruple of deputing him to anſwer for him ſuch objections as appeared difficult: *Let my Dutchman*, ſaid he, *anſwer for me. Solent Baſiliæ feriis vindemialibus doctiores ſtudioſi publicè interdum in Academiâ exercitii gratiâ aliquid extra ordinem docere. Eum laborem Arminius noſter haud invitus ſuſcepit, laudatus ob id à Reverendo viro D. Jacobo Grynæo, qui etiam lectiones ipſius præſentiâ ſuâ aliquoties cohoneſtavit: idem quoque in diſputationibus publicis, ſi quid gravius proponeretur, aut dignus vindice nodus occurreret, non eſt veritus honoris causâ, Arminium noſtrum mediâ in ſtudioſorum turbâ ſedentem citare, & (ut Grynæi candorem agnoſcas) dicere,* "*Reſpondeat pro me Hollandus meus* (2)." i. e. "It is the cuſtom at Baſil, in the Vintage Holy-"days, for ſome of the more learned of the Students "to read ſome publick lectures in the Univerſity, "diſtinct from the common rule of diſcipline, by "way of exerciſe. Our Arminius very readily un-"dertook that Province himſelf, for which he received "the praiſe of the Reverend James Grynæus, who "ſometimes

pleaſed to give him the Doctorſhip, without any expence. He excuſed himſelf modeſtly from receiving this honour, and returned to Geneva, where having found the adverſaries of Ramiſm leſs hot, he alſo moderated his ardour. He was deſirous to ſee Italy, and above all to hear at Padua the Philoſophical Lectures of the famous James Zabarella. He ſatisfied this curioſity, and ſpent ſix or ſeven months in this journey; after which, he came back to Geneva, and afterwards to Amſterdam, where he found himſelf much calumniated on account of his journey to Italy [C]; which had a little cooled the affection of the Magiſtrates, his patrons and favourers. He eaſily juſtified himſelf among men of ſenſe, but there were ſome weak and ſuperſtitious ſpirits who ſtumbled at this ſtone (b), till he made the whole church ſenſible of his fine talents for preaching. By this means he gained the love and eſteem of every body. His own Collegues paid homage to his learning, and owned that his Sermons were uſeful to them. Martin Lydius, Profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker, judged him a fit perſon to refute a writing, wherein the doctrine of Theodore Beza upon Predeſtination had been attacked by ſome Miniſters of Delft. Arminius

(b) *Infirmi quidam fratres factum illud perpetuo infectari, & in circulis ſuggillare.* Bertius, *in Oratione funebri J. Arminii.*

" ſometimes did his lectures the honour of his preſence: the ſame perſon when he was at any time " engaged in publick diſputations, and any thing " weighty or difficult to be reſolved happened to be " propoſed, did not look upon it as any diſgrace to " refer it to Arminius ſitting in the middle of all the " Students, and to ſay, (which ſhews the candor and " modeſty of Grynæus,) *Let my Dutch-man anſwer for " me.*" Let it be noted, that he knew very well his talent at refining upon things, in regard to which he gave him ſome very good counſel. I had this circumſtance, not from Bertius, but Philip Pareus. He tells us that Theodore Beza adviſed one of his friends to curb the ſubtilty of his genius, as being an engine, which Satan very often made uſe of, and not without ſucceſs to lead aſtray and deceive very great men. " Take care you do not, adds Beza, entangle and en" ſnare yourſelf in vain ſubtilties; and when any " new notions ariſe in your mind, however they may " pleaſe and flatter you at firſt, yet do not give your" ſelf up to them, till you have thoroughly weighed " and ſifted them. In a word, moderate and reſtrain " the vivacity and over-forwardneſs of your genius. I " myſelf, who, I thank God, am not quite deſtitute " of all natural endowments have endeavoured all " along to follow this advice, which was given me by " that great man of bleſſed memory JOHN CALVIN, " when I firſt gave myſelf up to the ſacred ſtudies, " nor have I ever yet repented taking his advice, nor, " I hope, ever ſhall." *Sicut magnopere te hortor, ut " Dei dona in te collata omni ſtudio excolas; ita cum te αὐχμὸν non vulgari donatum eſſe videam, quâ ſæpe ad maximos decipiendos viros non irrito conatu Satanas eſt abuſus, velim te diligenter cavere, ut nullis inanibus argutiis te ipſum irretias; & quoties nova quædam tibi in mentem veniant, diligenter illa, quantumlibet in initio tibi illa arriſerunt, excutere, priuſquam approbes. In omnibus denique iſtis prompto & alacri ingenio tibi conceſſo modereris. Ego quidem certè per Dei gratiam non prorſus hebes de hoc ipſo à magno illo viro beatæ memoriæ* JOHANNE CALVINO *admonitus, ita facere ſtatim ab initio ſtudui, cum ad ſacra ſtudia me totum converterem. Neque me hujus conſilii unquam pœnituit, nec, ut ſpero, pœnitebit* (3). Philip Pareus had the original of this letter of Theodore Beza; and he ſubjoins, that James Grynæus gave the like admonition to Arminius. *In quam ſententiam clariſſimum & ſagaciſſimum* JACOBUM ARMINIUM, *novi Pelagianiſmi inſtauratorem in Belgio, cum juvenis operam daret S. Theologiæ in Academiâ Baſilienſi, graviter quoque admonitum fuiſſe a venerando ſene D.* JACOBO GRYNEO, *cujus memoria ſit in benedictione! ipſemet mihi, quando ad pedes ejus in Raurica diſcentium Synagoga ſederem, narravit* (4). i. e. " To which purpoſe alſo the moſt celebrated and " moſt ingenious JAMES ARMINIUS, the reſtorer of the " modern Pelagianiſm in Holland, while he was yet a " young man and applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Di" vinity in the Univerſity of Baſil, was very earneſtly " admoniſhed by that venerable Old-man JAMES GRY" NEUS, whoſe memory be ever bleſſed! He himſelf " told me this, when I ſat at his feet, in the circle " of his ſcholars at Baſil." If any one ſhould except againſt me for having ſet down thoſe two paſſages at full length only with a deſign to ſwell the volume of my Book, he will at the ſame time give a proof of his want of judgment; for they are not only very proper for a great many, but even neceſſary to ſome readers to furniſh them with uſeful and profitable reflections. Let us remember the maxim of St. Paul, *Learning puffeth up* (5); but let us alſo beware of another talent which puffeth up ſtill more. A man of ſtrong memory, and vaſt reading, is apt to value himſelf upon his knowledge, and be proud; but he values and prides himſelf ſtill more, when he thinks he has found out a new method of explaining or treating any ſubject; he does not then look upon himſelf ſo much the maſter of a ſtock of learning, for which he ſtands indebted to Books, as the Author and firſt inventor of a new light or doctrine; it is his own inventions that he is in love with, and which have for him the moſt bewitching charms; it is this that blinds him and flings him off the biaſs of his judgment. This is the rock which many young people of fire and ſprightly wit ſplit upon, and which they can't be too often or too much cautioned to beware of.

(5) 1 Epiſt. to Corinth. chap. 8. ver. 1.

[C] *He was very much calumniated on account of his journey into Italy.*] Of all the epidemical diſtempers the human mind is ſubject to, I don't know any more culpable and more fruitful of ill conſequences, than that cuſtom of giving ourſelves up to ſuſpicions. It is a ſlippery way which carries us inſenſibly away from the point we ſet out from; we eaſily ſlide from the firſt ſuſpicion to a ſecond; from poſſibility we immediately paſs on to likelihood, from thence to ſtrong probability, and ſo what was juſt now but a reaſonable preſumption is preſently become certain and undeniable; and this pretended truth is immediately propagated thro' a whole city; and it is obſervable, that great cities are more ſubject to this contagion than others. It was given out at Amſterdam, that Arminius had kiſſed the Pope's toe, that he had a great intimacy with the Jeſuits, that he had procured an acquaintance with Bellarmine, and that he had abjured the Reformed Religion. Tho' all this was falſe, yet theſe calumnies did not fail to make an impreſſion on the minds of the Magiſtrates, who maintained this young man. Let us hear what the Author of his funeral Oration ſays. *Inter damna* (itineris Italici ponebat) *quod in ampliſſimi Senatûs Amſterdamenſis offenſiunculam ob id factum tunc temporis incurriſſet, ſuffundentibus frigidam quibuſdam, quos omnino præſtitiſſet judicia in ipſius reditum ſuſpendere. Hinc ergo, ſumptâ occaſione, ſpargebatur in vulgus illum Pontificis ſoleam deoſculatum, quem non niſi in confertâ turbâ, ut reliqui ſpectatores, vidiſſet; nec ſoleat bellua honorem iſtum niſi Regibus ac Principibus deferre* (6): *Jeſuitis adſueviſſe, quos nunquam audiviſſet: Bellarmino innotuiſſe, quem nunquam conſpexiſſet: Religionem orthodoxam abjuraſſe, pro quâ paratus eſſet ad ſanguinis uſque profuſionem decertare* (7). i. e. " Among his " misfortunes *(occaſioned by his journey into Italy)* he " reckoned up the following: that he had thereby in" curred the diſpleaſure of the moſt auguſt Senate of " Amſterdam, ſome people having inſinuated ſuſpi" cions, whom it would have become better to ſuſ" pend their judgment till his return. Hence a han" dle was taken to ſpread it publickly abroad that he " had kiſſed the Pope's ſlipper, whom he had never " ſeen but in a crowd with other ſpectators; nor is " it the cuſtom of that beaſt to admit any to that " honour but Kings and Princes: that he frequent" ed the ſchools of the Jeſuits, whom he had never " heard: that he was known to Bellarmine, whom " he had never ſeen: that he had abjured the ortho" dox Religion, in defence of which he was ready " to lay down his life."

(3) Beza, *apud* Philippum Pareum, *in Vitâ Davidis Parei*, cap. 57. See alſo a *Letter* of the ſame Beza amongſt thoſe of the Arminians, pag. 26. edit. 1684.

(4) Philippus Pareus, ibid.

(6) Bertius is miſtaken in this point, ſeeing that private perſons are admitted to this honour.

(7) Bertius *in Oratione funebri J. Arminii.*

minius complying with his intreaties undertook to refute this work; but upon examining it and balancing the reaſons on both ſides, he came into the opinions that he propoſed to deſtroy, and went afterwards ſtill further than theſe Miniſters of Delft. He joined with them in condemning Beza the Supralapſarian, and acknowledged no other election, than that which was founded in the obedience of ſinners, to the vocation of God by Jeſus Chriſt. They gave him trouble about this at Amſterdam: they accuſed him from departing from the common doctrine, but the authority of the Magiſtrates ſtopped the diſſenſion. He was called to the Profeſſorſhip of Divinity at Leyden in 1603, and he was obliged to ſet all his engines at work, to gain his diſmiſſion from Amſterdam. He compaſſed it at laſt; and after he had diſſipated the bad impreſſions which had been made with regard to his doctrines, he was created Doctor of Divinity at Leyden (*c*), and inſtalled in the place of the Profeſſor Francis Junius. He had exerciſed his Miniſtry in the church of Amſterdam for fifteen years. The diſputes upon Grace ſoon after kindled in the Univerſity, and the States of the Province were forced to appoint conferences between him and his adverſaries. He was ſent for to the Hague ſeveral times, and went thither to give an account of his doctrine. This conteſt, his continual labour, and the concern of ſeeing his reputation blaſted by a multitude of ſlanders (*d*), impaired his health ſo much that it threw him into a fit of ſickneſs of which he died October 19, 1609 [*D*], with ſtrong ſentiments of piety and reſignation (*e*). It were to be wiſhed that he had made a better uſe of his parts [*E*]; for although it is very probable that his intentions were good, one may ſay he made innovations without any neceſſity, and in ſuch circumſtances

(*c*) He was the firſt on whom this title was ſolemnly conferred in the Univerſity of Leyden. It was Francis Gomarus, who conferred it on him. Bertius, *in Oratione funebri J. Arminii.*

(*d*) Not with regard to his morals, but to his opinions.

(*e*) Taken from his funeral Oration, pronounced by Peter Bertius.

[*D*] *The concern of ſeeing his reputation blaſted . . . impaired his health . . . threw him into a fit of ſickneſs, of which he died* 1609.] It is very probable, that this anxiety contributed more than any thing elſe to his untimely death. This was a ſort of bad leaven, which fermented the peccant humours, and heaped upon him a complication of a thouſand diſtempers. *Quum indomita mali pertinacia ipſi quoque arti* (Medicinæ) *faceret opprobrium: altius enim defixa quam ut evelli poſſet, nova indies excitabat ſymptomata, febres, tuſſim, hypocondriorum extenſionem, expirandi difficultatem, oppreſſionem à cibo, laborioſos ſomnos, atrophiam, arthritidem; nullamque ægro pauſam vel requiem concedebat: acceſſere poſtea dolores in inteſtinis, ilio, & colo, cum obſtructione nervi optici ſiniſtri, & ejuſdem oculi obfuſcatione* (8). i. e. "Whilſt the obſtinate malignity of the diſtemper even baffled all the "ſkill of the Phyſicians, it being fixed too deep to be "rooted out, raiſed every day in new ſymptoms, "fevers, a cough, a ſwelling of the hypochondria, "difficulty of breathing, oppreſſion after eating, trou-"bled ſleep, atrophy, gout; and allowed him no "reſpit: to theſe ſucceeded pains in his bowels, and "an obſtruction of the left optic nerve, and a blind-"neſs in the ſame eye." He was often heard to groan, and to cry out, as a Prophet did formerly, *Wretch that I am, O my mother, why did you bring me into the world?* &c. The following paſſage is taken from Bertius. *Quid mirum ſi commotus fuerit famæ ſuæ, ſalutis & laborum diſpendio; quum ne viro bono quicquam famâ ſuâ ſit antiquius, neque Chriſtiano ſalute, neque S. Theologiæ doctori petitis ex ſcriptura demonſtrationibus? Oppreſſio, inquit Siracides,* inſanire facit ſapientem. *Eadem huic dolorem, ex dolore morbum conciliavit, ex morbo mortem. O tetrum & viperinum, exque imo tartaro excitatum malum! Quoties illum ex Prepheta privatim etiam cum gemitu exclamantem audivimus!* Væ mihi, mater mea, quare genuiſti me, virum diſcordiæ in univerſâ terrâ? Nec fœneravi, nec fœneravit mihi quiſquam; & tamen omnes maledicunt mihi. *Revocavit tamen ſeipſum ad rationis & tranquillitatis ſepta* (9). i. e. "What wonder if he "ſeemed ſo much diſturbed at ſeeing his reputation "aſperſed, his ſalvation called in queſtion, and all his "labours loſt, ſince to a good man nothing can be "dearer than his good name, to a Chriſtian than his "ſalvation, to a Doctor in Divinity than ſcriptural "proofs? *Oppreſſion,* ſays the ſon of Syrac, *makes a "wiſe man go mad.* This was what brought upon "him that grief which was the occaſion of his diſ-"temper, which effected his death. O dreadful and "tormenting anguiſh! How often have we heard "him in bitter groans crying out, when by him-"ſelf, as the Prophet did! *Oh me! O mother, why "did you bear me, a man at enmity with all the "world? I have neither put out to uſury nor taken in "upon uſury from any one, and yet every one curſeth "me.* Then he would recover his reaſon again, and "be calm and ſedate." One cannot reflect upon this without lamenting the vanity of human affairs. We are apt to look upon ſtupidity as a great misfortune; and thoſe fathers who are clear-ſighted enough to diſcern the dullneſs of their ſons, make it a matter of great affliction to themſelves; they wiſh to ſee them have a great genius and deep learning; and if they find them ſuch, then their joy is inexpreſſible: but alas! this too often proceeds from not knowing what they do or what they wiſh for. It had been a hundred times better for Arminius to have been a dunce than a man of ſuch parts and learning; for the glory of having a Sect to take its riſe and name from him, which has made no mean figure in the world, and produced ſome great genius's, is but a very chimerical happineſs, if compared to the more ſubſtantial evils, the ſorrows, vexations and bitter ſufferings he underwent in his life-time, and ſhortened his days; which he had never known had he been only a Divine of the common ſtamp, a blockhead, and in ſhort of that claſs of men to whom they apply that prediction, *they will never make Hereſiarchs* (10). Juvenal would not have failed to inſtance ſuch an example in his tenth Satyr, had there been any religious diſputes at that time, which had proved fatal to one of the Advocates.

(8) Idem, ibid. fol. **ij *verſo.*

(9) Idem, ibid. fol. ** *verſo.*

(10) This is a Proverb in France to denote a heavy fellow.

[*E*] *It were to be wiſhed that he had made a better uſe of his parts.*] I mean that he had walked by the ſame rule which St. Paul did. This great Apoſtle, inſpired of God, and guided by the immediate influence of the Holy Spirit in all his writings, ſtarted to himſelf the objection, which natural reaſon might raiſe againſt the doctrine of abſolute Predeſtination: he was ſenſible of all the force of the objection, and ſtated it in the ſtrongeſt light, without diminiſhing the leaſt from it. *God hath mercy on whom he will, and whom he will he hardneth* (11). This is St. Paul's maxim; now ſee the difficulty which he propoſes to himſelf from it. *But thou wilt ſay unto me then, why doth he yet find fault, for who is he that can reſiſt his will* (12)? It is impoſſible to urge this objection farther, nor could the moſt ſubtle Moliniſts have ſaid more to the purpoſe in twenty whole pages; for what is the moſt they could have concluded from it, but that, according to the hypotheſis of Calvin, it is agreeable to God's will that men ſhould ſin? Now this is exactly the objection as St. Paul has ſtated it. But how does he anſwer it? Does he call to his aid any nice diſtinctions, or endeavour to qualify it by forc'd interpretations? Does he deny the conſequence, or ſtrive to evade any part of it? Does he enter into any ſeries of arguments, or take away the equivocation of the words? No, he does nothing at all of this; he only has recourſe to the ſovereign power of God, and the ſupreme right the Creator has to diſpoſe of his creatures as ſeemed good unto him. *Nay but, O man, who art thou that repliеſt againſt God? Shall the thing formed ſay unto him that formed it, why haſt thou made me thus* (13)? He acknowledges here an incomprehenſibility which ought to put an end to our diſputes,

(11) Rom. ix. 18.

(12) Ibid. ver. 19.

(13) Ib. ver. 20.

ſtances where innovation was a ſource of diſorders, which ended in ſchiſm. He left ſeven ſons, and ſome daughters, and a great number of diſciples who continued the diſpute with ſo much vehemence, that it was neceſſary to have recourſe to a national Synod. They were there condemned, but would not ſubmit, and formed a Sect apart, which ſtill ſubſiſts, and fell by degrees into many other more conſiderable errors. The Amſterdam edition of Moreri points out ſome Authors who may give a light into this famous diſpute. I add the Hiſtory of Triglandius and Boxhornius, and a late work of a Profeſſor of Tubingen (*f*). This great diſpute was very fruitful in writings on both ſides. A Profeſſor of Divinity at Cologne, diſguiſed under a falſe name (*g*), has given a liſt of them in

(*f*) Joh. Wolfgangus Jager. His work is intitled *Hiſtoria Eccleſiaſtica Sæculi* 17. The 1ſt Decad was printed in 1692.

(*g*) Ægidius Athackerius. He took the fictitious name of Solomon Theodotus. *See* Val. Andreæ *Bibliotb. Belg.* pag. 22.

diſputes, and impoſe a profound ſilence on our reaſon. He breaks out (14), *O the depth of the riches both of the wiſdom and knowledge of God! how unſearchable are his judgments, and his ways paſt finding out?* All Chriſtians ought to look upon this as an irreverſible decree, as the dernier reſort from which there can be no appeal touching Diſputes upon Grace; or rather they ought to learn from this conduct of St. Paul never to diſpute at all upon Predeſtination, but at firſt to oppoſe this as a barrier againſt all the ſubtleties of human wiſdom, whether they ariſe in our minds while we meditate on this great ſubject, or are propoſed to us by others. The ſhorteſt and beſt way is to oppoſe at firſt this ſtrong bank againſt the inundations of our reaſonings, and to look upon this definitive ſentence of St. Paul as an unſhaken rock ſtanding in the midſt of the waves, againſt which the tow'ring billows ſpend their rage in vain, they foam, they beat againſt it with fruitleſs violence, and after all but daſh themſelves in pieces. All the darts that the power of man can caſt againſt this ſolid and impenetrable ſhield will meet with the ſame fate that thoſe of Priam did,

(14) Ibid. xi. 33.

Sic fatus ſenior, telumque imbelle ſine ictu
Conjecit; rauco quod protinus ære repulſum,
Et ſummo clypei nequicquam umbone pependit (15).

That is,

" This ſaid, his feeble hand a Javelin threw,
" Which flutt'ring, ſeem'd to loiter as it flew:
" Juſt, and but barely, to the mark it held,
" And faintly tinckl'd on the the brazen ſhield."
Dryden.

(15) Virgil. Æneid. lib. 2. ver. 544.

Thus ought this diſpute to be conducted betwixt Chriſtian and Chriſtian, but if at any time it ſhould be thought requiſite to exerciſe the underſtanding and to take the point into conſideration, we ought however to ſound a retreat in good time, and to withdraw behind the fence I am ſpeaking of. Had Arminius done this every time his reaſon ſuggeſted to him any difficulties againſt the hypotheſis of the Reformers, or whenever he ſaw himſelf called upon to anſwer his antagoniſts, his conduct then would have been truly ſage and apoſtolical, and he would have made a proper uſe of his intellectual faculties. If he met with any knotty points, which his reaſon could not untie in the ordinary doctrine, or if he found himſelf better diſpoſed to cheriſh a leſs rigorous opinion, he was at liberty to give private ſentiments their full ſcope, but then he ought at leaſt to ſtop here, and to have enjoyed the benefit of them in ſilence, I mean without attacking the rights of poſſeſſion, ſeeing it was not poſſible for him to do that without raiſing terrible tempeſts and hurricanes in the Church. His ſilence on this ſubject would have prevented a world of miſchief which befel him; and it may juſtly be ſaid that it would have been well for him had he remember'd the old moral,

Sed tacitus paſci ſi poſſet corvus, haberet
Plus dapis & rixæ multo minus invidiæque (16).

That is,

" But cou'd the talking crow in quiet eat,
" His envy had been leſs, but more his meat."
Creech.

(16) Horat. Ep. 17. lib. 1. ver. 50.

See the note [*D*] under the article of (JOSEPH) HALL.

But, it may be ſaid, *was it not acting the part of a prevaricator, and beneath the dignity of a Miniſter to be guilty of any neglect of informing his hearers, and ſetting them to rights when under any error in point of doctrine?* To which we anſwer, that two capital reaſons diſpenſed with his doing this, the one, becauſe he did not believe that the hypotheſis he diſapproved of was prejudicial to ſalvation; the other, becauſe his new method could be of no ſervice in clearing up the principal difficulties, which occurred on the ſubject of Predeſtination. It muſt be allowed, that the ſmalleſt truth is worthy to be propoſed and made manifeſt, and that there is no error however trifling and inconſiderable, which is not better rectified than retained; but when circumſtances of time and place do not ſuffer us to propoſe novelties, tho' never ſo true, without at the ſame time introducing a thouſand diſorders in the Univerſities, in private families, and in ſhort in all the State, it is much better to let things remain as they are, than to ſet about a Reformation of them, ſince the remedy would be worſe than the diſeaſe. We ought in this caſe to imitate the practice of Phyſicians with regard to certain patients, whom they do not allow to take phyſick, by reaſon it would inevitably ſtir up a thouſand ill humours in the body which are leſs dangerous in a ſtate of coagulation than of agitation (17). I except all thoſe caſes, where the ſalvation of ſouls is concerned, and where we are obliged to deliver them from the jaws of hell; there charity does not permit us to be inactive, how great ſoever the diſturbances may be which happen in the concluſion, but we muſt refer the iſſues to the care and direction of Providence. Arminius had no motive of this kind, which put him upon oppoſing the common and received doctrine, nor was it his opinion, that to follow the hypotheſis of Calvin, was riſquing one's ſalvation. We will alſo ſhew why he was inexcuſable upon another account. He ſubſtituted in the room of one hypotheſis, which abounded with great difficulties, another which at the bottom was attended with no leſs. One may very well ſay of his hypotheſis, what I have before ſaid of the Innovations of Saumur (18): it is more compact and leſs intricate than that of Monſr. Amiraut; but after all it is but a palliative remedy; for the Arminians have no ſooner anſwered certain objections, which, as they pretend, cannot be refuted by the Syſtem of Calvin, but they find themſelves expoſed to others, which they cannot extricate themſelves out of, but by ingeniouſly confeſſing the weakneſs of our underſtanding, or by paying an humble ſubmiſſion to the infinite incomprehenſibility of God. Was it worth his while to enter into a diſpute with Calvin for this? or did it become him to be ſo ſanguine at firſt, when he was forced at laſt to take ſhelter in this aſylum? Why did you not, it may be aſked, begin there, ſince ſooner or later you will be obliged to have recourſe to it at laſt? You are not to imagine, that after having entered the liſts with a potent adverſary, he will quit the field to you, becauſe you have gained ſome advantage over him at the beginning of the combat. The racer who gets before his adverſary the firſt third part or half of the courſe, is not upon that account entitled to the prize, but that is to be reſerved for his reward only, in caſe he gets the advantage at the latter end. It is exactly the ſame in caſes of controverſy: it is not enough to parry the firſt thruſts, we muſt ſtand our ground, anſwer objections, back our queſtion with proofs, till all difficulties are cleared up. Now this is what neither the hypotheſis of Arminius, nor that of the Moliniſts, nor yet that of the Socinians is capable of doing (19). The Arminian Scheme is only calculated to gain ſome ſmall advantage in the prelude to the combat, as Generals are wont to order out detachments of what they call the forlorn Hope, to begin a ſkirmiſh; but when they come to a deciſive battle, they are forced to retire behind the intrenchments of an incomprehenſible myſtery.

(17) *Expediebat quaſi ægræ ſaucique Reipublicæ requieſcere quomodocunque; ne vulnera curatione ipſâ reſcinderentur*, Florus, lib. 3. cap. 23. i. e. " It was expedient for the " Republick, " being as it " were ſick and " wounded, to " obtain reſt upon any terms, " leſt the unſound limbs " might have " been cut off in " the cure.

(18) See above the note [*E*] of the article AMIRAUT.

(19) *See* Mr. Jurieu in his Judgment of the rigid and milder methods of explaining Grace.

in the chronological order, in a work that he intitled *Pacificatorium diſſecti Belgii*. I ſuſpect his catalogue is not very compleat. It is difficult not to forget ſomething in ſuch a multitude of pieces. As to the writings of Arminius [F], ſee our laſt remark.

[F] *His Writings.*] The titles of them are as follow: *Diſputationes de diverſis Chriſtianæ Religionis capitibus; Orationes, itemque Tractatus inſigniores aliquot; Examen modeſti libelli Guilhelmi Perkinſii de Prædeſtinationis modo & ordine, itemque de amplitudine Gratiæ divinæ; Analyſis capitis noni ad Romanos; Diſſertatio de vero & genuino ſenſu capitis ſeptimi Epiſtolæ ad Romanos; Amica Collatio cum D. Franciſco Junio de Prædeſtinatione per literas habita; Epiſtola ad Hippolytum a Collibus; &c.*

☞ Since Mr. Bayle's death there has been publiſhed in 1724 a very accurate and compleat Life of Arminius, written in Latin by *Gaſpar Brandt*, formerly Miniſter of the *Remonſtrants* at Amſterdam, and Author of the *Hiſtory of the Reformation in the Low Countries*. We ſhall therefore extract ſome particulars from his *Hiſtoria Vitæ Jacobi Arminii* relating to our Divine. He obſerves, that Arminius was not the firſt even among the modern Divines, who oppoſed the doctrine of abſolute Predeſtination, and other points of that nature [A], though he was unhappily expoſed to the perſecution of his brethren upon that

[A] *Was not the firſt even among the modern Divines, who oppoſed the Doctrine of abſolute predeſtination.*] Among the Ancients, St. Auſtin and his followers, Proſper, Hilary, Fulgentius, and others, aſſerted this doctrine in very ſtrong terms; but St. Chryſoſtom, St. Ambroſe, and other Fathers, both of the Greek and Latin Church, were of very different ſentiments in that point, as appears evidently from their writings. But when the ſchools became devoted to St. Auſtin, and he was conſidered as the ſtandard of Orthodoxy preferably to all other ancient writers, there was a very zealous conteſt between the Franciſcans and Dominicans, in what ſenſe that Father was to be underſtood, with regard to that doctrine. When the Proteſtant religion began firſt to be publiſhed, there was a variety of opinions among the Reformers upon this ſubject; for Luther, Calvin, and Beza maintained one ſyſtem, while Eraſmus, Melanchthon, Bullinger, Sarcerius, Latimer, and many other eminent Divines were of contrary ſentiments; and they were followed in the Univerſity of Heidelberg by George Sohnius, at Cambridge by Peter Baro, in the United Provinces by John Holman, Anaſtaſius Veluanus, Hubert Duiſhuſius, Snecanus, and other conſiderable men. But notwithſtanding theſe differences, a brotherly charity and harmony was preſerved between them. But when ſeveral Miniſters, eſpecially thoſe, who had ſtudied at Geneva, or in the Univerſities of the Palatinate and Naſſau, began to enforce their rigid notions concerning the divine Decrees upon others, and refuſed to admit thoſe into the Miniſtry, who were of different ſentiments, and endeavoured to exclude thoſe, who had been already admitted; diſputes aroſe upon this account, and our Arminius particularly diſtinguiſhed himſelf by oppoſing their arbitrary impoſitions. This is the repreſentation of Brandt in his life of Arminius (1). We have a more ample account of the riſe and progreſs of the controverſies concerning predeſtination in Dr. Heylin's *Hiſtoria Quinq-Articularis, or a declaration of the Judgment of the Weſtern Churches, and more particularly of the Church of England in the controverted points reproached in theſe laſt times by the name of* ARMINIANISM. He obſerves in his preface, that if *Tertullian's rule be good, that thoſe opinions have moſt truth, which have moſt authentic Antiquity*, (id verum eſt, quod primum, *as his own words are,*) *the truth muſt certainly run moſt clearly in that part of the controverſy, which hath leaſt in it of the* ZUINGLIAN *or* CALVINIAN *Doctrines:* About the year 180 Florinus, and ſome others at home had expreſly affirmed, that God was the Author of ſin; which aſſertion was immediately attacked by St. Irenæus, who publiſhed a diſcourſe intitled (2), περὶ τοῦ μὴ εἶναι τὸν Θεὸν ποιητὴν κακῶν, i. e. "That "God was not the Author of ſin." This doctrine was afterwards propoſed in another form by the Manichees, and always conſidered by the Ancients as the moſt dangerous Hereſy. Nay St. Auſtin himſelf, notwithſtanding all his zeal againſt Pelagius, aſks this Queſtion (3); *Quis noſtrum dicit, quod primi hominis peccato perierit Arbitrium de humano genere.* i. e. "Who of us af-"firms that Free Will is periſhed utterly from man-"kind by the fall of the firſt man." He replies to this: *Libertas quidem periit per peccatum; ſed illa, quæ in Paradiſo fuit habendi plenam cum immortalitate juſtitiam:* i. e. "Freedom indeed is deſtroyed by ſin; "but it is that freedom only, which we had in pa-"radiſe, of having perfect righteouſneſs with immor-"tality." For otherwiſe, as Dr. Heylin obſerves (4), it appears to be his opinion, that man was not merely paſſive under all the influences of Grace, according to that celebrated expreſſion of his, *Qui creavit te ſine te, non ſalvabit te ſine te*; i. e. "that he, who firſt "made thee without thy help, will not ſave thee at laſt "without thy concurrence." But if any harſher expreſſions have eſcaped his pen, as it commonly happens in the heat of diſpute, they are to be qualified by this laſt rule, and another of his, in which it is affirmed, that God could not with juſtice judge and condemn the world, if all men's ſins proceeded not from their own Free Will, but from ſome over-ruling Providence, which enforced them (5). In the Council of Trent there was a conteſt between the Dominicans and Franciſcans upon the ſubject of the Decrees. The moſt conſiderable Divines there inclined to the opinion of the great School Divines, St. Thomas Aquinas, Scatus, and others, who affirm'd that God before the creation, out of the maſs of mankind, hath elected out of mere mercy ſome for Glory, for whom he hath prepared effectually the means to obtain it; that their number is certain and determined, and none can be added to them. And that others, who are not predeſtinated to ſalvation cannot complain ſince God hath prepared for them ſufficient aſſiſtance for this purpoſe, tho' none but the elect ſhall be ſaved. This doctrine they endeavoured to prove from St. Paul's Epiſtles and St. Auſtin. But the Franciſcans repreſented it as injurious to the attributes of the Deity, ſince he would act partially, if without any cauſe he ſhould elect one, and reject another, and unjuſtly, if he ſhould damn men for his own will, and not for their faults, and create ſo great a multitude of men to condemn them. Catarinus, who was for a middle way between the two opinions, obſerved, that St. Auſtin's doctrine was not heard of before his time; and himſelf confeſſed, that it cannot be found in the works of any writer before him. He added, that his heat againſt Pelagius had tranſported him too far (6). It appears upon a general view, that the Franciſcans among the Papiſts, and the followers of Melanchthon and the Arminians among the Proteſtants, were on one ſide with regard to the Divine Decrees; and the Dominicans, the rigid Lutherans, who followed Flacius Illyricus, and the Sublapſarian Calviniſts on the other; while Catarinus took the middle way, in which he was afterwards followed by Dr. Overal, Profeſſor of Divinity at Cambridge, and ſucceſſively Biſhop of Litchfield and Norwich (7). Calvin found out a way by himſelf, which neither the Dominicans, nor any other of *the Followers of St. Auſtin's Rigors*, as Dr. Heylin expreſſes it (8), had found out before, by making God lay on Adam an unavoidable neceſſity of falling into ſin and miſery, in order that he might ſhew his mercy in electing ſome few of his poſterity, and his juſtice in the abſolute rejecting of all the reſt. This ſcheme appeared very ſhocking to many of the Papiſts, and ſo offenſive to the Lutherans in general, that they have profeſſed a greater readineſs to return to Popery, than to give their aſſent to it (9). But by Calvin's intereſt it was received almoſt univerſally in all Churches of his platform, tho' ſtrongly oppoſed by Sebaſtian Caſtalio in Geneva itſelf, who met with

(1) Pag. 3, 4, 5.

(2) Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 5. cap. 20; *and* Valeſ. *Not. in locum.*

(3) Lib. 1. *contra Epiſt.* Pelagii, cap. 2. *apud* Heylin, *Hiſt. Quinq-Artic.* cap. 1. pag. 9.

(4) *Ubi ſupra*, cap. 1. p. 9.

(5) Idem, ibid.

(6) Idem, cap. 2.

(7) Idem, cap. 4. p. 34, 35.

(8) Idem, pag. 35.

(9) Idem, p. 36.

that account. His real name in Low-Dutch was *James Hermanni* (*a*), or *Jacob Van Harmine*, according to Dr. Heylin in his *Hiſtoria Quinq-Articularis* (*b*). He was very fond of Poetry all his life, and wrote ſeveral Poems in all kinds, which Brandt had in his poſſeſſion among Arminius's papers (*c*). He was ordained Miniſter at Amſterdam the 11th of Auguſt 1588, when he was twenty eight years of age, and ſoon diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his Sermons, which were remarkable for their ſolidity and learning; ſo that he was extremely followed upon that account, and univerſally applauded. In order to confine himſelf to a regular method in his preaching, he undertook to explain alternately the Prophet Malachi, and the Epiſtle of St. Paul to the Romans. He began the explication of the latter on the ſixth of November the ſame year, and endeavoured principally to ſhew the deſign of the Apoſtle with regard to the juſtification of the Jews and Gentiles, and the neceſſity of the Goſpel-Faith, with the inſufficiency of the works of the Law. He reſolved to diveſt himſelf, at his firſt entrance into his function, of all prejudices; and, whatever regard he might retain for thoſe perſons, who were of the higheſt diſtinction in the church, and to whom he had been moſt particularly obliged, he determined to follow alone what he thought himſelf to be the doctrine of Chriſt (*d*). This reſolution of his he ſhewed very remarkably the year following by his conduct in the diſpute concerning Predeſtination [*B*]. Sept. 16, 1690, he married Elizabeth Real, daughter of Laurence Real,

(*a*) Brandt, pag. 6. edit. Amſted. 1724.

(*b*) Chap. 5. pag. 48. edit. London 1660, in 4to.

(*c*) Brandt, pag. 37.

(*d*) Idem, pag. 36, 37, 38.

with ſevere treatment from Calvin and Beza upon that account. The terror of this example, and the great reputation, which Calvin had gained by his preaching and writing, not only confirmed his power at home, but alſo made his doctrines the more eaſily admitted abroad. His ſyſtem therefore was zealouſly adhered to in all thoſe Churches, which either had received the diſcipline of Geneva, or whoſe Divines endeavoured to advance it. By this means; as Mr. Hooker obſerves (10) in the Preface to his *Eccleſiaſtical Polity*, *that of what account the* Maſter of the Sentences *was in the Church of Rome, the ſame and more amongſt the Preachers of the reformed Churches Calvin had purchaſed, ſo that the perfecteſt Divines were judged, they who were ſkillfulleſt in Calvin's Writings. His Books almoſt the very Canon, to judge doctrine and diſcipline by. The French Churches both under others abroad or at home in their own country, all caſt according to that mold, which Calvin had made. The Church of Scotland in erecting the fabrick of their reformation took the ſelf-ſame pattern.* This was received not long after in the Palatine Churches and in thoſe of the Netherlands; in all which as his doctrine made way to bring in the diſcipline, ſo it was no difficult matter for the diſcipline to ſupport the doctrine, and oppreſs all thoſe, who durſt oppoſe it (11). We may obſerve however, that Beza and his followers proceeded to a much greater exceſs of rigor in fixing the decree of Predeſtination before the Fall, which Calvin himſelf had placed in *Maſsâ corruptâ*, the corrupted maſs of mankind; and which was maintained by the more moderate Calviniſts. But as they agreed with the reſt with regard to perſonal election and reprobation, in reſtraining the benefit of our Saviour's ſufferings to the elect, and aſſerting the irreſiſtible efficacy of Grace, with the impoſſibility of falling from it, there was hardly any notice taken of their deviation, tho' they differed in the very foundation; and they paſſed under the general name of Calviniſts. Thoſe Divines of the Low-Countries, who were of the old Lutheran ſtock, were more inclined to Melancthon's ſentiments concerning Predeſtination, than to thoſe of Calvin; yet knowing the prodigious eſteem, in which the latter was held amongſt them, or being unwilling to engage in any diſputes, they ſuffered his opinions to prevail without oppoſition. In this manner affairs ſtood till the year 1592, when Mr. William Perkins, an eminent Divine of Cambridge, publiſhed his Book, called *Armilla Aurea*, &c. containing the doctrine of Predeſtination as it had been repreſented by Beza, but digeſted into a more diſtinct and methodical form. This induced our Arminius to oppoſe the current of thoſe opinions, which appeared to him extremely ſhocking and injurious to all our natural notions of the Deity (12). But in order to ſhew that the doctrine of the Remonſtrants was more ancient than Calviniſm in the Churches of the Low-Countries, we may obſerve, that thoſe Provinces embraced the reformation at firſt, according to the Lutheran model. About the year 1530, the reformed religion was admitted into Eaſt-Frieſland, under Enno the firſt, upon the preaching of Hardingbergius, a learned man, and one of the principal reformers of the Church of Embden, a town of the greateſt eminence in that Earldom. From him Clemens Martini received thoſe principles, which he afterwards propagated in the Low-Countries, where the ſame doctrine, concerning Predeſtination had been publickly maintained in a Book intitled *Hodegus Laicorum* or *the Layman's Guide*, publiſhed by Anaſtaſius Velluanus in 1554, and highly commended by Henry Antonides, Divinity-Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Francka. But on the other hand, the French Miniſters having ſettled themſelves in thoſe parts, which either uſed the French language, or anciently belonged to the Crown of France, and exerting themſelves with more vigour than the other party, prevailed ſo far with William of Naſſau, Prince of Orange, that a *Confeſſion* of their own drawing up was preſented to the Lady Regent, ratified; Dr. Heylin tells us (13), in a forcible and tumultuous way, and afterwards by degrees obtruded upon all the Churches in the Low-Countries. However, the Miniſters ſucceſſively in the whole Province of Utretcht adhered to their former doctrines, and were not conſider'd upon that account as leſs reformed; nor were there wanting ſome perſons of great diſtinction among them, who oppoſed the doctrine of Predeſtination contained in that confeſſion, which was firſt publiſhed in the year 1567. Joannes Isbrandi, one of the Preachers of Rotterdam, openly profeſſed himſelf an Anti-Calviniſt, as well as Gellius Snecanus in Weſt-Frieſland, who eſteemed thoſe of Calvin's judgment as innovators in the doctrine which had been firſt received among them. And we find the ſame account of Holman, one of the profeſſors at Leyden, of Cornelius Meinardi, and Cornelius Wiggeri, two perſons of great reputation, before the name of Arminius was ever mentioned *.

(10) Pag. 9.

(11) Heylin, p. 37.

(12) Idem, pag. 38.

(13) Cap. 5. p. 47.

* Idem, pag. 48. See likewiſe his *Certamen Epiſtolare*, p. 22. edit. London 1659, in 8vo.

[*B*] *By his conduct in the diſpute concerning Predeſtination.*] There was a man of great character at Amſterdam, whoſe name was Theodore Coornhert, whom Hadrian Junius in his *Deſcription of Holland*, ſtiles, *virum divini ingenii*, a perſon of a divine genius. He had diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his vigorous efforts in defence of the liberty of his country and that of conſcience, in oppoſition to the tyranny of the Church of Rome. But he was of opinion, that the reformed Church was not yet ſufficiently purged from ſome errors, which appeared to him very inconſiſtent with the true genius of Chriſtianity. Above all, he was particularly diſpleaſed, that the greateſt part of the Miniſters maintained the abſolute decrees of election and Predeſtination with the ſame rigour, with which that doctrine was taught by the moſt famous Divines of Geneva. *Is etenim etſi pro patriæ conſcientiæque libertate ſtrenuam navâſſet operam, Romanæ Eccleſiæ tyrannide fortiter oppugnatâ, eam tamen, quæ titulo reformatæ gaudebat, uſque adeo haud repurgatam cenſebat, quin nonnullis adhuc etiamnum laboraret erroribus, veritati, pietatique Chriſtianæ adverſantibus. Præ ceteris autem malè ipſum habuit, quod a pleriſque Eccleſiæ hujus paſtoribus traderetur dogma illud de abſoluto divinæ Electionis & Reprobationis decreto, prout a ſcholæ Genevenſis doctoribus celeberrimis paſſim defenſum fuerat* (14). He thought himſelf obliged to oppoſe this opinion in converſation and writing as much as poſſible; and by that

(14) Brandt, *Hiſt. Vit. Jacob. Arminii*, l. 39.

Real, Judge and Senator of Amſterdam. In 1591 his Expoſition of the 7th chapter of the Epiſtle to the Romans expoſed him to very ſevere reproaches from his brethren [C]. In 1593 he was engaged in a new controverſy on account of his Explication of the 9th chapter of the ſame epiſtle [D]. The year following he was appointed to reform the ſchools, for which purpoſe he drew up a ſcheme of Laws to be obſerved by the maſters as well as ſcholars, which were highly approved of (e). In 1596 he diſcovered, that Gellius Snecanus, a Miniſter of great learning in Frieſland, was for the moſt part of the ſame ſentiments with himſelf, by reading his *Iſagoge in ix Caput ad Romanos*; which induced him to ſend that Miniſter in a letter an *Analyſis* of the ſame chapter. The year following he had a converſation with Francis Junius concerning the Fall, and other points which are connected with it [E]. He deſired likewiſe the aſſiſtance of Utenbogard, in examining

(e) Idem, pag. 92.

that means he began to open a large field of controverſy to the Miniſters in the Low-Countries, who maintained that ſcheme. There had likewiſe been a warm diſpute held about ten years before upon this and other ſubjects of that nature, between him and Arnoldus Cornelii and Reiner Donteklok, Miniſters of Delft, which diſpute was appointed by the States of Holland themſelves. This conduct of Coornhert expoſed him to the ſevereſt imputations of Hereſy, Libertiniſm, and many other crimes of that kind, and he became the object of the reſentments of all thoſe, who pretended a zeal for the reformed religion. The Synod of Amſterdam therefore, that they might not be thought wanting in their duty, deſired Arminius to engage in the confutation of Coornhert, and to write an anſwer to his Books. But he was prevented from executing this deſire of theirs, not ſo much by want of inclination in himſelf, as by an incident, which happened at that very time. For the Miniſters of Delft, who were to attack Coornhert, that they might the better defend their own opinion concerning the abſolute decrees againſt the grand objection of their antagoniſt, who aſſerted that *ſuch decrees made ſin as well as miſery neceſſary and inevitable, and conſequently that God muſt certainly be the Author of ſin*, thought proper to recede a little from the uſual track of the Divines of Geneva, and to remove the difficulty by fixing upon another method. For tho' they agreed with thoſe Divines in affirming, that divine Predeſtination was the antecedent, abſolute, and inevitable decree of God concerning the ſalvation or damnation of mankind without any regard to their obedience or diſobedience; yet they differed in this, that while Beza and others repreſented man, not conſidered as fallen or even as created, as the object of the divine decrees; the Miniſters of Delft on the other hand made this peremptory decree ſubordinate to the creation and fall of mankind. They ſubmitted their opinion therefore to the judgment of the learned in a Book, intitled, *An Anſwer to certain arguments of Beza and Calvin in the treatiſe concerning Predeſtination upon the IXth Chapter of the Epiſtle to the Romans.* This piece, which contained ſeveral difficulties, with which the rigid doctrine of the Divines of Geneva ſeemed to be embarraſſed, was tranſmitted by the Miniſters of Delft to Martin Lydius, profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker. He, notwithſtanding his inclination, and even promiſe to return an anſwer to the Authors of this piece, yet choſe rather to apply himſelf to Arminius, and deſired him by letters to undertake the vindication of Beza's doctrine, and to clear the way to a proper anſwer to Coornhert. At firſt, Arminius ſeemed inclined to agree to his requeſt; but when he came to examine the ſubject, and had conſidered the arguments on both ſides, he found ſuch inextricable difficulties attending both the Hypotheſes concerning the abſolute decrees of Predeſtination, that he began to doubt what ſcheme to determine upon. In ſhort, the more he reflected upon the objections urged againſt the doctrine of Calvin and Beza, the more he was inclined to that ſide of the queſtion, which he before had undertaken to confute. He thought it his duty therefore to break off his former deſign of a confutation, and to apply all the time, which he had remaining from the diſcharge of his function, to an accurate enquiry into this doctrine by reading the holy ſcriptures, and the writings of the ancient and modern Divines upon that ſubject. *Imo vero, quo magis hoc ſaxum volveret, momentaque rationum, quæ contra Calvini Bezæque ſententiam proferrentur, perpenderet eo plus ſibi difficultatis obortum ſenſit ad eas ſolidè reſpondendi, inque eam ſe maximè opinionem deferri, quam primâ fronte oppugnandam ſuſceperat. Quocirca ne bonæ conſcientiæ litare ſolitus, quidquam ageret præter officium legitimi divinæ veritatis alumni, aut temerè ſeſe huic aut illi de hoc ſententiæ opponeret, ante omnia in animum induxit cæptæ hujus refutationis filium abrumpere, & quicquid ipſi ab ordinariâ functione & publicis concionibus temporis, id omne penitiori hujus doctrinæ ſcrutationi legendiſque, juxta ſacra volumina, veterum pariter ac recentiorum Doctorum de hoc argumento ſcriptis impendere* (15).

(15) Idem, pag. 43, 44, 45.

[C] *His Expoſition of the 7th Chapter of the Epiſtle to the Romans expoſed him to very ſevere reproaches from his brethren.*] Having accurately examined the Apoſtle's manner of reaſoning in that chapter, and confirmed his own ſenſe of it by the Commentaries of Martin Bucer and others, he publickly taught, that St. Paul did not ſpeak in that paſſage of himſelf, as he then was, nor of man as under the Goſpel Grace, but that he aſſumed the perſon of a man under the Law, in whom the Moſaic Law had done its part; who therefore being brought to a ſtate of contrition by the Holy Spirit becauſe of ſin, and convinced of the inſufficiency of the Law to obtain ſalvation, ſought for a Redeemer, and was not yet regenerate, but in the next degree to regeneration. Having explained the paſſage of St. Paul in this manner, tho' without combating the oppoſite opinion in the leaſt, he fell under the ſevereſt cenſures. He was accuſed of Pelagianiſm, becauſe he aſcribed too much goodneſs to an unregenerate man; and was particularly charged with hereſy, becauſe Fauſtus Socinus under the name of Proſper Dyſidæus had given almoſt the ſame explication of that place of St. Paul. He was exclaimed againſt for advancing many things in the pulpit contrary to the Confeſſion of the Belgic Churches and the Palatine Catechiſm, and for raſhly introducing the Doctors of the ancient Church and ſeveral modern Divines as patrons of his opinion. Upon this account he was cited before the Synod, and had ſeveral diſputes with the Miniſters, who endeavoured to reclaim him from his ſuppoſed hereſies (16).

(16) Idem, pag. 48, 49, 50.

[D] *Engaged in a new controverſy on account of his Explication of the 9th chapter of the ſame epiſtle.*] He obſerv'd, that this chapter was generally conſider'd by the reformed Divines, as the grand foundation of their opinion concerning abſolute Predeſtination; and being unwilling either to confirm or contradict that opinion, he only aſſerted, that the Apoſtle in that chapter proſecuted the ſubject, which he had laid down in the preceding chapters, and vindicated his own doctrine of the Juſtification of man by Faith from ſeveral objections of the Jews. Theſe objections therefore Arminius confuted in a very ſtrong manner in ſeveral Sermons; but tho' he had advocated the cauſe of Chriſtianity to the ſatisfaction of the beſt Judges, yet he fell under the cenſures of others. For as he took a method a little different from the common one, and entirely omitted ſeveral of the crude notions, which ſome perſons have drawn from that chapter, the greateſt part of the Miniſters began to murmur againſt him, eſpecially as they found that his reputation encreaſed among the Lutherans, Mennonites, and others, who were averſe to the rigid doctrine of abſolute Decrees. This occaſioned a conteſt between him and the Members of the Synod, wherein the latter behaved in a manner very unſuitable to the principles of Chriſtian Charity (17).

(17) Idem, pag. 75—82.

[E] *Had a converſation with Francis Junius concerning the Fall and other points, which are connected with it.*] He paid a viſit to that Profeſſor at Leyden, and engaged in a free converſation with him about the Cauſe of the Fall of our firſt Parents, and the Manner, Contingency, and Neceſſity of it. He took occaſion

examining theſe difficult queſtions [F]. In 1598 he wrote his *Examen* of Perkins's *Armilla Aurea*, which he deſigned to ſend over to that Divine, but was prevented by the death of the latter, and therefore ſuſpended the publication of it (f). The year following, in his Letters to his friend Utenbogard, he lamented the wretched ſituation of the church at that time, as well as that of himſelf [G]. In 1600 he oppoſed thoſe, who urged, that

(f) Idem, pag. 108, 109.

occaſion to diſcourſe upon this ſubject from a Book, which Junius had juſt before publiſhed, in which he treated of that argument. Arminius propoſed to him ſeveral doubts and difficulties with regard to the Providence and infinite Preſcience of the Deity; and this queſtion was particularly moved, how, upon the ſuppoſition of the immutable Decree, which the followers of Calvin and Beza aſcribe to God, man could nevertheleſs voluntarily fall, and be ſaid to have been maſter of his own actions: *Quo pacto, ſtante immobili fixoque illo, quod Calvini Bezæque ſectatores Deo attribuunt, decreto, homo nihilominus voluntariè lapſus, dominuſque ſuarum actionum fuiſſe prædicari queat* (18). Junius anſwered theſe difficulties and many others of that kind in ſuch a manner, and explained the nature of things contingent and neceſſary with ſo much ingenuity, that Arminius aſſured Utenbogard in a letter, which he wrote not long after, that he was as highly ſatisfied with Junius's anſwers, as if he had found a treaſure, and that he deſpiſed all the riches of Crœſus and Midas in compariſon of the full and ſatisfactory lights, which he had obtained with regard to the articles of Providence and Predeſtination, about which he had been in the moſt anxious doubt for ſeven years before. Finding therefore, that this celebrated Divine was of the ſame opinion with himſelf concerning thoſe points, and that this converſation had ſucceeded agreeably to his wiſhes, he took the opportunity to diſcourſe upon Predeſtination, not ſo much with a view to be informed about it, (which the ſhortneſs of the time would not permit,) as to ſhew that he was in great ſuſpence in that point, and that he hoped by his means to be eaſily extricated out of his doubts. Junius readily agreed to ſatisfy him by letters. They promiſed each other ſecrecy, leſt they might be ſubject to ſome inconvenience, if the affair became known. Arminius therefore a few months after ſent him an epiſtolary enquiry into the various ſchemes relating to Predeſtination, and propoſed ſome arguments to ſhew the difficulties, which attend ſeveral of them. And as Junius was ſaid by ſome perſons to embrace the hypotheſis of the followers of St. Thomas Aquinas, and not ſo much to abandon the rigid ſcheme of Calvin and Beza, as to palliate it in ſome meaſure, by aſſerting, that the object of Predeſtination was not man before God had determined to create him, nor as he was created, and as it was fore-known that he would fall, but as he was furniſhed with ſupernatural gifts, and invited to a ſupernatural Good; Arminius endeavoured to prove, that both theſe opinions laboured under this inconvenience among others, that they introduced a Neceſſity of ſinning; and therefore it was proper to have recourſe to a third hypotheſis, which preſuppoſes the Creation and the Fall. Having gained this point, he reſolved to proceed farther, and at laſt to draw this inference from the premiſes, that God's Decree was to ſave thoſe, who believe, and to reject thoſe, who do not believe. Junius returned an anſwer to this piece of his, which, Arminius obſerves, was full of piety, learning, and brotherly charity. However it did not ſatisfy our Divine, when he had examined it with attention; for he found, that Junius had endeavoured by his own explanation of the words of the Authors in queſtion to form one hypotheſis from ſeveral others, tho' contrary to the real ſentiments of thoſe, who maintained each of them. Arminius determined therefore to break off this conference, and to write no more upon that ſubject for the preſent. But finding afterwards, that this Epiſtolary Diſpute between them had been ſhewn by Junius himſelf to one of the Students, who lodged at his houſe, and that it had been tranſcribed by him, and was become common among the other Students, ſo that Plancius his collegue upbraided him very ſmartly with being ſilenced by Junius, he was induced to proſecute this Diſpute. He drew up therefore *a Reply*, at the end of which he declared, that *he had objected theſe conſiderations to Junius, not ſo much with a deſign of confuting him, as of obtaining a full explication of his meaning, by which he might receive ſatisfaction in this ſubject, and his mind might be cleared from its doubts.* He added, that he prayed to God, that if he had written any thing contrary to truth, that he would pardon it, and ſhew him the truth; but if he had advanced any thing agreeable to truth, that he would confirm him in it, and influence Junius to aſſent to it, that by his means the truth might receive the greater ſanction, and be propagated every day more. *Se Deum orare, ſi quid ſcripſiſſet veritati contrarium, ut ipſi condonaret, & veritatem commonſtraret; ſin verò aliquid veritati conſentaneum protuliſſet, ut in eo ipſum confirmaret, Juniumque ipſi adſentientem redderet, quo per ipſum veritati eò major auctoritas indies conciliari, eaque magis ac magis propagari poſſet.* But Junius never replied to theſe conſiderations of Arminius, who enlarged them very much after the death of the former (19).

(18) Idem, pag. 97, 98.

(19) Idem, pag. 98-105.

[F] *Deſired likewiſe the aſſiſtance of Utenbogard in examining theſe difficult queſtions.*] He tells him in a letter, which he wrote to him the 19th of October 1597, that he ought to endeavour to find out ſuch arguments in defence of the truth, as are ſolid, in order to confirm it, and plain, in order that it may be diſcovered by thoſe, who oppoſe it out of a ſimplicity of mind and from the dictates of their conſcience; *among whom*, ſays he, *I profeſs myſelf to be one wherever I deviate from the truth. But I cannot but wonder*, continues he, *at the preſumption of ſome men, who ſtigmatize whatever does not ſuit their own way of thinking with the name of Hereſy, while they themſelves will ſcarce take the trouble of examining the controverted points, and tho' they were willing, yet have not the proper abilities for it, becauſe they are not maſters of the learning neceſſary to judge of queſtions of ſuch great moment. Truth, even that of Divinity, as far as it relates to the accurate knowledge of controverſies of this kind, is ſunk into a deep well, from whence it cannot be drawn up without prodigious labour. This obſervation is ſo true in that point, which we are treating of, that he, who denies it, declares immediately by it, that he never reflected ſeriouſly upon that ſubject. I wiſh, that God would at laſt vouchſafe to grant me the knowledge of the truth, for the eaſe and ſatisfaction of my mind! I ſhould greatly exult upon the diſcovery of it, as if I had found the moſt valuable treaſure, and I ſhall own myſelf highly obliged to every perſon, who ſhall afford me any aſſiſtance.* "Demerſa eſt veritas, etiam theologi-
" ca, quantum ad hujuſmodi controverſiarum accura-
" tam cognitionem, in puteo profundo, unde non ſine
" magno labore erui potuit. Quod adeò verum eſt,
" in iſto, qui nobis tractatur, articulo, ut qui hoc
" diffiteatur, eo ipſo declaret, ſe nunquam de iſto ſeri-
" am cum animo ſuo cogitationem inſtituiſſe. Utinam
" autem Deus veritatis illam aliquando ad animi
" mei tranquillitatem concedat! Tum ſanè tanquam
" inventâ pretiosâ gazâ magnopere lætabar, iiſque
" omnibus, qui aliquid adjumenti attulerint, me ob-
" ſtrictum multis nominibus fatebor." Our Author likewiſe ſent to his friend Utenbogard the year following a Theological Table concerning Predeſtination; in which were repreſented all the arguments propoſed upon that ſubject (20).

(20) Idem, pag. 105—108.

[G] *Laments the wretched ſituation of the Church at that time, as well as that of himſelf.*] This letter was dated the firſt of Auguſt 1599. He obſerves in it, what melancholy reflections poſſeſſed his mind, when he viewed the general impiety and wickedneſs prevailing over the whole world, the great diverſity of opinions concerning Religion in the Chriſtian Church, the licentiouſneſs of all ranks of men in oppoſing the truth, and the confidence and furious zeal of moſt of thoſe, who were in authority, in impoſing their own peculiar notions upon the Church of Chriſt, as if they were articles of faith neceſſary to ſalvation. In his letter to the ſame friend dated 8th of September following, he tells him, that he does as much as lay

that the Miniſters ſhould ſubſcribe the confeſſion and catechiſm every year. In 1602 a peſtilential diſeaſe raged at Amſterdam, during which he acted with the greateſt reſolution imaginable in aſſiſting the poor, and comforting the ſick under the moſt formidable apprehenſions (*g*). Lucas Trelcatius and Francis Junius dying of this diſeaſe at Leyden, the Curators of that Univerſity determined upon our Divine for the Profeſſorſhip of Divinity, which at laſt with great difficulty he obtained. He began is Lectures with three elegant Orations, the firſt *of the Object of Divinity*, the ſecond *of the Author and End of it*, and the third *of the Certainty of it*; and then proceeded to an expoſition of the Prophet Jonah (*h*). He endeavoured to reform the method of teaching Divinity [*H*]. Gomarus, the other Profeſſor of Divinity, ſoon began his perſecutions of him, which continued till Arminius's death. But the reputation of the latter was ſo well eſtabliſhed, that he was conſtantly attended by a very large audience, who admired the ſtrength of argument and ſolid learning, which he ſhewed in all his Lectures. This expoſed him to the envy of his brethren, who treated him with all the outrage, that a contracted bigotted ſpirit could prompt them to. When he laid down the office of *Rector Magnificus* of the Univerſity, he pronounced an Oration *de diſſidio Religionis*, in which he examined into the nature and effects of diſagreement in religion, and propoſed the remedies neceſſary to prevent the ill conſequences of it (*i*). The ſame year he was involved in a new conteſt by a diſputation of his *concerning the Divinity of the Son* [*I*]. In 1607 the publiſhing of *the Catechiſm of Gouda*

(*g*) Idem, pag. 121—129.

(*h*) Idem, pag. 197, 198.

(*i*) Idem, pag. 269.

lay in his power, by teaching the truth as far as it was known to him, by enquiring after what was yet concealed from him, and by engaging in a more accurate examination of what he had already diſcovered, and confirming it by ſolid reaſons. *This*, ſays he, *I do in ſilence and hope; tho' I am in the mean while expoſed to the unſeaſonable zeal and almoſt intolerable paſſion of ſome perſons, till God ſhall reſcue me from this uneaſineſs, or give them the ſpirit of diſcretion and prudence, which may temper and moderate their zeal. I think I have the greateſt reaſon imaginable to aſcribe to them a zeal without knowledge.* "For I perceive, "that they are ſollicitous about nothing leſs than that "which their duty obliges them to, the greateſt part "of which conſiſts in the enquiry after truth. This "is occaſioned by their opinion and perſuaſion, that "they are already maſters of the truth; which pre"judice is ſo ſtrong in ſome of them, that they will "not ſcruple to paſs the moſt peremptory judgment "immediately upon the moſt difficult points, which "they never thought of before, to the great in"convenience of the Church of Chriſt, and the cer"tain injury of truth." *Quod autem zelum illis tribuo abſque ſcientiâ, cauſam mihi habere videor juſtiſſimam. Video enim illos nihil minus agere, quam quod ex officio tenentur, cujus pars vel potiſſima in inquiſitione veritatis eſt poſita. Hujus autem rei cauſa illis eſt opinio & perſuaſio de veritate acquiſitâ, quæ in nonnullis ita eſt potens, ut ex tempore de quavis re, etiam difficillimâ & nunquam illis antea perpensâ, ſententiam dicere peremptoriam auſint, magno ſane Eccleſiæ Chriſtianæ malo & veritatis certo detrimento* (21).

(21) Idem, pag. 114, 115, 116, 117.

[*H*] *He endeavoured to reform the method of teaching Divinity.*] As ſoon as he was ſettled in his Profeſſorſhip, he found that the minds of the young Students had been perplexed with a multitude of uſeleſs and impertinent queſtions; and that while the genuine doctrines of Chriſtianity were neglected, they were put upon hunting after a variety of knotty and abſtruſe theorems and problems. He therefore conſulted with his collegues, what method was proper to be taken to ſtop this growing evil, and to recover the ancient and ſolid way of ſtudying Divinity. His chief taſk was to remove as much as poſſible that prodigious load of ſcholaſtick queſtions and aſſertions, which before clogged their ſtudies, and to inculcate upon his Scholars that divine ſcheme of doctrines, which is to be drawn out of the Scriptures themſelves, and which is abſolutely and ſolely deſigned to inſtruct men in the way to true happineſs. *Cæterùm cum in ipſis initii muneris veſtibulis ſatis perſpicuè animadverteret, juveniles animos inutilium multarum quæſtionum dumetis ſeſe implicare, & neglectâ cœleſtis veritatis normâ, ſpinoſa quædam theoremata & problemata ſectari, communicato cum collegis conſilio, gliſcenti huic malo obſtandum cenſuit, priſcumque illud & maſculum ſtudendi genus revocandum. Quapropter nihil prius habuit, quam ut, reſectis (quantum in ipſo) ſpinoſis quæſtionibus & ingenti ſcholaſticarum aſſertionum pondere, divinam illam diſcipulis ſapientiam inculcaret, quæ ex puriſſimis ſacri codicis fontibus petita, uniceque comparata eſſet ad vitam bene beateque tranſigendam.* The principal aim of all his publick and private labours was to gain this uſeful point; but he met with great difficulties in the execution of it on account of the envy, which he was expoſed to from ſome perſons, and the ſuſpicion of heterodoxy, which ſeveral of the Miniſters raiſed againſt him among his collegues (22).

(22) Idem, pag. 203, 204.

[*I*] *A Diſputation concerning the Divinity of the Son.*] Happening to preſide at a Diſputation upon this ſubject, and undertaking himſelf the defence of the common and orthodox opinion upon this important queſtion, one of the Students maintained in oppoſition to the propoſitions, which were to be publickly diſcuſſed, that the Son of God was αὐτόθεος or God of himſelf, and that he did not receive his Eſſence from the Father, but from himſelf: *Filium Dei* αὐτόθεον *eſſe, ſuumque adeo eſſentiam non a Patre, ſed à ſeipſo habere.* Upon this Arminius obſerved, that the word αὐτόθεος was not to be found in the Scriptures; however as it was made uſe of by Epiphanius, and other orthodox Divines both ancient and modern, it was not abſolutely to be rejected if it was rightly underſtood. That it might be taken according to the etymology of it in a double ſenſe, either to ſignify that he was real and true God, or that he was God of himſelf. In the former ſenſe it might be admitted; but in the latter it was contrary to the Scripture and orthodox Antiquity. The Student defended his opinion very reſolutely, and boldly aſſerted, that this word in the latter ſenſe was very applicable to the ſon of God, and that the Eſſence of the Father, could only be ſaid improperly to be communicated to the Son and Holy Ghoſt; but that rightly and properly the Eſſence of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghoſt was common to them all. He was the more confident in this aſſertion, becauſe he was ſupported by Luke Trelcatius, who in his *Common Places* juſt before publiſhed, had advanced this hypotheſis concerning the Trinity. Arminius replied to this, that this opinion was a novel one, and unknown to the ancient Greek and Latin Churches. That the ancients always affirmed, that the Divinity of the Son was derived from the Father by an eternal generation. That this notion laboured under very great difficulties. That not only Sabellianiſm would follow from it, ſince the Son was ſubſtituted in the place of the Father, as his Eſſence was underived from any other; but a way would be opened for Tritheiſm, and as many Gods muſt be ſuppoſed, as there were collateral perſons. In ſhort, that to be poſſeſſed of an underived Divinity was contrary to the definition of the Son, and that no attribute could be aſcribed to any Being, which is contrary to the definition of it. Arminius was the more ſanguine in oppoſing theſe innovations in doctrines, becauſe he obſerved, that Gomarus himſelf had attacked Trelcatius's notions both in publick and private. However this expoſed our Divine to the moſt malicious ſuggeſtions, that he was heterodox with regard to the Trinity and the Divinity of the Son. And theſe calumnies were encreaſed by a diſputation, which he held concerning the

Gouda gave occaſion to another warm diſpute [*K*]. The year following he wrote an excellent letter to the Embaſſador of the Elector Palatine, to vindicate his conduct with regard to the conteſts about religion, in which he was engaged [*L*]. He found himſelf likewiſe obliged to juſtify himſelf againſt the imputation of endeavouring to advance the cauſe of Popery [*M*]. The ſame year he gave a full account to the States of Holland of his

the Perſon of Chriſt, and by his explaining ſometimes in a different manner thoſe paſſages of the Old and New Teſtament, which were commonly applied to prove the Conſubſtantiality or Coeſſentiality of the Trinity (23). He defended himſelf extremely well againſt theſe imputations; and he declares himſelf, that almoſt every perſon, who knew him, knew with what caution and ſcrupuloſity of conſcience he treated of the ſublime Doctrine of the Trinity of Perſons. *How little fond I am*, ſays he, *of inventing new phraſes and expreſſions unknown to the Scriptures and orthodox Antiquity, or of uſing thoſe, which have been invented by others, appears from my whole method of teaching. And my auditors will teſtify how ready I am to bear with thoſe who expreſs themſelves in a different manner, if their meaning be but good* (24). With regard to the ſuſpicion of Socinianiſm, he declared, that *he was ſo far from being guilty of it, that he was confident, that if the Synod would give him a favourable hearing, he could propoſe ſome arguments, which would have a great effect in confuting the Socinians, or at leaſt in ſolving their objections* (25). It appears likewiſe from a letter of Janus Narſius, who was his ſcholar, to J. Sandius (26), that not long after this he undertook a publick and elaborate confutation of ſeveral of the chief opinions of Socinus, and eſpecially of his Book *de Servatore*.

(23) Idem, pag. 283-291.

(24) Armin. *Reſponſ. ad Artic.* 31.

(25) *Ex Epiſt.* ARM. *Kal. Septem.* 1606. *apud* Brandt, p. 293, 294.

(26) Dated 10 Sept. 1612. and publiſhed among the *Epiſt. Eccleſ.* pag. 327. *See* Brandt, p. 294.

[*K*] *The publiſhing of the Catechiſm of Gouda gave occaſion to another warm diſpute.*] This *Catechiſm* was drawn up by the Miniſters of Gouda, in order to ſee whether the Magiſtrates would introduce it into the common ſchools in the room of the Palatine Catechiſm, which they thought contained queſtions too abſtruſe, and expreſſed in very ambiguous terms. As ſoon as this Catechiſm of Gouda was publiſhed, it met with very different judgments. Arminius's friends recommended it, partly becauſe the Authors of it, tho' in the general diſpoſition of it, they had followed that of the Palatinate, yet had introduced nothing contrary to the Chriſtian doctrine; and partly becauſe it cut off all occaſion for difficult and diſputable opinions, and ſhewed every where a true, primitive, Chriſtian ſimplicity, and repreſented the points of faith in a few words, and thoſe taken exactly from ſcripture: *Quod ſcriptum hoc ſpinoſis quibuſvis & diſputabilibus digmatibus anſam præſcindens, ſpiranſque primævam Chriſtianitatis ſimplicitatem, credenda paucis, nec aliis vocibus, quam quas divina pagina præſcriberet, complecteretur.* But the oppoſite party immediately condemn'd it, and urged, that there was no opinion ſo monſtrous and ſhocking, but might be concealed under ſuch general terms. That the ſimplicity of the forms of faith was proper for the primitive ages, when the evils then unknown wanted no remedies; but afterwards, when errors encreaſed, ſuch forms and expreſſions were to be made uſe of, as would force the latent Heretics out of their receſſes and ſubterfuges. *At vero exorti ſtatim ex altero agmine, qui id ipſum publicè damnarent ac deteſtarentur, nec ullum dicerent tam horrendæ opinionis portentum, quod verbis tam generalibus non velaretur. Conveniſſe primis temporibus ſimplicitatem, cum ignota adhuc mala remediis non indigerunt; poſtea autem, increſcentibus erroribus, concipiendas fuiſſe loquendi formulas, quæ devios latebris ſuis excuterent.* They objected that in this Catechiſm the chief articles of the Chriſtian faith were ſuppreſſed or omitted; that it gave an opportunity to every one, who would affect innovations; and that Servetus himſelf would readily ſubſcribe to it. So that what one party affirmed to be agreeable to truth, the other exclaimed againſt as the covert for Heretics; and what one called liberty, the other repreſented as the means of confuſion. Arminius was accuſed by Reiner Danteklok of having a ſhare in this Catechiſm; but tho' he did not very much oppoſe the publiſhing of it, and afterwards confeſſed, that the Miniſters of Gouda had conſulted him before, and that he had agreed to their reaſons for printing it, yet he had no manner of ſhare in the compoſition of it (27).

(27) Brandt, p. 332, 333, 334, 335.

[*L*] *Wrote an excellent letter to the Embaſſador of the Elector Palatine to vindicate his conduct with regard to the conteſts about religion, in which he was engaged.*] At the cloſe of this letter, he tells the Embaſſador, that he wiſhes he could obtain this favour of his brethren, that they would at leaſt believe him to be actuated by ſome conſcience towards God, which Chriſtian charity would certainly oblige them to, if they would conſider the nature of it. For what intereſt could he propoſe to himſelf, by beginning a diſpute out of mere wantonneſs of mind, and by raiſing a ſchiſm in the Church of Chriſt, of which he profeſſed himſelf, by the Grace of God and Chriſt, a member? If they ſuppoſed him influenced to it by ambition and avarice, they were ſtrangers to his character. The latter he declares himſelf averſe to, tho' he might have ſome pretext to excuſe or palliate it. As for ambition, he had no other, than to ſeek after truth in the ſcriptures, and when he had found it, to defend it calmly, and without contention, or endeavouring to preſcribe to others. His only view was to be inſtrumental in the ſalvation of ſouls, and to obtain a good character in the Church; which he hoped by long patience at laſt to gain, tho' at preſent he was treated with the utmoſt ſeverity by his brethren. He wiſhes, that they would agree with him upon a ſerious and pacific conference upon religion; in which he promiſes to ſhew that moderation and love for truth and peace, which becomes a ſervant of Chriſt. In the mean while he deſires, that his brethren would let him reſt undiſturbed, as he does them. He demands only a fair and equitable trial, without prejudice or partiality. He refuſes not to preſent himſelf to the examination of any aſſembly of Miniſters, whether great or ſmall, whether natives or foreigners, ſo that the civil Magiſtrate would but take care to regulate the conduct of it, and put them under the ſame conditions as himſelf, ſince he was weary of anſwering particularly all the new calumnies ſuggeſted againſt him. "In this reſpect, ſays he, I act very differently from Heretics, who have either avoided all Eccleſiaſtical Aſſemblies, or endeavoured to obtain the victory by the number of their followers." *Hâc ſanè parte hæreticorum ſum diſſimilis, qui aut conventus Eccleſiaſticos refugerunt, aut hoc effecerunt, ut aſſeclarum numero fidere, & certam victoriam expectare poſſent* (28).

(28) Idem, pag. 341—346.

[*M*] *To juſtify himſelf againſt the imputation of endeavouring to advance the cauſe of Popery.*] There had been a rumour propagated, that the Pope had written kind letters to our Divine and Utenbogard, and deſired them upon the promiſe of a conſiderable penſion to advocate the cauſe of the Church of Rome (29). To obviate theſe calumnies Arminius publiſhed ſeveral learned *Theſes* concerning *Idolatry*, to which he added this corollary, that "the Pope of Rome was an Idol, and that thoſe, who regard him for what he pretends to be, are in fact Idolaters." *Pontificem Romanum eſſe Idolum, & qui illum pro eo habent, quem ſe venditat, eo ipſo Idololatras eſſe.* He publiſhed likewiſe other propoſitions, in which he maintained that the Reformed Churches had not made a ſchiſm from the Church of Rome, but that they had acted rightly in refuſing to have any communion with it; *Eccleſias Reformatas à Romanenſi ſeceſſionem non feciſſe, eaſque rectè facere, quod fidei cultuſque Divini communionem cum eâ habere & profiteri detrectant.* Not long after this, he diſputed publickly concerning the Pope, and fixed upon him the ſtrongeſt terms of infamy. *Publicè quoque diſputavit de Pontifice Romano, defendens illum eſſe adulterum & lenonem Eccleſiæ, Pſeudo-Prophetam & caudam Draconis, Dei & Chriſti adverſarium, Antichriſtum, ſervum malum, qui conſervos ſuos verberat, Epiſcopi nomine indignum, Eccleſiæ deſtructorem & vaſtatorem.* But all theſe declarations of his could not ſuppreſs the ſuſpicions, which were raiſed againſt him by ſome perſons. A certain perſon wrote a letter into Germany, wherein he mentioned in an imperfect manner the title of his *Theſes* concerning the diviſion of the Proteſtants from the

(29) Idem, pag. 335.

his ſentiments with reſpect to the controverted points, which he concluded in a manner exactly conformable to the principles of Chriſtian charity and moderation [*N*]. He died with

the Church of Rome, that foreigners might imagine Arminius to be inclined to that Church. And one of the Preachers at Amſterdam abuſed him publickly as a man who held many groſs errors, and eſteemed the Pope a member of the body of Chriſt, which doctrine he exclaimed, was ſo hateful to God, *that ſeveral perſons of reflection had obſerved, that ever ſince ſome men had begun to defend it, the publick affairs declined, and ſeveral of the beſt fortified cities were taken by the enemy.* This calumny was followed by another, that he had perſuaded a great many perſons to turn Papiſts, and given occaſion to ſome Politicians of ſhewing leſs zeal than before, in their refuſing the Roman Catholics the exerciſe of their religion. He was obliged therefore to declare in writing his innocence with reſpect to thoſe charges; as appears particularly from a letter of his to Sebaſtian Egbert upon this ſubject; wherein he declares, that he did not eſteem the Pope a member of the body of Chriſt; but conſidered him as an obſtinate enemy, a ſacrilegious perſon, a blaſphemer, a tyrant, and a moſt violent uſurper of an unjuſt dominion over the Church, as the man of ſin, the ſon of perdition, &c. " I mean, ſays he, ſuch " a Pope, as acts in the uſual manner. But if an " Hadrian of Utretcht, who is raiſed to that See without any intrigue or ſollicitation, endeavours a reformation of the Church, and begins it with the Pope " himſelf, and the Roman See and Court, and aſſumes " to himſelf nothing but the name and authority of " a Biſhop, tho' he challenges the principal place among the other Biſhops agreeably to the ancient " conſtitutions of the Church; I would not venture " to call him by thoſe names; ſince I cannot perſuade myſelf that he is an ill man, whom the defenders of Antichriſtianiſm and the court of Rome " hated ſo extremely as to take his life away. For " it is thought, that he was poiſoned by thoſe who " were jealous leſt he ſhould attempt a Reformation " of the Church, and eſpecially of the Court of Rome." *At ſi quis Adrianus Ultrajectinus, ad Pontificatum citra Ambitum evectus, reformationem moliatur Eccleſiæ, & ab ipſo Pontifice & Pontificatu, Curiâque Romanâ exordium faciat, ſibique nihil aliud quam Epiſcopi nomen & authoritatem uſurpet, quamquam inter reliquos principem locum obtinentis ex ſtatutis antiquis Eccleſiæ, illum ego iſtis nominibus adpellare non audiam; quia quem Satellites Antichriſtianiſmi, & Curia Romana inviſum habet adeò, ut & vitam ipſi eripiat, hunc ego peſſimum eſſe mihi perſuadere non poſſum. Creditur autem veneno ſublatus eſſe ab iis, qui Reformationem Eccleſiæ & præſertim Curiæ Romanæ ab illo futuram metuebant.* " But I ſuppoſe, continues he, and I think it can be " proved with great probability from ſcripture, that " a Reformation is not to be expected from a perſon, " who is raiſed to the See of Rome; and that if any one " ſuffer himſelf to be raiſed to it with that hope, he " will certainly incur the danger of death or baniſhment, " God himſelf even ordering affairs in that manner. " However this will be aboliſhed at the glorious coming of Chriſt, and the Reformation foretold will " come to paſs by means of the ſeparation of the nations from Babylon, which Babylon ſhall not be deſtitute of its head. But if that Preacher imagines, " that becauſe I believe, that God has not given a " bill of divorce to the Church, over which the Pope " preſides, it therefore follows, that I acknowledge " the Pope as a member of the Church, he ſhews, that " he cannot diſtinguiſh between thoſe, who are ſeduc'd " and ſuffer the tyranny, and the falſe Prophet and " Tyrant himſelf, who deprives himſelf of the character of a member of the Church, when he preſumes to call himſelf the head of it, and excommunicates or conſiders as excommunicated all thoſe, " who will not acknowledge him for the head." By this anſwer he thought he had ſufficiently juſtified himſelf, and at the ſame time anſwered the calumnies of thoſe, who had accuſed him of ſaying, that the fourth volume of Bellarmin's works was unanſwerable. But tho' he never ſpoke thoſe words, yet he owned, that he had often wiſhed to ſee a more ſolid confutation than had appeared, of the arguments which the Cardinal had drawn from the opinion of ſome of the Reformed Writers, to ſhew, that they made God the Author of all the ſins, which were committed. Beſides, he thought that even Conrade Vorſtius, who had gained a great reputation by his writings againſt Popery, had not done ſufficient juſtice to the Proteſtant cauſe, by his anſwer to *the Theſes of the Jeſuits concerning the faith of the Followers of Calvin.* He was of opinion therefore, that it is much more expedient, to reject the authority of ſome Divines of the Reformed Church, and to declare expreſly, that the notions of particular men were not to be imputed to the Proteſtant Churches in general; and that it might eaſily be recriminated upon Bellarmin, that there were many of the School Divines and others among the Roman Catholics, from whoſe writings the ſame conſequences might be drawn (30).

(30) Idem, pag. 376—383.

[*N*] *Concluded in a manner exactly conformable to the principles of Chriſtian charity and moderation.*] He returns the States his acknowledgments for their favourable attention to him; and aſſures them, that he was ready to agree to a friendly conference with his brethren upon theſe and all other points of controverſy, which might ariſe, at any time or in any place that their High Mightineſſes might think proper. " And I promiſe, " *ſays he*, in all theſe conferences to ſhew myſelf " gentle and tractable, equally prepared to learn myſelf as to dictate to others. Beſides as in all points, " which are to be diſcuſſed, it is neceſſary to enquire " firſt, whether the queſtion in debate be true or not, " and then whether it be neceſſary to be believed in " order to ſalvation, I proteſt in the moſt ſolemn " manner, that I will not urge upon my brethren, " who are of a different opinion, the belief of any " article, tho' I can prove it to be agreeable to the " Word of God by the moſt ſolid arguments, unleſs " I can clearly prove from the Scriptures, with the " ſame evidence with which I have ſhewn the truth of " it, that it is likewiſe neceſſary to ſalvation, that every " Chriſtian ſhould believe it in that manner. If my " brethren are ready to do the ſame, I am of opi- " nion, that no controverſy or ſchiſm will eaſily riſe " between us." *Præterea cum de omnibus, quæ diſcutienda ſint, dogmatibus primum inquirendum veniat an illud, de quo quæſtio inſtituitur, verum ſit, deinde an neceſſarium ad ſalutem creditu cenſeri debeat, equidem ſanctè pollicetor voveoque, nullum me articulum, ut ut eum ſolidiſſimis argumentis verbo divino conſentaneum eſſe probaverim, fratribus meis aliter ſentientibus obtruſurum ad credendum, niſi clarè ex verbo Dei probem, ac quidem æquè clarè ac veritatem adſtruxi; ſimul etiam neceſſarium eſſe ad ſalutem, ut quiſque Chriſtianus id ita credat. Idem ſi parati erunt fratres mei facere, haud facile, meo quidem arbitratu, controverſia aut ſchiſma aliquod inter nos exiſturum eſt.* " I add to " this, *continues he*, in order to remove all ſuſpicion " concerning myſelf from this honourable Aſſembly, " now employed about affairs of the utmoſt importance, upon which the ſafety of our Country and " the Reformed Churches depend, that they muſt be " numerous and grievous errors, which I will not " bear with in my brethren, ſince I have no right to " claim an authority over the faith of another perſon, but am only a ſervant to thoſe, who believe, " in order that the knowledge of the truth, and piety, " peace, and joy in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt may grow " in them. If my brethren are of a different opi- " nion, and think that I ought not to be tolerated, " or to enjoy any place among them, I hope notwithſtanding, that no ſchiſm will be raiſed by me; " ſince there are too many ſchiſms already among " Chriſtians, which is a melancholy conſideration; " and therefore every one ought rather to endeavour " to the utmoſt of his power, that they may be leſſen'd " and extinguiſhed. In this caſe I will ſupport my " mind with patience, and readily quit my function, " (tho' I ſhall endeavour to promote the intereſt of " common Chriſtianity, as long as God ſhall prolong my life;) being mindful of that ſaying, " ENOUGH HAS BEEN GIVEN TO THE CHURCH, " AND ENOUGH TO MY COUNTRY." *Quod ſi ſymmyſtis meis aliter videatur, ipſique me non ferendum, ullumve inter eos locum tribuendum cenſeant, per me tamen*

(1) Idem, pag. 437.

(31) Idem, 386, 387, 389.

with the ſtrongeſt ſentiments of piety and reſignation [O]. Dominic Baudius and Hugo Grotius wrote each of them a Poem upon his death; and Daniel Heinſius did the ſame, but his Poem was afterwards ſuppreſſed in the edition of his works (k). His voice was low, but very agreeable, and his pronunciation was admirable (l). He was eaſy and affable to perſons of all ranks, and facetious in his converſation among his friends. He had the greateſt reverence for the Deity, and was conſtant and regular in all the offices of devotion. He faſted frequently. He choſe rather to be religious in reality than in appearance, and preferred the approbation of his own mind to the opinion of the world. His motto was *Bona Conſcientia Paradiſus*; i. e. "A good Conſcience is a Paradiſe." The great object of his wiſhes and endeavours was, that Chriſtians would bear with one another in all controverſies, which did not affect the fundamentals of their religion; and the contrary behaviour of people in perſecuting each other for points of indifference, gave him the moſt exquiſite diſſatisfaction. He very ſeldom affected an oratorical turn in his diſcourſes, either becauſe he had no talent for it, or becauſe he thought that the divine truths had no occaſion for ſuch adventitious ornaments. He thought that the knowledge of the Hebrew and other Oriental Tongues, and of the Jewiſh Antiquities was of great importance in Divinity. He was a ſharp diſputant in all points relating to religion, and knew how to make uſe of the ſubtleties of his antagoniſts againſt themſelves; but in all other caſes where there was no occaſion for them, he ſtudiouſly avoided them. He was very modeſt and diffident of himſelf [P]. His enemies endeavoured to repreſent him in a very diſadvantageous light [Q]; but his memory has been ſufficiently vindicated

(k) Idem, pag. 435, 436.

(l) Idem, pag. 437.

men nullum inde ſchiſma oriturum ſpero; cum nimis multa (proh dolor) inter Chriſtianos gliſcant ſchiſmata, & unumquemque potius ſumma ope niti deceat, ut eadem minuantur atque extinguantur. Hoc vero caſu animam meam patientiâ ſuſtentabo, meumque munus, (victurus tamen communis Chriſtianitatis emolumento, quam diu Deo Opt. Max. placuerit, vitam mihi prorogare,) lubens deponam, illius memor, SAT ECCLESIÆ, SAT PATRIÆ DATUM (31).

(31) Idem, pag. 386, 387, 388, 389.

[O] *He died with the ſtrongeſt ſentiments of piety and reſignation.*] His ſickneſs was attended with the moſt painful circumſtances imaginable; and he almoſt loſt the ſight of his right eye. When this misfortune was known, ſeveral of his enemies, who had not yet remitted the leaſt of their former reſentments againſt him, immediately interpreted it as an inſtance of God's judgment upon him. And in order to countenance this preſumption of theirs, they applied to him the 12th verſe of the 14th chapter of the Prophet Zechariah; *And this ſhall be the plague, wherewith the Lord will ſmite all the people, that have fought againſt Jeruſalem: Their fleſh ſhall conſume away while they ſtand upon their feet, and their eyes ſhall conſume away in their holes, and their tongue ſhall conſume away in their mouth.* And likewiſe the 17th verſe of the 11th chapter; *Woe to the idle Shepherd, that leaveth the Flock: the ſword ſhall be upon his arm, and upon his right eye: his arm ſhall be clean dried up, and his right eye ſhall be utterly darkened.* Others likewiſe invented anagrams from his name Jacobus Arminius, which they found, when tranſpoſed, produced theſe words: *Vani Orbis Amicum*, i. e. "The "Friend of the vain World." But others on the contrary by the addition of one letter, form'd this anagram, *Habui curam Sionis*, i. e. "I had the care of "Sion." However our Divine, notwithſtanding the ſeverity of the diſtemper, preſerved his uſual ſerenity and chearfulneſs, and exhorted his wife to bear her affliction patiently, and to truſt in Providence. He was very importunate in his prayers for the ſafety and peace of the Church; and he placed all his hopes and confidence in Chriſt. The famous Epiſcopius came from Franeker to viſit him, and had frequent and long converſations with him upon the ſubject of Religion, the ſtate of the Church, the knowledge of Chriſt, and the efficacy of his Death and Reſurrection. When our Author found, that death approached, he made his will, in which are the following words: "Above all "things I recommend my ſoul, when it ſhall depart out "of this body, into the hands of God the Creator of "it and my faithful Saviour, before whom I de"clare that I have diſcharged my function and cal"ling with a good conſcience, and with ſimplicity "and ſincerity; always avoiding with the utmoſt "caution, to propoſe or teach any thing, which I "had not before upon the moſt careful examination "of the Scriptures found to be agreeable to them; "and have ſtudied to inculcate every thing, which "might tend to the promotion and enlargement of "the truth of Chriſtianity, the true worſhip of God, "the common intereſts of piety, and virtuous con"verſation among men; and in ſhort to that "ſtate of peace and tranquillity according to the Word "of God, which becomes the Chriſtian name; ex"cluding Popery, with which no unity of faith, no "bond of religion or Chriſtian peace can be main"tained." *Ante omnia commendo animam meam, quando ea ex corpore emigrabit, in manus Dei Creatoris ſui & fidelis Servatoris, coram quo teſtor, me bonâ conſcientiâ in munere meo & vocatione ſimpliciter & ſincerè ambulaſſe; ſollicitè admodum & curioſè hoc cavens, ne quid proponerem aut docerem, quod non adhibita ante diligentia ex S. Scripturis diſquirendis comperiſſem cum iiſdem Scripturis ad amuſſim convenire: quæcunque ad propagationem amplificationemque veritatis, Religionis Chriſtianæ, veri Dei cultûs, communis pietatis, & ſanctæ inter homines converſationis, denique ad convenientem Chriſtiano nomini tranquillitatem & pacem ſecundum verbum Dei poſſent conferre, excludens Papatum, cum quo nulla unitas fidei, nullum pietatis aut Chriſtianæ pacis vinculum ſervari poteſt* (32).

(32) Idem, pag. 426-433.

[P] *He was very modeſt and diffident of himſelf.*] He was very far from ſuperciliouſneſs in his manner of teaching, and ſo little confident of his own abilities, that he was with great difficulty prevailed upon by the importunities of his friends to publiſh any of his writings. *In docendo nullius ſupercilii . . . . tam parum ſibi confidens, ut amicorum flagitantium, ut opus aliquod à ſe ſcripto conſignatum typis publicandum daret, deſideriis ſatisfacere gravaretur* (33).

(33) Idem, pag. 441.

[Q] *His enemies endeavoured to repreſent his character in a very diſadvantageous light.*] We are told in the Preface to the Decrees of the Synod of Dort, that he was a man of a lively and acute genius indeed, but of ſuch a diſpoſition, that he was never pleaſed with any thing, but what came recommended to him under ſome ſhew of novelty, ſo that he ſeemed to diſlike the received doctrines of the Church upon this very account, becauſe they were received. *Virum ingenii quidem exercitatioris, verum cui nihil arrideret, niſi quod aliqua novitatis ſpecie ſe commendaret; adeo ut pleraque in Eccleſiis recepta dogmata, vel hoc ipſo nomine, quod eſſent recepta, faſtidire videretur.* Several foreigners likewiſe, as Mr. Brandt obſerves (34), being too eaſily influenced by the prejudices and clamours of bigots, ſpoke of him as an enemy to God, a man of an artful and diſhoneſt mind, who acted in all reſpects in a crafty manner; who like Ham diſcovered the nakedneſs of his fathers and predeceſſors, and wounded the Reformation itſelf in a ſcandalous way thro' the ſides of the firſt Reformers. *Inimicum Dei, virumque veteratorii ingenii eum appellarent, qui callide omnia egiſſet, Chami inſtar verenda patrum ſuorum revelaſſet, & qui per ſanctiſſimorum Reformationis Principum latus ipſum Eccleſiæ repurgatæ corpus fœdum in modum confodiiſſet.* King James I in his letter to the States of the United Provinces upon the affair of Conrade Vorſtius in the year 1611, falls very ſeverely upon

(34) Idem, pag. 447.

cated by men of the greateſt diſtinction [*R*]. He left behind him ſome children, the eldeſt of which was not above ſeventeen years old. Among theſe were ſeven ſons, whoſe names were Herman, Peter, John, Laurence, James, William, and Daniel, who became afterwards an eminent Phyſician, and Laurence was a Merchant. The reſt died young after their father's deceaſe. His two daughters were named Gertrude and Angelica. Peter

upon the memory of Arminius, and calls him *the Enemy of God*, charges him with direct hereſy, and puts the States in mind, that the diſputes raiſed by him, had embroiled their country, and broke them into factions (35). Arthur Wilſon in his Hiſtory of *the Life and Reign* of that King (36) tells us, that *Arminius left behind him the ſeeds of the Pelagian Hereſy. . . . The Myſteries of Predeſtination*, continues he, *and the ineffable Eſſence of God* (quæ tremenda & admiranda ſunt, ſed non ſcrutanda, *(to uſe our King's own words) which are to be trembled at, and admired, not pried into,) are the great theme. Such intuitions are too high for fleſh and blood. Yet what will not pragmatical ſpirits do, when they proudly look into divine things with the eye of reaſon, not humbly with the eye of faith?* He obſerves then, that the King told the States, *that by the unhappy ſucceſſion of two ſuch prodigies in one ſphere as Arminius & Vorſtius, ſome dreadful miſchief would ſucceed.* Hoornbeck repreſents him as a man fond of his own notions and ſpeculations, and ſtrongly inclined to oppoſe the ſentiments of others; and he calls him a Covenant-Breaker, who having abjured the faith, which he owed to God and to the Church, began to deſtroy the faith of the Churches and the doctrine of Chriſt, at firſt ſecretly, and afterwards openly, by his own efforts, and thoſe of his diſciples and friends, and attempted to diſturb not only the Churches, but even the civil Government itſelf; which he would have executed, if God had not interpoſed to prevent the danger. *Violatorem fœderis vocat, qui, ejurata quam Deo, quam Eccleſiæ dederat, fide, fidem Eccleſiarum & doctrinam Chriſti clam primum, inde palam, cum per ſe, tum per diſcipulos & ſocios, & Eccleſias non modo, ſed & politias nefario auſu turbare cæperit, ac pervertere: feciſſet etiam, niſi Deus laborantibus rebus ſuccurriſſet* (37).

(35) *See* Collier's *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* Part 2. book 8. pag. 704.

(36) Publiſhed in the 2d volume of the *Complete Hiſtory of England*, pag. 715. edit. 1706.

(37) *See* Brandt p. 447, 448.

[*R*] *But his memory has been ſufficiently vindicated by men of the greateſt diſtinction.*] Brandt obſerves (38), that Arminius himſelf had fully confuted moſt of the imputations caſt upon him; but after his death his conduct was fully juſtified by Peter Bertius, Utenbogard, Simon Epiſcopius, Corvinus, Narſius, Curcellæus, Poelenburgius, and others. Poelenburgius in particular anſwered the accuſations urged againſt Arminius by Hoornbeck, which we mentioned in the preceding note. The Curators of the Univerſity of Leyden had ſo great a regard for him, that they ſettled an annual allowance upon his widow and children, and the Academical Senate gave a very honourable teſtimony to his merit (39). Joſ. Scaliger, who was by no means liberal of his praiſes to others, calls him a very great Man, *virum maximum* (40). Meurſius in his *Athenæ Batavæ* (41) tells us, that he was a man of *a very acute wit and ſharp judgment*; and Druſius ranks him among thoſe *learned and candid men*, to whoſe judgment he willingly ſubmitted his writings. Dominic Baudius, in the Dedication of his *Epicedium* upon Arminius to the States of the United Provinces, calls him his *reverend Collegue, a Man of great merit*, whom he had a ſincere regard for while he was living, and eſteemed now he was dead, as a perſon endowed with all the valuable qualifications of genius and learning. And in his Letter to Utenbogard (42) after Arminius's death, he obſerves, that he never was lawfully convicted or condemn'd for any hereſies; but that to the laſt moments of his life, he diſcharged in the beſt manner the office, which the Curators and Burgomaſters had aſſigned him; and died in the poſſeſſion of his poſt; ſo that his memory deſerves the regard of all good men. He obſerves likewiſe, that he regretted the loſs of him, and that he had no greater wiſh, than to ſee the day, in which Arminius might have defended his innocence from the rumours, which were maliciouſly ſpread againſt him, and raſhly believed. *Nunquam legitimè ullius erroris convictus aut condemnatus eſt. Imo ad ultimum vitæ ſpiritum exornavit Spartam, quam ex decreto Curatorum & Conſulum noſtrorum adeptus erat, obiitque in poſſeſſione legitimi muneris, ut merito ejus memoriam boni omnes fauſta recordatione proſequi debeant. Mihi triſte ſui deſiderium reliquit, nec quicquam æque in votis habui, quam ut viderem diem illum, quo ſuam innocentiam ab invidioſè ſparſis & temerè creditis rumoribus tutari poſſet.* Anthony Thyſius, who had been very intimate with him, uſed frequently to ſay, that he never ſaw a man of more and greater virtues than him, or ſubject to fewer and leſſer faults. Mr. Richard Thomſon, a very learned man of the Univerſity of Cambridge, in a Letter to Baudius dated in Auguſt 1605, obſerves, that the fame of Arminius was not ſo little known among them, as Baudius ſeemed to imagine. "For, "ſays he, I knew him very well, before he was made "Profeſſor at Leyden; and ſince he gained that Pro"feſſorſhip, he is become known to many others "here. And therefore whenever any Students come "hither from your Univerſity, our Profeſſors enquire "very particularly about Arminius. I am extremely "glad for the ſake of your Univerſity, that ſhe has "ſo great men there." *De Arminio quod ſcribis, benignè. Quanquam viri illius fama non tam ignobilis apud nos eſt, atque tu videris exiſtimare. Nam & mihi olim notiſſimus, antequam apud vos profiteretur, & ex quo profitetur, multis aliis quoque hic innoteſcere cæpit. Itaque quoties iſtinc ſtudioſi aliqui ad nos veniunt, diligenter de Arminio inquirunt profeſſores noſtri. Itaque Academiæ veſtræ nomine ſanè lætor, quæ tantum virum tenet.* John Buxtorf, Profeſſor at Baſil, upon the news of Arminius's death, wrote a letter to Utenbogard, wherein he tells him, that he had great reaſon to be extremely ſorry at the unexpected deceaſe of that bright Luminary of Holland, as well on account of the common loſs to the Church of Chriſt, as that the acquaintance, which he had lately contracted with him, ſhould be ſo unfortunately interrupted; ſince he was in hopes of ſubſtituting him in the room of Scaliger, whoſe life was alſo cut off very early. *Tanti certe luminis Belgii inclyti, D. Jacobi Arminii inopinata extinctio juſtum animo meo mœrorem attulit, tum ob commune Eccleſiæ Chriſti incommodum, tum quod primus meus in tanti viri notitiam acceſſus tam luctuosè fuerit interruptus. Subſtituere enim hunc ſperabam in illuſtris heroïs D. Scaligeri P. M. locum, qui mihi quoque citius nimio ex his humanis fuit abreptus.* To theſe we ſhall add the teſtimony of the great Iſaac Caſaubon, who in his Letter to Samuel Næranus dated from Paris in Auguſt 1610, ſays, that he does not doubt, but that Arminius, then deceaſed, was a great man; tho' he had not yet met with any one of their Miniſters, who did not conſider him as an infamous heretick, being entirely of opinion, that Calvin's doctrine is the ſtandard of truth; and that tho' himſelf had a great regard for that Divine, yet he could not bear thoſe perſons, who hate all, who differ from him. *Arminium τὸν μακαρίτην, cujus ipſe mentionem facis, virum magnum fuiſſe non dubito; etſi noſtrorum paſtorum nullum adhuc inveni, qui pro infami hæretico illum non haberet, ut quibus ὁ κανὼν τῆς ἀληθείας ſit ſententia Calvini; quem ego virum vehementer ſuſpiciens, eos tamen ferre non poſſum, qui omnes ab eo diſſentientes malè oderunt.* M. Martinius likewiſe, who was afterwards an eminent Member of the Synod of Dort, and to whom our Divine a few weeks before his death complained very pathetically of the calumnies ſuggeſted againſt him, gave him this candid and unprejudiced character, that he thought he was a man, who had a real reverence for God, a Maſter of a great ſhare of learning, very converſant in theological controverſies and the Scriptures, and very cautious in applying philoſophical terms to points of Divinity. *Mihi vir viſus eſt verè Dei timens, eruditiſſimus, & in controverſiis theologicis exercitatiſſimus, & in ſcripturis potens, & valdè circumſpectus, & ἀκριβὴς in philoſophicis terminis ad res theologicas accommodandis* (43). Dr. Heylin in the 11th Book of his *Aerius Redivivus* or *Hiſtory of the Preſbyterians* (44) tells us, that he was *a man of equal learning with Francis Junius, and*

(38) Pag. 448.

(39) Idem, pag. 452, 453, 454, 455.

(40) See the *Scaligerana*.

(41) Pag. 177. *apud* Brandt, p. 455.

(42) *Apud* Brandt, p. 456.

(43) *See* Brandt, p. 456-460. § 15, 16.

(44) Pag. 380. edit. London fol. 1670.

Peter Bertius concludes his funeral Oration upon him with this elogium, that he was a man who could not be ſufficiently eſteemed by thoſe who knew him, and that thoſe who did not eſteem him, never knew him ſufficiently.

no leſs piety, and that *during the ſhort time of his ſitting in the Chair of Leyden, he drew unto him a great part of that Univerſity; who by the piety of the man, his powerful arguments, his extreme diligence in that place, and the clear light of reaſon, which appeared in all his diſcourſes, became ſo wedded at the laſt unto his opinions, that no time or trouble could divorce them from him.* T.

☞ARNAUD DE COUTIGNAC, a Gentleman of Provence in the XIV Century, diſtinguiſhed for his excellent talent in Poetry, which introduced him into the acquaintance of perſons of the greateſt quality in his country. He was very ſucceſsful in all his deſigns, ſo that Lewis King of Naples and Sicily, Earl of Provence, and his Queen Joan, gave him a commiſſion together with Guy Flote, Lieutenant of the County of Vintimiglia, to oblige the Tendians, who had revolted at that time, to do them homage. He performed this commiſſion in ſuch a manner, as raiſed him a prodigious reputation; and the King and Queen rewarded his ſervices with ſettling upon him an eſtate, which they had at Coutignac. He was in love with a Lady, whoſe name was *Yſnarde*, of the family of Agoult, daughter to Monſieur Entravenes. He wrote a great many Sonnets in her praiſe; but not being able to procure any opportunity of ſpeaking to her, he went to travel into divers parts of the world, as he tells us in his works. He endeavoured as much as poſſible to baniſh this Lady out of his memory, who, as he imagined, was inſenſible to all his pain. While he was in the Eaſt, he met with a very learned Jewiſh Magician and Aſtrologer, who foretold to him, that his poſterity ſhould prove illuſtrious for their virtues, and be highly eſteemed in Provence. S. Cezari calls this Arnaud, Guilhen, and tells us, that he was a long time in the ſervice of Queen Joan, and died during the war between the Tendians and the people of Vintimiglia, which happened in the year 1354. He obſerves likewiſe, that he wrote in his voyage to the Eaſt, a Treatiſe, intitled, *Las Suffrenſas d'Amours*, i. e. "The Sufferings of Love", which he addreſſed to Yſnarde (*a*).

(*a*) Du Verdier Vau-Privas, *Biblioth.* pag. 87. edit. Lyon. 1585.

☞ARNAUD DE MEYRVEILH, was a Poet of Provence in the beginning of the XIIIth Century. His father had an eſtate and Lordſhip at Meyrveilh near Aix in Provence, but was obliged by his misfortunes to ſell it. Arnaud, who had made ſome progreſs in learning, thought it neceſſary to travel, in order to enjoy the converſation of the Poets of that time; from whom he learned to write in the Provencal language, which was at that time the moſt in requeſt with thoſe, who were fond of Poetry and Romances [*A*]. He entered into the ſervice of the Viſcount of Beziers, whoſe name was Taillefer, and who

[*A*] *The Provencal language, which was at that time the moſt in requeſt of all others, with thoſe, who were fond of Poetry and Romances.*] Monſieur Huet, Biſhop of Avranches, in his *Origin of Romances*, has given us ſeveral very curious obſervations with regard to the Romances and Poetry of Provence. He tells us, that when the Latin tongue fell into neglect, the verſifiers, compoſers, jeſters, inventors of tales, and in ſhort, all who ſtudied what they called the *Gay Science*, began about the time of Hugh Capet to run into the humour of writing Romances, which they diſperſed over all France. Theſe Fables were compoſed in the Roman tongue; for formerly the people of Provence had a greater ſhare of learning and Poetry than all the reſt of France. This Roman tongue was that, which the Romans introduced into Gaul with their conqueſts. It was corrupted by time, and by mixing the Gauliſh language amongſt it; ſo that the French or Tudeſque, which followed, was neither Latin, Gauliſh, nor French, but a medley of them all. However, the Latin was predominant in it; and for that reaſon it continued to be called *Roman*, to diſtinguiſh it from the particular and natural language of each country, as the *French*, *Gauliſh* or *Celtic-Aquitanic*, and *Belgic*. For Cæſar obſerves, that theſe three languages were different among themſelves; which Strabo explains as different dialects of the ſame language. The Spaniards uſe the word *Romance* in the ſame ſenſe with us, and call their ordinary language by the ſame name. The Roman being then underſtood, thoſe of Provence, who applied themſelves to fictions, made uſe of it in their writings, which from thence were called *Romances*. The Verſifiers travelled about the country, and were well rewarded for their labours, and nobly entertained by perſons of quality, whom they viſited. Some of them would be ſo tranſported with hearing their performances repeated, that they would diveſt themſelves of their robes, to adorn the Poets with them. The Provencals were not the only perſons, who delighted in theſe amuſements; for almoſt every County in France had their Romancers, even as far as Picardy, which produc'd their *Servantois*, pieces treating of Love in a ſatyrical way. Monſieur Huet afterwards obſerves, that it is very probable, that the Italians were firſt induced to compoſe Romances by the examples of thoſe in Provence, who were famous for them at the time when the Popes ſat at Avignon, and perhaps by that of the other diviſions of the French, when the Normans and Charles Earl of Anjou, brother to St. Lewis, a Prince of great merit, and a Poet himſelf, made war in Italy; ſince the Normans themſelves cultivated the *Gay Science*. The Provencal Poets were called *Troubadours* or *Trouverres*, and were the moſt eminent of all the French in Poetry and Romance. But their art was ſo generally admired, that all parts of that country had perſons of that profeſſion. The eleventh and following Centuries produce a prodigious number of them both in proſe and verſe; and the Preſident Fauchet mentions one hundred and twenty ſeven Poets, who lived before the year 1300. Mr. Rymer in his *Short View of Tragedy* (1), tells us, that the Italian Authors, as Bembo, Speron Sperone, and others, acknowledge that the beſt part of their language and of their Poetry is derived from that of Provence; which is the caſe likewiſe of the Spaniſh and other modern languages. It is certain, that Petrarch, one of the moſt eſteemed Writers among the Italians, would appear very empty, if the Provencal Poets were to demand back from him what he has borrowed of them. In ſhort, all our modern Poetry comes from them. There never was known ſo great an application in the Princes and people, as there was at that time every where to the Provencal Poetry, which occaſioned the fancy of Philip de Mouſks, one of their Romancers, that Charlemagne made a donation of Provence to be the Poet's patrimony. Mr. Rymer tells us, that he was more particular upon this ſubject, in order to prevent an impreſſion, which the Monks of that time might otherwiſe make upon his Readers; eſpecially Roger Hoveden, who informs us, that King Richard I, (who with his brother Jeffrey had formerly lived

(1) Publiſhed in 1693. cap. 5. p. 66, *&c ſeq.*

who was deſcended of the Earls of Toulouſe; and he fell in love with the Counteſs of Burlas named Alearde, wife to Taillefer. Our Poet had a very advantageous perſon, and ſung well, and was extremely converſant in Romances. The Counteſs ſhewed him great civilities; but he durſt not declare to her, that the Sonnets, which he made, were of his own compoſition, but aſcribed the honour of them to others. However his paſſion induced him at laſt to write one, in which he declared openly his love for her; and this Sonnet made ſo great an impreſſion upon her, that ſhe received his chaſte deſires, as Du Verdier Vau-privas tells us (*a*), with the utmoſt humanity, and made him ſeveral noble preſents. He wrote a Book intitled *Las recaſtenas de ſa Comteſſa*, and a collection of Poems and Sonnets. He died in the year 1220. Petrarch mentions him in the 4th Chapter of his *Triumph of Love* (*b*).

(*a*) *Biblioth.* p. 89. edit. Lyon. 1585.

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

lived at the Courts of ſeveral Princes in and about Provence, and ſo came to take delight in their language and Poetry,) "in order to raiſe himſelf a name, went "about begging and buying verſes and flattering "rhymes; and by rewards enticed over from France "*Singers* and *Jeſters*, to ſing of him in the ſtreets. "And it was every where given out, that he had none "equal to him in the whole world." *Hic ad augmentum & famam ſui nominis emendicata Carmina, & rithmos adulatorios comparabat, & de regno Francorum* Cantores & Joculatores *allexerat, ut de illo canerent in Plateis, & dicebatur ubique quod non erat talis in orbe.* It is a miſtake, that theſe *Songſters* and *Jeſters* were brought from France; for theſe countries were fiefs of the Empire. Frederic I. had infeoffed Ramond Berenger of the County of Provence, Forcalquiers, and other places adjacent. Ramond Count of Toulouſe was the grand patron of thoſe Poets, and at the ſame time the Protector of the *Albigenſes*, who ſo much alarmed the Popiſh world, and coſt ſo many Cruſades to ſuppreſs them. Guilhem of Agoult, Albert of Siſteron, Rambald of Orange, (names ſince revived by the Duke of Savoy,) were principal Poets. All the Princes, who were in league together to ſupport the Albigenſes againſt France and the Pope, encouraged and patronized theſe Poets. Hence we may conclude the reaſon, why the Monks were ſo angry at theſe *Singers and Jeſters*; and uneaſy, that they ſhould enjoy any degree of familiarity with the King. The ſame Critic afterwards obſerves (*a*), that the Provencal was the firſt of the modern languages, that was adapted to the muſick and ſweetneſs of Rhyme: which paſſing by Savoy to Monferat, the Italians thence began to poliſh the *volgare*, and to imitate the Provencals in their verſes. The intermarriages of the Engliſh, and the dominions, which they held about that country, brought them much ſooner acquainted with the Provencal language and Poetry. And thoſe perſons amongſt the Engliſh, who wrote verſe, as King Richard, Savary de Mauleon, and Robert Groſtead, finding their own tongue too ſtubborn and inflexible, fell readily upon that of Provence, as more ſmooth and pliable. Chaucer ſeized upon all the *Provencal*, French, or Latin words, which he met with, and mixed them with the Engliſh, after he had modelled them according to the genius of his own language. The Provencal Poets were called *Troubadours*, *Jeongleors*, and *Chanterres*; the laſt word is not foreign to our Cathedrals; the ſecond Roger Hoveden renders JOCULATORES or *Jeſters*; as we may tranſlate the firſt *Trumpeters*. But the *Troubadours* were likewiſe called *Troverres* from their invention, as we ſay *treſor, troue*. The Italians call them *Trovatore*. And the name of *Jeongleors* was given them from ſome muſical inſtrument then in uſe, as the Greek and Latin were called *Lyric* Poets. This inſtrument was very probably the harp. T.

(*a*) Cap. 16. pag. 77.

ARNAUD, a noble and ancient family of Auvergne. It is above two hundred years ago, that a daughter of this houſe was married to a Lord de la Fayette, grandſon to him who was Marechal of France under Charles VI. HENRY ARNAUD married, about the year 1480, Catherine Bariot, a relation of him who was Counſellor to the Parliament of Paris, and Maſter of Requeſts, under Lewis XI (*a*). Soon after this marriage, he came to ſettle at Riom, whither he was invited with many other perſons of merit, by Peter de Bourbon, Count de Beaujeu [*A*], who there made his uſual reſidence. This Prince was married to Madame Anne of France, daughter of Lewis XI, who intirely governed Charles VIII her brother, and was Regent during his minority. Henry Arnaud got the eſteem of the Count and Counteſs de Beaujeu. He became Gentleman of the Horſe to the Count, and Governor of the City and Caſtle of Hermant, which was the place of his birth, being eight leagues from Riom, upon the frontiers of the Marche Limoſin, near Uſſel. This government was continued to him by the Conſtable of Bourbon, ſon-in-law to the Count de Beaujeu. He retained alſo the office of Maſter of the Horſe. He did a great piece of ſervice to this Conſtable by making his horſes be ſhod the wrong way (*b*), when Francis I, who treated him as a rebel, ſent out people to take him. They judging by the track of the horſes that he was gone from the place where he was hid, were diſappointed by going to the place where he was not. Henry Arnaud had contracted a very ſtrict friendſhip with Florimond de Robertet, Secretary of the Count of Beaujeu, and afterwards Secretary of State under Francis I, and it depended only upon him to procure his ſon a very advantageous match by the generoſity of this friend; but he requited this generoſity with another [*B*]. He left two ſons, John and Anthony. The firſt

(*a*) From him deſcended Mr. Bariot, Marquis of Mouſſy, and Meſſieurs Bariot, Counts of Honneuil and Mazy.

(*b*) We find in the *Galanteries des Rois de France*, printed at Holland in 1694. p. 189. tom. 1. that Arnaud's houſe was plundered on account of this ſtratagem.

[*A*] *He, with ſeveral other perſons of merit, was invited to come and live at Riom, by Peter of Bourbon, Count of Beaujeu.*] They ſhew at this day in Riom the houſes of Montboiſſier, Montmorin, Chazeron, Florat, Chaſteaugay, Mariliac, Dubourg, Duprat, Forget, and Robertet, which were all principal Officers and Favourites of the Count and Counteſs of Beaujeu, and of the Conſtable of Bourbon their ſon-in-law, by whom they were advanced in the end to the firſt poſts of the Army and the Long-Robe (1). See here how accidentally it fell out, that ſo many perſons from Auvergne have appeared in the Court of France in the higheſt poſts under Charles VIII, Louis XII, and Francis I. The Counteſs of Beaujeu firſt brought them from their own Province, and then put fortune into their hands; had it not been for her they would have died in obſcurity, and their great talents had never been known in the world. Hence we may conclude, that the particular glory of any Province, at certain times, entirely depends on ſuch patronages. You will find a Supplement of this at the end of the *Menagiana*, pages 304 and 305 of the Holland Edition.

(1) Extracted from a *Memoir* communicated to the Author of the *Galant Mercury*, and inſerted in that of the month of Dec. 1693.

[*B*] *He was an intimate friend of Robertet . . . and requited one generoſity with another.*] The ſtory is as follows: Florimond de Robertet quitted Montbriſon, his

firſt died and left no children; he gives himſelf in the Church Regiſters of the city of Riom in 1542, the title of Commander of Hermant. ANTHONY ARNAUD his younger brother kept up the family. He firſt married Margarite Moſnier-Dubourg, a near relation to the Chancellor of that name, ſiſter of the famous Anne Dubourg Counſellor of the Parliament, and of John Dubourg *Lieutenant Criminel* of Riom. He had but one ſon by this marriage, JOHN DE LA MOTTE ARNAUD, whom Thuanus in his hiſtory mentions with ſo much praiſe. This Gentleman, at the head of a company of horſe of which he was Captain, ſhut himſelf up in the city of Yſſoire, which declared on the King's ſide againſt the League, and maintained the ſiege a long time with the Lords de Chabanes and de Chazeron: after which, he made a vigorous ſally, at the head of thirty Troopers, and with his own hand killed the Count of Randam (*c*), chief of the League in Auvergne. His death cauſed the ſiege to be raiſed, and was the occaſion of gaining the battle, which was afterwards fought, and confirmed all Auvergne to Henry IV, the ſame day and the ſame year, that he won the battle of Yvri. The father of this John Arnaud at firſt followed arms. He raiſed a company of light horſe, and was in ſeveral engagements: but Catherine de Medicis, knowing his capacity and fidelity, made him her Attorney General, and the King's Attorney in the Preſidial of Riom, which at that time was above forty leagues in extent (*d*). He very much diſtinguiſhed himſelf in theſe two offices. He takes in all the acts which remain of him, the title of *Seigneur de la Motte, de Chantegrenelle, de Fontainebleau, de Peſſac*, and *de Bonnefilles*, which are fiefs and caſtles half a league from Riom. He had for his ſecond wife Anne Forget, daughter to the firſt *Maitre d' Hotel* to the Conſtable of Bourbon (*e*). He lived to be an hundred and one years old, and died at Paris, whither Queen Catherine *de Medicis* had invited him. He was buried in St. Sulpice's Church, at the firſt Chapel which was ever built there, of which he was the founder. The title of the foundation imports, that he had the office of Corrector of Accounts, and Comptroller General of the *Reſtes* [*C*], and that he was Lord of Corbeville, near Paris. By his ſecond marriage he had twelve ſons (*f*), and among others ANTHONY ARNAUD, of whom I ſhall ſpeak particularly; ISAAC ARNAUD, who was Comptroller of the Finances: DAVID ARNAUD a Captain, killed at the ſiege of Jerzeau; LEWIS ARNAUD, General of the Finances at Riom: another LEWIS ARNAUD, Secretary to the King at Paris, and PETER ARNAUD the youngeſt of the twelve brothers, who diſtinguiſhed himſelf the moſt in the profeſſion of arms. He was Marechal of the camps and armies to King Lewis XIII, Governor of Port Lewis and Colonel of the regiment of Champaigne. It is of him that the Sieur de Pontis makes ſuch honourable mention. He made no difficulty to compare him with the moſt famous Captains that ever were among the Greeks and Romans. He ſaid he was better acquainted than any man with the ancient military diſcipline, made it be beſt obſerved by the ſoldiers, and that they loved him to adoration. ISAAC ARNAUD, who has been mentioned above, was father to another ISAAC ARNAUD who was Governor of Philipſbourg, and *Maitre de Camp* of the Carrabins, one of the braveſt men, and fineſt genius's of his age. He is celebrated in the writings of Voiture: his ſiſter was married to Manaſſes de Feuquieres, who commanded the King's army before Thionville in 1639 (*g*).

(*c*) Madame de Seneccy Governeſs of the King, was his daughter.

(*d*) The Preſidials of Gueret, Clermont, and Aurillac had not yet been diſmembred from it.

(*e*) Monſ. Forget, Secretary of State under Henry IV, and *Preſident au Mortier*, was of the ſame family.

(*f*) In the *Diſcours Hiſtorique de la Vie de Monſ. Arnaud Docteur de Sorbonne*, pag. 2. Liege edition, in 1702, there are but eight ſons allowed to Anthony Arnaud, by the two marriages.

(*g*) Taken from a *Memoir* communicated to the Author of the *Mercure Galant*, and inſerted in the month of Dec. 1693.

his native place, and went to ſettle at Riom, where he was advanced to the place of Secretary to the Count of Beaujeu. He got the entire aſcendant over the Count, as he afterwards did over Charles VIII, to whoſe care the Queen Regent committed him, as alſo over Louis XII, after the death of Cardinal d'Amboiſe, and laſt of all over Francis I, to whom he was Secretary of State. He had ſo great a friendſhip for Henry Arnaud, that when he left Riom, to fix himſelf at the Court of Charles VIII, he carried with him thither all his children except Jane de Robertet his eldeſt daughter, whom he left at Riom under the care of Henry Arnaud's wife, on purpoſe that they ſhould marry her to John Arnaud their eldeſt ſon, when he ſhould be of age: but her guardians not thinking their ſon a match good enough for her, they married her to the wealthieſt young Gentleman in Riom, named Amable de Ceriers, ſon of a daughter of one Mariliac (2).

(2) Extracted from the ſame *Memoir*.

[*C*] *He was Corrector of Accounts, and Comptroller General of the Reſtes.*] Since the firſt edition of this work I received a little Memoir written by one of the greateſt Genealogiſts of Europe, in which I found the following account: "Anthony Arnaud, Sieur de la "Mothe and de Villeneuve, the King's Attorney in "the Juriſdiction of Auvergne at Riom, Sollicitor "General of the Reſtes of the Parliament in 1568, "and 1570, afterwards Auditor of the Accounts at "Paris, and laſt of all Attorney General to Catherine "de Medicis, was ennobled in December 1577, in "quality of Auditor of the Accounts. He was ſon "to Henry Arnaud, Bailiff of the place of Herman in "Auvergne, and of N. Colonges. He eſpouſed Anne "Forget, daughter of John Forget, Sieur de Bidoigne, "the King's Attorney General in Auvergne, and of "Jane Godinet, and died aged 101, about the year "1591. See the Memoirs of Sulli, Tom. IV, fo-"lio 71." But on the other hand read alſo the Sequel of the *Menagiana*, page 305 of the Holland Edition.

(*a*) Konig calls him Mark Anthony. The letter M, which he and others have ſeen before Anthony, in ſome French book, where it ſignified *Maître* or *Monſieur*, was probably the cauſe of this miſtake.

ARNAUD (ANTHONY) (*a*), Advocate of the Parliament of Paris, ſon of another Anthony of whom I have ſpoken in the preceding Article, acquired a prodigious reputation by his eloquence. Henry IV, having a mind to carry the Duke of Savoy to the Parliament, made choice of a day when Arnaud was to plead a fine cauſe [*a*] (*b*). He gave

(*b*) It related to the puniſhment for Calumniators. *See in* Matthieu's *Hiſtoire de Henri Quatriéme*, tom. 1. pag. 455, &c. the pleadings on that cauſe.

[*a*] *Henry IV, having a mind to carry the Duke of Savoy to the Parliament, made choice of a day when Arnaud was to plead a fine cauſe.*] 1. This is not true in fact: Peter Mathieu, whom Bayle quotes, relates it after this manner: "Preſident de Harley, *ſays* "*he*, knowing that the King would come to the "Parliament, choſe a cauſe to be pleaded on that "day, the ſubject of which was very tragical, &c." 2. Bayle has not fixed the date of that fact, which happened in the year 1600. Beſides, being led into an

gave this able man a Writ for Counſellor of State [β]. Queen Mary de Medicis made him her Attorney General [γ], and would have made him Secretary of State; but he refuſed that office, and told the Queen, *that he ſhould ſerve her Majeſty better by being Advocate, than by being Secretary of State:* This has been hinted at in his Epitaph [*A*] [δ]. The Advocate General Marion (*c*) was one day ſo well pleaſed with hearing him plead, that he took him into his coach, carried him to dinner, and placed his eldeſt daughter Catherine Marion next him. After dinner he took him aſide, and aſked him what he thought of his daughter; and underſtanding that he ſeemed to think her a very deſerving Lady, he gave her to him in marriage (*d*) [ε]. One of the moſt famous

(c) Meſſieurs Marion, Counts of Druys, deſcend from him.

(d) Taken from the *Memoir* inſerted in the *Mercure Galant*, Dec. 1693.

error by the Memoirs, which he follows (1), and which make him ſtumble at every ſtep, he thought, that this cauſe had been pleaded in a very ſolemn manner, which is falſe; the King accompanied by the Duke of Savoy, was at the Parliament only *incognito*. *They were*, ſays P. Matthieu, (Hiſt. d'Henry IV, p. 134. of the fol. Ed.) *in the gilt chamber, whence they could hear, without being ſeen.* The Pleas of Anne Robert, Ant. Arnaud, and the Attorney General Servin on this occaſion, are extant in the collection of thoſe of the latter; and there we find that every thing paſſed as uſual, without any extraordinary ceremony, as tho' the King had not been there. 3. *The queſtion was*, ſays Bayle (2), *concerning the puniſhment due to ſlanderers*; but he is miſtaken, the queſtion was not *de jure*, but *de facto*, viz. Whether the woman, called Domenchin, whoſe ſon had been murthered, and who had charged one Bellanger with the murther, ought to have been condemned, as being guilty of calumny, ſince the true murtherer had been found, and Bellanger, tho' innocent, had been put to the rack. Arnaud, who pleaded for the woman, gained the cauſe (3). CRIT. REM.]

(1) See the quotation (*d*).

(2) Marg. quotation (*b*).

(3) Critical Remark at the end of the French edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

[β] *He gave this able man a Writ for Counſellor of State.*] The Memoirs mentioned above, and which contain a continual elogium, even contrary to truth, inſinuate, that this Writ was granted to Arnaud, as a reward for his pleading; but all this is mere romancing. Counſellor Arnaud never had ſuch a Writ, as appears plainly by the titles he gives himſelf in the Certificate taken from the Pariſh-Regiſters, dated Feb. the 6th, 1612, relating to the chriſtening of his ſon. We find there only theſe words: *M. Ant. Arnaud, Advocate in the Parliament of Paris, and Counſellor of the ſame City, Lord of Andilli.* Is it probable, that a man who ſtiles himſelf Counſellor of the City, would omit the title of Counſellor of State, if it had belonged to him? It is true, that M. de Sainte Marthe ſays, *Anthony choſe to continue in the Hall as a Lawyer, rather than to accept the place of Attorney General, which Marion his father-in-law would have reſign'd to him, and a ſeat in the King's Council.* This fact, whether true or falſe, proves that this Lawyer never was Counſellor of State. Let it be obſerved, that at that time a Writ for the place of Counſellor of State did not hinder a Lawyer from continuing to plead at the Bar as uſual, ſeveral inſtances of it might be produced (4). CRIT. REM.]

(4) Ibid.

[γ] *Queen Mary de Medicis made him her Attorney General.*] This fact is not true. Mr. de Sainte Marthe, who does not forget to tell us, that Arnaud had been Attorney General to Catherine de Medicis after his father, does not ſay a word of what Mr. Bayle affirms; nay the abſtract from the Pariſh-Regiſters, related above, ſufficiently proves the falſity of it; nor does Father Queſnel in the leaſt mention it (5). CRIT. REM.]

(5) Ibid.

[*A*] *He declined being Secretary of State. . . . . This has been hinted at in his Epitaph.*] Monſr. le Maitre, grandſon and godſon to Anthony Arnaud the Lawyer, was Author of this Epitaph. Thoſe who have a deſire to read it need not take the trouble of ſeeking it elſewhere; thoſe who are not curious about it may paſs it over: tho' this piece of advice may perhaps be thought unneceſſary.

Paſſant du grand Arnauld révere la memoire.
Ses vertus à ſa race ont ſervi d'ornement,
Sa plume à ſon païs, ſa voix au Parlement,
Son Eſprit à ſon ſiecle, & ſes faits à l'Hiſtoire.
Contre un ſecond Philippe Uſurpateur des lis
Le ſecond Demoſthene anima ſes Ecrits,
Et contre Emmanuel arma ſon Eloquence.
Il vit comme un néant les hautes dignitez,
Et préféra l'honneur d'Oracle de la France
A tout le vain éclat des titres empruntez.

That is,

" Stop paſſenger, and view this ſacred place;
" Sacred to virtue and great Arnaud's name,
" And as his merit did adorn his race
" So let your gratitude record his fame!
" His pen he drew to fight his country's cauſe,
" His tongue did ever plead her ancient rights,
" His wiſdom ſtands recorded in her Laws,
" And Hiſtory ſwells her page with his exploits.
" Tho' lawleſs tyranny the crown did wear
" He bravely wrote in liberty's defence,
" Nor did the rage of the Uſurper fear,
" His buckler truth, his weapon eloquence.
" Honours and empty titles he diſdain'd,
" Thinking his greateſt honour was to be
" At once his country's Oracle and Friend,
" The State's ſupport and ſcourge of Tyranny."

[δ] *And would have made him Secretary of State, but he refuſed that office, &c. This has been hinted at in his Epitaph.*] 1. The fact related here is ſufficiently confuted by the teſtimony of Mr. de Sainte Marthe, and by the ſilence of Father Queſnel; who relates two ſuch facts, not of Anthony, but of John and Claude his brothers. 2. In order to praiſe, right or wrong, this Lawyer, who indeed was a worthy man, our Author makes him ſay, in my opinion, a downright impertinence. For can a man of ſenſe think or ſay, that he will be more capable to ſerve a Queen-Regent, by continuing to plead cauſes at the Bar, than if he were a Secretary of State? 3. His Epitaph is mere bombaſt; whence it can be only concluded that Mr. Arnaud had refuſed very honourable poſts, but not that of Secretary of State, rather than that of Firſt-Preſident, or Chancellor. See the three laſt verſes, and you will find, that they don't directly inſinuate, either that any thing had ever been offered to him, or that he refuſed it. Nay the very thought of theſe verſes ſeem to me falſe and ill grounded. For ſuppoſing the truth of the fact related by Mr. de Sainte Marthe, which I only believe out of courteſy, I mean, that Mr. Arnaud refuſed to be made Attorney General in the room of his father-in-law; if he had accepted that poſt, it might then have been ſaid, that he preferred the honour of being the *Oracle of France*, to ſome higher poſt, to which he might have aſpired. But to ſay that of a Lawyer, who never was a Demoſthenes, or a Cicero, is very ridiculous. Theſe words *Titres empruntez (borrowed titles)* is only put into the verſe to rhime with *Dignitez (dignities)*. For if Mr. Arnaud had been Attorney General, or Secretary of State, or in any poſt of that nature, theſe titles would not have been *borrowed*, but real (6). CRIT. REM.]

(6) Ibid.

[ε] *The Attorney-General Marion — gave him his daughter in marriage.*] Who would not imagine, from Mr. Bayle's account, that Mr. Marion was already Attorney General, when he did Mr. Arnaud the honour to give him his daughter? Yet the truth of the matter is, that this marriage was celebrated in the year 1587, when Mr. Marion and Mr. Arnaud were both but common Lawyers. Mr. Marion continued ſuch till the year 1596, when in the month of Auguſt he was made Counſellor of Parliament; afterwards he was raiſed to the poſt of Preſident, in what the French call *the firſt of the Courts of Inqueſt* (7), and to that of Attorney General in 1597, ten years after his daughter's marriage (8). CRIT. REM.]

(7) *La Premiere des Enqueſtes.*

(8) French edition of Bayle's Diction. *ubi ſupra.*

mous cauſes [ζ] that Anthony Arnaud has pleaded, is that of the Univerſity againſt the Jeſuits, in the year 1594. We ſhall ſee underneath what was the recompence of it [B]. Some ſay that he publiſhed a book in 1602, to hinder the reſtoring of them [C], but that having well foreſeen that they would return, and become formidable, he endeavoured to ſuppreſs it. He had been Counſellor and Attorney General to Queen Mary de Medicis. Thoſe who have ſaid that he was of the Reformed Religion, have uttered a very great falſhood [D]. He had twenty two children by his marriage with Catherine Marion (e)

[ζ] *One of the moſt famous cauſes &c.*] Mr. Arnaud had compoſed his Plea with all the fire of imagination, and ſtrength of eloquence, that lay in his power; and was extremely deſirous to deliver it in a ſolemn manner before a numerous audience; but he had the mortification to plead his cauſe privately, the doors of the court being ſhut. He was alſo diſappointed in his hopes of ſucceſs; his motion was, that the Court would be pleaſed to order, *that the Jeſuits ſhould retire out of the Kingdom in a fortnight after the ſentence had been pronounced againſt them, — and that if after this term any Jeſuit be found in France, he ſhould be immediately condemned as guilty of high-treaſon, without any further trial.* But the Court only ordered, that Arnaud's Plea, with the others made at the ſame time for or againſt the Jeſuits, ſhould be tacked to the other writings belonging to the law-ſuit commenced againſt them by the Univerſity within thirty years paſt, and depending ever ſince the year 1564, that is to ſay, ever ſince Paſquier's Plea againſt thoſe Fathers. So that, properly ſpeaking, the Jeſuits gained their cauſe, and Arnaud was caſt, or more properly nonſuited (9). CRIT. REM.]

(9) Ibid.

[B] *He was Council for the Univerſity againſt the Jeſuits. . . . . See what was the recompence of it.*] He ſent back the preſent which the Univerſity ſent him, and deſired to plead this ſo famous a cauſe *gratis*; upon which the Univerſity made an Act in the moſt ſolemn form, by which it engaged itſelf under a perpetual obligation to make an acknowledgment both to him and his poſterity. Theſe are the terms of the Decree: *Quapropter, cum Conſultorum diſertiſſimus, & Diſertorum conſultiſſimus D. ANTONIUS ARNALDUS, in Foro Pariſienſi ſpectatus à multis annis Patronus, pro Defenſione juris Academici. . . . . tantopere deſudarit; & longa comptaque Oratione, quæ Doctorum manibus teritur, probarit. . . . Cumque idem pro Defenſionis laboribus & Patrocinii jure oblatum ſibi ab Academia honorarium remiſerit, gratuitamque ſuam operam eſſe voluerit; ne apud Nos ingrati animi culpa reſideat, placuit Rectori, quatuor Facultatibus, & ſingulis Nationibus, ut perpetua tanti beneficii memoria, publicis Tabulis conſignata & teſtata apud poſteros extaret, huicque Sacramento ſe omnes Academiæ Ordines obſtringerent, ſe ea officia quæ à bonis clientibus fido Patrono ſolent deferri, omnia IN ILLUM EJUSQUE LIBEROS ac poſteros collaturos, nec eorum unquam honori, commodis, famæque defuturos* (1). i. e. "Foraſmuch as the moſt "eloquent Lawyer and Counſellor ANTHONY "ARNAUD, eminent for many years famous prac"tice in the Courts of Paris, has ſo ſtrenuouſly de"fended and maintained the privileges of the Uni"verſity in a long and elegant Oration well known "and extremely read by the learned. And foraſmuch "as the ſame perſon did return the præmium ſent him "by the Univerſity for his learned Defence and Pa"tronage, and refuſed to accept any reward for his "labour; leſt we ſhould lay ourſelves under any "imputation of ingratitude, it has ſeemed meet to the "Rector, and the four Faculties, that in order to per"petuate the memory of ſo great a benefaction, it "ſhould be committed to publick Tables, and tranſ"mitted to poſterity, and that all the Orders of the "Univerſity ſhould oblige themſelves by oath to acquit "themſelves of all thoſe duties and obligations TO HIM, "HIS CHILDREN and poſterity, which are due "from grateful clients to a faithful Patron; and that "they never would be wanting to maintain their ho"nour, ſupport their intereſt and defend their repu"tation." You will find this at large in the Preface to a Book printed at Liege, 1699, intitled *Cauſa Arnaldina, ſeu Antonius Arnaldus Doctor & Socius Sorbonicus à Cenſura Anno* 1656 *ſub nomine Facultatis Theologicæ Pariſienſis vulgata vindicatus.*

(1) *Præfat. Cauſæ Arnaldinæ*, pag. 97.

[C] *He publiſhed a Book to hinder the reſtoring of the Jeſuits . . . . he endeavoured to ſuppreſs it.*] It is a little book containing 144 pages *in* 12*mo*, intitled, *A frank and true Diſcourſe to the King, concerning the Re-eſtabliſhment of the Jeſuits as requeſted of him.* Father Richeome confutes it in his apologetical complaint, wherein he alſo confutes the Catechiſm of the Jeſuits, which came out at the ſame time and was wrote by Stephen Paſquier. I have read in the remarks upon the Catholick Confeſſion of Sancy (2) a circumſtance which I ſhall barely tranſcribe. "The "Lawyer Arnaud made no reply to this; not that "the *Livre de la Verité défendue* (3) made him give "out, but becauſe he foreſaw that the favour which "the Jeſuits were in with Henry IV, would prevail "with him more than all the reaſons that could be "offered for continuing in force the ſentence of their "baniſhment. In ſhort the poor man was ſo much "afraid that he had ſaid too much in his little "book, that I have ſeen a copy of it, wherein a very "ingenious man of that time made the following ob"ſervation with his own hand: *This Book* (Le franc "& veritable Diſcours) [ν], *was compoſed by Mr. An"thony Arnaud their good friend*; and underneath, "*the Copies were called in by the Author.*"

(2) Book 2. chap. 6. pag. 535.

(3) The Author of the *Remarks* has ſaid, p. 534, that Richeome, in 1594, had anſwered the *Plaidoier de Pâquier*, under the name of *Francis de la Montagne*, in a book intitled, *La Verité défendue.*

[ν] *This book* Le Franc & veritable Diſcours, *&c.*] I don't believe him to be the Author of that Book. The ſtyle of it is a great deal leſs violent and ſharp than that of his Plea. Beſides, the Author ſays (p. 37), that *he had loved the Jeſuits perhaps more than he ought to have done, &c.* This book was printed at Rochelle, according to Father Richeome, who confuted it, without knowing the Author of it. Let us obſerve here, that there are two errors in Bayle's marginal quotation (3); inſtead of *Pâquier's Plea*, it ſhould be *A. Arnaud's*; and inſtead of *de la Montagne* read *dez Montagnes.* Let us alſo take notice, that theſe words in the remark [C], *not that the* Livre de la Verité défendue *made him give out*, ſuppoſe, that this book was an anſwer to the *Franc Diſcours*, which is falſe. Laſtly, as long as we don't know who is the Author of that Remark upon Sanci's *Catholick Confeſſion*, we cannot rely upon his evidence (12). CRIT. REM.] (12) Ibid.

[D] *Thoſe who have ſaid that he was of the Reformed Religion have uttered a groſs falſhood.*] The Author of *the Amphitheatrum honoris*, concealed under the name of *Clarus Bonarſcius*, which is the anagram of *Carolus Scribanius*, his true name, calls him in plain terms a Calviniſt, and the *Imago primi ſæculi Soc. Jeſu* does the ſame. The Author of the Apology of John Chatel ſays, page 205, that the word Arnaud comes from ἀρνῆμαι, which ſignifies *to renounce* or *apoſtatize*, and that it comes near to that of Antichriſt, which is the name of the beaſt; and page 206, ſtyles him *a Servant worthy him, to whom was given a mouth uttering great things and blaſphemies, Revel.* 13 (4). Du Pleix was the author of the falſehood we are ſpeaking of, which he afterwards publickly retracted. He had ſaid in the firſt Edition of his Hiſtory of Henry IV, ſpeaking of the Law-ſuit that the Jeſuits had with the Univerſity of Paris, in 1594, that *by reaſon of Anthony Arnaud's being a profeſſed Calviniſt, the choice which the agents for the Univerſity had made of him, was looked upon as highly ſcandalous and odious.* But ſee in what manner he retracted his words. *Anthony Arnaud, a man of great eloquence, was employed as council for the Plaintiffs* (5). *Formerly I was led by wrong information to think him a Proteſtant, but it is certain that he never was; and has left behind him children of great virtue, and zeal to the Catholick Religion.* It is ſomething ſurprizing that an Hiſtorian, who was not of an inferior rank, could be ſo miſtaken as to what religion ſo celebrated a Lawyer profeſſed; and who had even appealed to the whole Parliament to bear witneſs of his Catholiciſm in that very pleading, from which Du Pleix takes occaſion to ſpeak of him. Let us hear what he himſelf ſays in this pleading. *If by*

(4) This was taken from the *Queſtion Curieuſe, ſi Monſ. Arnaud eſt heretique?* pag. 13.

(5) That is, the Univerſity.

by chance, they and their abettors are not ſo impudent as to dare to aſſert, that the Sorbonne was heretical when it made a Decree againſt them in 1554, *however, they are ſo barefaced and void of ſhame as to publiſh among the women of their Congregation, that all thoſe who proſecute this Law-ſuit are Heretics, who come from Geneva and England. As for me, who am council in it, were it not well known that from my infancy I was educated in the Royal College of Navarre, and that my Profeſſion which was ſo remarkable, and my admiſſion into ſuch publick and honourable employments ſince the year* 80 *and* 85, *did too openly place me above the reach of their vile aſperſions, they would not ſcruple to ſay that I was ſent from thence to plead againſt them.* But he found by experience as well as we do now, that he was deceived when he thought himſelf beyond the reach of calumny; for beſides the writers I have already inſtanc'd, there ſhortly after ſtarted up againſt him two new accuſers. The firſt is Father Hazart; the ſecond maſks himſelf under a fictitious name (6), but has produced a letter from a Gentleman named Mr. de Heucourt (7), who teſtifies that the father of Mr. Arnaud, Doctor of the Sorbonne, was born and died a Huguenot. I am of opinion, and not without reaſon, that Father Hazart only revived the former accuſation; his words are theſe. *I am not at all diſturb'd at the retractation of Mr. Du Pleix, nor leſs at my liberty to look upon his firſt opinion as the legitimate offspring of his beſt knowledge, and the ſecond only that of his complaiſance to the family of the Sieur Arnaud, which was of ſufficient credit at that time of day to engage, if not oblige an Author to pay a courteſy of this nature* (8). In anſwer to him it has been ſaid, that it is a certain mark of great obſtinacy and prepoſſeſſion, "to depend "upon what an Hiſtorian confeſſes he related from falſe "informations, rather than what he aſſerts from bet"ter information to be certain and indubitable; and "that if moſt people were of ſo bad a diſpoſition, the "injury which an Hiſtorian might do ignorantly, by "publiſhing from erroneous memoirs, falſities preju"dicial to the honour of a neighbour, would be ir"reparable, foraſmuch as a recantation could not give "any ſatisfaction (9)." They fortified themſelves ſtill farther out of the anſwer of Father Hazart. *Do but ſee*, ſay they, *in the mean time how gratefully Mr. Du Pleix is rewarded for his partiality to the Jeſuits in his Hiſtory! It is without doubt, doing him a great deal of honour to pretend that he was a man of ſo little conſcience as to give the lie to his knowledge, and to retract his words, after he had ſaid nothing but the truth, when he aſſured us that the Lawyer who pleaded againſt them was a Proteſtant.* I do not know (10) that the challenge [9] he received of him, who publiſhed that Letter of Monſieur d'Heucourt, was ever anſwer'd; however, it was written in very preſſing terms: he addreſſes Mr. Arnaud in the following manner: *This Letter, Sir, the original of which was ſent to me to tranſmit to you, abſolutely inſiſts upon your producing a certificate of your baptiſm; for it is no longer your enemies the Jeſuits, that reproach you with being born a Huguenot.* However, he that printed the Letter was confuted, for the publick was aſſured (11) that Mr. d'Heucourt diſowned it.

The publick received this piece of information from the Journal of Mr. Baſnage (12), as alſo from a Book which came out ſince the firſt impreſſion of this Article; I mean from the ſhort Hiſtory of the life and works of Mr. Arnaud. See with what haughtineſs the Author has treated this point in pages 17 and 18. *We ſhall not here take up our time in confuting the impertinent Author of an* Avis important *to* Mr. Arnaud, &c. *in which is exhibited the extract of a pretended letter from the Marquis of Heucourt, in order to prove that Mr. Arnaud was born a Calviniſt as well as his father. All this is nothing but impoſture, for we are ready to ſhew, not only a certificate of his baptiſm copied from the regiſter, which this Author of the advice calls upon him to produce, but alſo a formal declaration under the hand of the ſaid Marquis, dated from Brompton near London, May* $\frac{1}{2}\frac{3}{3}$, 1692, *in which he abſolutely denies that he either wrote or knew any thing of the Letter, and that it was nothing but a piece of malice and forgery.* It appears to me very probable that one of the brothers of our Arnaud the Lawyer, turned Huguenot [1] (13); for a perſon who was very capable of knowing the truth of this matter, wrote to me, that Madam de Feuquieres (14) and Madam d'Heucourt her ſiſter, who were both nieces to this Lawyer by the father's ſide, were of the Reformed Religion to the laſt. The ſame perſon informed me by letter, that ISAAC ARNAUD, Miniſter of Rochelle, and Author of a Book intitled, *Mépris du Monde*, was of the ſame family with Mr. Arnaud. This piece was printed more than once, for the Roan Edition, in 1637, implies, that it had been reviſed, corrected and augmented with three additional treatiſes by the Author; namely, *Réſolutions Virtueuſes; de l'Obeiſſance deue au Roi; Méditation ſur la Vieilleſſe.*

(6) That of Sainte Foi, in the *Avis importans à Mr. Arnaud ſur le Projet d'une nouvelle Bibliotheque d'Auteurs Janſeniſtes.* The Letter is dated, Paris Sept. 28, 1691.

(7) We muſt read it ſo, and not *Reucour*, as in the Pamphlet.

(8) See the 4th *Factum, pour les petits Neveux de Janſenius*, p. 20.

(9) Ibid.

(10) This was written in 1694.

(11) In the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans*, for the month of Nov. 1692, pag. 134.

(12) That is in the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans*. See the foregoing quotation.

(13) See the note [A] of the article of (SAMUEL) DURANT.

(14) Wife to him that was defeated before Thionville.

[9] *The challenge, &c.*] Mr. Bayle could have been inform'd of it ſince, for the abſtract from the Pariſh-Regiſter, mentioned above (13), was printed in the *Juſtification de Mr. Arnaud*, Anno 1702, pag. 4.

(13) Rem. β.

[1] *One of the brothers of our Arnaud the Lawyer, turned Huguenot.*] We ſhall ſhew, that ſeveral of his brothers and ſiſters were Proteſtants, and give ſome account of them. Father Queſnel mentions (14) eight of Arnaud's brothers, but he does not confeſs that ſome of them lived in the Reformed Religion: in which he is to be blamed. It is true, that the Author he confutes is miſtaken, when he aſſerts, that the Arnauds were but four brothers, and that they all died Proteſtants; but this laſt aſſertion is true with regard to two of theſe brothers. Here follows Father Queſnel's account, with ſome obſervations (15).

(14) *Juſtification de Mr. Arnaud*, pag. 7.

(15) What is in *Italic*, is F. Queſnel's.

The eldeſt of the eight brothers was he, whom Henry III would make Secretary of State; but he preferred a poſt in the Army, and was killed in the ſervice of that King. His name was John; F. de Sainte Marthe, who calls him *Anthony*, (I think he is miſtaken) tells us, that he died in Auvergne, in the ſervice of Henry IV againſt the Leaguers, but does not mention the place of Secretary of State. Father Queſnel ſays nothing concerning his Religion, which makes me ſuſpect, that he had no proofs of this John's having been a Roman Catholick. I am not able to decide whether he was or no. D'Aubigné in his Hiſtory (16) mentions one Captain Arnaud, who in the year 1573 did a very brave action at the ſiege of Rochelle, in defence of that city; but I cannot tell who he was, nor even whether he belonged to the family of the Arnaud, who is the ſubject of this article.

(16) Look for Arnaud in the Index.

The ſecond was the father of Arnaud Doctor of the Sorbonne; it is the Lawyer Anthony Arnaud; he was a Roman Catholick.

The third was Intendant of the Finances (17) . . . . , *and father-in-law to the Marquis of Feuquieres.* His name was Iſaac, and he was certainly a Proteſtant, which father Queſnel ought to have obſerved. Iſaac had at leaſt one daughter of a firſt marriage. After the year 1600 he married the widow of Mr. de Feuquieres, and afterwards gave his daughter to the ſon of that Lady. He had another daughter, but I don't know whether by his firſt or ſecond wife. He married this daughter to the Marquis d'Heucourt, who was a Proteſtant as well as the Marquis de Feuquieres. Iſaac Arnaud had been a Lawyer, and it was not before the year 1602 that he was made Intendant of the Finances, but I don't know exactly when; nor can I tell whether he be the ſame, who is mentioned in the *Biblioth. Baluziana* (18), where we find *a Decree of the Parliament, dated March the 9th, which mentions Iſaac Arnaud Comptroller General of the Arrears of the Court of Accounts.*

(17) Or, *Comptroller of the Exchequer.*

(18) Pag. 926.

The fourth was, as they then called it, Comptroller General of the Arrears. (19). I knew nothing of him. Perhaps he is the ſame who is mentioned in the foregoing Decree. I ſuſpect that he was there only called Arnaud, and that the perſon, who made the Catalogue of Mr. Baluze's books, added of his own accord the name of Iſaac, becauſe he knew, that one Iſaac Arnaud had had a place in the Finances. I could eaſily be perſuaded, that their fourth brother was one of the two Arnauds, who had been a good while Clerk to Mr. de Sulli Superintendant of the Finances; in this caſe he muſt have been a Proteſtant, for it is certain that the two brothers, who were in that Lord's ſervice, were of the Reformed Religion. Father Queſnel is entirely ſilent with regard to this Arnaud's Religion.

(19) *Controlleur General des Reſtes.*

The fifth was killed at the ſiege of Gergeau at the feet of Henry III.] His name was Benjamin; but inſtead of Henry III, I think we ſhould read Henry IV. Here again Father Queſnel does not ſay of what Religion this Arnaud was; which may make us ſuſpect that he was a Proteſtant.

The ſixth died in 1602, *juſt as he was upon the point of being made Secretary of State.* His name was Claude:

Marion (*e*) [*E*]. He died about the year 1618 [*x*]. Note that one of his

(*e*) Perrault, *Hommes illuſtres*, page 142. edit. Holland.

[*E*] *He had in marriage .... twenty two children.*] The eldeſt was named ROBERT. This was he who made himſelf ſo famous under the name of ARNAUD D'ANDILLI: See the following Article. The ſecond died Biſhop of Angers, in the month of June 1692: His name was HENRY ARNAUD [λ], and raiſed himſelf a great eſteem while he was Abbot of St. Nicholas, before he was advanced to the Mitre. When he was at Rome he, by his great addreſs and courage, preſerved the honour and the effects of the Barberini [μ] againſt the attacks of the creatures and relations of Innocent X. The Prince of Paleſtrina, and the Cardinals, Francis, Anthony and Charles Barberini, to ſhew their ſenſe of gratitude, did not only cauſe his medal to be ſtruck, and his picture to be drawn, which they plac'd in all their houſes; but alſo erected a ſtatue to him in their Palace at Rome, with a verſe underwritten, which Fortunatus [›] had compoſed

F. Queſnel does not ſpeak of his religion, but it is certain that he was a Proteſtant. He died the 21ſt of May 1603, and not before, as may be ſeen in the *Journal d' Henry IV* (20), where we alſo find that he was then twenty nine years wanting nine days: whence it follows that he was born May the 30th, 1574. Mr. De St. Marthe, who made his Elogium, ſays expreſly, that he was the brother of Anthony, Iſaac, &c. In his epitaph, which was in the burying place belonging to the Proteſtants, behind St. Sulpicius's Church, were found the following words. "Noble Claude Arnaud, "in his life-time Counſellor, Notary and Secretary to "the King, ... Treaſurer General of France in the "diſtrict of Paris, and placed by the King under the "Marquis de Roſni, to adminiſter his Majeſty's finances "under the inſpection of that Lord (21)."

(20) Tom. 1. p. 240.

(21) See *Journal d'Henry IV.* tom. 2. p. 16.

The ſeventh was Secretary to the King, and Comptroller General of the Arrears; and acquired in the management of the finances, the reputation of a diſintereſtedneſs which was proof againſt all manner of temptations. His name was Lewis, he was a Proteſtant very zealous for his religion. Bayle mentions him in the Article of SAMUEL DURANT, without knowing that he was Anthony's brother. Seven Sermons of this Durant were dedicated by the Miniſter Spanheim to one Arnaud, and F. Queſnel's words do not leave us any room to doubt but it is this Lewis Arnaud. We find another proof of it in the Biblioth. Baluz. (22), where we find theſe words. "A petition preſented to the Parliament, by "Anthony Arnaud, Advocate, and Iſaac Arnaud In"tendant of the Finances, BROTHERS, againſt *Ceſar* "*de Plaiſ.* .... who had publiſhed a Libel againſt "them .... under pretence of a law-ſuit which he "had againſt Lewis Arnaud Secretary to the King, "AND ONE OF THEIR BROTHERS. (This petition "was preſented after the death of Henry IV.")

(22) Pag. 927.

The eighth was the famous Colonel of Horſe, &c. F. Queſnel proves very well that he was a Roman Catholic. He died September the 14th, 1624, and was buried in the great Church of Fontenay-le-Comte. *I thought it neceſſary*, adds F. Queſnel, *to enter into theſe particulars .... to prevent the publick from being impoſed upon by the ſpurious letter*, in which it was affirmed, that the four brothers were Proteſtants. But could he be ignorant, that the publick would ſoon perceive, that his account is defective; and beſides, the zeal with which he juſtifies Anthony and Peter, compared with the ſilence he keeps concerning the religion of the others, may very well be conſidered as a tacit confeſſion, that they were not Roman Catholics.

That Father does not mention any of the Arnauds ſiſters, but in his *Hiſtoire abregée de la vie & des Ouvrages de Mr. Arnaud*, in the Edition printed in the year 1697, he owns that they had four ſiſters. It is very probable that they were all Proteſtants; this is certain of at leaſt two of them: for the Miniſter Spanheim ſpeaks to Lewis their brother after this manner. "I "can ſpeak as a domeſtic witneſs of the particular ſer"vices you and the Ladies your ſiſters have done him" (the Miniſter Durant.) 'Tis this Lewis, that Father Veron means, when he ſays (23), "Is there not even "at this preſent time at Charenton (24) a houſe ad"joining the Temple (or Church of the Proteſtants) "where Arnaud, the maſter of that houſe, entertained "the Miniſters at dinner every ſunday."

(23) See pag. 27. of his *Arrêt de Condamnation des Janſeniſtes confirmé*, printed in 1649.

(24) He was ſtill, and had been for thirty years Rector of that pariſh.

We find then that of theſe Arnauds, brothers and ſiſters, three brothers, and two ſiſters at leaſt were Proteſtants; and with regard to the others, F. Queſnel proves of two only, that they were Roman Catholics, viz. Anthony and Peter. But whence proceeded this diverſity of religion in that family? I own that I cannot account for it. If one reads Spanheim's dedication, it ſeems that the whole family were originally Proteſtants, and that it was only by accident, if I may ſay ſo, that ſome of them were Catholics. Thus Mr. Bayle ſeems to have underſtood Spanheim's words. For ſpeaking of Lewis Arnaud, in the Article of DURANT (25), he ſays, "Some of his relations having turned "Papiſts, he openly ſhewed his concern for it." Spanheim's words are, "Some of your relations have in"creaſed the number (of the converted Calviniſts) to "your great ſorrow. .... The grief you have felt and "ſhewn on this occaſion is a proof of your zeal &c." It ſeems to me certain, that the Father of theſe twelve children died a Roman Catholic. But had he always been of that religion? Were his two wives Catholics? The four daughters being Proteſtants make me doubt of it. However, I cannot affirm any thing poſitively on this ſubject. F. Queſnel does not ſay any thing that can clear up this matter. After all, his ſilence cannot but ſeem a little ſuſpected; for he had a fair opportunity to prove that the father and the mothers were Roman Catholics, if it had been in his power to do it (26). CRIT. REM.]

(25) Rem. [*A*].

(26) From the French edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

[*x*] *He died about the year* 1618.] Mr. Bayle tells us neither at what age Arnaud died, nor where he was born. Moreri and others ſay he was a 103 years of age when he died: But I have proved, in my *Bibliotheque de Richelet*, as I had done before in my *Remarks upon Moreri*, in the article GAMBARA, that Arnaud could be but ſeventy years old when he died. Mr. de Sainte Marthe ſays, he was not ſixty then. It is very probable, that he was born in the year 1560. With regard to his native place, I have ſaid formerly upon du Boulay's authority, that he was born at Paris; but now I can hardly doubt but he was born at Riom (27), whence his father did not go to ſettle at Paris till the year 1570, or thereabouts. We meet in the Biblioth. Baluz. p. 126, a convincing proof, that Arnaud was ſtill at Riom in 1566 (28). CRIT. REM.]

(27) In Auvergne.

(28) French edition of Bayle's Dictionary, *ubi ſupra*.

[λ] HENRY ARNAUD.] Mr. Bayle did not know, that he had been a Lawyer, before he entered into holy orders. He pleaded his firſt cauſe the 16th of February 1617. See Tronçon, *Coutume de Paris*. Edit. 1618. p. 378 (29). CRIT. REM.]

(29) Ibid.

[μ] *The honour of the Barberini, &c.*] This fact is extremely canvaſſed. Meſſrs. de Ste. Marthe, in their Elogium of this Prelate (30), don't ſay a word of it; they only tell us, that Henry Arnaud *managed very dexterouſly at the Court of Pope Innocent X the reſtoration of Cardinal d'Eſt*. And indeed Henry then Abbot of St. Nicholas of Angiers managed in the affairs of France during three years at the Court of Rome, whence he returned into France in January 1648; and the Barberini were not reſtored to the favour of Innocent X, by the interceſſion of France, till the year 1653. Whence it appears that the Abbot of St. Nicholas had not much forwarded their affairs, which is the true reaſon why Meſſieurs de St. Marthe don't ſpeak of this (31). See the Remark (›). CRIT. REM.]

(30) Gall. Chriſt. *in Epiſc. Andegav.*

(31) French edit. of Bayle's Dictionary.

[›] *A verſe of Fortunatus, &c.*] Here follows a proof of the falſhood of this fact; whence we may alſo conclude that the pretended medal and pictures mentioned by Mr. Bayle, are mere inventions. Mr. Arnaud de Pompone having been made Secretary of State in the year 1671, Mr. Faydit compoſed a congratulary Poem which he addreſſed to him. He cauſed the coat of arms of this Lord to be engraved at the head of the Poem, with the verſe of Fortunatus, which he altered after the following manner.

Alpibus Arvernis en mens *mons altior ipſis.*

The application of this verſe to Mr. De Pompone, ſays Menage (32),

his daughters reformed the Abby of Port-Royal [F].

He acquitted himſelf at the bar with ſo much honour, and in ſo ſublime a manner, that ſince him there has been no body except "Mr. le Maiſtre his grandſon, who has followed "it poſed for St. Gregory of Tours (15). He died in great reputation for his ſanctity, at Angers, in his dioceſe, from which he had not been once abſent during almoſt four and forty years, that he had been Biſhop of it [ξ]. CATHARINE ARNAUD, eldeſt of the daughters of Anthony, was married to Monſieur le Maitre, Counſellor to the King, and Maſter of the Accompts at Paris, by whom ſhe had Anthony le Maitre, a famous Lawyer, and Iſaac le Maitre de Sacy, famous for his tranſlation of the Bible, for that of the imitation of Jeſus Chriſt, for the life of Dom. Barthelemi des Martyrs, and for his ſacred Poems. ANGELICA ARNAUD, another daughter of Anthony, was perpetual Abbeſs of Port-Royal des Champs, and reformed this Abby according to the model of Clairvaux, and made it elective and triennial. Five of her ſiſters with their mother, took the veil upon them in this Convent, and lived their whole lives in it with great auſterity (16).

(15) Which was this: *Alpibus Arvernis veniens mons altior ipſis.* i. e. "From Auvergn "hills a loftier "mountain "roſe." The Barberini's alluded here to the arms and country of the Arnauds; for this family came from Auvergn, and bore for their arms a mountain. *Memoir* of the *Mercure Gallant*, Dec. 1693.

(16) Extracted from the ſame *Memoir*.

Note, in the abridgment of the life of Mr. Arnaud, page 20, we are told for certain, I, that he was the twentieth, and laſt of the children of Anthony Arnaud, and of Catharine Marion; but this does not agree with the memoir before cited (17), which makes them to have had two and twenty. II, That at the time that the father of ſo many children died, *there remained but ten of them living, four ſons and ſix daughters.*

(17) Viz. That which was inſerted in the *Mercure Gallant*, for the month of Dec. 1693.

[F] *One of his daughters reformed the Abby of Port-Royal.*] The name of Port-Royal makes ſo great a noiſe in the world, and the Hiſtory of the Arnauds is ſo intermixed with that of it, and this known only from general accounts, that I don't in the leaſt doubt but the curious will be very glad to be informed of any particulars relating to this ſubject; I therefore thought I could not entertain my Reader better than by tranſcribing here what I have read in a *Factum* (18), this being a kind of writing which very few people are in the leaſt acquainted with (19). "Port-Royal was "originally a Monaſtery of Religious Bernardine Nuns, "ſix leagues diſtant from Paris. One of the ſiſters "of Monſieur d'Andilly was made Abbeſs thereof, "about the beginning of this Century, when ſhe was "but eleven years old. There was at this time, "a general irregularity and remiſſneſs of diſcipline, "which by the Providence of God, was converted to "a great good; for when ſhe was 17 years of age, "ſhe found herſelf ſo ſtrongly diſpoſed, by a divine "influence upon her will, to reform her Abbey (tho' "there had not been ſo much as one, either of men or "women in the whole Order of the Ciſtercians, which "had undergone a reformation) that ſhe undertook "and accompliſhed the work with a great deal of "courage and expedition, ſo great ſucceſs, by the "bleſſing of God, did attend her pious reſolutions. "She baniſhed out of the houſe all property, all her "Nuns after her example, having united in one com-"mon ſtock all that they poſſeſſed before in private. "She alſo enjoined cloſe confinement, perpetual abſti-"nence, nocturnal devotions, faſting, work, and ſi-"lence, according to the rule of diſcipline eſtabliſhed "by Saint Bennet. And this was that ſweet ſavour of "holineſs, which like the perfume of the bridegroom "brought to this houſe, one after another, her ſiſters, "her neices, and even her own mother. The deſign "of ſo thorow a reformation, ſo vigorouſly undertaken, "and ſo happily executed, raiſed her to ſo high eſ-"teem in the Order, that ſhe was made choice of, "tho' not above 27 or 28 years of age, to reform "the famous Abby of Maubuiſſon: ſhe ſpent there 4 "or 5 years, and was therefore obliged, during her "abſence, to leave the government of her houſe of "Port-Royal to her ſiſter who acted in the capacity of "aſſiſtant, and who was afterwards called *Mother "Agnes.* It was at this time, during her abode at "Maubuiſſon, that ſhe ſaw St. Francis de Sales, who "was come to Paris, to erect there a houſe of the "Viſitation; ſhe ſent to deſire him to come and ſee "her, and placed herſelf under his governance. The "Letters of this Saint ſufficiently manifeſt the "eſteem he had for his dear daughter the Abbeſs of "Port-Royal."

(18) The fourth in defence of the Grand-Nephews of Janſenius, againſt Father Hazart.

(19) Since the firſt impreſſion of this Article, the *Factums* in defence of the Grand-Nephews of Janſenius have been inſerted in Vol. 8. of the *Morale Pratique des Jeſuites.*

The Author of the *Factum* adds, that the widow of Anthony Arnaud, and mother to this Abbeſs, was inſpired with a ſtrong deſire to take the veil upon her, under the conduct of her daughter, and that as God inſtilled into her mind this good deſire at the ſame time, that the Abbeſs was adviſed to remove her Monaſtery from the Country to Paris, "She "purchaſed a houſe and a very fine large garden in "the *Faubourg Saint Jacques*, which ſhe gave to the "Abbeſs, the Convent, and Nuns of Port Royal "to ſettle there, which they afterwards did, having "at a very great expence fitted up their houſe at Paris "in the condition in which it is at preſent, it pleaſ-"ing God to beſtow a bleſſing on their charitable "and diſintereſted undertakings. There it was that "this happy mother of ſo many pious children, "made choice of her own daughter to be her mo-"ther, dedicating herſelf to the ſervice of God in "leading a religious life under her government and "diſcipline; which having done for the ſpace of four-"teen or fifteen years, with a fervent zeal and an ex-"plary humility, ſhe had the conſolation before ſhe "died to give her bleſſing to her ſix daughters, and "her ſix grand-daughters, who were all in the ſame "Monaſtery, and took the veil in it, except one "who died young, being a penſioner in the ſame "houſe." In a word, we learn from this *Factum*, that *the Abbeſs of Port Royal was perpetual titular Abbeſs, and one of her ſiſters Co-adjutrix; but that both the one and the other having nothing in view but the good and advantage of their houſe, were content to quit their titles, in order to eſtabliſh a triennial election.* Mr. d'Andilly obtained of the King the grant neceſſary thereto, altho' he thereby incapacitated himſelf from preſerving this Abbey for ever in his family. Add to this what we ſhall ſay of him under his article.

Menage (32), is ſo much the more happy, that *as this Lord's family is originally come from Auvergne, ſo he bears a Mountain in his Coat of Arms.* The Abbot was perſuaded that no body had made ſuch an application before him. Menage himſelf, and the men of letters, who uſed to meet at his houſe every Wedneſday, looked upon it as a thought entirely new: nor did any one, in Mr. de Pompone's family, where the Abbot Faydit was very well known, ever imagine that the applying this verſe to an Arnaud, was only an old hint newly revived. All this proves that this verſe had not been applied to Mr. de Pompone's uncle by the Barberini ſeventeen or eighteen years before. Beſides, Mr. Linage de Vanciennes publiſhed in 1678 (33), *The diſpute of the Barberini with Pope Innocent X.* He relates there all that paſſed in the audiences, which the Abbot of St. Nicholas had of the Pope with regard to the affair of the Barberini, by which it appears that the Abbot acted with a great deal of prudence and courage. But Mr. de Vanciennes obſerves (34) having oppoſed a ſtep which the Barberini would take in 1641, *they were diſpleaſed with his conduct.* After that time he had but two Audiences more of the Pope; and the Hiſtorian obſerves, that *the affairs of the Barberini were not yet adjuſted*, when the Abbot of St. Nicholas left Rome in January 1648, the Marquis the Fontenay being then already arrived in that city with the character of an Embaſſador. It was Mr. de Valencey, this Marquis's ſucceſſor in his Embaſſy, who terminated that affair in June 1653. Whence appears how inaccurate, or rather falſe the account was, which Mr. Bayle followed (35). CRIT. REM.]

(32) Menagiana tom. 4. p. 162.

(33) In 12mo, at Paris.

(34) Pag. 158.

[ξ] *He died in great reputation for his ſanctity, at Angers, in his dioceſe, from which he had not been once abſent for almoſt four and forty years, that he had been Biſhop of it.*] He had been choſen in January 1649, and conſecrated June the 29th 1650; ſo that when he died he had been a Biſhop forty two years, wanting twenty days. Further it is not true that he never went out of his dioceſe, after he enter'd it the 15th of November 1650. For in an Elogium upon this Prelate, in which his praiſes are not ſpared, it is ſaid (36) that he left his dioceſe once, and went to Thouars, in order to endeavour the converſion of the Prince of Tarente to the Church of Rome (37). CRIT. REM.]

(35) French edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

(36) In the *Continuation des Memoires de Literature*, tom. 3. pag. 373.

(37) French edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

" it with more luſtre and greater dignity. His houſe was continually full of Princes and " great Lords, who came to conſult with him about their moſt important affairs, and he " was held in ſuch veneration every where, that after his death he lay in ſtate for ſome " time to ſatisfy the publick who earneſtly deſired to ſee him (*f*).

(*f*) Perrault, *Hommes Illuſt.* p. 54, 55. edit. de Hollande.

It is a great miſtake to aſcribe to him an apology for Phalaris [*G*].

[*G*] *It is a great miſtake to aſcribe to him an Apology for Phalaris.*] The words of Father Abram, which I ſhall tranſcribe here; do manifeſtly relate to our Arnaud. *De Phalaridis Agrigentorum Tyranni immani crudelitate ſupervacaneum fuerit dicere, cum & pleni ſunt aliorum libri, & ipſe ſe nefarium, immanem, & ſceleratiſſimum in Epiſtolis ſæpè fateatur. Unus inventus eſt Arnaldus, qui non ita pridem, orationem dicam an nugas? de ejus laude conſcripſerit: videlicet ex eodem calamo Phalaridis Apuleiique laudatio, & Societatis noſtræ criminatio manavit, ut quibus ſe ſimilem eſſe mallet, liquidius oſtenderet* (20). i. e. " It will be needleſs to ſay any " thing of the horrid cruelty of Phalaris Tyrant of " Agrigentum, ſeeing not only the writings of others " are full on this head, but alſo he himſelf in his Epiſtles confeſſes himſelf to be a wicked, inhuman, " and moſt cruel man. Yet there has been found " one Arnaud, who not long ago wrote, (ſhall I call " it an Oration or an idle Tale?) in praiſe of him: " and from the ſame pen came a Panegyrick on Phalaris, and Apuleius, and a libel on our Society, " that he might give the world a plain proof whom " he choſe moſt to reſemble." This is an egregious over-ſight, for he who wrote the Diſcourſe in defence of Phalaris, was one Arnaud Provencal. See the note [*M*] of the article EPICURUS.

(20) Abrahamus, *in Ciceron. Orat.* tom. I. p. 803.

ARNAUD D'ANDILLI (ROBERT) eldeſt ſon of the preceding, was a perſon of great merit. See his Elogium in Moreri's Dictionary, and in the *Hommes Illuſtres* of Monſieur Perrault. He married Madam de la Bodrerie, daughter of him who was ſo long Ambaſſador to England, and grand-daughter of a ſiſter of the Chancellor de Silleri. By this marriage he had five daughters, all Nuns at Port Royal, (of which the eldeſt ſiſter, Angelica of St. John, was eſteemed a prodigy of wit, of knowledge, and of virtue,) and three ſons. The eldeſt is M. L'Abbé ARNAUD, Commendatary Abbé of Chomes (*a*), who having born arms a great while for the ſervice of the King, in the regiment of Iſaac Arnaud his couſin, Quarter Maſter of the Carabins, retired to the Biſhop of Angers his uncle. The ſecond is HENRY ARNAUD Sieur of Luzancy, who ſpent his life in ſolitude. The third is SIMON ARNAUD Marquis of Pompone, formerly Miniſter and Secretary of State, and at preſent Miniſter of State, known by his Embaſſies to Holland and Sweden (*b*). M. Arnaud d'Andilly went out early into the world. He had divers employments, which attached him to the court, and to the attendance of the late King, and he did not ſuffer himſelf to be corrupted by the infectious air that is breathed in ſuch places [*A*]. One may ſee in the collection of his *Letters* the difference that he had with the Preſident de Grammond, who had ſpoken of him in his Latin Hiſtory otherwiſe than he ought. Thoſe who forged the Romance of the Aſſembly of Bourg-Fontaine, deſigned by the letters A. A. one of the pretended accomplices of the deſign, that they ſuppoſe was taken there to introduce Deiſm; and when they ſaw that theſe letters could not agree with Monſieur Arnaud the Doctor, they pointed out another perſon, Arnaud d'Andilly, as they have very clearly explained ſince (*c*). But the Author of the *Factums* of the great nephews of Janſenius, has ſhewn by ſolid reaſons, that this ſecond application of the two A. A. was abſurd [*B*]. Monſieur d'Andilly retired to the Convent of Port-Royal in 1644 [*C*], and there paſſed the reſt of his days in a continual

(*a*) He died in Feb. 1699.

(*b*) Taken from the *Memoir* inſerted in the *Mercure Galant*, Decemb. 1693.

(*c*) In F. Hazart's Anſwer to the *Factum des petits neveux de Janſenius.* See their 4th *Factum.*

[*A*] *He had divers employments . . . at Court, ... and did not ſuffer himſelf to be corrupted by the infectious air which is breath'd there.*] He was " one who " had the beſt eſtabliſh'd reputation, and of the " moſt confeſſed piety and probity, throughout the " whole courſe of his life, at Court, at Paris, and in " the Provinces, of any man in France; there not " being one perſon who did not ſincerely ſubſcribe to " that character which was given him by a famous " Author above fifty years ago, *that he was not " aſhamed of the virtues of Chriſtianity, nor vain of " practiſing moral duties.*" See what is ſaid in the fourth *Factum* of the great nephews of Janſenius (1). " We alſo read there (2), that even before he retired " from the world, and while he was yet at Court, " he employed his genius for Poetry no otherwiſe " than by devoting it to the glory of his Saviour, " and giving a reliſh to the truths of Chriſtianity; " for he had not then betook himſelf to his retirement, " when he wrote his Poem on the Life of Jeſus " Chriſt (3), and his Stanza's on the moſt exalted and " edifying truths of our Religion."

(1) Page 12.
(2) Page 18.
(3) See below the note [*C*] in the marginal quotation (9).

[*B*] *It has been ſhewn . . . that the application of the two A. A. to make him a member of the meeting at Bourg-Fontaine, was abſurd.*] I ſhall not ſet down all the reaſons which may be brought for the proof of this; I will only ſay, that it has been obſerved among other things, that he attended Lewis XIII in all the journeys which he made every year, both before and after the time of the Chimerical Aſſembly of Bourg-Fontaine (4), *to reduce to their obedience thoſe of his ſubjects, who had been engaged by their falſe principles of Religion to a revolt* (5). *This,* adds it (6), *was a motive to him to imbibe more zeal for the Catholick Religion, by reaſon of the averſion which theſe ſort of wars uſually implant in a perſon againſt hereſy; but this was no ways any ſtep towards becoming a Divine, he having never made Theology his ſtudy, which he muſt have done to anſwer that character which all the Authors of the Fable of Bourg-Fontaine are made to act. He knew as much of Religion as a man of wit can learn from the Catechiſm, from books of piety, from the converſation of very devout perſons, from reading the Word of God and hearing it preached; but the leſs he knew of it as it is taught in the ſchools, the more incapable was he of raiſing doubts concerning the truth of our myſteries* (7), *for he early accuſtomed himſelf to bring his mind under ſubjection to that Divine authority which is manifeſted to us by the Church, and never was any perſon more averſe to expoſtulating or cavilling with God, or ſtriving to comprehend by impotent though inſolent reaſon what ought to be the object of an humble modeſt faith.*

(4) This was in the year 1621.
(5) *Factum of the Great-Nephews of Janſenius*, p. 18.
(6) Ibid.
(7) Theſe words are very memorable, and confirm the ſuſpicions of ſeveral perſons, viz. that there are ſcarce any people leſs ſteady in their belief than thoſe who ſpend the greateſt part of their time in diſputing and teaching in the ſchools.

[*C*] *He retired into the Convent of Port-Royal.*] We will proceed in our quotation from the fourth *Factum.* " It was to Port-Royal des Champs that he re- " tired in 1644, where his nephews Monſr. le Maitre " the Lawyer, and a brother of his who had fol- " lowed the army, had retired five or ſix years be- " fore, when there were no Nuns at all there: for " it

tinual application to works of piety. He compoſed many books there (*d*), which the publick has favourably received, *and which are ſo numerous that they have printed eight volumes in folio of them* (*e*). He died there the 27th of Sept. 1674, in the eighty ſixth year of his age (*f*).

(*d*) See the Catalogue of them at the end of his Elogium in the *Journal des Savans*, Sept. 9, 1695.

(*e*) Perrault, *Hommes illuſtres*, pag. 142 of the Holland edition.

(*f*) Moreri, pag. 346.

He had left his wife in 1637; the reflection of Balzac upon this loſs is worth knowing [*D*].

" it was not till 1648, that the Houſe of Paris ob-
" tained leave of the Archbiſhop to ſend a part
" of their Nuns to their houſe des Champs." I leave it to my reader to decide the difference betwixt the Author of this *Factum*, and Mr. Richelet (8) [*a*], whomakes Mr. Arnaud d'Andilli to have retreated to no place but his houſe at Pompone. I content myſelf with confronting theſe two different authorities, and ſhall go on in my following relation, which I ſhall do with ſo much the more pleaſure, as it will furniſh us with ſome particulars relating to the lives of ſome great perſonages, which ſo many people are curious of.
" Arnaud d'Andilli . . . . ſerved his King and Coun-
" try twenty years; in recompence of which ſervices
" he was allowed a penſion of eight thouſand livres,
" which were afterwards reduced to ſix: with this he
" retired to Pompone, a village about ſeven or eight
" leagues diſtant from Paris; where, entirely diſen-
" gaging himſelf from the vanities of the world,
" and leading a thorow Chriſtian life, he compoſed
" ſeveral works. His *Letters, the Poem upon the Life of*
" *Jeſus Chriſt* (9), . . . *His tranſlations of Joſephus of the*
" *Hiſtory of the Jews, the Works of Saint Tereſa, and thoſe*
" *of Davila*, are the productions of his ſolitude. . . The
" beſt of his tranſlations is that of Joſephus (10).
" One day when Richelet went to ſee him at Pom-
" pone, not long after it was publiſhed, the conver-
" ſation, after ſome other diſcourſe, turned upon the
" manner in which Authors wrote; and as he knew
" that Richelet was intimately acquainted with the
" celebrated d'Ablancourt, he aſked him how many
" times that famous man reviſed every work that he
" gave the publick: *Six times*, anſwered Richelet;
" *and I*, replied Mr. Arnaud, *have reviſed the Hi-*
" *ſtory of Joſephus ten times; corrected the ſtyle of it*
" *with great care, and made it much more exact and*
" *conciſe than that of any other of my works*. . . . .
" Arnaud d'Andilli . . . . . in his retreat, after ſeven
" or eight hours ſtudy every day, uſed to divert himſelf
" with rural amuſements, and in particular with
" cultivating his trees, which he brought to ſuch
" perfection, and had ſuch excellent fruit from them,
" that he uſed to ſend ſome of it every year to Queen
" Anne of Auſtria, which this Princeſs liked ſo well,
" that ſhe always deſired to be ſerved with it in the
" ſeaſon." This application to gardening, and *to make philoſophical diſquiſitions into the nature of trees*, is atteſted by Mr. Perrault in his Lives of famous Men, pag. 143, of the Holland Edition.

(8) See his opinion of Mr. Arnaud d'Andilly at the beginning of the Collection of *Letters* which he publiſhed: edit. Amſterd. 1694, pag. 10.

(9) This contradicts what was ſaid above in the note [*A*], citation (3).

(10) The Critics find a great many faults in it. See the *Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande*. I have heard it ſaid that Mr. le Moyne was deſired by the friends of Mr. d'Andilly to mark the places where he thought the Tranſlator had committed any errors, and that he excuſed himſelf, for fear he ſhou'd mark too many.

(11) Balzac, *Letter XIX of Book II. to Chapelain*, dated Auguſt 14, 1637, pag. 82.

[*D*] *He loſt his wife in* 1637: *See Balzac's Reflection upon this loſs.*] What he has written thereupon does a great deal of honour to our Robert Arnaud and his family. " I am ſenſibly afflicted at the news of
" the death of Madam d'Andilli. I cannot help
" having an intereſt in all the good and bad for-
" tune of a family which ought to be ever dear to
" France, and which ſeems to have been born for
" the glory of the French name. But I am particu-
" larly ſorry for the ſake of our friend, who having
" never indulged any inordinate paſſion, has in his
" wife loſt all his miſtreſſes and all his pleaſures.
" However he is ſo well verſed in the doctrines of
" Chriſtianity, and is ſurrounded with ſo many learn-
" ed men of his own family, that he ſtands in no
" need of Stoiciſm or any other foreign aſſiſtance to
" fortify himſelf againſt the attacks of fortune; in
" his houſe all is reaſoning, all is preaching, all is
" perſuaſion, and one Arnaud is worth a dozen Epic-
" tetus's (11)."

[*a*] *I leave it to my Reader to decide the difference betwixt the Author of this Factum, and Mr. Richelet.*] This matter can be cleared up in a few words. Mr. d'Andilly retired to Port-Royal in 1644, and lived there about twenty years; but he was obliged to leave it in or about the year 1664; he then went to his ſeat of Pompone, where Richelet ſaw him in 1667. After what was called *the Peace of Clement IX*, d'Andilly returned to Port-Royal, but I cannot tell exactly in what year, and died there in 1674. See the *Bibliotheque de Richelet* (*). CRIT. REM.]

(*) French edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

ARNAUD (ANTHONY) Doctor of the Sorbonne, ſon of Anthony Arnaud the Advocate [*A*], was born at Paris the 6th of Feb. 1612, being the twentieth child by the marriage of his father with Catherine Marion. He ſtudied polite Literature and Philoſophy in the College of Calvi (*a*), and afterwards he began to ſtudy the Law; but he was ſoon withdrawn from this ſtudy, and determined to that of Divinity by the care of his mother, ſeconded by the Abbot of St. Cyran. After this determination he applied himſelf to ſtudy in the College of the Sorbonne (*b*), and learned the Treatiſe of Grace under Mr. L'Eſcot. As he did not think the Lectures of this Profeſſor of the Sorbonne agreeable

(*a*) It does not now ſubſiſt, the new buildings of the Sorbonne having been raiſed upon its ruins.

(*b*) In 1633.

[*A*] *He was ſon of Anthony Arnaud the Advocate.*] This deſcent did without doubt give occaſion to the Jeſuits to bear a great hatred to Mr. Arnaud, as it did on the other hand create a ſtrong averſion in Mr. Arnaud to the Jeſuits. The Author of the *Queſtion curieuſe* (1) will not altogether deny me this ſuppoſition, ſeeing he ſpeaks of him in the following manner (2). *Mr. Arnaud was born the ſixth of February in* 1612, *and his father was Mr. Anthony Arnaud, who was ſo famous at the Bar, and well known in the Hiſtory of the Jeſuits, by that famous pleading of his againſt them on the ſide of the Univerſity, in* 1594. . . *For the reaſon juſt mentioned Mr. Arnaud was born as it were under a ſecond original ſin, which no Sacrament can waſh away, and the guilt of the pleading having in the eyes of the Jeſuits* (3) *rendered the father a Calviniſt and miniſter of Antichriſt, tho' always and by every body elſe eſteemed a good Catholick and pious Chriſtian, the ſon could not fail, in their opinion, being born a child of wrath, of being an heretick, and ſomething ſtill worſe, before he became a Chriſtian.* One of the Proteſtants, who wrote againſt Monſr. Maimbourg's Hiſtory of Calviniſm, was of opinion, that Mr. Arnaud's hatred to the Jeſuits was owing to a prejudice of education. Take his own words (4): *I have in a former work compared him to Hannibal, who was perſecuted with too inveterate a hatred by the Romans* (5); *and I don't know whether I might not compare him to the ſame Hannibal in that circumſtance of his life, when in his youth he promiſed his father, that as ſoon as he ſhould be of age to bear arms, he would wage war againſt thoſe mortal enemies of his country. Every one knows that Mr. Arnaud was ſon of the famous Anthony Arnaud, who was Council for the Parliament of Paris, who pleaded with ſo much eloquence the cauſe of the Univerſity againſt the Jeſuits, in the year* 1594, *and who forgot no argument to perſuade the Judges how dangerous it would be to ſuffer them to remain in the Kingdom. This action made him as much, if not more, deteſted by that Society, than that Society was by him. It is very probable, that he inſtilled into his ſons his own ſentiments in relation to the Jeſuits; at leaſt it is very certain that they have not at all degenerated from their father's principles in this reſpect.*

(1) See the book in the margin to the text of this Article, quotation (*b*).

(2) Pag. 12.

(3) See the note [*D*] of the Article of ANTHONY ARNAUD the Lawyer.

(4) *New Letters on the Calviniſm of Maimbourg*, pag. 125.

(5) This is in Letter V of the *Critique Generale*, pag. 98, When I take a view in my mind of this great man reduced to the hard neceſſity of concealing himſelf, I cannot help thinking of the famous Hannibal, and of the laſt words which the unjuſt perſecutions of the Romans drew from him: *Libe-remus diuturnâ curâ populum Romanum quando mortem ſenis expectare longum cenſent. T. Liv. lib.* 39. i. e. " Let us releaſe
" the Romans
" from their
" long anxiety,
" ſince they have
" not patience to
" wait for the
" death of an old
" man.

able to the doctrine of St. Paul, he had a mind to ſtudy St. Auguſtin upon this ſubject, and he preferred his ſyſtem of Grace before that of Mr. L'Eſcot. This he teſtified in a publick manner by the firſt examination which he paſſed thro' in 1636 [α], when he took his Batchelor's Degree (c). He employed *in ſtudy the interval of two years, which according to the Laws of the Faculty of Paris, muſt be between the firſt examination and the licence*; after which he began the Acts of his Licence *at Eaſter* 1638, and continued them *to Lent* 1640. He maintained the Act of Veſpers the 18th of December 1641, and the next day he put on the Doctor's Cap. He had compoſed a *Courſe of Philoſophy*, and taught it publickly during his Licence (d). At the cloſe of this Courſe of Philoſophy, which he read at Paris in the College of Mans, he cauſed Theſes to be maintained, wherein he ſhewed in a very extraordinary manner his ſincerity, his eaſy temper, and his humility [B]. He was ordained Prieſt *in Ember Week in September* 1641, and he celebrated his firſt maſs *the day of all Saints the ſame year, after a retreat of forty days ... He had begun his Licence, without deſigning to be of the Houſe of Sorbonne .... He was contented with enjoying the rights of hoſpitality, which gave him the liberty to lodge in the houſe* (e); but the principal Doctors having preſſed him very much *to think ſeriouſly of entring there*, and having promiſed him, that provided he would read a Courſe of Philoſophy, they would not regard the circumſtance of time, he undertook the buſineſs without ſtopping at the obſtacle which preſented itſelf: *Which was, that being in his Licence, the time in which the ſtatute preſcribed the Courſe of Philoſophy ſhould be finiſhed, was paſt .... The two years of this hard labour being finiſhed, he petitioned the Houſe to admit him to the proof of his Courſe, and to conſider of the honour that he aſked of being received into that illuſtrious body.* M. L'Eſcot found there an opportunity to revenge himſelf. *He had not taught Cardinal Richelieu his Penitent to forgive, and he had learnt of his Penitent not to forgive* (f). He hindred M. Arnaud from being admitted into the Society of the Sorbonne [G].

(c) This *Theſis* was dedicated to the Clergy of France, at that time aſſembled at Paris.

(d) Note that the Author whom I copy does not diſtinguiſh; namely, that Mr. Arnaud did not begin to read this *Courſe of Philoſophy*, till the ſecond year of his Licence.

(e) He had been admitted thither Oct. 31, 1636. *Cauſæ Arnald. Præf.* pag. xxvj.

(f) He was Confeſſor to the Cardinal de Richelieu, and afterwards Biſhop of Chartres.

[α] *This he teſtified in a publick manner by the firſt examination, which he paſſed thro' in* 1636.] It is dated November the 14th 1635. But Mr. Arnaud falling ſick about that time, it was put off till the next year (1). CRIT. REM.]

(1) Crit. Rem. printed at the end of the French edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

[B] *He cauſed theſes to be maintained, wherein he ſhewed, in a very extraordinary manner, his ſincerity, his eaſy temper, and his humility.*] "At the end of "the courſe of Philoſophy, which he taught in the "College of Mans in the Univerſity of Paris, he "made ſeveral of his ſcholars hold diſputations, amongſt "whom were the Sieur Barbey, afterwards a celebrated Profeſſor of Philoſophy in the ſame Univerſity, "and Mr. Wallon of Beaupuis, a Clergyman of Beauvais, a man of great piety, who is ſtill living, and "has recorded this fact in writing. This laſt being "to defend his queſtions July 25, 1641, Mr. de la "Barde, a learned Prieſt of the Oratory, then Canon "of the Cathedral Church of Paris, was his opponent, "and urged his objections ſo home, that the Profeſſor was obliged to come to the aſſiſtance of his "ſcholar, but he himſelf was ſo warmly attacked "and ſo cloſely followed by this famous diſputant, "that he found there was no way left of rightly "anſwering his argument. It would have been no "difficult thing for him to have extricated himſelf by one ſubtle diſtinction or another, as is "the uſual cuſtom of Profeſſors, but this no ways "ſuited with his ſincerity and love of truth; he "therefore publickly told him without any more ado, "that he believed him to be in the right; that his "opinion appeared to him the more probable; and "that he ſhould be of the ſame himſelf for the future: nor did he prove worſe than his word; for "about three years afterwards this ſame diſciple of "his being to hold his act of probation in the Sorbonne for his Batchelor's Degree, he deſired Mr. "Arnaud to compoſe his Theſes for him, which he "accordingly did, and therein ſupported an opinion "contrary to that he had before maintained in his "Philoſophical Theſes (6)." This account is defective in a very eſſential circumſtance, ſince as it does not inform us what the opinion was which Mr. Arnaud maintained, and of which he found the falſity by the ſtrong objections of the opponent; we ſhall therefore ſupply this defect by acquainting the reader, that the poſition which Mr. de la Barde attacked was this: *Ens ſynonymè convenit Deo & creaturæ* (7). i. e. "Being is applied in the ſame ſenſe both to God and the "creature" The Author of this narrative ſpeaks very judiciouſly, when he ſays that this action of Mr. Arnaud was great in the ſight of God, and uncommon amongſt men, and that *what proceeds from an integrity of heart, from a conſtant and uniform love of truth, from a greatneſs of ſoul which is above the ambition of conquering, and the fear of leſſening a reputation .... is at all times truly noble* (8); but then he ſeems to me to make too light of the ſolutions which may be made of the arguments of ſuch as maintain that the idea of Being is not univocally the ſame in God and the creatures. I have formerly examined this diſpute, which is ſo famous in the ſchools, and it appeared to me that thoſe who deny the univocation of Being have indeed the majority of their ſide (9), but not the moſt ſolid reaſons; therefore I cloſed with the oppoſite party; and have often ventured to defend the contrary opinion in publick diſputations, and never found any difficulty in anſwering ſuch objections as were propoſed to me on that head; not but that it was preſently urged, *that God is called the Being by way of eminence, the neceſſary Being, infinite and perfect in the ſuperlative degree: whereas that of the creatures is but precarious and dependent.* I never could find any weight in this objection; for the very rudiments of the doctrine of Univerſals teach us, that the ideas of the genus are entirely to be diſtinguiſhed from any qualities or properties in the ſpecies by an abſtract conſideration of the mind: wherefore if I was ſure that Mr. Arnaud, after having maintained this hypotheſis, was determined by objections to change his opinion, I ſhould be inclined to ſuſpect that there were ſome certain difficulties attending it, which I never yet met with in any of the Spaniſh School-men which I have peruſed. Let us not forget that it has been remarked, that he was not reduced to any neceſſity of giving up his point, which implies that he did not think his former opinion untenable; but only looked upon analogical Being as a better doctrine than univocal Being. *Erudito diſcipulo ſub validiſſimorum argumentorum mole fatiſcente* (10) *ſuppetias venit magiſter, diuque conflictatus, non cedendi neceſſitate coactus, ſed veritate & veritatis amore victus, victum ſe ultrò profeſſus eſt, & à ſententia ſua diſceſſurum publicè ſpoſpondit. Promiſſis ſtetit, &c.* (11). "i. e. "While "his learned Scholar was labouring under the weight "of very powerful objections, his maſter came to "his relief, and having long ſtood the conflict he at "laſt, not compelled by any neceſſity there was of "giving up the victory, but prevailed upon by truth "and the love of truth, confeſſed himſelf over-pow"ered, and publickly promiſed that he would recede "from his former opinion. He performed his pro"miſe, &c."

(6) *Short Hiſtory of Mr. Arnaud* p. 46.

(7) *Præfat. Cauſæ Arnaldinæ*, pag. 18.

(8) *Short Hiſtory of Mr. Arnaud* P. 47.

(9) *Sed illos defendit numerus junctæque umbone Phalanges*, Juv. Sat. 2. ver. 45. i. e. "Your "ſtrong Phalanx the multitude defends, "And cloſe-join'd ſhields." Sir Rob. Stapylton.

(10) Note that in France they who preſide at any diſpute, never aſſume the argument but when their ſcholar is put to a ſtand. In other countries they ſpeak almoſt perpetually, and ſcarce allow him time to repeat the argument.

(11) *Præfat. Cauſæ Arnaldinæ*, pag. xix.

Sorbonne [C]. He had not the ſame credit after the death of the Cardinal; but tho' he was conſtrained to ſee this young Doctor enter into this Society in 1643, he did not forget to endeavour

[C] *Mr. l'Eſcot hindred Mr. Arnaud from being admitted into the Society of the Sorbonne* [β].] There were but two Doctors, who did not concur in favour of Mr. Arnaud's requeſt. *They contrary to the opinion of the reſt ſtood by the law and the cuſtom, which required that the courſe of Philoſophy ſhould be performed before the Licence, and upon this difference, which ought to have been decided by the plurality of voices, they gave it as their opinion, that the Cardinal de Richelieu, who was Patron of the Sorbonne, ought to be the conſtituted Judge, which was both contrary to the laws and liberty of the Houſe; but at that time of day it would have been a crime to have refuſed admitting ſuch a Judge as he; accordingly they deputed as meſſengers to him Mr. Hardiviliers Archbiſhop of Bourges, and Mr. Habert Prebend of the Cathedral Church of Paris* . . . . . (12). *The Cardinal judged it by no means proper for the Society to act any thing contrary to its eſtabliſh'd laws and cuſtoms; tho' at the bottom it was leſs out of zeal for the order or the rules of its conſtitution that he paſſed ſuch a judgment, than in regard to the knowledge he had of the near intimacy there was betwixt Mr. Arnaud and Mr. de St. Cyran; to the reſentment this Miniſter conceived againſt Mr. Arnaud, becauſe he had not fled to him for protection during his Licence; and in a word to the influence which Mr. l'Eſcot had over the mind of the Cardinal his penitent; for this Doctor was one of the two which oppoſed his admiſſion, and had entertained a great averſion to Mr. Arnaud, as I obſerved before, thro' a ſpirit of jealouſy and revenge. It was certainly more honour for Mr. Arnaud to be excluded from the Society after this manner, than to be received into it after the way as moſt others are. Notwithſtanding he was admitted after the death of the Cardinal, the Sorbonne then recovering its liberty as well as a great many other Societies* (13). Mr. l'Eſcot "ſatisfied his revenge on him at laſt by cauſing him to "be excluded, both from the College of the Sorbonne, "and alſo from the Faculty, by the cenſure of 1656, "of which he was the chief promoter together with "Mr. le Maine, who ſucceeded him as well in his "Profeſſorſhip as in his ſentiments (14)."

(12) *Short Hiſtory of Mr. Arnaud* p. 50.

(13) Ibid. p. 51, 52.

(14) Ibid. p. 33.

[β] *Mr. l'Eſcot hindred Mr. Arnaud from being admitted into the Society of the Sorbonne.*] It muſt be obſerved in vindication of Mr. L'Eſcot, and of Cardinal Richelieu, that they both acted according to the laws and uſages of the Univerſity, and conſiſtently with their former conduct. For in the year 1629, when there was no talk yet of Janſenius, nor of the Abbot of St. Cyran, nor of the friends or diſciples of either, one Hiſette a Franciſcan Friar petitioned the Faculty for a diſpenſation to be admitted a Licentiate againſt their Laws and Statutes. The Queen herſelf had promoted that petition, becauſe the Friar was an aſſiſtant to her Confeſſor. Yet Mr. L'Eſcot was one of thoſe, who oppoſed the petition; and he was ſent with two others to the Queen, to deſire her not to permit, that their Statutes be infringed. The Queen gave them a favourable audience, and the favour was refuſed. (See p. 3, of the *Memoire pour les Doyens & Batcheliers en Théologie de la Faculté de Paris, ... contre les Prieurs, Docteurs, & Batcheliers de la Maiſon de Sorbonne.* i. e. "A Defence of the Deacons and Batchelors of Divinity of the Faculty of "Paris, ... againſt the Priors, Doctors, and Batchelors of the Houſe of Sorbonne." Printed at Paris in 1721, 4to.

When Cardinal de Richelieu and Mr. L'Eſcot oppoſed Mr. Arnaud's requeſt in 1641, the Mendicant Friars petitioned for a favour of much the ſame nature: viz. that they might be permitted to preſent at every *Licence* or Commencement a greater number of Batchelors, than they were allowed by the Statutes. *But Cardinal de Richelieu, who was not leſs acquainted with what conduced to the ſupport of the Faculty than clear-ſighted in State-affairs, ſhewed how much he was diſpleaſed at theſe diſorders, and eaſily prevailed upon the Faculty to promiſe, that they would ſtrictly adhere to their Statutes.* This is, what a friend of Mr. Arnaud, Doctor Lewis de Saint-Amour, tells us, in a Collection which he publiſhed at Paris in the year 1649, with the following title, *Eclairciſſemens ſur les differens mûs en la Faculté de Théologie &c.* i. e. "An Explana-"tion of the Diſputes raiſed in the Faculty of Di-"vinity (2)."

(2) See Part 2, pag. 55.

Mr. de Saint-Amour relates (3) a fact of later date, and of the ſame nature: and he gives us a Letter written by Mr. L'Eſcot from Ruel January the 14th, 1642, by the Cardinal's command. We read there, that Mr. L'Eſcot was one of thoſe who had been deputed in the foregoing affair by the Faculty, to acquaint the Cardinal with the reſolution they had taken, *never to grant ſuch favours for the future, and to obſerve their Statutes with the utmoſt ſtrictneſs.* We alſo read there, *that his eminence was perſuaded this was the beſt method to ſupport the Faculty in its ancient ſplendour. That therefore, ... they muſt not ſpeak any more of this favour, nay they muſt take care that no favours be ever granted hereafter by the Faculty.* Theſe facts entirely clear the Cardinal and Mr. L'Eſcot from the raſh imputations laid upon them.

(3) Pag. 156.

But that the reader may have a juſt notion of this ſtory, we ſhall give an account of it free from thoſe falſe and invidious gloſſes, with which Father Queſnel has diſguiſed it. Mr. Arnaud preſented himſelf to the Society of the Sorbonne at a time, when, according to their Laws and Statutes, he could not be admitted. Bayle himſelf confeſſes it. Arnaud's petition being preſented: the Aſſembly took it into conſideration; we are not told how many perſons were preſent, but it it is certain, that all agreed to grant a diſpenſation, except two, of whom Mr. L'Eſcot was one. Theſe two having heard the arguments of the others, offered their own againſt them; and then, that they might proceed in a regular manner, they propoſed to acquaint the Cardinal with this affair, and to adhere to his determination. Nothing was more reaſonable, in a caſe in which the Statutes of the Houſe were to be infringed, than to lay it before the perſon, who was their particular ſuperior and benefactor. Therefore the Aſſembly agreed to it and ſent Mr. Hardivilliers and Mr. Iſaac Habert to his Eminence, to acquaint him with the reaſons that have been alledged on both ſides; they told him, that thoſe, who were for the diſpenſation, grounded their opinion on the great merit and abilities of the petitioner; and thoſe who oppoſed it, on the neceſſity they were under to obſerve their Laws in order to keep up the reputation and ſplendor of the Society: they added, that there was not one perſon in the whole Aſſembly, who did not agree that Mr. Arnaud deſerved the eſteem the Houſe had for him. The Cardinal, who till that time did not know Mr. Arnaud perſonally, heard his commendation with pleaſure; and ſaid, that *he had a great eſteem for him, not only becauſe he loved the family to which he belonged, but alſo becauſe he had heard that he was a man of great virtue and learning: that he would give him proofs of his eſteem when opportunity offered, but that on the preſent occaſion he could not but be of the opinion of t'oſe, who thought that in order to obſerve their Statutes, they ought not to admit him.* The whole Aſſembly came into the Cardinal's opinion, which was thought very reaſonable even by thoſe, who had been for the diſpenſation; and thus Mr. Arnaud was unanimouſly refuſed on the 14th of Auguſt 1641.

He did not make any further motion during the life of the Cardinal, but after his death, which happened the fourth of December 1642, Mr. Arnaud renewed his ſuit; and two weeks after he preſented himſelf to the ſociety, and was unanimouſly refuſed: which ſhews that the Sorbonniſts had not voted againſt him out of fear, as Mr. Bayle inſinuates after F. Queſnel, but with a full liberty, and according to reaſon. F. Queſnel himſelf has given us (4) the reſolution of the Sorbonne, taken from their Regiſters, which is as follows. *In Comitiis ordinariis . . . . in pervigilio Natalis Dom. An.* 1642. *decretum eſt; ſtandum eſſe graviſſimo Judicio Emin. Proviſoris, in Negotio Domini Arnauldi: atque adeo illum deinceps ad ſocietatem Sorbonicam aſpirare* NON POSSE. i. e. "In the ordinary Aſſembly. . . . "held on Chriſtmas-Eve An. 1642, it has been re-"ſolved, that we muſt conform our ſelves to the moſt "weighty opinion of our eminent Proviſor in the affair "of

(4) In his Preface to his *Cauſa Arnaldina*, p. 29.

endeavour to exclude him from it, as ſoon as an occaſion offered itſelf. The book of the *Frequent Communion*, publiſhed by Mr. Arnaud [γ] in 1643, extremely diſpleaſed the Jeſuits. They refuted it, both in their Sermons, and in printed books, as being filled with a very pernicious doctrine. The diſputes upon Grace, which broke out at that time in the Univerſity of Paris, ſerved only to foment the reciprocal animoſity between the Jeſuits and Mr. Arnaud. This Doctor ſupported the party of Janſenius by writings of great ſtrength, both by refuting the three Sermons of Mr. Habert, and the Apology that Preacher made for it, and by refuting M. le Moine a Profeſſor of the Sorbonne (*g*), and ſome others. They found no room to cenſure him legally, but when he had publiſhed two *Letters* upon an adventure of the Duke of Liancour, a great friend of Port-Royal [*D*], they found in the ſecond of theſe Letters two propoſitions, that the Faculty of Divinity condemned in 1656. M. Arnaud was at the ſame time declared excluded from the Faculty. There were many irregularities in the proceedings [*E*]. For many years he did not ſhew himſelf; for after he found himſelf cited to Rome on account of the troubles of his book concerning frequent communion, and that it was only by mere dint of remonſtrances that they got the Queen-Mother to recal the orders ſhe had given him to depart immediately, *he remained either hid in divers places, or in a manner ſolitary at Port-Royal des Champs*. This retired life laſted near twenty five years till the peace was concluded with Janſeniſm in 1668. Mr. Arnaud was comprehended in this peace: he went to attend the King and the Nuncio, and appeared as much as he would in public till 1679, when he voluntarily departed out of the Kingdom, becauſe he knew his enemies made the King ſuſpect him (*b*). It is not queſtioned but from that time he lived in the Low-Countries; but he never made himſelf known but to a few of his faithful friends. He was diſturbed at Liege in 1690 [*F*]. The reflection that has been made upon this enterpriſe is worthy the

(*g*) This Refutation is intitled, *Apologie pour les Saints Peres de l'Egliſe Defenſeurs de la Grace de Jeſus Chriſt.*

(*b*) Extracted either from a book printed in 1690, under the title of *Queſtion curieuſe ſi Mr. Arnaud, Docteur de Sorbonne, eſt heretique*, or elſe from a book which is the 2d edition of it enlarged and publiſhed in 1695, under the title of *Hiſtoire abregée de la Vie de Mr. Arnaud*. See alſo the Preface of the *Cauſa Arnaldina*.

" of Mr. Arnaud, and that therefore he CANNOT for " the future aſpire to be a member of this Society." How is it poſſible, that Mr. Bayle, who ſo often quotes this Preface, ſhould either not have read, or not have obſerved this paſſage? For he imagined, from Father Queſnel's falſe account, that after the Cardinal's death, Mr. Arnaud carried his point without oppoſition. It is true that he was finally received the laſt day of October 1643; but Mr. Bayle is guilty of a fault of omiſſion for not having told us how the whole affair was paſſed. For it was only by intrigues and cabals, that Mr. Arnaud was admitted; his friends having ſent from diſtant countries (*ex longinquis provinciis*) for a great many Doctors, who at laſt were more numerous than the reſt, and made the majority of the votes be for Mr. Arnaud's diſpenſation; tho' thoſe, who would ſtand by Richelieu's deciſion oppoſed it with all their might; *nequicquam reluctante adverſariorum parte, quæ pro Actis Richelii pugnabat*. Theſe are facts related by Father Queſnel himſelf (5), who did not, or perhaps would not ſee, that they clearly prove, that thoſe Doctors, who oppoſed Mr. Arnaud either during the Cardinal's life, or after his death, did not act out of fear of his Eminence; and that Mr. Arnaud's admiſſion was much more irregular, than his excluſion had been (6). CRIT. REM.]

(5) Ibid. pag. 30, 31.

(6) French edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

[γ] *The Book of the Frequent Communion, publiſhed by Mr. Arnaud.*] This Book, in which Mr. Arnaud had a very little ſhare, except the correcting of the ſtyle, was compoſed partly by the Abbot of St Cyran, and partly by Mr. Le Maître, and Mr. de Sacy his brother (7). CRIT. REM.]

(7) Crit. Rem. printed at the end of the French edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

[*D*] *He publiſhed two Letters upon an adventure of the Duke of Leancour, a great friend of Port Royal.*] This Duke educated his grand-daughter at Port Royal, and kept in his houſe with him the Abbé de Bourzeys. It happened in the year 1655 that he offered himſelf for confeſſion to a Prieſt of St. Sulpice his pariſh-church, who *poſitively declared to him that he could not give him abſolution, unleſs he promiſed him that he would break off all commerce with thoſe Gentlemen; to call back his grand daughter from Port Royal, and to diſcard this Abbé. . . . . This affair having made a great noiſe in Paris, and throughout all France, Mr. Arnaud was deſired to print a Letter in juſtification of this Lord. . . . . This Letter gave occaſion to a great number of Pamphlets being publiſhed againſt it, whereupon Mr. Arnaud thought himſelf obliged to confute the falſities and calumnies, with which they were ſtuffed, by printing a ſecond Letter, which contains an anſwer to nine of thoſe pieces* (15).

(15) *Queſtion. Curieuſe*, pag. 58, 59.

[*E*] *He was excluded from the faculty. There were great irregularities in the proceedings.*] " They named " for Commiſſaries (to ſit upon Mr. Arnaud's trial) " his moſt declared enemies, againſt whom he had " written upon theſe ſubjects, and whom all the world " knew to be reſolutely bent upon his deſtruction; nor " did all his remonſtrances and repreſentations there- " upon profit him any thing (16). All the Doctors " of the community of St. Sulpice, it adds further, " againſt whom the Letter of Mr. Arnaud was writ- " ten, were ſo hard hearted and unjuſt as to ſit as " his Judges, notwithſtanding his exceptions againſt " them; whereas, had they had one grain of honour, " they would have refuſed the office themſelves, as all ho- " neſt men do, even in Lay-Courts of Judicature (17)." You will find many other *irregularities, innovations, contraventions of order always obſerved in diſputes of this kind, and even manifeſt violations of natural equity*, if you read the Act of Proteſtation, which Mr. Arnaud ſent to the Faculty (18).

(16) Ibid. pag. 69, 70.

(17) This expreſſion will make ſeveral of thoſe people ſmile, who cannot be of opinion that the Civil Courts can any otherwiſe be compared to Eccleſiaſtical, than as better to worſe.

The piece which was publiſhed at Liege, 1699, under the title of *Cauſa Arnaldina*, will furniſh us with a thorow information of this proceeding of the Pariſian Divines, and of the grounds of the tenet which they cenſured. In this work is alſo a collection of ſeveral pieces which Mr. Arnaud and his adherents publiſhed about this time in vindication of the juſtice of his cauſe.

(18) It is in page 71 of the *Queſt. Curieuſe*. See the opinion of Mr. de Launoi touching this cenſure of the Sorbonne in the *Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lettres* for the month of June 1686, Article 3. REFLECTION on Mr. Arnaud's being ſtiled *one Arnaud*.

[*F*] *He was diſturbed at Liege, in* 1690.] Six Superiors aſſembled to proceed againſt him according to form and Canon: theſe were the Superior of the Recollects, the Superior of the Cordeliers, the *Sub-Prior Vicar* of the Auguſtinian Monks, the Rector of the Jeſuits, the Vicar of the bare-footed Carmelites, and the Prior of the Dominicans. In this Convocation they ſtiled him *one Arnaud*; though with ſubmiſſion to their great judgment this appellation does no great honour to their communities; but ſhews either an ignorance not to be pardoned in men of learning, or elſe an affectation of a diſdainful air, which is no ways becoming perſons who are dedicated to the ſervice of God, and who ſat to decide about points of faith. Nothing can appear more ridiculous in the eyes of the learned, than for a man of letters to ſay, one Scaliger, one Sirmond, one Petavius, one Salmaſius, one Grotius, one Selden, and (if we are ſpeaking of a Doctor of the Sorbonne) to ſay one Arnaud. The diſputes in which this laſt was engaged, have made ſo much noiſe in the world, and have been attended with ſo many remarkable circumſtances both on the one and the other ſide of the queſtion, that were any man of reading but to be ſuſpected of being unacquainted with theſe controverſies, he might with reaſon, to wipe off from himſelf ſuch injurious ſuſpicions, apply theſe four lines of Virgil to the preſent caſe:

Quis genus Æneadum, quis Trojæ neſciat urbem,
Virtuteſque viroſque, aut tanti incendia belli?

Non

the attention of thoſe who govern (*i*). He continued to exerciſe his pen with great ſtrength againſt the Jeſuits till his death. He continued alſo for ſome time to write againſt the Proteſtants; but a Miniſter, the moſt expoſed to his attacks, employed in 1683 a ſtratagem, which put a ſtop to his irruptions upon the Proteſtant party. I mean the author of the *Eſprit de M. Arnaud* [G]. We could give a long liſt of falſe facts relating to this Doctor; but we ſhall content ourſelves with mentioning ſome of them. They ſaid that he was born a Huguenot (*k*): They have made him one of the Aſſembly of Bourg-Fontaine [H]: They have made him go to the Witches Meeting [I]:

(*i*) See the note [A] of the article of JAMES LE BOSSU.

(*k*) See the note [D] of the Article of ANTHONY ARNAUD the Advocate.

Non obtuſa adeo geſtamus pectora Pœni,
Nec tam averſus equos Tyria ſol jungit ab urbe (19).

(19) Virgil. *Æneid.* lib. 1. ver. 569.

" Who has not heard the ſtory of your woes?
" The name and fortune of your native place,
" The fame and valour of the Phrygian Race?
" We Tyrians are not ſo devoid of ſenſe,
" Nor ſo remote from Phœbus influence.

DRYDEN.

Be this as it will, I cannot forbear tranſcribing in this place the Decree of the ſix Regulars of Liege (20): the diction of it is ſo very extraordinary, that it cannot fail giving my Reader ſome diverſion. *Nos infra ſcripti Superiores Conventuales Regularium in civitate Leodienſi, certiorati de Conventiculis quæ habentur apud* CERTUM ARNOLDUM *doctrinam ſuſpectam ſpargentem, cenſemus D. Vicarium charitative certiorandum, ut ſimilia Conventicula diſſipare, & prohibere non dedignetur etiam cum dicto Arnaldo converſationes. Datum in Conventu Minorum hac 25 Auguſti* 1690. *Ad quem effectum commiſimus R. P. M. Ludovicum Lamet Priorem Dominicanorum, ad nomina noſtro accedendum D. Vicarium, & exponendum intentionem noſtram.* i. e. " We whoſe names " are underwritten, Superiors of the Convents of Regulars in the City of Liege, being informed of certain Conventicles being held at the houſe of one " ARNAUD a ſpreader of ſuſpected doctrine, we think " it fitting to acquaint the Vicar therewith, that " he would vouchſafe to diſperſe ſuch like meetings, and even forbid all converſation with the ſaid " Arnaud. Given in the Convent of Minors this 25th " day of Auguſt, 1690. To which effect we have " commiſſioned the Reverend Father Lewis Lamet " Prior of the Dominicans, to go in our name to the " Vicar, and lay before him our intention." The Author of the *Queſtion Curieuſe* ſays very well, that Father d'Iſerin bragg'd *that he had a commiſſion, or at leaſt a permiſſion from his Highneſs* the Biſhop of Liege *to cauſe Mr. Arnaud to be apprehended in whatever part of the dioceſe he ſhould be found* (21); but he calls this a notorious falſhood (22).

(20) It is given us in page 228 of the *Queſtion. Curieuſe.*

(21) *Queſtion. Curieuſe*, p. 198.
(22) Ibid. pag. 200.

[G] *I mean the Author of a Book intitled* l'ESPRIT DE M. ARNAUD.] There is room to make a hundred remarks upon this work; but as we ſhall take occaſion probably to ſpeak of it in another place, we ſhall confine ourſelves here to a ſmall number of obſervations. The Author of this Book had before publiſhed a Piece which met with great ſucceſs; and which was, by thoſe who had the care of the impreſſion of it at the Hague, intitled, *La Politique du Clergè de France*. Theſe were dialogues in which was ſomething very entertaining and polite, but little of ſolid reaſoning, and leſs prudence in relating ſeveral facts notoriouſly falſe. Mr. Arnaud confuted this Book (23), with ſomewhat too much haughtineſs, and after a manner ſo much the more diſobliging, as he plainly proved his adverſary guilty of ill reaſoning, and of having advanced ſeveral falſities. He fell upon another work of the ſame Author's (24), and made it appear, that he had a deſign to anſwer a Book called the Apology for the Morality of the Reformed, touching the impoſſibility of falling from Grace; in ſhort, the Author of the Politicks of the Clergy, plainly foreſaw that he was like to find in the perſon of Mr. Arnaud, an adverſary that would never let him be at reſt, or give him the leaſt quarter whenever he found him in any contradiction, falſe reaſoning, or untruth. This was no way grateful to a man who was poſſeſſed with a ſpirit of writing a great deal, and who ſcarce ever gave himſelf the trouble to reviſe what he had once written; giving himſelf entirely up to the ſuggeſtions of a warm and active fancy, without attending to the dictates of a cool and ſober judgment, which gave occaſion to an almoſt inexhauſtible fund of falſe reaſonings and groſs contradictions: he therefore began to think of ſome expedient to rid himſelf of ſo troubleſome an antagoniſt, and to prevent Mr. Arnaud's following him ſo cloſe at his heels; and none appeared to him more uſeful for this purpoſe, than to attack him in perſon, I mean, to load him with all the perſonal ill qualities he could think of. This deſign he executed with all the heat and fury imaginable, and having got into this train of ſcandal, he gave no quarter to any body, but laid about him ſo unmercifully on all ſides, that what was ſaid of Voiture upon the ſubject of love, may very well be applied to him on the ſcore of ſcandal; he ſpared none *from the Sceptre to the Crook, from the King to the Cobler*. Mr. Arnaud not thinking it adviſeable to engage with a man that fought with ſuch ſort of weapons, choſe to forbear writing any longer againſt the Reformed, and by this means, what the whole ſociety of the Jeſuits could never invent, one ſingle Miniſter found out and put in execution with ſucceſs; I mean the art of putting this Doctor to ſilence. Nor is this the only advantage, that the Author of the Book, intitled, *L'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud*, reaped from this ſatyr; but he alſo ſtruck ſuch a terror upon a hundred other Authors, who had a mind to fall upon him, and upon a vaſt number of others, to whom he might have made himſelf obnoxious, that they had not courage to riſque the danger of his reſentment: nor ought one to wonder at this, ſeeing there are very few families that are not liable to reproach on ſome ſcore or other (25), or that have not enemies ſpiteful enough to blacken them by ſome malicious ſtory, when they can have a Printer at command, and do it with impunity; and the Book called, *L'Eſprit de M. Arnaud*, ſeemed to threaten a publication of all the little ſcandalous tales that any one ſhould ſend by the poſt, whether relating to a private perſon, as the Prieſt Soulier, or to a Secretary of State, as the deceaſed Mr. Colbert.

(23) In the *Apology for the Catholicks*, printed in 1682.

(24) Intitled, *A Preſervative againſt change of Religion.*

(25) The Spaniards have this Proverb *No ay generacion, do no aya puta ô ladron*; that is, " there is no fa- " mily without " either a whore " or a thief in " it."

I remember that a young Janſeniſt, ſpeaking of the effect of this Satyr, compared Mr. Arnaud to the ancient city of Troy, which was impregnable to the attack of the braveſt warriors, and a thouſand ſhips, and was at laſt taken by the ſtratagem of a deſerter and a wooden horſe.

Talibus inſidiis perjurique arte Sinonis
Credita res, captique doli....
Quos neque Tydides nec Lariſſæus Achilles,
Non anni domuere decem, non mille carinæ (26).

That is,

(26) Virgil. *Æneid.* lib. 2. ver. 195.

" With ſuch deceits he gain'd their eaſy hearts,
" Too prone to credit his perfidious arts.
" What *Diomede*, nor *Thetis* greater Son,
" A thouſand Ships, nor ten years ſiege had done,
" Falſe tears and fawning words the City won.

DRYDEN.

(27) *Huc delecta virûm ſortiti corpora furtim*
Includunt cæco lateri, penituſq;
cavernas
Ingentes, uterumque armato milite complent. Virgil. *Æn.* lib. 2. ver. 18. i. e. " In the hollow " ſide Selected " numbers of " their ſoldiers " hide: " With inward " arms the dire " machine they " load, " And iron bow- " els ſtuff the " dark abode." Dryden.

'*Tis true*, added he, *this compariſon does not run upon all fours, ſince the Book, intitled*, L'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud, *does not at all reſemble the wooden horſe, in which were concealed the chief Captains of the Army* (27), *but rather thoſe veſſels which by the contrivance of Hannibal were ſtored with earthen pots filled with ſerpents*. See Cornelius Nepos, in the life of this Carthaginian General.

[H] *They have made him one of the meeting at Bourg-Fontaine.*] The miſtake committed by Du Pleix with regard to the Father, is nothing, if compared to the falſhood which Mr. Filleau, Counſellor to the King in the Parliament of Poitiers, publiſhed in relation to the ſon in the year 1654; for there is no room to doubt but that he placed Mr. Arnaud among the ſeven Doctors who conſtituted the aſſembly of Bourg-Fontaine (28). Take the whole ſtory in a few words. Mr. Filleau, in a juridical relation, which he publiſhed in 1654, of what paſſed

(28) This is a monaſtery of Carthuſians about 16 or 17 leagues from Paris.

Meeting [*I*] : They have ſent him to command the troops of the Vaudois [*K*] : They have given him the office of Armour-Bearer to the Goliah Peter Jurieu [*L*] : They have ſaid that

paſſed at Poitiers upon the ſubject of the new doctrine of Janſenius, openly declared that an Eccleſiaſtick had told him, that in a conference held by ſeven perſons at Bourg-Fontaine 1621, it was deliberated of ways and means to aboliſh Chriſtianity ; that this Eccleſiaſtick was one of the ſeven perſons ; and that ſome time after he broke off with the other ſix, of which there only remained one living, and who were (J. D. V. D. H.) (C. J.) (P. C.) (P. C.) (A. A.) (S. V.). By certain circumſtances attending this relation, and by the character of certain Books which they hint at to have been only printed in execution of ſome engagements entered into at Bourg-Fontaine, every body was of opinion that by the letters of the firſt name was meant *John du Verger de Hauranne*, Abbot of St. Cyran ; by thoſe of the ſecond, *Cornelius Janſenius*, Biſhop of Ipres ; by thoſe of the third, *Philip Coſpean*, Doctor of the Sorbonne, Biſhop of Nantes, and afterwards of Liſieux, by thoſe of the fourth, *Peter Camus*, Biſhop of Belley ; by thoſe of the fifth, *Anthony Arnaud*, who is the ſubject of the preſent Article ; and by thoſe of the ſixth, *Simon Vigor*, Counſellor in the Grand Council. Mr. Filleau aſſures us, *that they came to a reſolution in this aſſembly to attack the two Sacraments moſt frequented by adult perſons, which were thoſe of Penance, and the Euchariſt ; and the way in order to effect this was to be, by inſpiring people with a fear of the frequent receiving of them, not by betraying any deſign of making them leſs frequented, but by rendring the practice of them ſo difficult, and attended with circumſtances ſo incompatible with the condition of men of this age, as to make them in a manner inacceſſible ; and ſo by this diſuſe of them, founded on ſuch plauſible pretences, to undermine, and by degrees deſtroy the faith.* The publick was of opinion that this alluded to Mr. Arnaud, by reaſon of his Book on frequent Communion ; and that Mr. Filleau could only mean him by the letters (A. A.) (29), for the fifth of theſe dangerous conſpirators againſt the Chriſtian Religion.

(29) IVth *Factum* in defence of the Relations of Janſenius, p. 11, 12. ſhews that it was he who was meant in the *Juridical Relation.*

As it is not my buſineſs here to examine into the truth or falſhood of this combination, I will content myſelf here, with ſaying that Mr. Arnaud looked upon this as the moſt virulent piece of calumny that ever was heard of, and that in particular, he unanſwerably vindicated himſelf from this accuſation laid to his charge, of making one at the conference of theſe Deiſts (30), for he made it appear that being born in 1612, he was but nine years old at the time when they pretended it was held. This juſtification of himſelf is ſo ſtrong, that not only the ſilence of his accuſer, but alſo the formal confeſſion of one of the friends of the latter was an undeniable proof that they had nothing to alledge againſt it. Moreover, Father Meynier pretending that the relation of Mr. Filleau contained nothing but the truth, *confeſſed that Mr. Arnaud had given convincing proofs of his not belonging to this aſſembly ; but he is miſtaken*, adds he, *in ſuppoſing that by theſe letters A. A. is meant* Anthony Arnaud ; *for let me tell him from this Author, that another perſon is deſigned by theſe letters, who is ſtill living, and is too intimate a friend of Mr. Arnaud's to be unknown to him* (31). Mr. Paſcal, who was then writing the Provincial Letters, preſſed the Jeſuits in a very ſtrong manner to name the private betrayer of the conference, the ſix Doctors who were preſent at it, and in particular him who was deſigned by the letters A. A., *who tho' it was not Mr. Arnaud, yet was too nearly allyed to him in friendſhip to be unknown to him* ; but this challenge was ſuffered to drop ; and it was not till a few years ago, that a celebrated Jeſuit of Antwerp declared to the publick, that this friend of Mr. Arnaud was his own brother Arnaud d'Andilli (32) : this has been refuted. See the Note [*B*] of the Article ARNAUD D'ANDILLI.

(30) In his *Letter to a Duke and Peer of France in* 1655. See alſo Part 1 of *Factum IV of the Relations of Janſenius.*

(31) Father Meynier in his book intitled, *The Port-Royal and Geneva united againſt the Holy Sacrament of the Altar*, printed at Poitiers 1656.

(32) Father Hazart, in his *Anſwer to the Factum in defence of the Relations of Janſenius.* See the *Hiſt. des Ouvrages des Savans*, Feb. 1688, and Part 2. of the 4th *Factum of the Relations of Janſenius*, p. 2.

(33) This probably was the late Ducheſs of Longueville.

[*I*] *They have made him go to the Witches Aſſembly.*] It is difficult to ſay, which of theſe two Aſſemblies Mr. Arnaud would chooſe to be thought a member of, whether that of Bourg-Fontaine, or that which Mr. Maupas Biſhop of Evreux has now and then made mention of. *It is certain that he aſſured ſeveral perſons, that a converted Sorcerer informed him that he had ſeen Mr. Arnaud and a Princeſs of the Blood* (33) *at the Witches Aſſembly, and that Mr. Arnaud made there a very fine harangue to the Devils* (34). *If he was to have his choice of theſe two extremes, and if the harangue ſpoken of, only tended to perſuade the Devils to ſome better courſe of life, I make no doubt but the Doctor would rather be thought to have harangued at the Witches Aſſembly, than be ſuſpected to have been a member of the Aſſembly of Bourg-Fontaine with a deſign to aboliſh Chriſtianity, and to propagate Deiſm.*

(34) IVth *Factum of the Relations of Janſenius*, pag. 2.

I ſhould treſpaſs on the patience of my Readers, were I to tell them how ridiculous this ſtory which the above-named Prelate related to ſeveral perſons is, and it was one of thoſe falſhoods which Mr. Arnaud thought unworthy the pains of confuting. Take his own words (35). *Honour may be conſidered as concerned in a two-fold reſpect, either in relation to the calumny in itſelf, which may be of a heinous nature, or with relation to thoſe who being prejudiced thereby, may for the future conceive an ill opinion of the perſon calumniated ; now it is the latter of theſe two, which obliges us to vindicate ourſelves from it, for, however enormous any ſcandal may be in itſelf, yet if it be of ſuch a nature that no man in his right ſenſes can give any credit to it, it ought to be diſregarded. For example, what the late Mr. de Maupas, Biſhop of Evreux formerly ſaid, how that he was informed by a converted Sorcerer, that Mr. Arnaud had been at the Witches Aſſembly, and that the Devils were charmed with the harangue which he there made to them, was in itſelf a horrible piece of calumny ; nevertheleſs, if any inventor of ſcandal was pleaſed to inſert this in a libel, would any man deſire this Doctor to take the trouble of refuting it ; or that for not doing ſo, would one have reaſon to ſuppoſe that ſuch a ſilence proceeded from being incapable to anſwer it, and was in effect pleading guilty to the charge ?*

(35) Extracted from tom. 3. of *Moral Pratique*, cap. 11. p. 257.

[*K*] *They have ſent him to command the Troops of the Vaudois.*] This falſhood is no leſs improbable than the foregoing. There have been manuſcript News-papers handed about, affirming for certain, that this Arnaud, who is at the head of the Vaudois, is Mr. Arnaud Doctor of the Sorbonne ; *that he has at laſt openly declared for them ; and that he does wonders in Savoy at the head of the troops of the party* (36).] This would be a ſurprizing metamorphoſis with a witneſs, that a Doctor of the Sorbonne at the age of ſeventy eight years, who had never followed any thing but his ſtudies, and who had written ſo much againſt the Reformed Miniſters, ſhould from a militant in the Church become one in the Army, that he ſhould lay aſide his pen to handle a muſquet and a broad ſword, and ſhould take more pains to make the Carabins of Arnaud famous in ſtory, than one of his uncles, well known to the Rochellers, did to make them ſo in the reign of Louis XIII (37). The late Biſhop of Liege heard it ſaid at his own table, *that Mr. Arnaud had abjured the Catholick Faith at Boſleduc, and that he was married there* (38). The greateſt part of thoſe who are called zealots, fear nothing ſo much as thoſe perſons being orthodox, whom they have once accuſed of hereſy, herein not imitating the Almighty, *who wills not the death of a ſinner, but rather that he ſhould be converted and live* : as for their part they deſire that the perſon they accuſe ſhould be more corrupted, and are chagrined if he does not go over to the heretical party the better to juſtify their accuſations. In ſhort, they had rather that another perſon ſhould damn himſelf, than that they ſhould incur the imputation of ſcandal. See the words of a modern Author (39).

(36) *Queſtion. Curieuſe*, p. 4.

(37) See the *Memoirs of the Sieur de Pontis.*

(38) *The third Complaint of Mr. Arnaud*, p. 8.

[*L*] *They have given him the office of Armour-bearer to the Goliah Peter Jurieu.*] Thoſe who placed Mr. Arnaud at the head of the Vaudois doubtleſs paid him a greater compliment than they, who have made him Armour-bearer to the Goliah Peter Jurieu, which the Biſhop of Malaga has done in his *Catholick Complaint*, by applying, as well as he could, a thought of St. Bernard upon Peter Abelard and Arnold of Breſcia (40) to theſe two famous Authors ; from which he takes occaſion to draw this concluſion : *Iſti qui modo ſurrexerunt, novus Golias & ejus Armiger, PETRUS ſcilicet & ARNALDUS, facili negotio exterminabuntur.*

(39) In the *General Criticiſm on the Calviniſm of Maimbourg*, pag. 584, edit. 2.

(40) Father Maimbourg is very witty upon the ſame Equivocation of Arnald of Breſcia in his *Decleniſion of the Empire* ; and Father Theophilus Raynaud publiſhed a book intitled, *Arnaldus de Brixia redivivus in Arnaldo de Lutetia.*

that he was baniſhed from France [*M*], and that he had written the Apology for the Catholicks to recover his benefices [*N*]: They have imputed to him many books that he

tur. i. e. "That upſtart Goliah and his Armour-"bearer, viz. PETER and ARNAUD, will eaſily "be vanquiſhed." The Letter which Mr. Arnaud wrote to this Prelate has been publiſhed, in which he ſhews him, that his Highneſs (41) muſt have been ſtrangely impoſed upon to take Dr. *Arnaud for the Armour-bearer of Jurieu the Goliah of the Proteſtants againſt the Catholick party. For*, adds he, *if your Highneſs had known this Arnaud, could you poſſibly have been guilty of ſo great an over-ſight as to rank together two perſons that were the moſt profeſſed enemies, and to miſtake him, who zealouſly ſupported the cauſe of the Church againſt this Miniſter, for his aſſociate and abettor in the impious war which he declared againſt the Church?* It is certain that theſe two Authors, the one of whom is taken for Goliah, the other for the Armour-bearer of Goliah, are ſo far from being ſo, that it is not a leſs notorious falſhood that Mr. Arnaud bore a part in the Conference of Bourg-Fontaine, or at the Witches Aſſembly, or in the inſurrection of the Vaudois, than that he was Armour-bearer to the Goliah Peter Jurieu. Nothing therefore can be, not only more abſurd, but alſo remote from truth, than the alluſions in this paſſage of St. Bernard.

(41) Hé is honoured with this title by reaſon of his being natural ſon of Philip IV, King of Spain.

This is alſo what the pretended Goliah has reproached the Author of the Catholick Complaint with, no leſs than his pretended Armour-bearer. *If this Biſhop*, ſays he (42), *had had any thing of a true taſte, he would never have founded his bitter invectives on ridiculous alluſions borrowed from the names of* Arnold of Breſcia *and* Peter Abelard, *intimating that Mr. Arnaud muſt be the ſucceſſor of Arnold of Breſcia, and the Miniſter Peter Jurieu that of Peter Abelard; nor would he have called this Miniſter the Goliah of the enemies of the Church, and Arnaud his Armour-bearer, ſince theſe two have too bad an underſtanding with each other to be engaged in the ſame intereſt; beſides Mr. Arnaud has age, and abilities ſufficient to be Goliah himſelf rather than his Armour-bearer. This is what he alſo pretends, and I believe no body will diſpute the honour of it with him.*

(42) *Religion of the Jeſuits*, p. 59.

I ſhall juſt take notice here of a little ſlip of memory of Mr. Arnaud. He complains (43), that after making the *ſimple compariſon betwixt* Arnold of Breſcia *and* Arnaud of Paris, *and betwixt* Peter Abelard *and* Peter Jurieu, they ſhould make the Biſhop of Malaga ſay, *that this Doctor was the Goliah of the Party, and the Miniſter his Armour-bearer*; whereas we have ſeen that they have made him to ſay quite the contrary.

(43) At the end of tom. 3. of the *Morale Pratique*, p. 773.

[*M*] *They have ſaid that he was baniſh'd from France.*] A Doctor of the Sorbonne, a Savoyard by nation (44), has aſſerted in his Book entitled, *Well-grounded Prejudices againſt Janſeniſm*, printed at Geneva (45), in 1686, that Mr. Arnaud was driven out of France by order of the King. This is intimated in thoſe words of the Advertiſement to the Reader: *I thought it impoſſible for me to ſpeak the truth, and not to cenſure the conduct of this old Tartuffe, WHOM THE JUSTICE OF THE MOST CHRISTIAN KING HAS MADE A FUGITIVE into Holland.* Notwithſtanding all this it is certain, that he retired out of the Kingdom of his own accord; nor is there any room left to doubt the truth of it, ſince the Letters which he wrote in 1679 to the Chancellor le Tellier, and to the Archbiſhop of Paris, printed in Tome I of *l'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud*, 1684. It is very ſtrange therefore that two years after, the Abbé de Ville ſhould betray his ignorance of a truth which had been made ſo publick to the world in a Satyr which had ſo great a run; and it is ſtill ſtranger, that in the year 1690 Mr. Arnaud ſhould be obliged to print theſe two Letters in confutation of thoſe, who *publickly gave out, that he was a rebel to his King, and was driven out of France for a raiſer of ſedition* (46). Nor was it in my opinion a leſs notorious piece of ſcandal and falſhood, which the Author of *l'Eſprit &c.* propagated when he aſſerted, *that he was driven from Flanders. However this good man*, adds he (47), *may fancy to himſelf that his adventures are kept ſecret, yet we have not, for all his cunning, wanted a very good hand to inform us that he was driven out of the Low-Countries by an order of the Governor.* The word *chaſſer*, i. e. "to drive out," which the Author of the General Criticiſm on Calviniſm makes uſe of, has an equivocal meaning. *They have given out*, ſays he (48), *that the houſe of Mr. Arnaud was a rendezvous of mal-contents, that factious and ſeditious cabals were held there, and that Memoirs were prepared there for the Court of Rome; in ſhort they obtained all the neceſſary orders to DRIVE him AWAY together with the reſt of the gang.* This means no more than that they obtained that certain orders ſhould be given to Mr. Arnaud, which proved the cauſe of his chooſing a retreat in a ſtrange country.

(44) He calls himſelf the Abbé de Ville. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for July 1686, Article 8.

(45) We are not to give any credit to the title page, which ſays that it was printed at Cologn, for Abraham du Bois.

(46) *Queſt. Curieuſe*, pag. 212.

(47) *Epiſt. de M. Arnaud*, tom. 1. p. 38.

(48) *General Criticiſm on the Calviniſm of Maimbourg*, Letter 5.

[*N*] *It is ſaid . . . that he made the apology for the Catholicks to recover his benefices.*] Mr. Jurieu was guilty of a very great miſtake, when he ſaid that Mr. Arnaud wrote the defence of the Chatholics with a view of being recalled into France, that he might there *peaceably enjoy his eſtate and benefices* (49), and that the apprehenſions of the confiſcation of his benefices engaged him to take certain meaſures. Geometrical demonſtration is ſcarcely more convincing than the publick declaration, which Mr. Arnaud has made of his having no benefice, was of the falſhood of this aſſertion: for it cannot enter into the thoughts of any man of ſenſe, that a Doctor, ſo jealous of his reputation as he was, and who could not any ways hope to eſcape the moſt ſhameful confutation, in caſe he falſly denied his having a benefice; I ſay, it cannot reaſonably be thought that he had any, when he ſo plainly denied it in print. We need only therefore have recourſe to the following words of Mr. Arnaud to be fully convinced of the falſhood of what his adverſary charges him with. *The ſcandalous manner*, ſays he (50), *in which they have had the impudence to ſpeak of the affairs of this country, has obliged the Ambaſſador from his Britannick Majeſty to obtain of the States to affix a publick ſentence of condemnation upon the moſt virulent of their libels, which they were pleaſed to call that of* l'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud, *tho' I am perhaps more favourably uſed than a great number of perſons, who are therein fall'n foul upon, and beſpattered without any the leaſt relation to me, but a ridiculous or imaginary one; having ſcarce any thing to reproach me with but ſecret intentions, and thoſe often founded on notorious untruths: as for example, when they ſay that it was not from any motive of Religion that I wrote the defence of the Catholics, but from a view of intereſt and to ſave my benefices, WHOM ALL THE WORLD KNOWS NOT TO HAVE SO MUCH AS ONE.* This is what he ſays in a Letter dated October 20, 1684. Nor does he ſpeak leſs poſitively in a piece of his printed in 1689. *As for the Book falſly intitled*, l'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud, *he* (51) *never had any thoughts of replying to it; for it having been ſent to him a little time after it came out, opening it in ſeveral places, he chanced to pitch upon ſome paſſages which made him ſee plainly the drift of this Miniſter, ſuch, for inſtance, as this ridiculous piece of calumny*, that they ſuffered young perſons of quality about twelve or thirteen years of age, at Port Royal, to read the Books of the Socinians, and that they were inſtructed in polite learning (52); *and another full as ridiculous tho' not ſo heinous, viz. that Mr. Arnaud, WHO NEITHER HAS, NOR EVER SOUGHT AFTER ANY BENEFICE, wrote the Defence of the Catholicks in order to keep his Benefices; from thence he concluded that ſo extravagant and unjuſt a ſlanderer, as he was unworthy of credit, ſo was he unworthy of a reply, and from that time he never read any thing in that Book, till your* Defence *appeared. This is what I have learned from the perſon himſelf* (53). We may therefore ſay of the Author of *l'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud*, what the Latins expreſſed by the Proverb, *Cantherius in Portâ*, he made a falſe ſtep at his firſt ſetting out.

(49) *Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud*, tom. 1. pag. 34, 36, 44.

(50) Second addition to the *Apolog. pour les Catholiq.* p. 14.

(51) Mr. Arnaud here ſpeaks of himſelf.

(52) See this ſtory refuted in Mr. Arnaud's *Diſſertation upon the pretended happineſs of the pleaſures of the Senſes*, printed in 1687.

(53) Tome 3 of the *Moral. Pratique*, pag. 237, 238.

Let it be noted, that Mr. Arnaud had a Canonſhip in the Cathedral Church of Verdun, when he commenced Licentiate, in the year 1638 (54); but he quitted this preferment a little before he received Deacon's Orders in the year 1641 (55).

(54) *Præfat. Cauſæ Arnaldinæ*, pag. 7.

(55) Ibid. p. 19.

he never compoſed [O]: I ſhall mention ſome; and I do not queſtion but many others may

[O] *They have imputed many Books to him which he never compoſed.*] We will divide this Remark into four Sections.

PERPETUITY OF FAITH. A Diſpute betwixt Meſſieurs Arnaud and Claude.

I. I ſhall, without paying any regard to the order of time, among the Books which were falſly aſcribed to him, firſt of all conſider, that intitled, the *Perpetuity of Faith*, foraſmuch as this Piece has occaſioned one of the moſt famous diſputes that ever was ſtarted betwixt the Roman Catholics and the Proteſtants. Mr. Claude, who was the advocate of the latter, has thereby gained the greateſt reputation that ever Miniſter did: and on the other hand Mr. Arnaud, who was the principal advocate of the former, perhaps never diſplayed the force of his genius with greater application than in that diſpute. We are entertained through the whole courſe of this famous conteſt, both on one ſide and the other, with the brighteſt thoughts and the greateſt ſtrength of argument, that wit, eloquence, reading and Logick can furniſh us with; each party laying claim to the victory, notwithſtanding the incredible pains the Port Royal was at, in procuring at a very great expence, a great number of certificates from the Levant, which yet proved of no weight to leſſen the perſuaſion the Reformed were of, concerning the faith of the Chriſtians in thoſe parts with regard to the Euchariſt. The ignorance which reigns amongſt thoſe Chriſtians, the diſcredit the Greek nation has laboured under time immemorial on the ſcore of orthodoxy, the power of money in procuring their hands and ſeals, a charm they were thought not proof againſt (56) &c. very much weakened in the opinion of the Proteſtants, the authenticknes of the certificates produced by the Port Royal. However, this is no reaſon why this diſpute ſhould not be eſteemed, (ſetting aſide party prejudices) as one of the moſt memorable and glorious undertakings that Mr. Arnaud ever engaged in. It was not therefore without reaſon, that I choſe to begin this Remark with the firſt tranſaction of this great combat.

(56) See below the note [S].

It were to be wiſhed that the Author, who has given us a good abridgment of the Life of Mr. Claude (57), had been critically exact in giving us the Epocha of this paper war, ſeeing Mr. Claude has not affixed any date to the Preface of his firſt Book; which default of date may lead a great many People into an error; for example, I have Mr. Claude's firſt anſwer, printed at Paris for Stephen Lucas, in 1672. The title does not inform us whether it is the firſt or ſecond Edition; and from the firſt line of the Preface, I learn that this diſpute had then been on foot about four years, and that the manuſcript at that time communicated to Mr. Claude, had been printed a year before. If I had had no other information, I muſt inevitably have fall'n into this error, that the *Perpetuité de la Foi* had been firſt printed in 1671. I don't ſay this, without having obſerved that one is often deceived in this manner, by not finding the proper dates affixed to Prefaces. My Edition of the *Perpetuité de la Foi* is the fourth, and of the year 1666, tho' I have therein diſcovered the date of the firſt, for I there find underneath the copy of the grant of privilege, that the firſt Edition of this Book was printed off July 15, 1664; and the firſt anſwer of Mr. Claude was, I think, publiſhed in 1666 (58). The Author of his Life not thinking an exact account of dates neceſſary in an abrigdment, has given occaſion to thoſe learned perſons who write the Leipſick Journal (ſo much to the advantage of the Republick of Letters, and ſo much to the glory of their city, which may juſty be ſtiled the Athens of Germany) to commit an error with regard to the firſt Piece which this Miniſter wrote. They pretend that his firſt anſwer to the *Perpetuité de la Foi* was printed before he went to ſerve the Church of Montauban (59), but in reality the firſt and ſecond were both printed at the ſame time, after that the firſt had been handed about four or five years in manuſcript, and after he had left Montauban. But to return to our point.

(57) *A. R. R. D. L. D. P.* that is to ſay, *Abel Rotolp de la Deveze Paſteur.* He was heretofore Miniſter at Caſtres, and is ſo at preſent at the Hague.

(58) That is according to the antedate of the bookſeller; for I am of opinion that the book came out in 1665.

(59) *Acta Eruditor. Lipſienſ.* An. 1687. pag. 659.

Mr. de la Deveze does not aſſure us that Mr. Arnaud was the Author of the *Perpetuité de la Foi*, but contents himſelf with ſaying that he was the reputed Author of it; and the Journaliſts of Leipſick go no further (60); tho' in the ſupplement of Moreri, in which we are preſented with a very long Article of Mr. Claude, partly taken from the abridgment of his Life, we are told point blank that Mr. Arnaud is the Author of this Book. However, the moſt common as well as the moſt probable opinion is, that it was written by Mr. Nicolle, the three great volumes of the *Perpetuity defended* by Mr. Arnaud, and the general anſwer to the ſecond Book of Mr. Claude by Mr. Nicolle. The *Queſtion Curieuſe* determines nothing on this head, by reaſon that in the enumeration which is there made of the writings of Meſſieurs de Port-Royal againſt thoſe of the Reformed Religion, there is no diſtinction made betwixt thoſe of Mr. Nicolle and thoſe of Mr. Arnaud.

(60) *Acta Eruditor. Lipſienſ.* ibid. but in 1683, pag. 442, they affirm it.

Note, that the firſt Tome of the *Perpetuity defended* was printed in 1669, and that the Author having demurred a whole year, whether he ſhould reply to Mr. Claude's Books or no, began his work in January 1667, and finiſhed the firſt volume in June 1668 (61). Note alſo, that it is aſcribed to Mr. Arnaud in ſome of the approbations prefixed to the work. This ought to put the matter out of diſpute.

(61) See his Preface.

THE ſecond tome of the *Morale Pratique.*

II. The Author of *l'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud* makes this Doctor to be the Author of the ſecond volume of the *Morale Pratique*; but gives no reaſon for his aſſertion; and Mr. Arnaud has contradicted him in a publick manner. *It is certain*, ſays he (62), *that Mr. Arnaud is not the Author of the Morale Pratique, nor do the Jeſuits lay it to him.... but upon the credit of Mr. Jurieu, a man ſo infamous for his lies and fictions, and who aſcribes this Book to Mr. Arnaud only as he does a great many others, which the world knows he had not the leaſt hand in.* The accuſer from that time never undertook to juſtify his charge, from which we may equitably judge it to be a falſe imputation. It muſt be allowed to be a hard matter to prove this, ſeeing that the Biſhop of Malaga himſelf mentions it with ſome doubt, and upon the ſingle authority of Mr. Jurieu, *Modo ſit ARNALDUS*, ſays he (63) *ut innuit PETRUS JURIEU in ſuo SPIRITU.* i. e. "If ſo "it be ARNAUD's, as PETER JURIEU intimates "in his Book called *l'Eſprit &c.*" The Author of the *Defence of the New Chriſtians*, who is thought to be Father le Tellier, one of the beſt writers of the Order, has been more peremptory in his deciſions than the forementioned Prelate, tho' he ſeems to have no other warrant for what he ſays, than that of Mr. Jurieu; for which reaſon Mr. Arnaud gives him a very ſevere reprimand, and accuſes him of *a raſh judgment, which, upon duly weighing all circumſtances, is deſtructive of charity and juſtice. The ſole reaſon*, adds he (64), *that induces you to judge him to be the Author of it, is founded upon the teſtimony of a man whom you yourſelf confeſs to be unworthy of all credit, and ſo ſcandalous for his lies as to make one doubt of the moſt evident truths, when advanced by him.*

(62) *Letter of a Divine on the Defence of the New Chriſtians*, pag. 2.

(63) *Catholic Querim.* p. 103.

(64) Tome 3 of the *Morale Pratique*, pag. 36.

WELL-GROUNDED PREJUDICES.

III. The Leipſick Journal aſcribes the *Well-grounded Prejudices againſt the Calviniſts* to Mr. Arnaud (65). Notwithſtanding this, according to the general opinion of all thoſe who are beſt ſkilled in particulars of this kind, Mr. Nicolle is the Author of it, and the Abbot de Ville expreſly aſcribes it to him (66) in the Preface to a Book which I have before mentioned, wherein he retorts upon Meſſieurs de Port-Royal the very prejudices they objected againſt the Reformation. As for the proof which the Journaliſts of Leipſick bring, it is very inconcluſive; for altho' the Biſhops of Condom and Grenoble did by the ſame act give the approbation to the *Well-grounded Prejudices*, and to three other Books, one of which is confeſſedly Mr. Arnaud's, yet they did not thereby acknowledge the other three to be his likewiſe; but they joined them all together, by reaſon that they all four came from Port-Royal about the ſame time. Theſe four Books, are the *Well-grounded Prejudices*, the *general Anſwer to Mr. Claude*, the *Subverſion of Morality*, and the *ſecond Tome* of the *Perpetuity defended.*

(65) *Acta Eruditor. Lipſ.* Ann. 1683. pag. 438, 450. and in the Index pag. 561. An. 1690. pag. 18, 595.

(66) He improperly calls him *Nicol. Let them*, ſays he, *rightly aſcribe it to Mr. Nicol, one of the moſt polite writers of Port-Royal.*

THE DEFENCE OF THE CHURCH.

IV. The Defence of the Church in anſwer to a Book of Mr. Claude's, intitled *the Defence of the Reformation*, was printed at Antwerp (67) in 1689. The Journaliſts of Leipſick conjectured that this work was written by Mr. Arnaud (68); but it is the production of another hand, viz. of Father d'Antecourt, a Monk of Sainte Genevieve, and Chancellor of the Univerſity of Paris,

(67) The title page ſays at Cologn, for Peter Marteau.

(68) *Acta Eruditor. Lipſienſ.* An. 1690. p. 18, and in the Index pag. 611.

may be named: a false reason has been assigned for his silence [P]: they have given out

Paris, as another excellent Journalist informs us (69).

I forbear to mention an error of the Jesuit Papebroch: I mean that of fixing upon Mr. Arnaud the Books which came out under the name of Petrus Aurelius. *Petrus Aurelius vero nomine est Antonius Arnaldus* (70). i. e. "The true name of Peter Aurelius is "Anthony Arnaud." I can't help taking notice here of a fact [b] I met with in a Pamphlet (71), intitled, *A Defence of the Order of Monseigneur the Bishop of Arras, of December* 30, 1697, *against a Libel intitled*, The Ancient Heresy of the Jesuits revived, &c. The Author of this Defence pretends to prove that the Jansenists have all along acknowledged the authority of the Church in determining the sense of any Work: See what he says in page, 24. "Of a great number "of instances that I could produce, I will content "myself with only one, which may serve instead of "all the rest; that is Mr. Arnaud the Captain and "Oracle of Jansenism, who after having outdone in his "fourth part of the apology of the Religious of Port-"Royal, all that ever had been said before against "the infallibility of the Church, with regard to the "interpretation of the sense of Books; he is at last "in a new Work, written on purpose to support this "Apology and others of his Writings, reduced to an "impossibility of defending himself any other way "from the consequence he was reproached with, viz. "that his reasonings tended to destroy the certainty "of Tradition, and he found himself necessitated in "spite of all his efforts to the contrary, to make this "important and decisive confession, which in a few "lines destroyed all his labours of so many years. "*There are certain facts*, says this Writer *, *which "necessarily evince the truth of any doctrine, and "such are those which establish the Tradition of "the Church: for example, it follows that what "the Fathers unanimously taught as a doctrine of "faith, is a doctrine of faith . . . . . and so in like "manner it is manifest that the Church being in-"fallible in the decision of opinions, is also infallible "in the decision of such facts as are the necessary con-"sequences of such opinions, and which are the neces-"sary means, by which it attains to the knowledge of "the truth of matters of faith.* All this is Mr. Ar-"naud's." How concise and conclusive is he! It is positively affirmed, that the *Apology of the Religious*, and the confutation of a Book of Father Annat's were both the productions of our Doctor. I will not take upon me to deny this, tho' on one hand the style of the Apology appears to me to be more chast than his, and on the other to have less spirit and briskness. This Apology is one pretty large volume *in quarto*, divided into IV Parts, printed in the year 1665. Observe by the way the ordinary fate of disputes: it scarce ever happens in the course of defending any opinion, that we are wholly at liberty to make use of maxims which are intirely universal; for we have commonly some other opinions to support, which oblige us to some restrictions, which kind of limitations often prove a great embarrassment; for our adversary will make our exceptions a matter of triumph, they will furnish him with arguments *ad hominem*, and other great advantages, and it is for the most part by this means that he rallies again after a defeat. The Jansenists are an instance of the truth of this in the defence of the Order of the Bishop of Arras; and I should be glad to see how they will extricate themselves. Both parties are subject to a dilemma in this dispute; for the infallibility of the Church with regard to facts cannot be defended, and yet not to admit it would lay one self open to a thousand difficulties. As to the Book *of the two Heads which make but one*, I shall speak of it in some other place. This is another Piece which is unjustly laid to Mr. Arnaud, in an anonymous Piece printed in 1688, which passed for Father le Tellier's: it is called, *Lettre apologetique pour* Mr. Arnaud, &c. It might with more reason be said, that the opinion of *the two Heads which make but one*, was maintained by this Doctor of the Sorbonne in the Preface to his Book on Frequent Communion, tho' this stands in need of some explanations. See the short History of his Life (72).

[b] *I can't help taking notice here of a fact &c.*] 1. The book intitled *L'ancienne Heresie des Jesuites, &c.* i. e. "The ancient History of the Jesuits," is a Satyr, which by a great many persons was ascribed to Father Quesnel, who has publickly disowned it. 2. The *Defence* was wrote by an Author, whom I don't know. But I believe that both these pieces came from the same person, who assumed the character of a Jansenist in the former, which is the reason why Father Quesnel made such a clamour, when it was ascribed to him. 3. What is asserted in these two books, namely that Mr. Arnaud has admitted and maintained the Infallibility of the Church, *in determining the sense of a dogmatical work*, is very true. He has maintained it even with regard to the Pope; here follows an undeniable proof of it, which I borrow from the *Considerations sur l'entreprize faite par Maitre Nicolas Cornet, &c.* i. e. "Some Reflections upon "the attempt of Nicholas Cornet &c." This Pamplet printed in 4to in 1649, is undoubtedly a work of Mr. Arnaud; he tells us there (6), that "to say "that the doctrine of St. Augustin is not safe, and "that by following it one may fall into heresies or "errors, is a DOWNRIGHT HERESY, and long since "condemned." Observe his proof of this assertion: "This, *adds he*, Pope Celestinus has determined a-"bove twelve hundred years ago. . . . . This shews "manifestly, that one cannot now believe WITH-"OUT HERESY . . . . that there may be in the books "of St. Augustin some errors, and some propositions, "which deserve to be censured." And in another place (7) he says, "The question is not, to know "what has been the opinion of some private per-"sons concerning the Doctrine of St. Augustin; "but what THE CHURCH HAS DETERMINED about "it. 'Tis a question *de facto*, an affair already "decided. The only thing left, is to know that de-"cision, and to declare it to all the Catholicks, in "order to OBLIGE them to follow it, &c." And even with regard to Jansenius, Mr. Arnaud supposed (8), that if the Church decided this QUESTION *de facto*, viz. "Whether this learned Bishop "had well understood and explained St. Augustin, "one could not oppose this judgment, without being "an Heretick, and that we ought to say of all those, "who dared to resist it, *Sit tibi sicut Ethnicus*, i. e. "*Let him be unto thee as an Heathen man* (9)." 4. The Refutation of Father Annat is certainly Mr. Arnaud's; but the Apology for the Nuns of Port-Royal, of which Mr. Bayle says, *he does not pretend to deny Mr. Arnaud's being the author of it*, is only partly his; he wrote the fourth part of it, the three first were almost entirely written by Mr. Nicolle (10). CRIT. REM.]

[P] *A false reason has been assigned for his silence.*] The difficulties proposed to Mr. Steyaert, are a proof that the Author of the voyage thro' the world of Des Cartes did not exactly consult the date of the controversy betwixt Mr. Arnaud and Father Mallebranche, when he said that the former engaged himself in that dispute, on purpose to have a pretence for not replying to two Books which appeared against him, the one composed by a Minister, the other by a Jesuit. It must be confessed that the publick has not yet well recovered the astonishment it was under, at some of the first years silence of this Doctor with regard to these two Books; nevertheless it is certain, whatever the sagacious and polite Author of the voyage thro' this new world may please to say, that the party was engaged with Father Mallebranche before *l'Esprit de Mr. Arnaud*, and the observations of Father le Tellier made their appearance (73). I must not here dissemble, that the reasons Mr. Arnaud gave for his silence have satisfied some persons, but have been far from giving content to all Readers. I have before set down (74) a passage relating to these reasons (75), to which I will add this other: "And as for Mr. Jurieu, he "has made himself so remarkable all over Europe "for his calumnies and slander, that he is no longer "capable of doing any harm to those whom he takes "in hand. I know that two different persons, both "Protestants, wrote about him to Mr. Arnaud as of "a man who had lost his credit even amongst them "of his own party, and one whose extravagances "they were ashamed of; and that they offered to "send

(69) *Hist. des Ouvrages Savans*, August 1689; pag. 541. Sept. 1689. pag. 34.

(70) Papebroch, *Elucid. Histor. Actor. in Controversiâ Carmelitanâ*, pag. 135.

(71) Printed at Cologn for Vand Buning at the Palm-branch, 1698; it contains 50 pages in 12°.

* *Confutation of a book writ en by F. Annat, &c.* pag. 5.

(72) Pag. 85, & *seq.*

(6) N. 20.

(7) N. 31.

(8) *Apologie pour Mr. Jansenius*, printed in 1644, pag. 25, 26.

(9) Matth. xviii. 17.

(10) French edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

(73) See the *Difficulties proposed to Mr. Steyaert*, Part 6. pag. 59, & *seq.*

(74) Above, citation (53).

(75) In page 237 of tome 3 of the *Morale Pratique*. See also p. 361.

out that he made uſe of ſpectacles, and that he had an unfaithful ſervant [Q]. The principal Books that he wrote after his departure from France concern Father Mallebranche's Syſtem of nature and grace, the philoſophical ſin, the moral practice of the Jeſuits, and ſome propoſitions of Mr. Steyaert. He vigorouſly oppoſed Father Simon in this laſt Book, both with regard to the New Teſtament of Mons, and concerning the Inſpiration of the ſacred Authors, and the Tranſlations of the Scripture into the vulgar tongue [R], and in favour of the atteſtations of the Greeks [S], &c.

He died in the night betwixt the 8th and 9th of Auguſt 1694, aged eighty two years, ſix months and two days. He received from heaven in that very advanced age two remarkable and very rare favours; for the diſeaſe of which he died laſted but about a week, and did not prevent him from ſaying Maſs or hearing it, *and reciting his Breviary very near the uſual hours* (*l*). His laſt agony was eaſy, quiet and ſhort. He had on the other hand as great ſtrength of genius, memory, and command of his pen, in the laſt year of his life, as when he was but forty or fifty years old. Theſe are two bleſſings

(*l*) *Hiſtoire abrégée de Monſ. Arnaud*, p. 279.

" ſend him ſome memoirs which ſhould expoſe him " in his proper colours: but it is no wonder that Mr. " Arnaud did not take them at their word, nor " thought it worth while to write againſt a man, who " only excelled in ſcandal and obloquy (76)." He preſently after produced ſome facts which he pretends were nothing elſe than notorious pieces of ſlander publiſhed by that Miniſter. As for the reaſons which he gives for not anſwering Father le Tellier (77), they have given ſatisfaction to very few people.

(76) *Diſſertation on the pretended Happineſs of the Pleaſures of the Senſes*, p. 12.

(77) *Morale Pratique*, tom. 3. pag. 266, 267.

[Q] *They have given out that he made uſe of ſpectacles, and that he had an unfaithful ſervant.*] The pieces which were publiſhed on the intercourſe of Letters betwixt a ſpurious Arnaud and a Profeſſor of Doway, contain ſome things which might not be thought improper to be inſerted in this work; however I ſhall content myſelf with giving the reader Mr. Arnaud's confutation of a report which was raiſed of him, how that he complained that this ſervant had robbed him, and that by reaſon of his great age he met with great difficulty in reading a ſmall print. *How*, ſays he (78), *could I complain of my ſervant's robbing me and being falſe to me, who never had any but what were very faithful; and who have not kept one theſe twelve years, ſince my leaving Paris?* In a note on the Letter of Mr. de Ligni it is ſaid, *that Mr. Arnaud never made uſe of ſpectacles, and that he is able to read the ſmalleſt character as well as the largeſt* (79). Here are two little particularities, which might deſerve to be communicated to ſuch as are very curious in the Hiſtory of famous Men. As for the intrigue of the fictitious Arnaud, it is one of the moſt ingenious Comedies that ever was acted, and has met with ſucceſs equal to the greateſt expectation of its Authors. There cannot perhaps be given one example of an Academy's loſing more of its Profeſſors in ſo ſhort a time by any ſickneſs or mortality, than the Univerſity of Doway did by this affair, or of the ranks of an army being more thinned after a diſbanding; one can ſcarce help here calling to mind thoſe words of the Pſalmiſt, *& renovabis faciem terræ*, i. e. " and thou ſhalt renew the face of the earth.

(78) *Firſt Complaint*, p. 9.

(79) Imperialis relates, *that Francis Piccolomini, who lived to the age of* 84, *never made uſe of ſpectacles.* And the *Valeſiana*, p. 3. tells us, that *Hadrian Valeſius, when upwards of* 80 *years of age, could both read and write the ſmalleſt characters without the help of ſpectacles.*

[R] *He vigorouſly oppoſed Father Simon, concerning the inſpiration of ſacred Authors, and the tranſlations of the Scripture . . . .*] We have ſeen before, under the article of Father Adam (80), two propoſitions of the Jeſuits cenſured by the Faculties of Divinity at Louvain and Doway; theſe were propoſitions which ſeemed to limit or however modify the inſpiration of the Scripture. Monſr. Simon undertook to write againſt the Cenſurers (81), and was himſelf confuted by Mr. Arnaud from page 113 to page 236 of the 6th Part of the Difficulties propoſed to Mr. Steyaert: you will find his defence of himſelf in his New Obſervations on the Text and Verſions of the New Teſtament (82), from page 33 to page 91. An exact compariſon of the reaſons of one with thoſe of the other will afford us ample matter of inſtruction. Every body knows that Mr. Arnaud maintained the uſefulneſs of the Scripture Verſions with the greateſt learning and moſt ſolid reaſoning of all the Catholick Writers. What he hath ſaid with regard to matter of right on this ſubject is admirable, and what he has advanced with regard to matter of fact, in order to prove that it never was the intention of the Church, that the Laity ſhould be debarred from reading the Word of God in the Vulgar Tongue, is excellent and curious; tho' if on the other hand we carefully peruſe the anſwers of Mr. Simon (83), we ſhall be at a loſs what to think was the intention of the Church concerning this matter. The ſentiments of Doctors, the opinions of Univerſities, the Mandates of Prelates, and in ſhort publick Records produced on both ſides, form ſuch a ſtrange variety of contradictions, but more eſpecially when we examine into the particular motives and principles of thoſe who are for, and thoſe who are againſt, the publick uſe of tranſlations, that one can't help concluding from the whole, that the Church both allows and denies the people the liberty of reading the Holy Scripture; and perhaps there is no fact more reſolvable into the doctrine of Hiſtorical Pyrrhoniſm than this queſtion; *Whether the Church has condemn'd or approved of the reading of the Scripture by the Laity in the Vulgar Tongue?* What great pity is it that they can come to no certain reſolutions on a queſtion of this importance, neither on the negative nor affirmative ſide! Might one not reaſonably expect that a body, which boaſts of infallibility, ſhould be more unanimous in its proceedings? Mr. Arnaud's great learning and eloquence muſt inevitably have brought over moſt of his readers to look upon the numberleſs reproaches which have been caſt upon the Church for excluding the Laity from reading the Word of God as a ſcandalous aſperſion; I ſay he muſt certainly have gained upon his readers to be of this opinion, if Mr. Simon had not oppoſed his reaſons, and thereby put a ſtop to the ſucceſs of his Rhetorick. We ſee here how in the very ſame communion one Doctor pulls down what another builds up, and leaves the common enemy to profit by their quarrel, and to cry out,

Sæpe præmente Deo fert Deus alter opem.

(80) A little before citation (9).

(81) See chapters 23, 24 of his *Critical Hiſtory of the New Teſtament.*

(82) Printed at Paris in 1695, in 4to.

(83) In the *New Obſervations on the Text and Verſions of the New Teſtament*, from page 465 to page 584.

[S] . . . *Is in favour of the atteſtations of the Greeks.*] I have ſaid already (84), that the Proteſtants deſpiſed them, as things which might eaſily be obtained of that venal Nation. [*Emendicatis undique per Legatos Regios, Conſules, Miſſionarios, Græculorum hac de re Teſtimoniis, à quibus nihil non pretio extorqueas* (85). i. e. " Having begged every where by their Ambaſſadors, Conſuls, and Miſſionaries, the Teſtimonies " of the Greeks concerning this matter, from whom " you may get any thing for money." " Mr. Ar- " naud produced ſeveral atteſtations of the Greek Fa- " thers, to ſhew that they were in that caſe in the " Hypotheſis of the Roman Catholicks; but it is alſo " true, that he obtained the greateſt part of them by " money. Sir George Wheeler ſays in his Voyages " to Greece, that he had talked with ſeveral Papa's, " whom Mr. de Nointel, the nephew of Mr. Arnaud, " had endeavoured to corrupt in that manner (86)." Here are two teſtimonies of the fact which I have advanced. Note that Mr. de Nointel is not the nephew of Mr. Arnaud. The Writer evidently called him ſo, becauſe he had read in Mr. Claude's Anſwer (87, that Mr. de Pompone, nephew of Mr. Arnaud, and Ambaſſador at that time in Sweden, had procured him ſome of the materials] (88). However that be, Monſr. Simon has maintained that there are even ſome Catholicks, who *do not put the utmoſt confidence in that great number of atteſtations* (89); and tells us the grounds of their doubts. Monſr. Arnaud examines it all with great heat, and gives a ſummary account of what he had anſwered to Monſr. Spainheim in the Apology for the Catholicks (90).

(84) In the note [O], num. I. immediately after the citation (56).

(85) Spanhem. *Strictur. in Expoſitionem Epiſcopi Condom.*

(86) *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*, tom. 11. pag. 445.

(87) Claude, *Réponſe à la Perpetuité défendue*, Liv. 4. ch. 3, p. 597.

(88) Note that what is here between two crotchets was in the margin of the note [M], citation (*a*), in the firſt edition. It is in this note [O] citation (56).

(89) In his *Hiſtoire Critique de la Creance du Levant.*

(90) *Difficult. propoſées à Mr. Steyaert*, Part 6. pag. 275, & ſeq.

sings which befal few men of letters. He wrote a few months before his death four *Letters againſt Father Mallebranche* (*m*), and one Letter to Mr. Du Bois, his old friend, full of *Reflections on the eloquence of Preachers* (*n*). The publick has ſeen theſe laſt works, and has not perceived any diminution of ſpirit therein. Mr. Du Bois did not live long after his reception into the French Academy nor after the reading of the Reflections [ε]; where he might have learnt, that he underſtood nothing of the doctrine of St. Auſtin touching the eloquence of the Pulpit (*o*). I don't know whether the publick will ever ſee what Monſr. Arnaud wrote about the ſame time in favour of Mr. Deſpreaux [*T*]; but I make no doubt that that Letter was an admirable one. There is another happineſs to be conſidered in his life, and which ſurpaſſes what I have pointed out; namely that he was always exact in the practice of thoſe exerciſes of piety which his ſacerdotal function required of him; and what is ſtill more difficult, that even in his youth he kept himſelf from ſenſual pleaſures, and that the purity of his manners never failed (*p*). It has never been obſerved that his adverſaries have thrown any imputations upon him on that ſcore, whereas with regard to orthodoxy they have endeavoured to defame him to the utmoſt. If the reading of wicked books produced in the minds of young people the ſame effects as in him, it would not be amiſs to recommend them [*V*]. The profeſſions which he made of his attachment to the true faith, and of his zeal for God, appeared in divers paſſages of his books, and above all in his *Spiritual Will* [*X*], which he made the 16th of September 1679, wherein he calls God to bear witneſs of the diſpoſitions, with which he engaged in the compoſing ſuch and ſuch books. His value was at

(*m*) See the *Journal des Savans*, of the 28th of June 1694, and the following ones.

(*n*) *Hiſtoire abrégée de Mr. Arnaud*, p. 294.

(*o*) What he has ſaid upon that head is in the Preface of his French tranſlation of ſome Sermons of St. Auſtin. See the *Journal des Savans* of the 7th of June 1694.

(*p*) *Præfat. Cauſæ Arnald.* p. ix. See alſo the *l'Hiſtoire abrégée of his Life*, p. 26.

[ε] *Mr. Du Bois did not live long after . . . . . reading his Reflections.*] He did not read them, for he died before Mr. Arnaud's Manuſcript was brought to Paris (2). CRIT. REM.]

[*T*] *I don't know whether the Publick will ever ſee what Monſr. Arnaud wrote —— in favour of Monſr. Deſpreaux* *.] The Criticiſm upon the 10th Satyr of Monſr. Deſpreaux (91), having fallen into the hands of Monſ. Arnaud [ζ] occaſioned him to think of writing *a Diſſertation in form of a Letter, wherein he undertook the defence of that Satyr with ſuch force of genius and ſtyle as never failed him: the Partizans of the ancients boaſted of it, and that produced thoſe fine verſes of Mr. Deſpreaux to Mr. Arnaud, wherein he prefers to all his advantages, even to his being the King's Hiſtorian, the Apology which this Doctor had made for his Satyr. The rigid Janſeniſts, or Rigoriſts, were not ſatisfied with this laſt piece of Mr. Arnaud. A Doctor that is grown old in grave and ſerious diſputes to talk at above eighty years of age about Verſes and Women and Romances! How inconſiſtent a conduct was it! The party fretted at it, and whiſpered one another that the great man was declined. Poetry, according to their diſcourſe, was a trifling art, which ought not to give a moment's interruption to ſo great a genius. This came to the ears of Monſr. Deſpreaux, and he thereupon ſet about his Poem* On the Love of God, *to ſhew that Poetry might handle the moſt ſublime ſubjects.* Theſe particulars have been communicated to me by a man of very great wit and learning (92), intimately acquainted with Monſr. Deſpreaux. Let us here ſet down a paſſage of the 10th Epiſtle (verſ. 115 *&* *ſeq.*) of this great Poet, where he addreſſes himſelf to his verſes,

Mais des heureux regards de mon Aſtre étonnant
Marquez bien cet effet encor plus ſurprenant,
Qui dans mon ſouvenir aura toujours ſa place:
Que de tant d'Ecrivains de l'Ecôle d'Ignace
Etant, comme je ſuis, ami ſi déclaré,
Ce Docteur toutefois ſi craint, ſi révéré,
Qui contre Eux de ſa plume épuiſa l'énergie,
Arnaud, le grand Arnaud, fit mon Apologie *.
Sur mon tombeau futur, mes Vers, pour l'enoncer (93).
Courez en Lettres d'Or de ce pas vous placer.
Allez juſqu'on l'Aurore en naiſſant void l'Hydaſpe,
Chercher, pour l'y graver, le plus précieux jaſpe.
Sur tout à mes Rivaux ſachez bien l'étaler.

That is,

" But moſt, my Verſe, the wond'ring world ſurprize.
" With this kind influence of my friendly ſkies,
" (Which ever ſhall in my remembrance live,
" And grateful praiſe, I'll where I owe it give,)
" Say, tho' I've liſted in my friendly roll,
" So many Writers of Ignatius' School,
" That learned Arnaud ſo eſteem'd and fear'd,
" By ev'ry good impartial man rever'd;
" Who, his whole ſcience and reſiſtleſs ſenſe
" Againſt them bent, appear'd in my defence.
" He juſtify'd my works, for me he drew
" His pen, and ſet my innocence in view.
" This on my future tomb, my Verſe, proclaim
" And mine confirm by his immortal fame.
" There place your ſelves in characters of gold,
" Fly farther than young Ammon flew of old,
" The richeſt Jaſper ſeek, and on the ſtone,
" Grave my high fate, and make his goodneſs
" known.

[*V*] *If the reading of wicked books produced in the minds of young people the ſame effects as in him, it would not be amiſs to recommend them.*] This is what himſelf tells us. " I remember to have read heretofore,
" when I was very young, in *les Muſes Raillées* (that
" was the title of the book, if I remember right)
" ſomething very wicked on this ſubject. There is
" a Poet who glories in having obtained what could
" not be aſked without a crime; and the reaſon
" which he gives for his bringing his ſcheme to bear
" is quite abominable. It was (ſays he) becauſe the
" perſon had too much ſenſe *to take thoſe old ſtories of*
" *honour, which are put into mens and womens heads,*
" *for any thing but inviſible Chimeras.* I am certain
" that what is in Italick was in theſe verſes. For
" I was ſo ſhocked, that it has ever ſince dwelt upon
" my mind. Therefore the Poet ſuppoſes that there
" was nothing but the conſideration of *honour*, which
" could prevent that woman from gratifying him;
" but that he overcame it by the force of his wit (94)."

[*X*] *He made a ſpiritual Will.*] I have a copy of it from the Liege edition, in 1696. There is a Preface to it, wherein the edition that was already publiſhed was diſowned.

(49) Arnaud, *Cinquiéme dénonciation du Peché Philoſophique*, pag. 57, 58.

[* Mr. Deſpreaux inſerted it in his edition of 1702. This piece has ſince appeared in all the editions which have followed that of 1702. *Add. de l'ed. d'Amſt.*]

(91) It is the *Satyr againſt Women.*

(92) Monſ. Marais, Advocate to the Parliament of Paris.

* Monſ. Arnaud has compoſed a *Diſſertation*, wherein he juſtifies me againſt my cenſurers; and it is his laſt work.

(93) It is thus in the edition which I make uſe of, which was publiſhed in ſome city of the United Provinces.

[ζ] *Having fallen into the hands of Mr. Arnaud, &c.*] This fact is not exactly related; for Mr. Perrault himſelf ſent his *Criticiſm* to Mr. Arnaud, and deſired his opinion of it; this was the occaſion of Mr. Arnaud's Letter. Let us obſerve here, that the marginal quotation to the eighth verſe of Boileau is not exact. It is ſaid there, that Mr. Arnaud's *Diſſertation . . . . . is his laſt work*; whereas Mr. Bayle ſhould have obſerved, that the Letter to Mr. Perrault is dated . . . May, 1694, and that the four Letters to Father Mallebranche, the laſt of which is dated July the 24th, were written after that to Mr. Perrault. Arnauld's reflections addreſſed to Mr. Du Bois is alſo poſterior to it (11). CRIT. REM. There are ſeveral other Remarks upon this article, but as they are either trifling, or relate only to the trite diſpute between the Jeſuits and the Janſeniſts, we thought proper to omit them; for it is very plain, that they were inſerted in the Edition publiſhed in France, only to ſerve as a paſs-port for it. In theſe Remarks, the Jeſuits are always in the right, and the Janſeniſts in the wrong. ADD. REM.]

(11) French edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

at length acknowledged at the Court of Rome [Y], and it depended only upon himſelf to be made a Cardinal. There is no need to ſay that he oppoſed with all his power a looſeneſs of morals, and that he was always a teacher and director of auſterity. It appears that he ſwerved a little from the right way, in the affair which gave room for a Factum of Monſr. Des Lyons [Z]. We may obſerve that the name of the place where he died is not known: It is thought that it was in a village of the country of Liege. The place where he was buried is ſtill leſs known; and that is one of the agreements, which his friends have obſerved to be betwixt his deſtiny and that of Moſes (q). He deſired that his heart might be carried to Port-Royal (r). His deſire was executed; but Monſr. Santeuil's verſes on that ſubject raiſed a furious paper war [AA], which gave a great deal of diverſion

(q) See the *Hiſtoire abrégée of his Life*, p. 303.

(r) Perrault, *Hommes illuſtres*, pag. 57.

[Y] *His merit was at length acknowledged at the Court of Rome.*] Pope Clement X, having read ſome of Mr. Arnaud's works, commended them extremely, and declared that the Author would do him a great deal of pleaſure, if he would ſend him a copy of them, or would give one to his Nuncio (95). The Cardinal Altieri, who had occaſioned the Pope to ſee theſe Letters, could not ſufficiently commend them, and twenty times finiſhed his praiſes with this honourable teſtimony: "Monſr. Arnaud has done the "Church the higheſt ſervices. It were to be wiſhed "that death would never deprive it of ſo great a "man." *De Eccleſiâ optimè meritus eſt Arnaldus: optandum eſſet ut talem ac tantum virum mors illi nunquam ereptura eſſet* (96). The eſteem and affection of Innocent XI for this Doctor have been made known to the publick. See the Letter which he cauſed Cardinal Cibo to write to him, Jan. 2, 1677: it follows the Letter which Monſr. Arnaud wrote to the Biſhop of Malaga, the 2d of December, 1688. There is a Letter from Mr. Favoriti, this Pope's Secretary, dated from Rome the 3d of April, 1680, in which are high compliments, and ſtrong tokens of the concern which this Pope had for the perſecution which Monſr. Arnaud ſuffered (97). He had a mind to raiſe him to the purple, and it was owing to none but the Doctor that it was not put in execution. *De Arnaldo in purpuratorum Procerum Ordinem adlegendo aliquando ſanctitatem ſuam cogitaſſe, etſi certum eſt & pluribus notum, nollem tamen hic commemorare, niſi Eminentiſſimus Cardinalis intimorum Romanæ Aulæ conſiliorum teſtis locuples, id nuper Pariſiis evulgaſſet, aſſeruitque per unum Arnaldum ſtetiſſe quo minus is eminentiſſimâ illâ dignitate ornaretur* (98). i. e. "Though it is certain "and well known that his Holineſs had once ſome "thoughts of raiſing Arnaud to the dignity of the "purple, yet I would not mention it here, had not "a moſt Eminent Cardinal, who is thoroughly in-"formed of the ſecret counſels of the Court of Rome "lately made it publick in Paris, and aſſerted that "it was only owing to Arnaud's ſelf that he was not "dignified with that high honour." Alexander VIII, who before he was Pope had had a great friendſhip and eſteem for Mr. Arnaud, did not change his diſpoſitions after he was raiſed to St. Peter's Chair. He granted him ſeveral favours, and would have granted him more had he lived longer, or if Mr. Arnaud had given him opportunities of doing ſo (99).

Note that the Biſhop of Malaga cauſed almoſt all the copies of the firſt edition of his *Querimonia Catholica* to be burnt as ſoon as he knew that the appellation of Heretick was given therein without his conſent to Mr. Arnaud. The perſon who burnt the copies with his own hand gave an atteſtation thereof in form (100).

[Z] *It appears that he ſwerved a little from the right way in the affair which gave room for a Factum of Mr. Des Lyons.*] A niece of Monſr. Des Lyons, Doctor of the Sorbonne, and Dean of Senlis, was artful enough to engage Monſr. Arnaud in ſuch proceedings as did him no credit. She pleaded againſt her father: He protected her in this cauſe to his utmoſt. That is not the duty of a rigid Caſuiſt. Beſides ſhe was a girl ſo whimſical in her devotions, and of ſuch an ill turn of mind, that Monſr. Arnaud did not ſhew any great diſcernment of ſpirits, when he ſuffered himſelf to be deceived by that hypocrite. Monſr. Jurieu, who had heard the *Factum* of Mr. Des Lyons talk'd of, had a vehement deſire to get a copy of it, and made ſeveral requeſts for it to a perſon who could have furniſhed him therewith. He chiefly made uſe of the interceſſion of the Bookſeller who had printed at the Hague, Anno 1685, his Juſtification of the Morals of the Reformed (101). That was a right way of proceeding. For if any body could have obtained it, that Bookſeller undoubtedly could: but he that had the *Factum* in his poſſeſſion would never part with it in favour of a Writer whom he knew to be diſpoſed to draw from it new matter for inſults and invectives. He knew that Author's way of poiſoning every thing, when he wanted to pull Mr. Arnaud to pieces. But take notice of this little piece of artifice. Monſr. Jurieu, having miſt his aim there, would have perſuaded the publick that he did not want to take hold of that advantage, and that he had been a perſon of ſo much moderation as voluntarily to forego it: *And even*, theſe are his words (102), *to let the publick ſee that we are not induſtrious in ſearching for what might render Monſr. Arnaud odious, we forbear to take notice of all that the Factum of Monſr. Des Lyons could have furniſhed us with againſt him.* There are a great many falſhoods in Prefaces, which paſs for venial ſins, not only at the Bar of the Republick of Letters, but likewiſe at the Bar of the Church. But this ought to be excluded from that privilege in both thoſe Tribunals. The Jeſuits have not let this Factum of Mr. Des Lyons drop: they have maliciouſly weighed all the circumſtances thereof and have drawn from it materials for a great many reflections and railleries. See a work which is thought to be done by Father le Tellier, and which appeared in the year 1688. Obſerve the title of it: *An Apologetick Letter for Monſr. Arnaud, written to an Abbot his friend, on the three laſt books which have been publiſhed againſt the Doctor:* I, *L'Eſprit de Mr. Arnaud:* II, *Obſervations on the new defence of the French Verſion of the New Teſtament printed at Mons:* III, *The Anſwer of Mr. Des Lyons, Doctor of the Sorbonne, Dean and Prebend of Senlis to Monſr. Arnaud's Letters.*

(95) *Præfatio Cauſæ Arnaldinæ*, pag. 59.

(96) Ibid. p. 60.

(97) Ibid.

(98) Ibid. p. 61.

(99) Ibid. pag. 61, 62.

(100) Ibid. p. 64.

(101) He is living. One may know of him, whether I tell the truth, I write this the 2d of Ap. 1699.

(102) Jurieu, *Preface de la Juſtification de la Morale des Reformez*, edition de la Haie, in 1685.

[AA] *Monſr. Santeuil's verſes on Mr. Arnaud's Heart raiſed a furious paper war.*] The Ladies of *Port-Royal des Champs* received Monſr. Arnaud's Heart *with all the tranſports imaginable, and depoſited it in the moſt honourable place they could. The Heart being placed, a queſtion aroſe about an Epitaph. It was thought that they could not apply themſelves to a perſon more proper for it than Mr. Santeuil. . . . . As it was a delicate affair, the Nuns thought they ought to take Mr. Santeuil at an advantage. For that reaſon they invited him to come and ſpend ſome days at Port-Royal with one of his brethren, who was the Superior thereof* (103); *and, during the ſtay he made there, he compoſed the following verſes:*

Ad ſanctas rediit ſedes ejectus & exul
Hoſte triumphato, tot tempeſtatibus actus
Hoc portu in placido, hac ſacra tellure quieſcit
Arnaldus, veri defenſor, & arbiter æqui.
Illius oſſa memor ſibi vindicet extera tellus;
Huc cæleſtis amor rapidis cor tranſtulit alis,
Cor nunquam avulſum, nec amatis ſedibus abſens (104).

(103) *Hiſtoire des Troubles cauſez par Monſ. Arnauld apres ſa Mort, ou le Démeſlé de Mr. Santeuil avec les Jeſuites*, pag. 5. edit. de 1696.

(104) Ibid. pag. 40.

Mr. de la Fémas has tranſlated them into French to this effect:

Enfin, après un long voyage,
Arnauld *revient en ces ſaints lieux:*
Il eſt au Port *malgré les envieux,*
Qui croioient qu'il ſeroit naufrage.
Ce Martir de la vérité
Fut banni, fut perſécuté,
Et mourut en terre étrangere.

Heureuſe,

verſion to ſeveral people. The Jeſuits were much complained of becauſe they carried their point ſo far as to oblige Mr. Perrault to ſuppreſs the ſheet which he had deſtined to Mr. Arnaud in his Collection of the Portraits and Elogies of the illuſtrious men of the French

Heureuſe, de ſon corps d'être dépoſitaire !
Mais ſon cœur toujours ferme, & toujours innocent,
Fut porté par l'amour, à qui tout eſt poſſible,
Dans cette retraite paiſible,
D'où jamais il ne fut abſent (105).

(105) Ibid. pag. 41.

That is,

" Here Arnaud exil'd for the cauſe of truth,
" Tho' long by tempeſts toſt, in port arriv'd,
" Triumphs, and ſcorns the malice of his foes.
" What tho' a foreign land his bones contains,
" His heart on wings of heav'nly love is flown
" To thoſe lov'd manſions which it ne'er forſook."

As ſoon as theſe two pieces, which were printed together, had been publiſhed, the Jeſuits *reproached Monſr. Santeuil for his proceedings. . . . . He took no notice of them, flattering himſelf that all the murmurs which were then raiſed would fall of themſelves inſenſibly* (106). But when he ſaw *a piece that was ſent from the country levelled at him* (107), ... *he took ſteps towards making ſatisfaction.* " He was as it were thunder-ſtruck " with it, and ran directly to the College of the Je- " ſuits, deſiring mercy, with the moſt humble and " moving terms in the world; entreating all that he " met not to ruin him; that he had been always a " friend to their Society; and that the Epitaph in " queſtion was none of his, but that it had been " laid upon him by his enemies, to make a dif- " ference betwixt him and the Jeſuits. He was told " that it were to be wiſhed, that what he advanced was " true; but that that ſimple diſowning of it was not " ſufficient, and that he ought to diſabuſe the pub- " lick by ſuch an authentick denial of it as might " be demanded for a proof of his ſincerity. He " promiſed all that was aſked of him; but how to " make good his promiſe was the difficulty (108)." The flattery and *compliments which he made to their Society* ſignified nothing (109). They were aware " of " the artifice which he made uſe of, to get out of the " difficulty: they treated him as a double-minded " man and a perſon of no ſincerity; he found him- " ſelf in an inſtant overwhelmed with Epigrams, " which came pouring upon him from all ſides, and " in which the young Jeſuits of the College, whom " he in one place calls *Pubes Jeſuitica ſagittaria*, " bore a great ſhare. The Janſeniſts, on their part, " were not leſs ſhocked at his cowardice, than the " Jeſuits were at his double-dealing, and they gave " him ſigns of it by a piece of Burleſque Verſe which " they pointed againſt him, and which begins with

(106) Idem, pag. 7.

(107) Intitled, *Santollus Vindicatus.*

(108) *Hiſtoire des Troubles cauſez par Monſ. Arnauld apres ſa Mort*, pag. 9.

(109) Ibid p. 10.

" *Santeuil, ce renommé Poëte.*

" Thus he found himſelf wide of his mark, and ſaw " that by attempting to manage every body he had " pleaſed no body." Every thing being well weighed, he reſolved to ſacrifice the Janſeniſts to the Jeſuits: he made to them by letter an humble confeſſion of his fault; but that did not ſatisfie them, they would have a publick recantation (110). He ſaw himſelf preſſed on that head *every day by Epigrams upon Epigrams, which he received continually, and which would not let him reſt* (111). He wrote a letter to Father la Chaiſe, where he put the beſt interpretation he could upon ſome terms of the Epitaph. The anſwer that he received from that Jeſuit, augmented his inquietude (112); he was obliged to think of a ſecond Apology. *The moſt delicate paſſage, and upon which lay the whole difficulty, was this where he ſays of Mr. Arnaud,*

(110) Ibid. pag. 11.

(111) Idem, ibid. pag. 14.

(112) Idem, ibid. pag. 17.

Ictus illo fulmine (Vaticano)
Trabeate Doctor, jam mihi non amplius
Arnalde ſaperes.

That is to ſay,

" If you had been ſmitten by the Thunder of the " Vatican, I would have renounced you abſolutely."

But that was ſaying nothing. The Jeſuits would have him make it ſapies, *inſtead of* ſaperes. *(For all this ſtir was about the proof ſheet, before the Copies were ſtruck off.) To make it* ſapies, *was declaring Mr. Arnaud excommunicated and damned. One of his friends, with whom he adviſed about it, made a propoſal to him to find a mean betwixt* ſaperes *and* ſapies: *that was to make it* ſapias, *which might equally favour the two different ſenſes of the other two words: but he was aware that he could not give up* ſaperes *without offending the Janſeniſts. At length after much deliberation, he reſolved upon a method of ſerving each party almoſt ſuitably to their own taſte. Therefore he cauſed two ſorts of Copies to be worked off: the one where he had* ſapias *for the Jeſuits, telling them vivâ voce that he took it in the ſame ſenſe with* ſapies; *and the other, where he left it* ſaperes, *to make his Court to the Janſeniſts* (113). To this, he added an interpretation of ſome other paſſages of the Epitaph. He neither ſatisfied the Jeſuits nor the Janſeniſts. The latter levelled at him a very ſmart piece (114): the others did not puſh him with leſs vigour. Father Commire entred the liſts. He *had kept himſelf out of the fight as a* Corps de reſerve; " but at length he " appeared in the field of battle; and to put an end " to a diſpute that was in no likelihood of being fi- " niſhed, and to prevent Mr. Santeuil from ſo often " ſaying and unſaying things, he fell upon him, and " put ſuch a gag in his mouth, as gave him a great " deal of trouble ever afterwards. I am ſpeaking of " the *Linguarium*, which all the learned attribute to " that great Poet (115)." A Poet of the Univerſity, and not at all in the intereſt of the Jeſuiſts, made one amongſt the Combatants, and publiſhed a Piece, intitled *Santolius pendens*, that is, *Santeuil upon the Gallows.* This is one of the beſt that appeared during this long Poetick war. There have appeared, I think, three accounts of this controverſy. The firſt I have never ſeen: that which I have quoted is the ſecond; the third was in the year 1697, after Mr. Santeuil's death. it contains the letters which were written to that Poet by divers Jeſuits, and does not agree with the ſecond in ſome circumſtances.

(113) *Hiſtoire des Troubles cauſez par Monſ. Arnauld apres ſa Mort*, pag. 20.

(114) Intitled *Santolius pœnitens.* See *l'Hiſtoire des Troubles, &c.* p. 20.

(115) Idem, p. 33.

It is certain that this diſpute made a great noiſe, and it is for that reaſon that the Author of the account of it, thought himſelf obliged to make uſe of this preamble (116). " It is the fate of thoſe who " have cauſed great diſturbances in their life time, " to be the occaſion of ſtill more after their death. " That of Alexander the Great did not extinguiſh " the war in Aſia. On the contrary it made it blaze " out with the greater fury, through the ambition of " his Captains, who for a long time diſputed the crown " amongſt themſelves. Something like this happened " to Monſieur Arnaud, if it be lawful to compare a " Doctor to a Conqueror. His death, which one " would have thought ſhould have put an end to " all the troubles, which he had occaſioned in his life " time, has inſtead thereof created new ones. Every " body knows in how unworthy a manner the Janſe- " niſts have inveighed againſt a holy Abbot (117), " for having expreſſed himſelf too freely on this oc- " caſion, in ſaying, upon the ſubject of the great " head of the party being juſt now fallen in the per- " ſon of Monſr. Arnaud, *Happy are they that are en- " gaged in none but that of* Jeſus Chriſt. This is what " the firſt news of Monſr. Arnaud's death produced. " But his heart being afterwards carried into France, " it could not enter therein without ſowing there freſh " ſeeds of diſſention, by the ſquabble which it occaſi- " oned betwixt Mr. Santeuil and the Jeſuits." A great many people will call to mind here a complaint of Balzac againſt the Epitaph of Father Goulu (118). But if on the one hand the Jeſuits could ſay, that the very monument of Mr. Arnaud inſulted them, the Janſeniſts had reaſon to cry out on the other hand, that this Divine was not ſuffered to lie quiet even in his Grave:

(116) Idem, p. 3 and 4.

(117) That is to ſay, the Abbot de la Trappe.

(118) See the note [*M*] of the article of P. GOULU General of the Feuillans.

Et ce n'eſt pas aſſez de paier en la vie,
Il faut encor paier au dela du trepas (119).

(119) Theſe are two verſes of the Opera that was acted in 1674: I think it was called, *Le Triomphe d'Alceſte.*

That is,

" Tis not enough to plague him whilſt he lives;
" His troubles muſt extend beyond the grave.

French Nation [*BB*]. I will not omit to mention the eſteem which this Doctor of the Sorbonne merited from Mr. Des Cartes [*CC*]. I have been told by perſons, who had been admitted into his familiar converſation, that he was a man very ſimple in his manners, and that unleſs any one propoſed ſome queſtion to him, or deſired ſome information of him, he

[*BB*] *Mr. Perrault was obliged to ſuppreſs the ſheet which he had deſtined to Mr. Arnaud in his .... illuſtrious men of the French nation.*] Here follows an extract of a letter which was publiſhed in 1697. "Monſr. "Perrault of the Academy, publiſhed *the Elogiums of* "*the Illuſtrious Men* of this Kingdom. Mr. Arnaud "and Mr. Paſcal had juſtly a place there. Baptiſt "and Moliere are there in their proper place as be"ing illuſtrious in their way. The Book was printed "by permiſſion, the Pourtraits engraved. It ought "to have appeared four months ſooner; but the Jeſuits "made ſuch a ſtir amongſt the great people, that "they procured an order to be ſent to the Author "and Bookſeller to ſtrike out Monſ. Arnaud and Paſ"cal, and to ſuppreſs their Elogiums. Monſ. Ar"naud was one of the greateſt men of this age. He "had done ſervice to the Church, by oppoſing Cal"viniſm, and by defending the faith of the Euchariſt. "He lived and died in the Communion of the Church, "and in perfect obedience to the Holy See, which "would have aſſuredly rewarded his great merit, if "the profound humility of this learned perſonage had "not occaſioned him more than once to refuſe the "higheſt dignities of the Church. Moliere lived a "wicked life, and died like a reprobate, and excommu"nicate. Nevertheleſs Monſ. Arnaud is eraſed out "of the number of Illuſtrious Men, and Moliere is "retained there (120)." Theſe kinds of reflections were made all over France, and in other countries; nor was the ſaying of Tacitus forgot, on occaſion that the images of Caſſius and Brutus did not appear at the funeral of Junia. *Præfulgebant Caſſius atque Brutus eo ipſo quod effigies eorum non viſebantur* (121). i. e. "Caſſius and Brutus ſhone ſo much the brighter, be"cauſe their effigies were not ſeen." This thought was applied to Meſſieurs Arnaud and Paſchal: the Verſes that have been made thereupon have run all the world over, for they have been inſerted in the *Nouvelles Hiſtoriques & Politiques* which are publiſhed monthly at the Hague. To this may be added, that a great many people thought that the Jeſuits did not act with any kind of prudence in this affair, inaſmuch as the moſt effectual method of drawing the eyes and attention of the publick upon theſe two illuſtrious perſons, was to procure Mr. Perrault to be obliged to ſuppreſs their Elogiums and Portrait. Such a proceeding could only ſerve to render more conſpicuous that merit, which it was intended to obliterate: it led directly to the paſſage of Tacitus; and that could not but be a quick ground for exclamations, and for paſſing judgments in favour of the two perſons ſuppreſſed, and againſt the inſtrumens of their ſuppreſſion. But all the world does not give point blank into this imaginary notion of imprudence. Several perſons well verſed in theſe kinds of affairs, have maintained that the party that was adverſe to Mr. Arnaud, did nothing but what favours of the fineſt and moſt ſure policy. Do you think, ſay they, that Tiberius did not foreſee the reflections that would be made on account, that the effigies of Caſſius and Brutus were not ſeen amongſt ſo many others in a funeral pomp? He knew well enough what would be the conſequence of this abſence: but he found a much greater inconveniency, in ſuffering thoſe two aſſaſſins of Julius Cæſar to appear amongſt the images of their kindred. That would have been in ſome ſort to reſtore their memory; and it was for his intereſt not to take any ſtep that had the leaſt tendency in the world thereto. The Jeſuits likewiſe undoubtedly foreſaw very plainly the conſequence of the ſuppreſſion, which Mr. Perrault made; but all things well conſidered, they thought like wiſe men, that this would be a much leſs diſadvantage than to give room for the other faction, to value themſelves upon Mr. Arnaud and Mr. Paſcal's having places by authority in the Theatre of illuſtrious men. By cauſing them to be retrench'd, a new point was gained, that might be of ſervice in the proceſs; they were continued under the brand of infamy; nobody could alledge the licence obtained by Mr. Perrault as a mark of their being reſtored to favour: and what is a thing of conſiderable importance, the publick was prevented from thinking that they had leſs credit now than heretofore. It is not eaſy to believe that the publick will imagine, that if the Portraits and Elogiums of theſe two Gentlemen, have full liberty to make their appearance in an authoriſed work, that it is becauſe the Jeſuits had no inclination to prevent it: it is more natural to believe that it will be given out, that they want the power to hinder it. But that is a terrible judgment to be paſſed; the reſult of it might be of conſequence: therefore it muſt be prevented: for the influences of a reputation are of the utmoſt efficacy, whether it be to forward or retard events. Who does not know that in affairs of commerce, a Merchant, who is thought to be rich and is not ſo, carries on his affairs better than a Merchant, who ſhould be rich and was thought to be poor? Other conditions of life are like this, as to that point. If it be imprudent to engage ones ſelf in certain things, it is much more ſo, to give them up after having engaged in them. Honour and glory lie at ſtake, and that is ſaying every thing. This principle is not of leſs conſequence in the wars of the long robe, than in the wars properly ſo called (122). In ſhort, all the world knows, that in a debate of great importance, one ſide prepare themſelves againſt all the ſteps that are likely to favour the other. Policy therefore adviſes not tacitly to acquieſce in the proceedings of the Janſeniſts. It is neceſſary to uſe precaution both againſt the Epitaphs, and againſt the Authors of the Elogium, and to multiply the Papers, in order the better to maintain the grand proceſs, and to diſcuſs the problem or *Curious Queſtion whether Mr. Arnaud be an Heretick?* A ſtrange queſtion, and upon which ſome Roman Catholics take the affirmative ſide, and others the negative every day with impunity. This ſhews that there is in mankind a ſource of Anarchy which cannot be ſtopped up. It chiefly finds its vents in the eccleſiaſtical bodies; for ſince the Church of Rome has not got the ſecret how to fix the liberty of ſaying yes and no with regard to the ſame things, what other Church can do it? Other Churches have not, as that has, Tribunals that are acknowledged to be infallible. They do not govern with ſuch airs of authority and magnificence as it does. One ought therefore to be leſs ſurprized that the Proteſtant Miniſters accuſe one another of Hereſy in their printed Books, than to ſee a great Doctor of the Sorbonne pulled to pieces as an Heretick by the faction of the Moliniſts, at the ſame time that three Popes honour him with their friendſhip, their eſteem, and commendations, and that the moſt illuſtrious Prelates put their ſolemn approbations at the head of his works. This diſpute has laſted near ſixty years (123), and any one is ſtill at his liberty either to affirm or deny. The diviſions of Miniſters do not laſt ſo long; they commonly make up the difference after the third or fourth Libel, and are aſſured of the reputation of Orthodoxy, which they endeavoured to take from one another. But even this does not prevent our obſerving a little, that Anarchy and State of nature, where the perſon who attacks has ſcarcely any thing elſe to fear but the reſiſtance of the perſon attacked, and not the chaſtiſements of a common judge. Bodies Politick are not ſubject to ſuch diſorder. It is not left there to any one's liberty to call others either knaves or honeſt men; thieves, traitors, murderers, proſtitutes, or perſons of good life (124). There the condition and quality of a reputation is a little better ſettled. The ſuppreſſion that was enjoined Perrault, did not prevent thoſe copies of his Book which were publiſhed in Holland, from containing the Elogiums of Mr. Arnaud and Paſcal. It only occaſioned a little diſorder in the figures of the Pages. The Dutch Edition has put thoſe things in order again.

[*CC*] *Mr. Arnaud merited the eſteem of Mr. Des Cartes.*] He was the Author of the fourth ſet of objections againſt that Philoſopher's meditations, and every body was of opinion that thoſe are the moſt ſolid that have been propoſed againſt that work. Mr. Des Cartes paſſed that judgment of them: ſee his Hiſtory, compoſed by Mr. Baillet (125). It is obſervable that Monſ. Arnaud had taught in Paris *the ſame Philoſophy with* that

(120) *Lettre d'une Dame de Qualite a une autre Dame Sçavante*, pag. 24, 25.

(121) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 3. *in fin.*

(122) *Marcellus multa magnis ducibus ſicut non aggredienda, ita ſemel aggreſſis non dimittenda eſſe dicendo, quia magna famæ momenta in utramque partem fierent, tenuit ne inceptо abiretur.* Tit. Livius, lib. 4. Decad 3.

(123) This was written in 1699.

(124) This is to be underſtood with regard to public accuſations.

(125) Baillet, *Vie de Des Cartes*, tom. 2. pag. 124 and the following. *See alſo* Perrault, *Hommes illuſtres*, pag. 57, 58.

he ſaid nothing that was beyond common converſation [*DD*], and which might make one take him for a man of great abilities; but when he ſet himſelf to give an anſwer to ſuch as propoſed a point of learning to him, he ſeemed as it were transformed into another man. He was heard to deliver a multitude of fine things with great perſpicuity and learning, and he was found to have a particular talent at making himſelf intelligible to perſons of not the greateſt penetration. I believe I ſhall inſert in ſome part of my work (*f*) a letter which it is thought the King wrote to him in 1678. They who were the cauſe of his taking a reſolution of going into a voluntary exile, loſt more by it than they gained; for he had written nothing againſt them in Paris: he had in that obſerved the conditions of peace; whereas when he ſaw himſelf out of the Kingdom, he publiſhed a great many writings which bore hard upon the Jeſuits (*t*). It is even pretended that he became the Apoſtle of Janſeniſm in Holland [*EE*].

(*f*) See the note [*A*] of the article YPRES.

(*t*) See the *Hiſtoire abrégée of his Life*, pag. 179.

(126) Idem, pag. 541. See alſo pag. 128.

(127) *Hiſtoire Abrégée de Monſ. Arnauld*, p. 35.

(128) Idem, pag. 31.

(129) *Hiſtoire abrégée de Monſ. Arnaud*, pag. 287, 288.

(130) Intitled *Memoire touchant le progrés du Janſeniſme en Hollande.*

(131) Pag. 8 and 9.

that of Mr. Des Cartes, before the latter had yet publiſhed the firſt Eſſays of his own (126). He is therefore as falſly called a Carteſian as a Janſeniſt. Read what follows: *He had drawn from their fountain* his ſentiments on Grace; *that is to ſay, from St. Auſtin, before Janſenius's Book had made its appearance.* He had *publickly maintained them in the preſence of the Biſhops, four or five years before that Prelate's Book was publiſhed* (127). He had embraced them without ſo much as knowing *that Janſenius was at work about Grace. . . . . He hardly knew that there was ſuch a perſon as Janſenius in the world* (128).

[*DD*] *He ſaid nothing that was beyond common converſation.*] This muſt be underſtood with ſome true reſtriction; for otherwiſe it cannot be reconciled with what we find in the account of his life, concerning the hours of converſation after his meals, in which *there was a great deal to be learnt by him, becauſe being a man of reflection, he was continually making ſuch as were very ſolid, whether it were upon human events, on the conduct of life, upon the rules of morality, or even on matters of Science, and publick affairs. Oftentimes the converſations were employed in reading new Books; and he always paſſed ſuch excellent judgments of them, that his judgment though rarely given with a deciſive air, was of itſelf deciſive and without appeal. His memory, on occaſion of things which occurred in reading, or that any body ſaid, always furniſhed him with ſomething beautiful that Authors had on that ſubject; and it was often matter of ſurprize to ſee him recite a great number of Verſes, either Latin or French, which he had only read in his youth, or a great many years before. He was intimately acquainted with the Latin Poets, and he applied the moſt beautiful paſſages in them with the utmoſt juſtneſs, and with great preſence of mind, according to the occaſions, which aroſe in converſation* (129). Let us ſay therefore that his diſcourſes were not plain and vulgar, except when he was with ſuch people as he had but ſmall acquaintance withal, and who did not by their queſtions put him upon diſplaying his knowledge.

[*EE*] *It is pretended that he became the Apoſtle of Janſeniſm in Holland.*] There appeared in 1698 a little Book (130), wherein we are aſſured (131), that Mr. Arnaud *after having wandred ſome time in the Catholic Low-Countries, at laſt came to take refuge in Holland. Mr. de Neerkaſſel, Biſhop of Caſtorie, and Apoſtolic Vicar in the United Provinces, received him as a man of God, and lodged him in his Nunnery of Delft, where Mr. Arnaud dwelt ſeveral years without being known by any except thoſe that were in his confidence. There he governed abſolutely the mind of the Prelate, and he had nothing more at heart than to refer to him all the young Divines in whom he found a genius, in order that he might inſtruct them. The moſt aſſiduous about him were Mr. de Codde, now Arch-biſhop of Sebaſte, and Succeſſor of the Biſhop of Caſtorie in the Apoſtolic Vicarſhip; Mr. Van Huyſſen; . . . It is therefore properly in the Nunnery of Delft, that the Janſeniſm of Holland had its riſe, about the year* 1689.

☞ ARNDT (JOHN), a famous Divine among the Proteſtants in Germany, who maintained ſome doctrines, which engaged him in a diſpute with thoſe of his own communion [*A*]; was born at Ballenſtad in the Duchy of Anhalt in the year 1555. After he had performed his firſt ſtudies, he applied himſelf to that of Phyſick; but falling into a dangerous ſickneſs, he made a ſolemn vow to change his profeſſion, and to turn his thoughts to Divinity, if he ſhould be reſtored to health; which reſolution he executed as ſoon as ever he recovered his health. He was ſucceſſively Miniſter in his own country, at Quedlinbourg, and Brunſwick. He met with great oppoſition in this laſt city. The ſucceſs of his preaching raiſed the envy of his brethren, who became his ſevereſt enemies,

[*A*] *Some doctrines, which engaged him in a diſpute with thoſe of his own Communion.*] He was of opinion, that the irregularity of manners too frequent among Proteſtants was occaſioned by their rejecting of good works, and contenting themſelves with a mere ſpeculative barren faith; as if it were ſufficient for ſalvation to believe in Jeſus Chriſt, and to apply his merits to ourſelves. He taught that the true Faith neceſſarily exerted itſelf in charity; that a real unaffected and ſalutary ſorrow preceded it, and that it was followed by a perfect renewal of the mind, and a diſengagement from all irregular and vitious habits and diſpoſitions; in ſhort, that a ſanctifying Faith infallibly produces good works. His adverſaries treated him with the greateſt ſeverity imaginable, and accuſed him of Fanaticiſm and Enthuſiaſm. They maliciouſly endeavoured to repreſent him as ſymbolizing in his opinions with the followers of Weigelius and the Roſicrucian Philoſophers, and they imputed to him a great many of the errors and abſurdities of thoſe Viſionaries; becauſe upon ſome ſubjects he expreſſed himſelf in a manner not very different from them, and becauſe he preferred the method of the myſtical Divines to that of the Scholaſtics, which had been done likewiſe by the Enthuſiaſts abovementioned. Our Author had been very conſtant in reading the Works of Thomas à Kempis, St. Bernard, and other devotional Writers, who recommend a ſpiritual life; and it is confeſſed, that he made ſome uſe of thoſe of Weigelius, ſince he has tranſcribed whole Chapters out of him into his own Writings. There were ſeveral conſiderable perſons, who eſpouſed his cauſe; but among his enemies Lucas Oſiander, a Divine of Tubing, diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the moſt particular manner. He publiſhed againſt our Author in the year 1624 a work intitled, *Judicium Theologorum*, i. e. "The Judgment of the Divines." Arndt wrote his *Treatiſe of true Chriſtianity* in High Dutch. The firſt Book of it was printed ſeparate in 1605 at Jena by Stegman. He publiſhed the three others in 1608. The firſt was called the Book *of Scripture*. The Author endeavours in it to ſhew the way of the inward or ſpiritual life, and that Adam ought to die every day more and more in the heart of a Chriſtian, and Chriſt to gain the aſcendant there. The title of the ſecond is *the Book of Life*. He propoſes in it to direct the Chriſtian to a greater degree of perfection, to give him a reliſh for ſufferings, and to encourage him to reſiſt his enemies after the example and by the virtue of his Saviour. The third is intitled, *the Book of Conſcience*. In this he recalls the Chriſtian within himſelf, and diſcovers to him the Kingdom of God ſeated in the midſt of his own heart. The laſt Book is intitled, *the Book*

enemies, merely upon this account, that his uncommon zeal in the execution of his function ſeemed to be a tacit condemnation of their indolence and indifference. In order to ruin his character, they aſcribed a variety of errors to him; and their ill uſage of him was carried ſo far, that he was obliged to leave Brunſwick and retire to Iſleb, whither he was invited. He was Miniſter of the Church in that village for three years. In 1611 George Duke of Lunenburg, who had a great opinion of the integrity and ſanctity of his character, gave him the Church of Zell, and appointed him Superintendent of all the Churches in the Duchy of Lunenburg; which office he executed eleven years; and his death, which happened in 1621, was attended with ſeveral very extraordinary circumſtances. It is reported that he foretold his death, having ſaid to his wife upon his return home after his laſt Sermon, that now he had preached his Funeral Sermon. We have an account of his Life and Writings in the *Preface* to the Latin Tranſlation of his four Books of *true Chriſtianity* reviſed and publiſhed by Anthony William Boehm at London in 8vo, 1708.

of Nature. The Author proves here, that all the creatures lead men to the knowledge of their Creator. This Work of his has been tranſlated into a great many languages. The Latin tranſlation was publiſhed at Lunenburg in 1625, Francfort in 1628, and Leipſic in 1704. It was printed in Low Dutch in 1642 and 1647; and tranſlated into the Daniſh and Bohemian tongues. The firſt Book *was publiſhed* in Engliſh in 1646. In the year 1708 the Latin tranſlation was reprinted at London in 8vo. with the following title: *Johannis Arndtii Theologi apud Germanos celeberrimi ac Superintendentis quondam in ducatu Lunæburgico meritiſſimi, de vero Chriſtianiſmo Libri quatuor, ob præſtantiam ſuam olim Latinè redditi, nunc autem reviſi ac emendati, curâ & ſtudio Antonii Wilhelmi Boemi. Accedit huic editioni nova præfatio de vitâ & ſcriptis Arndtianis.* i. e. "Four Books concerning true Chriſtianity, "written by John Arndt a very celebrated German "Divine, and heretofore Superintendent of the Churches "in the Duchy of Lunenburg, formerly tranſlated in- "to Latin on account of the excellence of them, "and now reviſed and corrected by Anthony William "Boehm. To this Edition is added a new Preface "concerning the Life and Writings of the Author." An Engliſh tranſlation of it was publiſhed at London in 1712, in 8vo, intitled, *Of true Chriſtianity, four Books; wherein is contained the whole OEconomy of God towards man, and the whole duty of man towards God.* This Edition was dedicated to Queen Anne by Mr. Boehm. We are told in the Preface (1), that our *Arndt* (1) Pag. 39. *was an Ornament of the Lutheran Church in the beginning of the ſeventeenth Century endeavouring to awaken people from their lifeleſs formality into an inward ſenſe of* true Chriſtianity, *by reſtoring the Doctrine of a* living Faith *to its firſt integrity and practical application.* And that Dr. *Worthington* in the Preface to his tranſlation of *The Chriſtian's pattern*, introduces him as one of the brighteſt lights of the Reformed Churches; and having compar'd him with *Salvian* among the Ancients, and *Thomas à Kempis* among the Moderns, he likens him in the laſt place to the Prophet *Micajah*, with regard to the hardneſs of his lot, informing us how *ſuch a plain and ſincere dealing met with great oppoſitions and cenſurings even among Proteſtants themſelves; but how unjuſtly and undeſervedly hath been obſerved by others.* This Work was likewiſe tranſlated into French by Mr. Samuel Baſnage de Beauval.

T.

ARNGRIMUS, a learned man, and native of Iſland. See JONAS.

ARNISÆUS (HENNINGUS) a native of Halberſtad, and Profeſſor of Phyſick in the Univerſity of Helmſtad, was a Philoſopher and Phyſician of great reputation about the beginning of the ſeventeenth Century. His political works are much eſteemed, wherein he ſets up a doctrine directly contrary to that of Althuſius [*A*]. He was invited into Denmark, and went thither, and there had the dignity of Counſellor and Phyſician to the King (*a*). The Academy of Helmſtad had a great loſs by his departure [*B*]. It has

(*a*) Witte, *in Diario Biogr. ad ann.* 1635.

[*A*] *He ſet up in his political writings a doctrine directly contrary to that of Althuſius* (1).] For he maintained that the authority of Princes ought never to be violated by the people. See his book *de Autoritate Principum in Populum ſemper inviolabili*, printed at Francfort in 1612. See alſo his three books *de Jure Majeſtatis*, printed at the ſame place, in 1610, and his *Reflectiones Politicæ*, printed alſo at Francfort, in 1615. He did not finiſh this laſt work, which in other reſpects appeared to be an excellent one. *Opus præclarum, ſed imperfectum* (2). He has given a Catalogue of thoſe who have maintained that the ſovereignty belongs to the people; a doctrine which, according to Boeclerus's judgment, is highly pernicious, and the hinge of rebellions. *A fatali hoc & peſtilenti errore . . . . ſuſpenſa eſt omnis illa rebellandi licentia, quam variis vocabulis præſcribunt* (3). i. e. "From "this fatal and peſtilent error . . . . is deduced all that "licence of rebellion which they preſcribe under va- "rious names." Boeclerus adds that it is a deplorable thing, that there are ſome very great men in that liſt; and he points out the different paſſions which have influenced them to be on that ſide. *Patronos & præcones nefariæ Philoſophiæ recenſuit* Arniſæus principio libri de Auctoritate Principum in Populum ſemper inviolabili. *Fuiſſe in illis magnos viros, dolendum: quorum aliquos animus arrogans, elatus, indomitus, ad fingendam & pingendam libertatem Stoico ſupercilio forte impulerit: alios metus oppreſſionis & tyrannidis eo evibraverit, ut poteſtatem civilem bene conſtitutam negarent niſi populo ſubjiciatur: nonnullis commentitiæ ſapientiæ ſpecies placuerit, ut tali tanquam terriculamento reges, ne in tyrannidem elaberentur, retentatos cuperent* (4). i. e. "Arniſæus in the begin- (4) Idem, ibid. "ning of his book *Of the Authority of Princes over "the People being always inviolable*, has reckoned up "the patrons and cryers up of this wicked Philoſophy. "It is to be lamented that there were ſome great "men amongſt them: ſome of whom perhaps an ar- "rogant, haughty and unbending mind has impelled "to feign and paint liberty with a Stoical haughtineſs; "others the fear of oppreſſion and tyranny has driven "ſuch lengths that they denied the civil power to "be well placed, unleſs it were made ſubject to the "people: ſome were ſo far influenced by a kind of ima- "ginary wiſdom, that they were deſirous of keep- "ing their Kings in awe by ſuch a kind of bugbear, "leſt they ſhould fall into tyranny." If ſuch a Catalogue were to be drawn up this preſent year 1699, it would make a very long one; for the doctrine of the ſuperiority of the people has become faſhionable for ſome time. Grotius commends very much a political work of Arniſæus (5).

(1) See the article ALTHUSIUS.

(2) Boſius *de Comparandâ Prudentiâ Civili*, num. 20.

(3) Boeclerus *in Grot. de Jure Belli & Pacis*, lib. 1. cap. 3. num. 8. p. 236.

(5) Grotius *de Imperio ſummarum Poteſtat. circa Sacra*, cap. 3. num. 8.

[*B*] *The Academy of Helmſtad had a great loſs by the departure of Arniſæus.*] That is what Conringius teſtifies, who ſtiles him *æternum Juliæ Academiæ & incomparabile ornamentum* (6); i. e. "the everlaſting "and incomparable ornament of the Julian Academy." "*Vir incomparabilis*, ſays he in another book (7), *à quo civilis Philoſophia in Academiâ Juliâ ut alibi nuſquam fuit exculta, & ſimul Imperii quoque ut aliarum Rerumpublicarum veterum recentiumque hiſtoria, etiamſi ſparſim quidem, accurate tamen ſatis eſt inculcata . . . . illius in Daniam diſceſſu ſimul utrumque hoc ſtudiorum genus fuerit heic quaſi conſepultum.* i. e. "An incom- "parable man, by whom Civil Philoſophy was cultivat- "ed

(6) Conring. *de Civili Prudentiâ*, cap. 14.

(7) *Idem in Dedicat. Exercitat de Repub. Imperii German.*

has been falſly given out that he was Profeſſor at Jena [C], and that he left his Library to the Univerſity of that place. It might have been ſaid, without a miſtake, that he read Lectures in the Academy of Francfort upon the Oder, before he read any in that of Helmſtad (b). He had travelled into France and England (c). He died in November 1635 (d). I give the titles of ſeveral of his works [D].

(b) Arniſæus *Præf. lib. de Jure Majeſtatis.*
(c) Idem.
(d) Witte, *Diarium. Biograph. ad ann.* 1635.

" ed in ſuch a manner as was done no where elſe, " and at the ſame time the Hiſtory of the Empire, " and likewiſe of other Republicks both ancient and " modern, though done in a ſcattered manner, yet " was inculcated after a faſhion ſufficiently accurate. " . . . Upon his departure into Denmark, both theſe " kinds of ſtudies were in a manner buried together.

[C] *It has been falſly given out, that he was Profeſſor at Jena.*] That is found in one Edition of a piece of Boſius *de comparanda Prudentia civili*. But that Edition was diſowned by Boſius's widow. See the Advertiſement which ſhe cauſed to be prefixed to the ſame Book, when ſhe had it printed exempt from thoſe faults, which diſfigured it in the preceding Edition.

[D] *Here are the titles of ſeveral of his works.*] Beſides his political treatiſes, which I have already mentioned (8), he wrote a book *de Subjectione & Exemptione Clericorum*; another *de Poteſtate temporali Pontificis in Principes*; another *de Tranſlatione Imperii Romani*; another *de Republicâ*; another *de Jure Connubiorum* (9); another whoſe title was *Doctrina Politica in genuinam methodum quæ eſt Ariſtotelis, reducta, & ex probatiſſimis quibuſque Philoſophis, Oratoribus, Juriſconſultis Hiſtoricis breviter comportata & explicata.* I have ſeen the Amſterdam Edition of that work, in 1643: It is very learned and ſolid. He wrote likewiſe upon Phyſic: his *Obſervationes aliquot Anatomicæ* were printed at Francfort, in 1610, in 4to. His diſpute *de Lue Venereâ cognoſcendâ & curandâ* was printed at Oppenheim, in the ſame year in 4to (10). I do not know the date of the firſt edition of his *Diſquiſitiones de Partus humani legitimis terminis*, nor of his books *de Præſervatione à Peſte*; *de Hydropum Eſſentiâ & Curatione*; *de Apoplexiâ & Epilepſiâ cognoſcendis & curandis* (11). As to his writings on Philoſophy, we are to know that he made *the Notes upon the Logic of Crellius*; *Epitome Metaphyſices ad mentem Ariſtotelis*; *de Conſtitutione & Partibus Metaphyſicæ*; *Vindiciæ pro Ariſtotele de ſubjecto Metaphyſicæ & naturâ Entis*; *Diſputationes VIII Metaphyſicæ*; *Epitome doctrinæ Phyſicæ.*

(8) In the note [A].
(9) See the *Diarium Biograph.* of Witte, *ad ann.* 1635.
(10) See *Lindenius renovatus*, pag. 390.
(11) Witte, *Diarium Biograph. ad ann.* 1635.

ARNOBIUS, Profeſſor of Rhetorick at Sicca in Numidia, towards the end of the third Century, was engaged by dreams in the profeſſion of Chriſtianity (a). He made his application to the Biſhops to be admitted into the church; but as they ſtill remembered the vehemence wherewith he had always oppoſed the true faith, they diſtruſted him; and, before they would admit him into the number of the Catechumens, they would have him give them ſome proofs of his good intentions [A]. To ſatisfy them he wrote *a work againſt the Gentiles*, wherein he very ſtrongly refuted the abſurdities of their religion and ridiculed their falſe Gods. He there employed all the flowers of his Rhetorick, and diſplayed a great deal of Learning therein; but as he had a laudable impatience to be admitted into the body of the Faithful, he made a little too much haſte in compoſing his work [B]; which is the reaſon that there do not appear in it ſuch exact order and juſt œconomy as one could wiſh. The worſt is, that not having a very exact knowledge of the Chriſtian faith, he publiſhed ſome very dangerous errors [C]. It is not known what he did

(a) See the note [A].

[A] *Before the Biſhops would admit him into the number of the Catechumens, they would have him give them ſome proofs of his good intentions.*] It is from St. Jerom that we learn theſe particulars. *Arnobius*, ſays he (1), *Rhetor clarus in Africa habetur: qui cum in civitate Siccæ ad declamandum juvenes erudiret, & adhuc Ethnicus ad credulitatem ſomniis compelleretur, neque ab Epiſcopo impetraret fidem quam ſemper impugnaverat, elucubravit adverſus priſtinam religionem luculentiſſimos libros, & tandem velut quibuſdam obſidibus pietatis fœdus impetravit.* i. e. " Arnobius was eſteemed a famous Rhethorician in Africa, who whilſt he " was teaching the youth in the city of Sicca the art " of declaiming, and being ſtill a Heathen was influenced to embrace the faith by dreams, but could not " obtain to be admitted by the Biſhop into that " faith, which he had always oppoſed, wrote ſome " excellent Books againſt his former Religion, and at " length having as it were given pledges of his piety, obtained that privilege." He was look'd upon as an enemy that made overtures for a treaty of peace; but before it was concluded on, it was thought proper to have ſome pledges for his keeping his word. Hoſtages were demanded of him: he gave them; they were ſeven invectives againſt the Pagans. After that he was look'd upon as a good brother, and was received into the Pale of the Church.

(1) Hieronymus, *in Chronico Euſebii, ad annum 2 Olymp.* 270.

[B] *He made a little too much haſte in compoſing his work.*] We ſhall illuſtrate this by a paſſage from Baronius. *Quod verò opus illud, ut inter fideles admitteretur, quaſi fidei ſuæ vadem feſtinus abſolvit; hinc planè eſt quod in eo (ut ait Hieronymus) fuiſſe viſus eſt inæqualis & nimius, & abſque operis ſui partitione confuſus. Rurſum verò quòd nondum plenè eſſet ſcientiâ rerum Chriſtianarum imbutus, utpote cùm non ſolùm non fuerit baptiſmate illuſtratus, ſed nec in Eccleſiam inter Catechumenos acceptus* (2); *veniâ dignus eſt, ſi aliquibus nævis viſus eſt commentarius ille eſſe reſperſus* (3). i. e. " But becauſe he finiſhed that " work, the Pledge of his Faith, in a hurry, that he " might be admitted amongſt the faithful; from hence " ariſes the reaſon that he ſeems therein (as Jerome " ſays) to have been inconſiſtent and to ſay too much, " and to be confuſed for want of a proper diſtribution " of his ſubject. But again as he was not as yet " fully informed in the knowledge of the Chriſtian Religion, becauſe he was not only unbaptized, but even " not received into the Church amongſt the Catechumens; he is excuſable, if that Commentary ſeems " to be blemiſhed with ſome errors."

(2) Mr. Du Pin is not of that mind. He compos'd, ſays he, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* tom. 1. p. 203. ſeven books, while he was yet only a Catechumen.
(3) Baron. *ad Ann.* 302. num. 67. pag. 733.

[C] *He gave out ſome very dangerous errors.*] We have juſt now obſerved, that Baronius attributes the heterodoxy, which is to be met with in Arnobius's ſeven Books, to the precipitation with which they were written; becauſe the Author had not patience to wait the compoſing them till he had had time to be well inſtructed in all the points of the Chriſtian Faith. The Annaliſt is for having Arnobius's faults excuſed, and he repreſents them as inconſiderable miſtakes; but it is certain that the Inquiſition now-a-days would ſentence to the faggot all thoſe that ſhould vent ſuch doctrines. I am willing that Arnobius ſhould have ſome indulgence granted him: but nevertheleſs it cannot be denied that his notions about the origin of the ſoul, and the cauſe of natural evil, and ſeveral other important points, are highly pernicious. I have remark'd this elſewhere (4). He might have ſaid with reſpect to our myſteries what Perſius declares with regard to Poetry, that he took upon him to talk of them before he underſtood them:

(4) Conſult the Table of this Dictionary at the word *Arnobius.*

Nec fonte labra prolui Caballino,
Nec in bicipiti ſomniaſſe Parnaſſo
Memini, ut repente ſic Poeta prodirem.
Heliconidaſque pallidamque Pyrenen
Illis remitto, quorum imagines lambunt

Hederæ

did afterwards, nor at what time he died. His work contains ſeven books and not eight, as was thought for ſome time [*D*]. It has been commented upon by

* *Hederæ ſequaces. Ipſe ſemipaganus*
Ad ſacra Vatum carmen affero noſtrum (5).

(5) Perſius, *in Prologo.*

" I never did on cleft Parnaſſus dream;
" Nor taſte the ſacred Heliconian ſtream:
" Nor can remember when my brain inſpir'd,
" Was, by the Muſes, into madneſs fir'd.
" My ſhare in pale Pyrene I reſign:
" And claim no part in all the mighty nine.
" Statues, with winding ivy crown'd, belong
" To nobler Poets, for a nobler ſong:
" Heedleſs of verſe and hopeleſs of the crown,
" Scarce half a wit, and more than half a clown,
" Before the ſhrine I lay my rugged numbers down.
Dryden.

This is Mr. du Pin's judgment of him. " It appears " that he was not as yet throughly inſtructed in the " myſteries of our Religion. He attacks the Pagan " Religion with a great deal more dexterity than he " defends that of the Chriſtians. He is more happy " in diſcovering the folly of Paganiſm, than in clear- " ly demonſtrating the truth of Chriſtianity. But " that is not to be wondred at; for it is com- " monly the caſe of all new converts, who, being as " yet full of their own Religion, are more ſenſible " of the errors and weak parts of it, than of the proofs " and excellence of that which they embrace (6)." I do not know any one, who ſpeaks ſo ſlightly of the errors of Arnobius, as Dr. Cave. He ſays that his doctrines do perhaps a little deviate from the true faith. *Dogmata quædam habet* FORSAN *minus Catholica, quæ homini è Gentilium tenebris recens erumpenti, & nondum Chriſtianæ fidei elementis ſatis inſtructo condonanda ſunt* (7). i. e. " He has ſome doc- " trines that are PERHAPS not altogether Catholick, " which are to be excuſed in a man juſt emerging " from the darkneſs of the Gentiles, and not yet ſuf- " ficiently inſtructed in the elements of the Chriſtian " faith." That is carrying toleration a great deal farther than is done in the Preface of the Leyden Edition in 1651, where it is only ſaid, that Arnobius deviated a little from orthodoxy. *Aliis in locis à veritate Chriſtianâ* NONNIHIL *recedit. Sed hoc condonandum illi, qui ex Ethniciſmi tenebris recens ad veritatem Chriſtianam pervenerat. Idem huic Autori evenit, quod iis ſolet, qui ex carcere tenebricoſo in lucem perducti viſum adhuc dubium habent* (8). i. e. " In other " places he A LITTLE recedes from the Chri- " ſtian verity. But for this ſome allowance muſt " be made to him, who had juſt come from the " darkneſs of Paganiſm to the truth of Chriſtianity. " It happened to this Writer, as it does generally to " thoſe perſons, who being brought from a dungeon " into the open light, have their ſight dubious for " ſome time." Once more, let us excuſe this father; but let us not be ſo weak as courteouſly to call the doctrines, which he gave out, by the name of ſlight errors. They deſerve, when one conſiders them in themſelves, the very ſame appellations as would be given them at this time of day, if any Divine ſhould advance them. It muſt be granted without diſpute, that a modern Writer has made on this occaſion ſome good remarks concerning the perſon who criticized upon him. Obſerve what he ſays: *Mr. Jurieu weighs errors in a falſe ballance. He judges of a doctrine by the perſons, and not of the perſons by the doctrine. The very ſame error changes its nature according to the circumſtances of time and place. It is a monſtrous hereſy, according to the perſon, in whom it is found, and according to the age in which it reigns. Proofs of this partiality may be ſeen in all Mr. Jurieu's diſputes againſt the Sectaries of this time, to whom he gives no quarter, at the ſame time that he carries his indulgence and toleration for the Fathers to a prodigious exceſs. . . .* (9). *The regard that we have for perſons ſhould not make us reſpect their errors, when they are capital. On ſuch an occaſion, every thing ought to be called by its right name. Mr. Jurieu is very ready* to excuſe the errors of Origen on account of his great zeal; but if any body now-a-days gives into the extravagancies of that ancient Writer, Mr. Jurieu would not think himſelf obliged to give him any countenance. *If thoſe notions are hereſies and impieties, which change Hell into a Purgatory, and by that means take away the fear of eternal puniſhments, and the fear of God, how can any one countenance them in Origen? . . .* (10). *The tenderneſs with which Mr. Jurieu mentions the errors of St. Hilary and St. Jerom, is certainly not edifying.* He excuſes them, and ſays that they are miſtakes and overſights. *But if a Divine of this Age ſhould take it into his head to maintain the ſame opinions, Mr. Jurieu* would think himſelf obliged to call them extravagancies and impieties. *What a ſad piece of injuſtice is this! The ſame things which are extravagancies and impieties at this time of day, are only miſtakes and pardonable negligences in the fourth Century. How comes this to paſs* (11)? This Writer pretends to know from whence this double kind of treatment ſprings. Let us hear him once again. Mr. Jurieu *pardons in them, as very trivial and inconſiderable faults, ſuch errors, as, in people of our age, are damnable hereſies. People are commonly fond of ſhewing a profound reſpect and an high eſteem for thoſe who have the happineſs of living ſeveral Ages before us, although there appear in them ſuch foibles and bad qualities as one cannot bear in the moderns. Tho' one cannot thoroughly eſteem the ancients, yet it is thought neceſſary at leaſt to ſhew a fondneſs for them, and from a principle of Chriſtian charity, to put the moſt favourable interpretation that can be upon what they ſay. On the contrary people pride themſelves in, and aſſume to themſelves, the honour of a zeal inflamed againſt their contemporaries: no allowances are made to them; and towards them, they are very liberal of anathema's. It ſhould ſeem nevertheleſs that, as far as is conſiſtent with the intereſt of Religion, charity ought to exert itſelf rather towards the living than the dead, who have been dead ſeveral Ages. The charity which a perſon has for theſe laſt coſts him nothing, becauſe their merit does not excite our jealouſy and envy, and we do not look upon them as claſhing with our ſelves; but in order to judge charitably of an adverſary who ſpeaks and writes againſt us, and whoſe reputation eclipſes our own glory, we ought to mortify our ſelf-love a little: and that is a ſacrifice which is not eaſily made. As Mr. Jurieu has had no quarrel with Origen, and has had perſonal enemies in the Socinian party, it is not to be wonder'd at, that he has more toleration for the one than the other* (12).

(6) Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſiaſt.* tom. 1. pag. 204. Col. 2. the Holland edition.

(7) Gulielmus Cave, *Hiſtoriæ Literariæ*, pag. 112.

(8) *Præfat. Arnobii in edit. Lugd. Bat. an.* 1651.

(9) Saurin, *Examen de la Doctrine de M. Jurieu*, pag. 681.

(10) Idem, pag. 683.

(11) Idem, pag. 684.

(12) Saurin, *Examen de la Doctrine de Mr. Jurieu*, p. 687.

[*D*] *His work contains ſeven Books, and not eight as was thought for ſome time.*] Every body knows that the title of Minucius Felix's little Book was *Octavius*. It was found joined to Arnobius's Books in ſeveral ancient Manuſcripts. That was the reaſon why it has paſſed for one of Arnobius's Works, and undoubtedly the word *Octavius*, miſtaken for *Octavus*, led a good many Readers into the error. Theſe are Mr. Du Pin's words. " This Book (13) has paſſed a long time for " the 8th Book of Arnobius; for having been found " along with the ſeven Books of Arnobius in an an- " cient Manuſcript of the Vatican Library, it was " four times printed under that name *, without any " body's knowing who was the real Author. The " learned Civilian Baudouin was the firſt who took " notice of this vulgar error, and had this little trea- " tiſe printed ſeparate in 1560, at Heidelberg, with " a learned Preface, wherein he reſtores it to its true " Author. But altho' the honour of having firſt made " this diſcovery be owing to this famous Civilian, yet " thirty years afterwards, Urſinus, being about an edi- " tion of Arnobius's Works at Rome, whether he had " not ſeen Baudouin's Edition, or whether he had " a mind to take the honour of that obſervation to " himſelf, ſeparated Minucius's Book from thoſe of " Arnobius, without taking any notice that it had " been done before him, thus aſſuming to him- " ſelf the whole honour of that diſcovery (14)." The ſame thing is ſaid in the Preface of Minucius Felix, printed at Leyden in 1652 (15). One finds there likewiſe, that about the ſame time that Francis Baudouin ſhewed the pretended eighth Book of Arnobius to be the Work of Minucius Felix, another Critic had ſome ſuſpicion of the miſtake. *Eodem ferè tempore id ipſum ſuboluit etiam Hadriano Junio* (16). i. e. " About

(13) That is to ſay, that of Minucius Felix.

* The firſt time by Sabæus, from the manuſcript of Rome in 1542; the ſecond, in Germany by Gelenius; the third in Holland at Leyden in 1552; the fourth at Baſil, by Erafmus in 1560.

(14) Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſiaſt.* tom. 1. pag. 119. Col. 2.

(15) This Preface is by James Ouzelius.

(16) Jac. Ouzelius, *in Præfatione* Minucii Felicis.

by learned men, and has paſſed through ſeveral editions [*E*].

☞We

" About that time Hadrianus Junius had likewiſe got " ſome ſcent of the ſame thing." This is not the true State of the caſe: it ſhould be ſaid that Francis Baudouin was not the firſt who made the diſcovery; for he did not publiſh his thoughts on that head till four years after another perſon had communicated this thought to the public. His Minucius came out in 1560. But obſerve a paſſage in a Work which Hadrianus Junius printed in 1556. *Arnobio, qui ſeptem duntaxat adverſum gentes libros edidit, octavus accrevit, quum ſit Minucii Felicis, Octavius, ab interlocutorum uno ita vocitatus, nova ratione obliterandi auctoris* (17). i. e. " Arnobius who publiſhed only ſeven Books againſt " the Gentiles, has now got an eighth, though it be " the Octavius of Minucius Felix, being called ſo " from one of the interlocutors in the dialogue, a new " way of obliterating an Author." In the following year Baudouin was not aware of the common error; for he cites the treatiſe of Minucius as the VIIIth Books of Arnobius. *Sic ille apud Arnobium Cecilius Chriſtianos dictitat, cum coeunt infantis occiſi ſanguinem lambere....* (18), *Horribilis profecto eſt oratio Cecilii illius leguleii Romani, qui apud Arnobium libro octavo hæc adhuc Chriſtianis objicit* (19). i. e. " Thus Cecilius " in Arnobius, relates that the Chriſtians, when they " come together, drink the blood of a murdered infant. " .... The ſpeech of Cecilius the Roman Lawyer is " truly horrible, who according to Arnobius in his " eighth Book ſtill objects theſe things to the Chri- " ſtians." Lewis Carrion has given to Junius the honour of being the firſt who had reſtored the Octavius to its true owner. *Illi* (Minucio) *Octavum adverſus gentes librum Junius noſter in Animadverſis ſuis princeps jam olim vindicavit* (20). i. e. " Junius in his " animadverſions is the firſt who long ago aſſerted " his (Minucius's) right to the eighth Book againſt the " Gentiles." Carrion talks in the ſame ſtrain in a work which he publiſhed at Paris, in 1583. Theſe next are the words of Mr. Joli: *Minucii Felicis vetuſtiſſimi Scriptoris Chriſtiani Dialogus elegantiſſimus contra Idolorum vanitatem tam diu pro octavo Arnobii adverſus Gentes Libro habitus eſt, quia Minucius eum ſub nomine Octavii protulerat, donec a Franciſco Balduino Juriſconſulto anno* 1560 *Arnobio abductus, & genuino Autori redditus eſt, veluti Nicolaus Rigaltius in Præfatione ad eundem Minucium obſervavit* (21). i. e. " That " moſt elegant dialogue of Minucius Felix a very " ancient Chriſtian Writer againſt the vanity of Idols, " was ſo long thought to be the eighth Book of Ar- " nobius againſt the Gentiles, becauſe Minutius put it " out under the name of Octavius, till it was taken " away from Arnobius in 1560, by Francis Baudouin " a Civilian, and reſtored to its genuine Author, as " Nicolaus Rigaltius has obſerved in his Preface to " the ſame Minucius." Here are two learned men (22) who do not know that Junius had the ſtart of Baudouin in diſcovering the real Author of the Octavius. I do not think that Mr. Joli is right in placing this Book under the claſs of Pſeudonymes. He pretends, that the Author in publiſhing it, diſguiſed himſelf under the name of Octavius: It would be more proper in my opinion, to ſay that Octavius is the title of the work, and not a fictitious name of him that wrote it. It would not be a juſt way of talking, if any one ſhould ſay that Plato's Dialogues were publiſhed under the fictitious names of thoſe Perſonages, which their titles bear. Minucius Felix imitated Plato. He would have his Dialogue bear for its title the name of the principal interlocutor.

(17) Hadrianus Junius, *Animadverſ.* lib. 6. c. 1.

(18) Franciſcus Balduinus *ad Edicta Veterum Principum Roman. de Chriſtianis*, pag. 47. ed. Baſil. *apud* Oporinum. an. 1557.

(19) Idem, ibid. pag. 50.

(20) Ludov. Carrio, *Emendat.* lib. 2. cap. 18. folio 52.

(21) Claudius Joly, *Diſſertat. de Verbis Uſuardi*, p. 134. This book was printed in 1669.

(22) Rigaltius and Joly.

[*E*] *His Work has paſſed through ſeveral Editions.*] If I had the neceſſary Books I would undertake to give an exact Hiſtory of the Editions of Arnobius; but I am obliged to give up that deſign, and confine myſelf to ſome critical Notes againſt thoſe who have given us the liſt of thoſe Editions. The Writer of the Preface of Arnobius printed at Leyden, in 1651, relates, I, that the firſt Edition of this Father, was that which Francis Priſcianenſis a Florentine publiſhed at Rome. He does not ſay in what year; which is ſuch a fault of omiſſion as is not to be pardoned: II, that Sigiſmond Gelenius altered ſeveral things in that Edition, not by the aſſiſtance of the Manuſcripts, but relying upon the conjectures of his own genius: III, that Theodore Canterus, publiſhing Arnobius with Notes, complains of the aſſurance of Gelenius: IV, that Godeſcalc Stewechius took a great deal of pains about this Father; V, that Elmenhorſt added to his Commentary the different readings collected as well from the Manuſcripts, and the Edition publiſhed at Rome in 1542, from an ancient Manuſcript of Francis Sabæus (23), as from the Edition of Fulvius Urſinus: VI, that at length, Deſiderius Heraldus publiſhed ſome elegant Notes upon the ſeven Books of Arnobius. I have three things to remark thereupon. Firſt the liſt of the Editions is very imperfect. In the ſecond place, the Edition of Rome, in 1542, is not at all different from the former and yet it is given out here as a different one. In the third place, it is not true that the remarks of Deſiderius Heraldus came out after the Edition of Elmenhorſt. This laſt was in the year 1610, and Heraldus's Work was publiſhed at Geneva in 1597, and at Paris in 1605.

(23) His name was *Fauſtus* and not *Francis*.

Let us examine Mr. Du Pin's liſt (24). I. I remark, in the firſt place, that the proper names are there very much diſfigured (25). We ſee there Canrerus, inſtead of Canterus; Hermenhorſtius, inſtead of Helmenhorſtius; Stevuchius, inſtead of Stewechius. II. Beſides this, I remark, that we have one Theodore Priſcianenſis given us as the Printer of the firſt Edition. That is undoubtedly wrong. We have ſeen that *Franciſcus Priſcianenſis* the Florentine was the firſt, that brought Arnobius's Books to light. But he was no Printer. Poccianti does not give him that title; he only repreſents him as a good polite Scholar and Author of ſome Italian Books (26). I am perſuaded that it was to him that Fauſtus Sabeüs, Library Keeper of the Vatican, communicated the Manuſcript, from which was made the impreſſion of Rome, in 1542. Thus in the Preface of the Leyden Edition, there is made a wrong diſtinction betwixt the Edition of Francis Priſcianenſis, and that which was made from the Manuſcript of Sabeüs. Note, that Lewis Carrion thinks that the Manuſcript of Arnobius, which is in the King of France's Library, is that made uſe of for the firſt Edition (27). He fancies that becauſe the Book was dedicated to Francis I, the Manuſcript was ſent thither too. III. In the third place, I obſerve, that it is not true that the ſeven Books of Arnobius were printed with Heraldus's Notes in 1583, nor that there ought to be a diſtinction made betwixt the Hamburgh Edition of 1610, and that of which we have juſt been ſpeaking, I mean, that which had Elmenhorſt's Commentary along with it. IV. Laſtly, I remark that Stewechius did not give an Edition of Arnobius, at Doway, in 1634: His Edition was of Antwerp, in 1586, and he had been dead a great while, when his *Electa in Arnobium* were reprinted at Doway in 1634, *cum Paratitlis ſeu Summariis Leandri de Sancto Martino*. You will find a like miſtake at the citation * of the preceding Page, where Mr. Du Pin ſays, that Eraſmus publiſhed Arnobius in 1560. He died in 1536.

(24) It is the Page 205. Col. 1. of the firſt volume of his *Bibliotheque* the Holland edition.

(25) I only make uſe of the Holland edition.

(26) Poccianti, *de Scriptor. Florentinis*, pag. 69.

(27) Ludov. Carrio, *Emendat.* lib. 1. cap. 9. folio 18. Mr. Du Pin affirms it at page 119 of his firſt volume of his *Bibliotheque*.

Let us ſay ſomething of Father Labbe. He approves of the Leyden Edition extremely; but is aſtoniſhed, that they who publiſhed it have not inſerted the *Arnobianus Criticus* of Meurſius, printed at Leyden, in 1598, *cum Hypocritico Minutiano*. He wiſhed that at leaſt they had mentioned thoſe Pieces (28), They who ſhould reproach him, that he himſelf ought to have remembered the *Eclogiæ ad Arnobium* of Julius Cæſar Bulenger (29), would not have ſufficient grounds for it; for that work is of no uſe, neither to correct Arnobius's text, nor to clear up his literal meaning. It is nothing but a heap of Quotations, which have only ſome very diſtant relation to ſome thought of Arnobius. The ſame Jeſuit cenſures the great Salmaſius, who had promiſed ſome Commentaries upon this Author, and who did not keep his word. *Salmaſiani autem illi Commentarii tam diu expectati, tam ſæpè ejus amicorumque literis promiſſi atque jactati, in fumum tandem ventoſque evanuerunt* (30). i. e. " But thoſe " Commentaries of Salmaſius, which have been ſo " long expected, and ſo often promiſed and boaſted " of in his own and his friend's Letters, are at length " vaniſhed into ſmoke and air." I fancy that ſuch a Writing of Salmaſius would have furniſhed us with more good things, than his learned Commentary on Tertullian's treatiſe *de Pallio*.

(28) Philippus Labbe *Diſſertat. de Script. Eccleſ.* tom. 1. p. 105.

(29) Printed at Toulouſe in 1612 in 8°.

(30) Labbe *de Script. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. 1. p. 105.

☞ We ſhall give the reader ſome account of his ſeven books againſt the Gentiles [*F*]. St. Jerom in his Epiſtle to Paulinus (*a*), is of opinion, that his ſtyle is unequal and too diffuſe, and that his book is written without any method; but Dr. Cave thinks this judgment is too ſevere; and that Arnobius wants neither elegance nor order in his compoſition. Voſſius ſtiles him the *Varro of the Eccleſiaſtical Writers* (*b*). Du Pin obſerves (*c*), that his work is written in a manner worthy of a Profeſſor of Rhetoric. The turn of his ſentiments is very oratorical, but his ſtyle is a little African, that is, his expreſſions are harſh, diſpoſed in an ill manner, inelegant, and ſometimes not Latin. The Latin *Commentary upon the Pſalms*, which is publiſhed under the name of Arnobius, is allowed by all the Critics not to have been written by him, but by a much later writer of that name, who is called *Arnobius Junior*, and who appears to have lived after the Council of Chalcedon, ſince he mentions the Pelagians and Predeſtinarians.

(*a*) Pag. 104. *apud* Cave, *Hiſt. Litter.* p. 102. edit. Colon. Allobrog. 1720.

(*b*) *De Analogiâ* lib. 1. c. 9.

(*c*) *Biblioth.* tom. 1. edit. Paris 1693. p. 204.

[*F*] *His ſeven Books againſt the Gentiles.*] Mr. Du Pin (1) obſerves, that Arnobius begins his *firſt* Book by confuting the objection, which the Pagans had propagated againſt the Chriſtians, that they were the authors of the misfortunes and calamities, under which the world laboured. He ſhews, that this imagination had no manner of foundation; that before our Saviour's time there were plagues, famines, and wars; that there was no change occaſioned by his coming; and that he was ſo far from being the author of miſeries, that he was of great advantage to the world. That misfortunes have their proper natural cauſes; and that very frequently things, which appear unfortunate to men, are not ſo in reality. That if the Chriſtians had been the cauſe of theſe misfortunes, they would not have ceaſed ſince the time of Chriſt. That if the Heathen Deities inflicted theſe misfortunes upon mankind in order to puniſh the Chriſtians, they were unjuſt and their power very inconſiderable. That if the Chriſtians worſhip'd the true God, they had no reaſon to fear the falſe Gods. That they adored Jeſus Chriſt, but did not conſider him as a man put to death on account of his crimes; but on the contrary as a God, who had aſſumed the form of human nature, in order to appear among mankind, that he might inſtruct them in the truth, and accompliſh all the ends, for which he came into the world; and that he died and roſe again, to ſhew men, that the hope, which they had of ſalvation, was certain. He proves the Divinity of Jeſus Chriſt from the holineſs of his life; the great number of miracles, which he performed; the power, which he gave to others of working wonders; and from the prodigies, which appeared upon the earth at the hour of his death. He ſhews, that the truth of theſe things cannot poſſibly be doubted, ſince the evangeliſts, who have written an account of them, are remarkable for their ſincerity and ſimplicity; that it is extremely improbable, that men ſhould be ſo abſurd and infatuated as to agree together to pretend, that they had ſeen things, which they had not ſeen, eſpecially if we conſider, that they were ſo far from making any advantage of ſuch an impoſture, that they expoſed themſelves to the hatred of the world in general. In the *ſecond* Book he ſhews, that it was unjuſt to perſecute Jeſus Chriſt, ſince he had done nothing, that deſerved puniſhment; that he was no tyrant, no deſtroyer of people; that he did not acquire riches, nor commit any acts of violence or injuſtice. That the Pagans have no principles to diſtinguiſh between the true and falſe Religion. That they were unreaſonable to reproach the Chriſtians with credulity, ſince in moſt of the concerns of life men act upon confidence in the credit of certain perſons. That Jeſus Chriſt deſerves much greater regard than the Philoſophers of the world, on account of the miracles, which he performed. That the Pagan Philoſophers believed the ſame things, which the Chriſtians believed, particularly the immortality of the ſoul, the reſurrection of the body, and future puniſhments. He takes occaſion here to treat of the Nature of the Soul; he ſays it is of a middle quality between ſpirit and matter; and is mortal in its own nature, but that God renders the ſouls of thoſe immortal, who truſt in him. He confutes the opinion of Plato with regard to the immortality, excellence, and dignity of the ſoul, and its baniſhment or impriſonment in the body. He ſuppoſes, that it is corporeal, and propagated by the parents. That man is but little different from brutes. He obſerves, that we ought not to indulge our curioſity too much in Religion, or preſume to penetrate into the reaſons of God's conduct, or judge according to our imperfect ſenſe of things. *Jeſus Chriſt*, ſays he, *was God; for ſince it is neceſſary to tell you this, tho' you will not underſtand it, he is God, and he ſpeaks to us from God; he commands us not to perplex ourſelves about uſeleſs queſtions; let us therefore leave the knowledge of theſe things to God, and not give ourſelves the trouble of an over-curious enquiry about them.* However Arnobius does not omit replying to the queſtions, which the Pagans uſually propoſed concerning Chriſt. They aſked why, ſince his coming was neceſſary to deliver the ſouls of men from death, it was deferred ſo long. Arnobius anſwers: *Can you tell in what manner God acted towards the ancients? Who has told you, that he did not aſſiſt them by ſome other method? Do you know how many men there are in the world? Do you know the place, in which the ſouls of the ancients were reſerved? Who inform'd you, that Chriſt did not deliver them by his coming? Ceaſe to perplex your minds about theſe things; leave ſuch queſtions, as you cannot reſolve; believe that God has ſhewn mercy to them; but when and in what manner Chriſt perhaps would have informed you, if this would not have made you vain? But why*, continue the Pagans, *did not he deliver all mankind in general? He calls upon, and invites the whole world*, anſwers Arnobius, *he rejects none, he receives all, who come to him. It depends upon men's will; he does not force them, becauſe that would be violence, and not a favour. But are none but Chriſtians delivered from death? No certainly, for none but Jeſus Chriſt has the power of reſcuing them. But this Religion*, ſay the Pagans, *is a new one; and why ſhould we abandon that of our anceſtors to embrace it? Why not*, replies Arnobius, *if it is a better Religion? Have not old cuſtoms been diſcontinued? Have not laws been changed? Is there any thing, which has not had its beginning? Is it reaſonable to eſteem a religion on account of its antiquity, rather than out of regard to the Deity, whom we honour? It was but two thouſand years ago, that none of thoſe Deities, whom the Pagans now adore, exiſted; whereas the true God and his Religion are eternal. There were particular reaſons for the coming of Chriſt at the time, in which he appeared. But why does he ſuffer*, it will be ſaid, *thoſe, who honour him, to continue under perſecution? And why*, anſwers Arnobius, *do your Gods ſuffer you to be afflicted with war, peſtilence, and famine? With regard to us Chriſtians, it is not at all wonderful, that we ſuffer in this life, ſince we have no promiſes with relation to this world, but on the contrary the evils, which we labour under here, are a deliverance to us.* In the three following Books he attacks the Pagan Theology, and ſhews, that the Chriſtians have the greateſt reaſon imaginable to reject a Religion, which is ſo full of abſurdity, extravagance, and impiety. In the *ſixth* and *ſeventh* Book, he ſhews that the Chriſtians act very reaſonably in not building temples, nor having among them ſtatues, images, or ſacrifices; and that it is a folly to ſuppoſe, that God dwells in temples, that Images are Gods, or that Deities reſide in them; or that the true God is honoured by offering ſacrifices, burning incenſe, or pouring out libations to him. T.

(1) *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* tom. 1. p. 203, &c. edit. Paris 1693.

☞ ARNOLD of Breſcia, a famous Heretick in the twelfth Century, was born at Breſcia in Italy, from whence he went to France, where he ſtudied under the celebrated Peter

Peter Abelard. Upon his return to his own country, he took upon him the habit of a Monk, and began to diſtinguiſh himſelf by preaching ſeveral new and uncommon doctrines; particularly, that the Pope and all the reſt of the Clergy ought not to enjoy any temporal eſtate. Upon this foundation he maintained in his Sermons, that thoſe Eccleſiaſticks, who had any eſtates of their own, the Biſhops, who poſſeſſed any revenues, and the Monks, who held any lands, were entirely cut off from the leaſt hopes of ſalvation (*a*). That the Clergy ought to ſubſiſt only upon the alms and voluntary contributions of Chriſtians; and that all other revenues belonged abſolutely to Princes and States, in order to be diſpoſed of among the Laity as they thought proper (*b*). He was accuſed likewiſe of other Hereſies with regard to Baptiſm and the Lord's Supper (*c*). Otto Friſingenſis, who knew him perfectly well, and St. Bernard have drawn his character in a very ſtrong light [*A*], but repreſent him under ſuch colours, as are of no advantage to his reputation. He engaged a great number of perſons in his party [*B*], who were diſtinguiſhed by his name, and proved very formidable to the Popes. His Doctrines rendered him ſo obnoxious, that he was condemned in the year 1139 in a Council of near a thouſand Prelates, held in the Church of St. John Lateran at Rome under Pope Innocent II (*d*). Upon this he left Italy, and retired to Swiſſerland (*e*). After the death of that Pope he returned to Italy, and went to Rome, where he raiſed a ſedition againſt Pope Eugenius III [*C*], and

(*a*) Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* tom. 9. p. 105. edit. Paris 1697.

(*b*) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. de la Décadence de l'Empire aprés Charlemagne*, lib. 4. p. 418. *ad ann.* 1142. edit. Paris 1681.

(*c*) Du Pin, *ubi ſupra.*

(*d*) Idem ibid. *and* Maimbourg, *ubi ſupra.*

(*e*) Du Pin, *ubi ſupra.*

[*A*] *Otto Friſingenſis, who knew him perfectly well, and St. Bernard have drawn his character in a very ſtrong light.*] The former tells us, that he did not want wit, or addreſs, or eloquence, tho' in reality his eloquence was of the falſe kind, and conſiſted rather in a torrent of words, than in ſolid and juſt ſentiments. *Arnaldus iſte ex Italiâ, civitate Brixiæ oriundus; vir quidem naturæ non hebetis, plus tamen verborum profluvio quam ſententiarum pondere copioſus* (1). He obſerves likewiſe, that he was prodigiouſly fond of peculiar and new opinions, which is the general characteriſtic and diſpoſition of thoſe, who endeavoured to introduce hereſies, and divide the Church into ſchiſms. *Singularitatis amator, novitatis cupidus; cujuſmodi hominum ingenia ad fabricandas hæreſes, ſchiſmatumque perturbationes ſunt prona* (2). That he aſſumed a religious habit in order to impoſe upon mankind more effectually; and under pretence of piety, and, as the Goſpel expreſſes it, in ſheep's cloathing, carried the diſpoſition of a wolf, tearing every one as he pleaſed with the utmoſt fury, without the leaſt regard to any perſon, and having a particular enmity againſt the Clergy, Biſhops, and Monks. *Religioſum habitum, quo amplius fallere poſſet, induit; ſub typo religionis, & ut Evangelicis verbis utar, ſub ovina pelle lupum gerens; omnia lacerans, omnia rodens, nemini parcens, Clericorum & Epiſcoporum derogator, Monacorum perſecutor* (3). The picture that St. Bernard gives of him, does not at all flatter him. The ſtrokes of it are ſtrong, and the colours lively *. *Would to God*, ſays he, *that his doctrine was as holy as his life is ſtrict. Would you know what ſort of man this is? Arnold of Breſcia is a man that neither eats, nor drinks; who, like the Devil, is only hungry and thirſty after the blood of ſouls; who goes to and fro upon the earth, and is always doing among ſtrangers what he cannot do amongſt his own countrymen*; who ranges like a roaring lion, always ſeeking whom he may devour. *An enemy to the Croſs of Chriſt, an author of diſcords, an inventor of ſchiſms, a diſturber of the publick peace. He is a man*, adds he in another place, *whoſe converſation has nothing but ſweetneſs, and his doctrine nothing but poiſon in it. A man, who has the head of a dove, and the tail of a ſcorpion. Whom Breſcia has produced, or rather ſpewed up, whom Rome has abhorred, whom France has rejected, Germany deteſts, and Italy will not receive.*

(1) *De Reb. Geſt. Frid.* lib. 2. cap. 20. *apud* Maimbourg, *Hiſt. de la Décadence de l'Empire*, lib. 4. pag. 417.

(2) Idem, ibid.

(3) Idem, ibid.

* See *Ingenious Thoughts of the Fathers of the Church collected by Bouhours in French, and tranſlated into Engliſh*, pag. 195, 196, edit. London 1727.

[*B*] *Engaged a great number of perſons in his party.*] Notwithſtanding he was obliged to leave Italy after the council of the Lateran, yet his doctrine had prodigious ſucceſs among the people of Rome. For the Romans being extremely uneaſy, that Pope Innocent II ſhould become abſolute maſter of the city, revolted openly from him, and maintained agreeably to the maxims of our Arnold, that he had no right to any temporal poſſeſſion. They reſtored the Senate and Tribunes, notwithſtanding all the Pope's efforts to the contrary. They wrote likewiſe a very artful letter to the Emperor Conrade himſelf, in order to engage him to ſupport them, aſſuring him, that what they had done was only with a view to put him again in poſſeſſion of the Capital of his Empire, and of the other cities, which the Popes had uſurped from the Emperors, eſpecially Pope Innocent, who had juſt made a league with Roger King of Sicily, a declared enemy to the Empire, and had granted him the inveſtiture by the Croſs and Ring. This, as Maimbourg informs us (4), was a falſe repreſentation, and deſigned only to render the Pope odious to the Emperor, to whom he had refuſed that favour. But Conrade, who was a Prince of great prudence and moderation, eaſily diſcovered this malicious artifice; and as he was unwilling to have the Pope his enemy, eſpecially during the war, in which he was engaged againſt the Bavarians and other Princes their confederates, he treated their meſſage with great contempt; and on the other hand received the Embaſſadors of Pope Innocent, who came to deſire his protection againſt the Rebels, with the utmoſt civility. However, this ill ſucceſs did not ſtop their fury; for finding themſelves ſlighted by the Emperor, and Pope Innocent dying at this juncture, and Celeſtin II his ſucceſſor five months after him, they created a Patrician, and conferred upon him the ſovereign power and authority in Rome, in the ſame manner as their anceſtors in conjunction with the Pope had given it with the ſame title to Charlemagne, and afterwards to Otho the Great (5). This new Patrician was Jourdan, ſon of Peter de Leone, and brother to Anacletus the Antipope. After they had acknowledged him for their Head and Leader, they went in a body to the new Pope Lucius II, and told him in a very confident manner, that he muſt immediately reſign up to their Patrician, not only the city of Rome, but likewiſe all that his Predeceſſors had ever received of the Emperors and other Princes; and that according to the laws of God, he ought to be contented with the alms of Chriſtians and the tythes, after the examples of the Popes and Biſhops of the primitive Church. In ſhort, they carried things to ſuch exceſs in derogation to the See of Rome, that Lucius died of grief the ſame year in 1144 (6).

(4) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 419.

(5) Otto Friſing. lib. 7. cap. 31, 38. *apud* Maimbourg, p. 420.

(6) Idem, lib. 7. cap. 31.

[*C*] *He returned to Italy, and went to Rome, where he raiſed a ſedition againſt Pope Eugenius III.*] Being informed of the ſucceſs of his followers, who had made themſelves Maſters of Rome, he went thither, and declared publickly, that the time was now come, when the people of Rome ſhould throw off the yoke, which the Pope, who had no right to interpoſe in any but mere Eccleſiaſtical affairs, had endeavoured to impoſe upon them. That they would now ſhew the world, that they were the worthy deſcendants of their great anceſtors, who after they had expelled their tyrants, became the Sovereigns of mankind. Father Maimbourg obſerves upon this occaſion (7), with his uſual bigotry, that as it has been found in all ages, that Heretics being impatient of any Maſters or Superiors are neceſſarily the moſt determined enemies to Monarchy, ſo this Preacher of novel doctrines, who equally attacked the Pope and the Emperor, and even the new Patrician himſelf, called upon the Romans under the pretence of liberty, to reſtore the form of their ancient Commonweal. By his bold ſpeeches likewiſe he exaſperated the people ſo much againſt Eugenius, that the latter was obliged to retire from Rome to

(7) Pag. 421.

and afterwards againſt Hadrian IV [*D*], who laid the people of Rome under an interdict till they had baniſhed Arnold and his followers. This threatning had its deſired effect. The Romans ſeized upon the houſes which the Arnoldiſts had fortified, and obliged them to retire to Otricoli in Tuſcany, where they were received with the utmoſt affection by the people, who conſidered Arnold as a Prophet. However he was ſeized ſome time after by Cardinal Gerard, and notwithſtanding the efforts of the Vicounts of Campania, who had reſcued him, he was carried to Rome, and condemned by Peter the Prefect of that city to be hanged [*E*], which was accordingly executed in the year 1155. Thirty of his followers went from France to England about the year 1160, in order to propagate their doctrine there; but they were immediately ſeized and deſtroyed, before they made above one proſelyte, which was a woman. The Author who mentions this particular obſerves, that they were called *Publicans*. William Neubrigenſis, who lived not long after, tells us, that theſe Heretics condemned Baptiſm, the Euchariſt and Marriage, and deſpiſed the Catholick Unity (*f*). Dr. Freind ſeems to have confounded *Arnoldus de Villâ Novâ* with our Arnold, when he tells us in the 2d volume of his *Hiſtory of Phyſic*, p. 253, that *he in a manner founded a Sect, which went by the name of* Arnoldiſtæ.

(*f*) Idem, ibid.

☞ARNOLDUS

Viterbo, in order to eſcape their fury, while they were plundering and deſtroying the Houſes and Palaces of perſons of the higheſt rank, and the Cardinals, who had refuſed to take the Oath of Fidelity to their Patrician. But at laſt Eugenius, after he had made uſe of his ſpiritual Arms and Anathema's againſt the Patrician Jourdan and his Adherents, had recourſe to others Arms, which ſoon proved more effectual to reduce them. For having raiſed a good body of troops, and joined them to thoſe of the city Tibur, who were enemies to the people of Rome, whom they had defeated three or four years before, he attacked them with ſuch ſucceſs, and reduced them to ſuch extremities in Rome, that they were obliged to deſire peace in the moſt ſubmiſſive manner imaginable, which they obtained upon theſe conditions; that the Rebel Jourdan ſhould be deprived of his dignity of a Patrician, which office ſhould be entirely abrogated; that the Governor, whom the Popes had appointed at home, ſhould be reſtored; and that the Senators ſhould act only according to the Orders, and under the authority of the Pope. Thus Eugenius entered Rome again as it were in triumph; where, notwithſtanding that Arnold was forc'd to leave the city, his party was ſo numerous and formidable, that the Pope for his own ſecurity quitted the Palace of the Lateran, and removed to the other ſide of the Tiber, that he might have the river between him and his enemies, whom he could not well confide in, whatever ſubmiſſion they had made (8).

(8) Otto Friſ. *Chronic.* lib. 7. cap. 31, 34, and 38. *and* Maimbourg, pag. 421, 422.

[*D*] *And afterwards againſt Hadrian IV.*] This Pope was an Engliſhman, whoſe name was Nicholas Breakſpear (9), and had been educated at the Abbey of St. Albans. At the beginning of his Pontificate he met with great oppoſition from the Arnoldiſts, who imagined, that they had a favourable opportunity under a Pope, who was a Foreigner, to recover the Sovereign Authority at Rome, which they had loſt under Eugenius. The moſt conſiderable therefore of that party, who were Senators, went to Hadrian, and told him that he muſt immediately conſent, that the Senate ſhould have the abſolute government of the State, as it had anciently; and deſired him to agree voluntarily to ſo juſt and equitable a demand; otherwiſe they were reſolved to obtain it by force. In ſhort, when they found that the new Pope, who kept himſelf on this ſide of the Tiber in the Vatican, that he might not be expoſed to their fury, rejected their petition, they ſent again for Arnold into the city, where by his vehement declamations againſt the Biſhops and Cardinals, whom he wanted to reduce to a mere ſubſiſtence upon the Alms of the people, and againſt the power of the Pope, which he endeavoured to aboliſh, he ſoon raiſed an inſurrection, eſpecially among the loweſt rank of people; ſo that every thing was involved in the moſt dreadful confuſion imaginable. Several of them fell upon the Cardinal of St. Pudentiana, who was going to the Pope, and left him upon the ſpot half dead of the wounds, which they gave him with a ſword. Hadrian being aſtoniſhed at this ſhocking attempt of theirs, and having no other arms to recur to but the ſpiritual, laid the whole city under an interdict; ſo that none of the divine offices were celebrated for a conſiderable time. This was conſidered as a dreadful circumſtance at Rome, to be abſolutely deprived of the Sacraments, and all the exerciſes of Religion; and it made a great impreſſion upon the minds of thoſe, who had the leaſt ſentiments of devotion. The moderate part of the Senate therefore, at the deſire of the Clergy, and even of the people, who began now to relent, went and caſt themſelves at the Pope's feet, and deſired him in the moſt humble and moving terms imaginable to take off the interdict, and ſwore to him upon the Holy Goſpels, that they would baniſh Arnold and his moſt reſolute adherents from Rome and its territories, if they would not immediately ſubmit to his Holineſs. *Super ſancta quatuor Evangelia juraverunt, quod prædictum Arnaldum hæreticum & alios ipſius ſectatores de totâ urbe Româ & ejus finibus expellerent, niſi, &c.* Upon their refuſing this, and abſolutely rejecting the authority of the Pope, they were obliged to leave the city; and Hadrian performed the day following at St. Peter's the Office for Holy Thurſday. He was afterwards carried by the people as it were in triumph to St. John Lateran, where he celebrated Eaſter, and lodged in the Pontifical Palace of that Church according to the cuſtom of his Predeceſſors. However, he did not continue there long; for as he could not truſt the Arnoldiſts, whoſe party was very powerful at Rome, he retired to Viterbo, to wait the arrival of the Emperor, from whom he expected a very conſiderable aſſiſtance againſt their attempts, after the great actions, which that Prince had done in Italy. But the Pope being a little apprehenſive of Frederic's victorious Army, went to *Citta di Caſtello*, from whence he ſent ſeveral Cardinals to him, to treat with him concerning the conditions of his Coronation, and to obtain ſecurities, which the Emperor gave in writing, that the Pope and Cardinals ſhould enjoy their lives, liberties, and eſtates, and not be expoſed to any inſult. He promiſed likewiſe that Hadrian ſhould have all his rights preſerved to him inviolably. But one of the principal inſtructions given to the Cardinals, was to demand that Arnold ſhould be ſurrendred to him; who having been ſeized in Tuſcany, where he ſtill continued to preach his doctrines, notwithſtanding all the Anathemas iſſued out againſt him, had been carried to the Emperor's camp. Frederic had a great curioſity to examine the man, who had been the occaſion of ſo much conteſt and diſorder in Italy; and finding, as Father Maimbourg tells us, that he was a mere impoſtor, who under pretence of reforming the world, and eſpecially the Eccleſiaſtical conſtitution, endeavoured abſolutely to deſtroy all lawful power and authority, he readily delivered him up to the Pope, who procured him to be put to death ſoon after (10).

(9) Maimbourg, pag. 432. calls him erroneouſly *Breskpeade.*

(10) Maimbourg, p. 435—438.

[*E*] *Condemned by Peter the Prefect of Rome to be hanged.*] This Prefect was entirely diſengaged from Arnaud's party, ſo that he proceeded immediately to a ſtrict trial of him, and ordered him to be hanged, and that his body, as he was an Heretic, ſhould be burnt to aſhes, and thrown into the Tiber, to prevent the weak and ſuperſtitious part of the people, who had a prodigious reverence for him, from preſerving his relicks, as if he had been a martyr. *In Tuſciæ finibus captus, principis examini reſervatus eſt, & ad ultimum ligno adjectus ac rogo, in pulverem redacto funere, ne a ſtolidâ plebe corpus ejus venerationi haberetur, in Tiberim ſparſus* (11).

Affixuſque cruci, flammâque cremante ſolutus
In cineres, Tiberine, tuas, eſt ſparſus in undas,
Ne ſtolidæ plebis, quem fecerat improbus error,
Martyris oſſa novo cineresque foveret honore (12).

(11) *Vide eund.* ibid. pag. 438.

(12) Gunter. Ligur. lib. 3. *Cod. Vatic. apud* Baron. *See* Maimbourg, pag. 438.

T.

ARNOLDUS (GODFREY or GOTHOFREDUS) a famous Miniſter and Writer among the Papiſts, in the latter end of the ſeventeenth and beginning of the eighteenth Century. We have an ample account of his Life and Writings publiſhed in Latin by John Chriſtopher Colerus [*A*] in the year 1718; but as the Author of that account was a rigid *Lutheran*, he has every where treated Arnoldus with a peculiar ſeverity and acrimony of ſtyle. However we ſhall endeavour to ſelect ſuch particulars from him, and from another Hiſtory of his Life and Works publiſhed by an anonymous Writer in High-Dutch, relating to our Divine, as may give the reader an idea of him. Arnoldus was born of a good family at Annaberg in the Mountains of Miſnia in Upper Saxony, the fourth of September 1666 (*a*). His Life written in High German ſays the fifth. His father, who was of the ſame name with him, was born at Schlettaw, and was the ſixth Collegue of the School at Annaberg, and died of a dropſy in 1695 (*b*). Our Author was three years at the Academy of Gera, from whence, by his father's advice, he went in 1685 to the Univerſity of Wittemberg, and ſtudied under the celebrated Profeſſors Waltherus, Roerenſeus, Daſſovius, Schurzfleiſchius, Quenſted, and other eminent men. Here he diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his exemplary probity, temperance, and modeſty; which virtues he himſelf acknowledged to be owing to his intenſe application to his ſtudies (*c*). While he continued at this Univerſity he publiſhed ſeveral Diſſertations [*B*]; but with regard to the Syſtem of Divinity, which he was taught by the Profeſſors there, he afterwards expreſſed the greateſt contempt for it [*C*]. In the year 1689 he obtained the Academical Degree of *Maſter of Philoſophy*, which in the following part of his life he

(*a*) Jo. Chriſt. Coleri, *Hiſt. Gothofr. Arnoldi*, Sect. 1. p. 4. Vitembergæ 1718.

(*b*) Idem, p. 7.

(*c*) Idem, pag. 7, 8.

[*A*] *An ample account of his life and writings publiſhed in Latin by John Chriſtopher Colerus.*] It was printed at Wittemberg in 1718 under the following title, *Jo. Chriſtophor. Coleri Hiſtoria Gothofredi Arnoldi, quâ de vita, ſcriptis, actiſque illius non copioſe magis quam verè atque idoneâ fide exponitur. Præmiſſa eſt Diſſertatio Critica de Corruptoribus Hiſtoriæ Eccleſiaſticæ. Cum Præfatione Gottlieb Wernſdorfii Theol. D. & P. P. O. Templi OO. SS. Præpoſ. & Senat. Eccl. Aſſeſſoris:* i. e. "The Hiſtory of Godfrey Arnoldus "by John Chriſtopher Colerus, in which an ample "and authentick account is given of his Life, Writ-"ings, and Actions. To which is prefixed a critical "Diſſertation concerning the Corrupters of Eccleſia-"ſtical Hiſtory. With a Preface by Gottlieb Wernſ-"dorf Doctor of Divinity, &c." Colerus in his *Prolegomena* (1) aſſures us, that he was not influenced by any prejudice or partiality in writing his account of Arnoldus, but had paid the utmoſt regard to truth. That he has frequently quoted his own words; and omitted nothing deſignedly, which could be of the leaſt advantage to the defence of his cauſe. That he had taken the utmoſt pains to inſert all that had been urged by him and his friends in his favour. *Nolim verò aliquis exiſtimet me quidquam vel odio dediſſe, vel amori. Simpliciter & bonâ fide ſcripſi. Ipſius Arnoldi ſubinde excitavi verba & confeſſionem. Nihil ſtudioſe præterii, quod ad qualemcunque illius defenſionem pertinere poterat. Cumulavi ferè & diligenter attuli, quæ vel Arnoldus vel amici ad cauſam dicendam excogitârunt.* However he obſerves on the other hand, that he thought proper to omit nothing, which had been remark'd againſt Arnoldus by men of the beſt reputation and character; much leſs to favour thoſe perſons, who ſeemed to have confederated together to deſtroy the Church, of which he was a member. *Verum tamen minimè quoque omittenda cenſui, quæ optimi & integerrimi viri contra Arnoldum monuerunt; multoque minus iis adblandiendum putavi, qui in ruinam cœtus noſtri conſpirâſſe videntur* (2). Dr. Gottlieb Wernſdorf in his Preface to this Book of Colerus, tells us, that the Author had the beſt aſſiſtances poſſible in compoſing his account of Arnoldus; and that notwithſtanding all the clamours of the Fanatics, who may complain that he has been injured in it, impartial perſons will be of a different opinion; and find, that Colerus has written without the leaſt prejudice of any kind, and imputed nothing to Arnoldus without the ſureſt grounds, and in ſhort confirmed every thing which he has advanced, by the moſt undoubted teſtimonies. *Frement, ſcio, fanatici, multaſque viro injurias per hoc ſcriptum illatas eſſe clamabunt: at æqui rerum æſtimatores multo aliter judicabunt. Nihil enim odio, nihil gratiæ, dediſſe Colerum, & nec finxiſſe quicquam, nec Arnoldo præter meritum imputaſſe, ſed omnia idoneis validiſque, imo & publicis documentis ac teſtimoniis comprobaſſe hi facilè largientur noſtro, qui libellum non obiter inſpicere dignabuntur.* But the judicious reader will ſuſpect, that Dr. Wernſdorf is a little too much prejudiced himſelf, when he ſhall obſerve in what terms he ſpeaks of Arnoldus in that Preface. He tells us, that among all the innovators ſince Luther's Reformation there was none appeared to ſo much diſadvantage as Arnoldus, that *Pedler in Hiſtory*, as he calls him, who is generally contemned, *quam infamatus ille à pleriſque hiſtoricaſter Arnoldus.* In ſhort, that it will ſeem a prodigy to poſterity, that Saxony, which before was the ſeat of pure doctrine, and produced many excellent perſons, ſhould give birth to a man of ſo fanatical, irregular, and malignant a diſpoſition and conduct. *Prodigio ſimile poſteritati videbitur intra Saxoniam, quæ huc dum purioris doctrinæ ſedes, bonorumque ingeniorum ferax eſt habita, hominem uſque adeo* fanaticum, diſtortum, & maledicum, *naſci potuiſſe.* He proceeds then to repreſent him under the moſt odious colours, and in all the ſeverity of language imaginable; which muſt render Dr. Wernſdorf a very improper perſon to give a recommendation of another man's performance with regard to the impartiality of it.

(1) Pag. 47.

(2) Ibid. p. 48.

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſeveral Diſſertations.*] The ſubjects of them were *de Lotione manuum*, i. e. "con-"cerning the waſhing of the hands;" *de Hermunduris*, i. e. "concerning the *Hermunduri*, an ancient "people of Germany;" *de locutione Angelorum*, i. e. "concerning the ſpeaking of the Angels;" *de Hiſtoria Georgii Ducis, &c.* i. e. "of the Hiſtory of Duke "George, &c." They were publiſhed at Wittemberg in 1686, and at Gieſſen in 1697. The ſtyle of them is not inelegant (3).

(3) Colerus, *Hiſt. Got. Arnold.* Sect. 4. pag. 107. *and* Sect. 3. p. 100.

[*C*] *He afterwards expreſſed the greateſt contempt for it.*] Colerus (4) obſerves, that it was the cuſtom not only of Arnoldus, but of all the other Fanatics, as he ſtiles them, of our Age, to treat Syſtematical Divinity as a mere ſcholaſtic Scheme, conſiſting of a ſett of terms not to be found in Scripture. He then proceeds to ſome remarks upon this ſubject, the ſubſtance of which we ſhall give the reader. The term *School-Divinity* may be conſidered in two ſenſes; the one grammatical and common, and the other more peculiar and determinate. In the former ſenſe, all that Divinity, which is taught in the Schools and Univerſities, of what kind ſoever it is, may be called School-Divinity. But in the other ſenſe, it ſignifies that ſcheme of doctrines, which is not only oppoſed to myſtical Divinity and that of the Fathers, but likewiſe to that, which depends rather upon Revelation, and the Prophets and Apoſtles, than upon human Reaſon and Art. If School-Divinity indeed were to be eſtimated only from the works of Peter Lombard and Thomas Aquinas, and the Commentators upon them, who are full of trifling and impertinent diſquiſitions, it might juſtly be rejected. But School-Divinity is not to be confined within ſuch narrow limits. For there is certainly an uſeful ſcheme of it, which teaches us to diſcourſe properly and ſolidly concerning God and his Attributes, and other points of Religion, out of the Scriptures, and conſiſts in an accu-

(4) Sect. 1. pag. 9, 10, 11, 12.

rate

he opposed so vehemently, and absolutely refused to make use of [D]. From Wittemberg he removed to Dresden Anno 1689, and put himself under the direction of the famous Philip James Spener, who had the greatest regard for him imaginable, and introduced him to the acquaintance of Christopher Ritter, Counsellor of the Elector of Saxony, by whose means he was made Tutor to the children of Goetzius and Bircholzius. In 1693 he went to Quedlinburg, and taught the sons of Mr. Stammius for near four years together (*d*). He was more than once sollicited to engage in the Ministry, but refused, because he thought the Church of Germany was sunk into many flagrant corruptions [*E*]. He was employed as a corrector of the press at Francfort upon the Maine (*e*), according to Colerus; but the Author of his Life in High-Dutch, plainly proves this to be without any grounds. In 1697 he was appointed Professor of History at Giessen, by the Landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt, without any application on his part; but as he had a very scrupulous conscience, and could not conform himself to all the formalities received in the Universities of Germany, he resigned his Professorship (*f*), and published a book to explain the reasons of his conduct in that point [*F*]. He retired therefore to Quedlinburg in

(*d*) Idem, ibid. pag. 8—17.

(*e*) Idem, p. 18.

(*f*) *Journal Literaire de May & Juin*, 1714. p. 223. *and* Colerus, p. 21.

rate and methodical explication of them. This is necessary, not indeed with regard to the Scriptures themselves, but on account of the arts of various adversaries, which we are obliged to encounter with in Religion, especially the Papists; which if the Church was not disturbed with, we might easily dispense with the want of School-Divinity, even the more sound and pure part of it. *Necessaria quidem est, non propter res ipsas sacras & divinas, earumque interpretationem, sed ob adversariorum, maxime Pontificiorum, artes & technas, quibus nisi infestaretur Ecclesia, facile omni illâ careret, quam dixi, theologiâ scholasticâ, etiam emendatiori & satis sobriâ.* Nor does there seem any sufficient reason, why all Philosophy should be excluded from Divinity and the profession of it, if it be but used with proper caution and moderation. Arnoldus and his followers object against the Lutheran Systems of Divinity as scholastic and full of philosophical terms; which Colerus imagines may be confuted, by shewing that their Divinity is not at all like that of the Roman Catholicks, which has no dependence upon Scripture, but upon the Doctrines of the Fathers, and the Canons of Councils, and is almost wholly employed in profane or frivolous enquiries.

[*D*] *Obtained the Academical Degree of Master of Philosophy, which in the following part of his life he opposed so vehemently, and absolutely refused to make use of.*] We are told in the Life of him written in High-Dutch, that *he himself declared, that the vice of ambition had been greatly inflamed in him by the usual provocations of some of his Superiors, insomuch that they prevailed upon him in the year* 1686, *to accept of the Academical Degree of Master of Philosophy.* But Colerus observes (5), that it was undoubtedly with his consent. His opinion concerning the Academical Degrees appears from the following passage in his *Ecclesiastical History* (6). *It is a scandal and a sin, (Bona verba, quæso,* says *Colerus) that these weighty Pillars of Anti-Christianity are yet almost every where preserved, by those who value themselves upon a Reformation, as so many* Holy Relicks; *and as such are in use at our Universities. But what will not the hypocritical world do for money?* And particularly with regard to the Degree in Philosophy he tells us (7): That whereas at Wittenberg, in the year 1544, in Luther's time, but three Candidates took at one time their Degree of *Master of Arts*, no longer afterwards than in the year 1551, forty, and in the year 1602, sixty two were admitted at once. So that between the years 1502 and 1655 the number amounted to 7467, who were sent from that one University, dignified with this Degree, to seek their fortune in the wide world. This abuse gave occasion to the following lines.

(5) Pag. 15.

(6) Part 1. lib. 12. cap. 3. pag. 352.

(7) Ibid. pag. 2. B. 16. c. 10.

Quamvis sit nostri appellatio vana magistri,
Omni qui vacuum fert ratione caput.
Attamen est nostro reverentia danda magistro,
Et suus est asinis attribuendus honos.
Felicem O nostram, cui contigit esse magistrum,
Non tribuit cunctis Laida amare Venus.
Dulce sonat; Bene veneretis, venerande Magister
Noster, & in primo docte sedeto loco.
Magna magistrorum solet esse superbia nostrûm,
Larvas bullati qui subiere Dei.
Per casus omnes est bestia stulta magister,
Inflat quem nudi larva magisterii.

These Verses are extracted from Naogeorgius's *Appendix Regni Papistici* (8). Francis Albertus Apinus published a Dissertation at Rostoch in 1702, intitled, *De Moralitate Graduum Academicorum ex juris naturæ principiis contra Fanaticos præsertim asserta*; i. e. "The Lawfulness of Academical Degrees proved "from the principles of the Law of Nature, particularly in opposition to the Fanaticks."

(8) Pag. 41. *apud* Coler. pag. 16.

[*E*] *Because he thought the Church of Germany was sunk into a great many flagrant corruptions.*] He confesses this himself in his *Confess. de Abdic. Prof. Giss.* (9), where he tells us, *That, besides being convinced of the great decay, into which the whole state of what they called Christianity was fallen, he had no design to accept of any Ecclesiastical Dignity, especially as he found he had neither the capacity nor the inclination to conform to the outward ceremonies, and the dissimulation which almost necessarily attended them.*

(9) § 4.

[*F*] *Publish'd a Book to explain the reasons of his conduct in that point.*] It was printed in 12°, in 1692, and intitled, *Offenhertzige Bekaentniss &c.* i. e. *A candid Confession upon his late resigning of his Academical Dignity.* The sixth edition printed at Francfort in 12°, in 1700, is intitled, *Offenhertzige &c.* i. e. *A candid Confession, to which is now added,* 1. *Several Testimonies of Christian liberty, in the common service of the Church*; 2. *The State of the Universities (in Germany)*; 3. *A short Counter-Admonition, in answer to an anonymous sincere Admonition, &c.* Compare Intercepted Letters, I. Pack. p. 39---40. Colerus tells us, that his reasons were for the greatest part impertinent and trifling; and that one of the chief causes, which he urged for leaving his Professorship, was the great scruples and uneasiness of conscience, which he suffered. Arnoldus's words are as follow (10): *Die Haupt-Ursachen, &c.* i. e. *The chief motives for this my resolution, as far as I am allowed to reveal and express them, from the inward recesses of my heart, were as follow:* §. 11. *Hence,* says he, *it is easy to conceive, what a conflict was excited in me, between the flesh and the Spirit.... Insomuch that my heart was frequently in a manner rent asunder, lifeless, overwhelmed with misery and pain, and as it were swimming in tears.* He alledges likewise the manner of life among the Asceticks (11). *Meines Orths gestehe &c.* i. e. *For my part, I readily confess, that when I have, at any time, look'd into ancient History, the examples of the primitive Christians, and, among them, of the Hermits, and Asceticks, have made me blush for shame... Especially when several persons of their own accord assured me, they should never believe, that notwithstanding this knowledge, and the testimony I had frequently born of it, I should nevertheless accept of a regular dignity, and submit to the ordinances. I must thereby necessarily be tied down.* He urges the example of Abraham (12): *And suppose, Abraham was tempted even to the murder of his son, and without doubt at that time, if it had been made known, would have been cruelly censured, yet would his faith have been accounted to him a justification.... However, it is very grievous to observe, that* God, *in the wonderful ways of his hidden Providence, should hardly deviate a step from the common path,*

(10) § 14.

(11) § 43.

(12) § 52.

in 1698, and lived privately in the houſe of Mr. John Henry Sproegelius, where he had frequent conteſts with the Divines of that city [G]. In the year 1700 he went to Altſted, where he indeed engaged in the Miniſtry, and was made Chaplain to the Ducheſs Dowager of Eiſenach, but with an abſolute liberty of conſcience. About the ſame time he married Anna Maria, the daughter of Sproegelius, by whom he had one ſon and one daughter, both of whom died in 1709 (*g*). He met with great difficulties in being admitted into his function at Altſted; and at laſt in 1705 was obliged to leave that city. He took his leave of his Auditors in a ſhort Sermon, which is publiſhed in his Poſtills [H]. It happened very fortunately for him, that he was ſoon after invited to Brandenburg by the late King of Pruſſia to ſucceed his father-in-law as inſpector of the Dioceſs, and appointed the Magiſtracy Paſtor of the church of Werben, which function he diſcharged very peaceably for ſeveral years (*h*). In 1707, after long ſollicitation of the Magiſtracy and Citizens, his Pruſſian Majeſty appointed him Paſtor and Inſpector of the Churches of Perleberg, and afterwards Hiſtoriographer to that Court (*i*). He died of a fever [I] the 30th of May 1714 (*k*), being forty eight years of age. Colerus tells us, that there was a report, that juſt before his death he expreſſed his concern for having publiſhed his *Sophia*, and written his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* with too little caution and prudence, which fact however other leſs prejudiced writers have very much queſtioned; and the Author of his Life in High-German, who is very particular as to his behaviour in his laſt illneſs, and eſpecially in his laſt hours, takes no manner of notice of it. We have his epitaph in the account of his Life publiſhed in High-Dutch; but Colerus has written one for him, which is the ſtrongeſt Satyr upon him imaginable [K]. We are informed in the *Journal Literaire* (*l*),

(g) Colerus, p. 34, 35.

(h) Idem, pag. 36, 37.

(i) Idem, pag. 38.

(k) Idem, pag. 39, 40.

path, or perform a work, which is not conſonant with the hypocritical ways, and falſe appearances of the world, &c. He then proceeds to the example of St. Gregory Nazianzen and St. Baſil (13). *In ſubſequent times not only many thouſands purſued that manner of life, but even ſome famous Teachers, partly as being weary of ſo frequent diſperſions, and partly with a deſire to avoid falling into the general corruption of the times, continued it. Thus, among many others,* Greg. Naz. *and* Baſil the Great *frequently laid down the moſt eminent Eccleſiaſtical Dignities to embrace a retired and ſolitary life, &c.* But Colerus ſhews, that he was miſtaken in thoſe two inſtances with regard to Nazianzen and St. Baſil; ſince the latter at laſt returned from the wilderneſs, and undertook the care of the Church of Cæſarea under Euſebius, whom he ſucceeded in that See in the year 370. And St. Gregory was Biſhop of Nazianzum (14). Arnoldus (15) urges the ſaying of our Saviour in Matth. vi. 24; and *Thro' this ſuperior and heavenly power all falſe motives, objections, and colours of reaſon and obſtinate ſelf-will, were ſo ſuppreſſed, that, at length, a juſt and certain concluſion followed:* "That no man could ſerve "two maſters." He treats the univerſities in general with great ſeverity and particularly in §. 62, where he ſays, *To conclude, my earneſt deſire and prayer to God is, that he will direct the hearts and minds of Kings, Princes and Magiſtrates, and excite in them a ſpirit of zeal for his honour, to break down the high places of Baal, to hew down all the groves, and to purge the land of its idolatry, &c.* Nay he ſhews the utmoſt contempt for all human learning, as appears by the following paſſages: *I make no ſcruple to confeſs, that I have found no more plauſible, and at the ſame time more powerful and conſtant ſuppreſſor of the Spirit, and hinderance of a perfect union with* CHRIST, *than human learning. . . . . In truth, there is a peculiar peſt predominant with the learned, which ſeizes and bewitches all the faculties of the ſoul with a ſecret but penetrating venom, and without a real apoſtacy renders them unfit for the holy and meek Kingdom of* CHRIST. l. c. §. 57. He tells us likewiſe as follows. *My natural inclination and capacity drew me to aim at much knowledge, eſpecially in Philoſophy, and therein in Antiquity, Civil and Critical Hiſtory: And in this the Spirit, labouring under great uneaſineſs, was liable to much danger and detriment. From this likewiſe the love of* GOD, *by a conſtant oppoſition and teſtimony, frequently drew me with great vehemence, and led me to the one only neceſſary knowledge. Inſomuch that I was ſeveral times conſtrained, by the utmoſt anxiety of my own heart, and by the conviction of the extreme vanity* (of human learning) *not only to lay aſide all unneceſſary ſtudy, but to part with all my Books, ſome few only excepted; &c.* Lit. A. 3. b. A. 4. §. 3.

(13) § 45.

(14) Coler. pag. 28, 29.

(15) § 17.

[G] *Where he had frequent conteſts with the Divines of the city.*] Theſe Divines (16) *made it their buſineſs to excite the Abbeſs of Quedlinburg againſt him, and in order thereunto publiſhed an invective, in which they laid many heinous crimes; none of which, when it came to the point, they could ſhew any grounds for. The King of Pruſſia being made ſenſible of the oppreſſion he laboured under, took both him and his father-in-law under his ſpecial protection, and appointed a Commiſſion of Enquiry, enjoining his accuſers to juſtify their charge before this Commiſſion, but they evaded it by calling the competency of it in queſtion, as they were immediately dependant on the Abbey, and ſo the matter reſted.*

(16) Colerus, Sect. 7. pag. 215, 216, 217.

[H] *Took his farewel of his auditors in a ſhort Sermon, which is publiſhed in his Poſtills.*] *In this Sermon he applied that Text of Scripture to himſelf, in which Our Saviour ſays in a Prophetick ſtyle:* They will thruſt you out of their Synagogue, &c. and adds: *My departure from hence does not proceed merely from the will of man,* (for then I muſt long ſince have left you) *no, it is ordained by the holy and unblameable counſel of* GOD.

[I] *He died of a fever.*] We are informed in his Life publiſhed in High-Dutch (17), *That on the thirtieth of May,* 1714, *being Whit-ſunday, ſome Officers who were liſting ſoldiers broke into the church during the Communion, and by force ſeized and carried off ſome young men, the fright of which gave ſuch a ſhock to his weak conſtitution already worn out by too great an application to ſtudy, that he never was himſelf afterwards; and tho' he preached a Funeral-Sermon the afternoon of the day following, his ſpirits ſo failed him, that the Burgomaſter perceiving it, ſent the Sexton into the pulpit, to ſtand behind him, leſt he ſhould ſink down in the midſt of his Sermon. This ſurprize and fright threw him into a burning fever, which carried him off ten days afterwards.*

(17) Cap. 3.

[K] *Colerus has written an Epitaph for him, which is the ſtrongeſt Satyr upon him imaginable.*] It is as follows: *M. S. Hic ſitus eſt Gothofredus Arnoldus Theologus non tam ipſe, quam Theologorum inſectator acerrimus, hæreticorum defenſor perpetuus, theologiæ myſticæ inſtaurator, & fanaticiſmi incruſtator æque impudentiſſimus, corruptorum hiſtoriæ ſacræ facile princeps, ſcriptorum mole orbem literatum non tam auxit quam obruit. Qui ut plurimum detrimenti caperet Eccleſia Lutherana curavit diligenter; magnum ſui reliquit deſiderium apud Novatores omnes, infelicem apud orthodoxos memoriam. Religionem coluit miſcellaneam aut nullam. Jam Deo relictus Judici. Ilicet.* That is, "Here lies the body "of Godfrey Arnoldus, who was not ſo much a Di- "vine himſelf, as a moſt vehement oppoſer of the Di- "vines; a conſtant defender of Heretics, a reſtorer of "myſtical Divinity, and as weak a reviver of Fanati- "ciſm. He was the Head of all the corruptors of Eccle- "ſiaſtical Hiſtory; and he did not ſo much enrich the "world as overwhelm it with the multitude of his "writings. He took all poſſible pains to injure "the Lutheran Church. His loſs is greatly regret-

Literaire (*l*), that he was a ſolid Divine, a great lover of peace, and exempt from prejudices, and that though his learning was very extenſive, his piety was ſtill much ſuperior to it. That he was a ſincere Profeſſor of the myſtical Divinity, and practiſed himſelf what he preached to others. And that after Mr. Spener's death he was conſidered as the Patriarch of the Pietiſts. But as that name is generally given to thoſe, who endeavour to reform the abuſes introduced into the church, and condemn a laxneſs of morals, this imputation was a real advantage to his character. The rigid Lutherans repreſent him in a very different manner, and particularly Colerus, who endeavours to ſhew, that Arnoldus was not a Lutheran [*L*], but deſerved the title of an *Indifferentiſt* [*M*], and maintained ſeveral

(*l*) *Ubi ſupra.*

" ted by all Innovators in Religion, and his memory " abhorred by the orthodox. He was fond of a mix- " ed Religion or rather of none. But now he is left " to God his Judge."

[*L*] *Endeavours to ſhew, that Arnoldus was not a Lutheran.*] He obſerves, that Arnoldus in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* every where repreſents the Lutheran Church in the moſt ſhocking colours imaginable; and he refers us for the proof in what manner he treats the Lutherans to the Index of that Book under the word *Lutheran*, where we find the following reproachful terms; *They are fallen into the uttermoſt Corruption; their Decay is general; their ſcandalous Lives; their Pride and Diſſentions, which he compares to the Confuſion of Babel; the utmoſt Perverſity of the greateſt part; worſe than Papiſts or Heathens; their Security and Preſumption; their Epicuriſm; their Errors and Hereſy; their Heterodoxy; their Fanaticiſm; their Impurity; their Enmity againſt the Calviniſts; their human Traditions, Popery, and ſymbolical Books; their Perſecution of others; their falſe Goſpel, their Paganiſm, Atheiſm, &c.* Colerus then remarks, that he ſhewed the utmoſt averſion to all Creeds, Confeſſions of Faiths, and other Forms of Doctrine among the Lutherans, which he repreſented as dangerous, impious, contrary to Chriſtian liberty, or adapted to bring Popery itſelf in again; and that he exploded the oath, which is taken in the Lutheran Church to defend the doctrine contained in theſe Forms and Confeſſions of Faith. *Libros autem eccleſiæ noſtræ ſymbolicos, quibus ab aliis demum heterodoxorum cœtibus diſcernimur, non ſolum ſuſque deque habuit, verum etiam noxios, impios, libertati Chriſtianæ contrarios, & ad reducendum poſtliminio ipſum papatum aptos pronunciavit, juſque illud jurandum, quo ad tuendum librorum ſymbolicorum præſcriptam doctrinam obſtringimur, audacter exploſit* (18). This he proves from ſeveral paſſages in Arnoldus's Writings, and particularly in the Index of his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, in which *they are ſaid to be unprofitable, erroneous, and unpracticable, unneceſſary, hurtful and reprovable.* Wernſdorf in his Diſſertation *de Auctoritate Librorum ſymbolicorum*, ſubjoined to his *Comm. de Indiff. Relig.* (19) obſerves, that while Arnoldus upon every occaſion oppoſes and remonſtrates againſt Creeds and other innocent Forms of declaring our ſentiments in Religion, ſeems to regret this only, that the Church is not expoſed to greater danger, and that the truth does not lay open to the attacks of more of its ſecret enemies. *Sane dum Arnoldus ſymbola & innocentes loquendi formulas quavis occaſione reprehendit & taxat, nihil aliud dolere & miſereri videtur, quam eccleſiam non majori expoſitam eſſe periculo, aut veritatem pluribus opportunam inſidiis.* Colerus infers therefore from Arnoldus's ſentiment upon that ſubject, that upon this very account eſpecially he ought not to be conſidered as a Lutheran, ſince he proceeded in ſo licentious and wicked a manner to oppoſe all Creeds and Forms of Religion, and refuſed his aſſent to them; which being removed, not only the unity of the faith will be deſtroyed, but a new faith will ariſe every year, as St. Hilary writes concerning the Arians, or perhaps every month, and there will neceſſarily follow ſuch an unbounded liberty of conſcience, as has filled Holland, England, and many other countries with a variety of monſtrous opinions: *Quibus tamen è medio ſublatis non tantum exſpirabit unitas fidei noſtræ, ſed, quod de Arianis ſcripſit Hilarius, annua ſolum & menſtrua fides exſurget, eaque ſubſequetur credendi libertas, quæ Belgiam, Angliam, plureſque alias Regiones tot peſtibus implevit* (20). He ſhews likewiſe, that Arnoldus ſpeaks every where of the Lutheran Divines, as well dead as living, in the ſevereſt terms of reproach (21); and owns expreſly, that the ſtate of the Lutheran Church, as well as others, appeared to him ſo very corrupt, that he ſcrupled to join himſelf to it. The following paſſage in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (22) is directly to this purpoſe: *That, whereas as well in this Century, as in the foregoing, no other judgment can be formed of this (the Lutheran) Church; but that it is, juſt as the other mighty and ruling Sects in the world, fallen into the uttermoſt corruption; and that the few* (abovementioned) *witneſſes, together with the reſt of the myſtical ſervants of the Lord, diſperſed in every viſible Church-Community, have always, and alone, conſtituted the true tho' inviſible Church of* God, *&c.*

(18) Coler. Sect. 2. pag. 46, 47, 48.

(19) Pag. 512. § 7. *apud* Coler. pag. 47, 48.

(20) Coler. pag. 43.

(21) Idem, pag. 48, 49.

(22) Pag. 2. B. 17. cap. 5. pag. 174. § 29. *apud* Coler. p. 51.

[*M*] *Deſerv'd the title of an Indifferentiſt.*] Colerus affirms, that he was not only no Lutheran, but even could not be juſtly ranked in any Proteſtant Church; and was conſequently an *Indifferentiſt*, as he expreſſes it, or a man of all religions, or none, at leaſt of no determinate ſcheme of Doctrines. Wernſdorf in his *Brevis & nervoſa de Indifferentiſmo Religionum Commentatio* (23) tells us, that Arnoldus was infected above all others with the pernicious doctrine of Indifferency with regard to religion, as appears from his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, wherein there is ſcarce a page, in which he does not deny the exiſtence of any viſible Church; and rejects all the peculiar diſtinctions between the different commotions; he places all the ſects upon the ſame foot with the true Church; repreſents the Socinians, thoſe ſworn enemies of the Divine Majeſty, as true and ſincere Chriſtians; defends thoſe profeſſed Indifferentiſts, Puccius, Werdenhagius, Kainus, Tſcheſchius, Coornhert, and others; ridicules the complaints and judgments, which our Divines make of them; deſpiſes all external obſervances; and maintains only an internal and enthuſiaſtical ſenſe of religion. This is evident from ſeveral paſſages in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, and particularly, in P. II. f. 726. n. 4. he writes thus; *When we hear it on every ſide loudly proclaimed: Behold, here is* Christ, *there is* Christ! *See, he is in this Church, or School; in this or that Sermon or Service, in this College, Chamber or private Aſſembly; in this or that Perſon he is alone; a Soul that has a knowledge of* Christ *gives no heed to theſe calls, nor ſeeks him any where but in herſelf, &c.* Again, in P. IV. *And herein* (viz. *that* God *ſows his* Myſtical *Seed every where in private, by an inviſible Communion, and ſpiritual faculties, the growth of which no Tyrant, falſe Zealot or Hypocrite can ſuppreſs, or hinder from bringing forth fruit, in ſome a thouſand times a thouſand fold,) lies the foundation, why the true Church of* Christ, *muſt, at all times, neceſſarily have ſubſiſted, in every Sect, Nation and Language, inviſible, hidden, oppreſſed and ſolitary; becauſe the Kingdom of* God *has always been internal, and conſequently not to be diſcerned by human eyes, &c.* And again evidently; n. 13. *Hence it follows neceſſarily, that indeed (according to the confeſſion of* St. Peter) *among all theſe multitudes, all thoſe are acceptable to* God, *who fear him and do Righteouſneſs, and therefore, he every where ſows, nouriſhes and preſerves his* Myſtical *Seed: But that, nevertheleſs, no one who has otherwiſe an honeſt and upright intention, is to be blamed, if he fixes his happineſs, in depending on* God *alone, and in following his only* Lord *and Shepherd,* Jesus Christ, *without naming or conforming himſelf according to the Name, Tradition, or Model of any other Perſon whatſoever,* &c. Colerus likewiſe endeavours to prove him an *Indifferentiſt*, becauſe Arnoldus, as he informs us, conſidered the Scriptures as a rule of life only, and not as a ſtandard of Doctrine; diſapproved of all Creeds and Confeſſions of Faith, and complained that their authority was too great; rejected all the diſtinguiſhing names among Chriſtians, and exploded all Churches under

(23) Pag. 80, 81. *apud* Coler. p. 54, 55, 56.

several groſs errors [*N*]; and conſequently that his antagoniſts have merited the greateſt honour by defending the Church againſt his attacks. He proceeds then to give his opinion concerning the genius, prejudices, and learning of Arnoldus; and obſerves, that his mind had a great mixture of good and bad diſpoſitions; that he had an uncommon quickneſs and

under the title of Sects; affirmed, that no ſcheme of Religion was exactly true, or exempt from all error and guilt; but that all of them have ſo much truth remaining among them, that the Profeſſors may be ſaved, if they make the proper uſe of it. He diſapproved of Polemical Divinity, and condemned all diſputes concerning Religion; and oppoſed all Syſtems, Catechiſms, Confeſſions, and Creeds. He affirmed, that a ſimple, general, and ſuperficial knowledge of Divinity was ſufficient for ſalvation. He extenuated the efficacy of the outward word of God; and plainly objected againſt Infant-Baptiſm. He repreſented the uſe of the Lord's Supper as an indifferent point; and imagined that there was an extraordinary converſion of men to Religion. He denied the reality of a viſible Church, and the neceſſity of embracing it. He profeſſed that he was averſe to all Parties and Sects in general. He affirmed, that the Characteriſtic of the true Church, was not the lawful diſpenſation of the Word and Sacraments, but Charity and the Love of Peace. He aſſerted, that the very worſt deſigns, expreſſions, and actions of Heretics were to be explained in the moſt favourable ſenſe, and that all errors were to be excuſed; and that manifeſt Heretics ought not to be confuted, or even condemned, or baniſhed out of the State. And he rejected all external obſervances, Worſhips, Ceremonies, and Churches. This is the repreſentation, which Colerus has given us of his Doctrine (24); who tells us, that we may properly ſtile Arnoldus the *Mareſchal de Camp General* of all the Indifferentiſts, who ever appeared: *Rectius Arnoldum Indifferentiſtarum omnium, quos ſol vidit unquam*, Generalem Campi Mareſchallum *vocemus, licet* (25).

(24) Pag. 56, 57, 58.

(25) Coler. pag. 58.

[*N*] *Maintained ſeveral groſs errors.*] We have mentioned in the preceding Note ſeveral of his aſſertions, which render'd him very obnoxious to the Orthodox; and we ſhall now proceed to what Colerus further obſerves concerning his opinions. He acknowledged, according to that Author (26), the authority of the Scripture, but weakened the certainty and perfection of it, and aſſerted, that we ought to wait for the *Afflatus* or Inſpiration of the Holy Spirit, which is of higher importance to us. His ſentiments upon this ſubject will appear from the following paſſages in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*. *In the Writings even of the Apoſtles* (ſays he) *we meet ſometimes with Paſſages, which ſeem to be doubtful, and might not be ſo readily aſſented to by every one*, as 1 Cor. XI. 4. ſeq. *And for this very reaſon, the* Primitive Chriſtians *were to form their judgment how to underſtand theſe Writings, by the direction of* God; *and thereby to prove all things, as it was commanded them, without exception.* 1 Theſ. V. 21. Vid. Hæreſiol. L. I. C. V. §. 5. f. 49. id. n. 6. *The* Theſſalonians *alone were taught by* God, *and ſtood in no need of Apoſtolick Epiſtles..... That* God *alone might have the Honour of it, and no other* God *but him be made of any thing*, &c. He endeavoured, ſays Colerus (27), to render the Canon of the Scripture doubtful and uncertain, or even to remove it, and complained that too great a regard was paid to its authority. And he was of opinion, that without ſome higher principle, and the immediate and extraordinary Revelation of the Spirit, there could have been no certain grounds for ſettling the Canon of Scripture, becauſe there was no outward teſtimony or command, which was delivered down to the Chriſtians of that age for that purpoſe. *Nimirum ita ſenſit Arnoldus, ſine ſublimiori principio & afflatu Spiritus immediato & extraordinario non potuiſſe de libris in Canonem Scripturæ referendis aliâ ratione conſtare, utpote de ipſo externum ad neminem Chriſtianorum illius ætatis vel teſtimonium vel mandatum pervenerit.* This aſſertion of his is examined by Godfrey Olearius in the *Prolegomena* to his *Obſervationes Sacræ in Matthæum* (28). With regard to the Trinity, Arnoldus affirmed, that the explicit knowledge of that myſtery is not neceſſary to ſalvation; and he objected againſt the Decree of the Council of Nice, and treated the terms of *Trinity, Perſon, and* Ὁμοουσία or *Conſubſtantiality* with contempt. Beſides, he contemned all the labours of the ancient Church in defence of this myſtery, as appears from this paſſage in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (29). *The* Primitive Chriſtians *talked in a very different ſtrain of the* Godhead, *than they began afterwards to diſcourſe of it from* Human Tradition. *They knew nothing of the words*, Trinity, Perſon, ὁμοούσιος, *and the like.* He calls the ſenſe of the Church concerning the Trinity, *ſpurious, inſincere*, and *idolatrous* (30). He ſpeaks of our Saviour in ſuch an ambiguous manner, as makes him very much ſuſpected of Arianiſm (31). He derogates extremely from the Sacraments; and repreſents Baptiſm as a mere ceremony. He ſeems evidently to diſapprove of Infant-Baptiſm, as appears from the following paſſage in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (32). *At his very entrance in this life, he* (Wenceſlaus) *is ſaid by the Prieſts, to have been guilty of a crying ſin, becauſe he bewrayed the Font; tho' the poor child could not help the juggling tricks they were playing with him: which, as well as his Coronation, they ought to have deferred till he had been of riper years. And he expreſſly calls Baptiſm* (33), *an ancient Cuſtom, which was retained in the firſt Century.* With reſpect to the Lord's Supper, he repreſents it in a very low manner, as a mere outward obſervance, which the more perfect Chriſtians have no occaſion for; and conſiders the uſe of it in the Lutheran Church as abſolutely idolatrous. The following paſſages (34) will give light into his ſentiments upon this ſubject. *On this foundation, they,* (*the* Primitive Chriſtians) *as many of them as were perfect*, Phil. iii. 15. *ſtood in no need of exteriour remedies, ſuch as were ordained for the weak, in whom* Christ, *himſelf, was not yet firmly rooted. They, therefore, laid no ſtrict injunction on one another to communicate; neither as a means to ſtrengthen their faith, nor in remembrance of* Christ, *nor as an union among themſelves. They left every man to his liberty, in this point; becauſe they found no direct command for it, either from* Christ *or the Apoſtles, who only had admoniſhed them, as often as they did it* (*without determining the neceſſity or circumſtances of it,*) *to do it in remembrance of* Christ, *and that, till he himſelf came. For them, therefore, to whom* Christ *was come, and, according to his promiſe, had manifeſted himſelf, this practice muſt of courſe ceaſe, the Lord having taken up his conſtant abode in them. And, in ſuch, the marriage of the Lamb took place of it as a fore-runner of a future, manifeſt carrying home* (35). *And of juſt the ſame ſentiments they were, with regard to other exteriour ſigns with which they no longer amuſed themſelves, after they had attained to the real eſſence of CHRIST*, &c. Vid. Hæreſiol. P. I. p. 53. Idem. p. 110. *Much leſs did any idolatry or conceit, ſuperſtition and abuſe prevail among them, or induce them to make uſe of it as a* Panacea, *which abuſe of it afterwards crept in, and has been of long duration.* Again, p. 346. *The moſt abominable Idolatry and arrant* Capernaiſm *continue yet to bear ſway among thoſe who pretend to Orthodoxy. They build all their hopes upon it, and think, the Holy Food muſt cleanſe them from all their abominations, which is the ready way to* Atheiſm. Laſtly, he bears this teſtimony of himſelf. *I, for my part, am ſtrenuouſly for the participation of the* Lord's-Supper, *according to the plain and evident words of* Christ, *and the example and practices of the Primitive Apoſtolical Church, in remembrance of him, and for a manifeſtation of his death; and that, frequently and oftener than I could ever have an opportunity of doing it in the Church. And here, I would be underſtood, not alone of the internal and eternal* Supper of the Lord; *but likewiſe of the external participation of the Bread and Wine, ordained by* Christ. *However, without the leaſt ceremony and ſhew, in the decent ſimplicity of the Spirit of* Christ. Vid. Arnold's *Expoſition on* Hereſy, and going to Church and the Sacrament, &c. p. 34. and 37. *The whole act of the Lutheran Sacrament of the* Lord's Supper *has retained nothing in it that can be called good, or that does not give offence or ſcandal*, &c. His notions of the Church were very peculiar; for he was of opinion, that the inviſible Church of thoſe, who are commonly conſidered as Heretics, is the only true one; that the Church was improperly called a Mother;

(26) Idem, pag. 64, 65.

(27) Pag. 66, 67.

(28) *See* Coler. p. 66, 67, 68.

(29) Part 1. § 50, 51. *apud* Coler. p. 69.

(30) Ibid. *apud* Coler. p. 70.

(31) Coler. pag. 70, 71.

(32) Part 1. pag. 386. *apud* Coler. pag. 71, 72.

(33) Ibid. pag. 110.

(34) *Ap.* Coler. Pag. 73, 74, 75.

(35) The original word, which ſignifies *a carrying home*, has no Engliſh word, that fully expreſſes the ſenſe of it.

and vivacity, and an admirable talent at Poetry (*m*). That he had a ſtrong propenſion to Enthuſiaſm and Fanaticiſm [*O*], and was actuated by a ſpirit of pride and obſtinacy in defending his paradoxes (*n*). That his prejudices were very numerous [*P*]. He then enquires into our Author's character with regard to learning, and remarks, that if learning conſiſts in the general knowledge of a multitude of books, and in being able to form new books from a variety of others, and to repreſent old errors under new colours, Arnoldus has then a juſt claim to the character of a very learned man. But if true learning conſiſts in the ſolid underſtanding of thoſe things, which are uſeful and neceſſary, improved by a ſound judgment, and applied to the beſt purpoſes with reſpect to the good of the perſon

(*m*) *Hiſtor. Goth. Arnoldi*, Sect. 3. pag. 83—87.

(*n*) Idem, pag. 87-89.

that all the Eccleſiaſtical ſolemnities were vain, and the publick buildings appointed for worſhip, uſeleſs; and he exploded all the outward profeſſion of a Church. *Exiſtimat enim ſolam Eccleſiam inviſibilem hominum, qui vulgo præ hæreticis & improbiſſimis habiti fuerunt, veram eſſe; perperam Eccleſiam matrem dici; ſolennia Eccleſiaſtica vana eſſe omnia, ædeſque templorum inutiles ac profanas, ipſamque profeſſionem Eccleſiæ externam exp*lodit (35). His opinion concerning Civil Government, is plainly intimated in ſeveral parts of his Writings; but Dippelius his Diſciple has declared his ſentiments without any diſguiſe or reſerve (36). Let us hear what Dr. Cyprianus ſays of Arnoldus in this point, in his Preface, pag. 18. Sect. 10. Arnoldus, *in his Index, has remarked many things to the diſadvantage of the* Lutheran *Magiſtracy, of whom he thought he ſtood in no need; but of the Magiſtracy of other Religions he makes no particular remarks in his Index. However, in the Hiſtory itſelf, he hardly ever mentions any Orthodox Ruler, without thinking it neceſſary to enumerate his vices, tho' he paſſes by his virtues and good qualities in ſilence. He, indeed, endeavours to conceal his real meaning; but his Diſciple,* Dippelius, *ſpeaks ſo much the plainer: In the Kingdom of* Christ (ſays he) *Magiſtrates are unneceſſary. A great Ruler, as a great Ruler, can be no member of the Body of* Christ, *much leſs a Biſhop of his Church. A true* Chriſtian, *who is freed from the Bondage of ſin, by the Spirit of* Christ, *is, like his Maſter,* Christ, *exempt from all worldly juriſdiction; tho' not to give offence to ſuch as are yet under the law, he does not inſiſt on his right.* Arnoldus expreſſed himſelf in very ſevere terms of marriage. He tells us in *Myſter. Soph.* (37). *Marriage is a brutiſh, worldly and polluted State, and conjugal affection an impure affection. Whoever enters* (ſays he) *into the ſtate of matrimony, bereaves himſelf of the true union with the heavenly* Sophia *or Wiſdom, and falls into a dangerous and abſurd Apoſtacy.* But Colerus obſerves, that he afterwards corrected his opinion in that point, eſpecially when he had married himſelf. We may judge in ſome meaſure of his notion concerning the ſtate of the damned, from ſeveral paſſages in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (38), *which, however, are conceived in ſuch abſtruſe, out-of-the-way terms, that many of them are hardly intelligible. They are, nevertheleſs, reducible to this one point:* The reſtoration of all things, in the moſt unfathomable ſea of that eternal love, which is inſeparable from the Being of God, that God may be all in all. See his *Hiſtory of the Church, P.* II. p. 727.

(35) Coler. pag. 75, 76.

(36) Idem, pag. 77, 78.

(37) Pag. 80. *apud* Coler. pag. 78.

(38) P. II. pag. 727. *apud* Coler. pag. 79.

[*O*] *That he had a ſtrong propenſion to Enthuſiaſm and Fanaticiſm.*] Wernſdorf (39) calls him *a profeſſed Enthuſiaſt*; which Colerus ſays (40) was the juſt character of Arnoldus, ſince he made the ſtrongeſt pretences to immediate revelation, defended all the chief Enthuſiaſts, and was particularly zealous in patronizing the cauſe of Quakeriſm; as we are informed by Dr. Cyprianus (41). "It is a modern and nugatory doctrine of "the Quaker's approved of by *Arnoldus*. If any one "(ſays he) queſtions this my aſſertion, I will prove it "more plainly. *Arnoldus* tells us (P. II. p. 62.) that not "long ſince, a Perſon of quality in *England*, going into "a Quaker's Meeting, with a whip in his hand, with "an intent to put the patience of ſome of them to the "trial, was ſo powerfully inſpired that he immediately "adhered to their confeſſion:" and then adds in the margin: "*This was one of the wonderful inligtnings and "ſecret ways of* God. What then is plainer than that "*Arnoldus* declares Quakeriſm to be the true Religion? "God leads no man to a falſe Religion: When it "pleaſes God to lead any man, by the hidden ways "of his Providence to any Religion, it is to the true "Religion. But (ſays *Arnold*) this man was led by the "immediate inſpiration of God to embrace Quakeriſm, "and conſequently, according to him, the Quaker's Re"ligion is the true religion; &c." He was likewiſe extremely fond of myſtical Divinity, which he wrote an Hiſtory of; and he tells us with regard to Taulerus, the great leader of the myſtical Divines, that "a ſoul, "which is devoted to God, will find in one Page of "a Book written by a perſon taught by God, more "Divine light, life, counſel, comfort and peace, than in "ten Poſtils in folio, with which and with other Fables "of that kind the itching ears of people are filled, "and in which they ſpend their time to no manner of "purpoſe." *Jam manifeſtum eſt Dei avidam mentem in una libri hujuſmodi Theodidacti pagina plus divinæ lucis, vitæ, conſilii, ſolatii, & pacis invenire, quam vel in decem Poſtillis in folio, quibus, aliiſque fabulis aures prurientes implent, & horas temere & inutiliter conſumere quærunt* (42). With regard to his Fanaticiſm, Colerus tells us (43), that all his Writings and Conduct afford the ſtrongeſt proofs of it; eſpecially the little regard, which he paid to Scripture and the Sacraments; which, ſays that Author, is the very genius and eſſence of Fanaticiſm. He ſuppoſes, that Arnoldus's propenſion to that and to Enthuſiaſm aroſe partly from his ſtrong and exorbitant imagination, and partly from his melancholy temper, not to inſiſt upon the concurrence of the Devil in ſtrengthening his natural diſpoſition to them. *Cauſam ſi quæras utriuſque mali, huc advocanda eſt partim vehementior & exorbitans imaginatio, partim vero ipſa melancholia, ne quid de infernalis genii efficacia addam.*

(39) *De ſtatu primi hominis*, pag. 7. § 6. *apud* Coler. p. 86.

(40) Pag. 86.

(41) *See* Coler. pag. 86, 87.

(42) *Hiſt. Theol. Myſt.* cap. 8. p. 151, 152. *apud Coler.* pag. 61.

(43) Pag. 87, 88.

[*P*] *That his prejudices were very numerous.*] Colerus tells us (44), that his firſt and grand prejudice was, that a good Chriſtian ought to leave all Sects and Communions of Religion, and the outward profeſſion of Faith; that all the ſects are in a dangerous ſtate, and that no pious perſon can ſafely join with them. The reſt of his prejudices may be ſeen in the Preface to his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*; wherein he preſſes men to abandon the preſent corrupt Churches, to depend upon immediate inſpiration for the underſtanding of Scripture; to wait for the renovation of all creatures; and to reject the modern Babel-Schemes of Divinity, which do not at all agree in defining what hereſy is, which conſiſts not in the underſtanding but in the will (45). Colerus likewiſe remarks (46), that he was no great friend to the Reformation by Luther, ſince he declared his opinion, that there was no occaſion for ſo vehement a conteſt as was raiſed by him, ſince the parties did not differ in fundamentals, but only in indifferent points, as ceremonies and traditions, which they contended about ſo furiouſly, to the neglect of all peaceable methods, which might have put an end to that great variety of Sects now in the world. This obſervation of Colerus is founded upon the following paſſage in Arnoldus's *Hiſtor. & Deſcript. Theolog. Myſtic.* (47). *Cum D. Jo. Eckius eandem ob cauſam, quod Lutherus Taulerum laudaviſſet, eumque citaſſet, hunc damnare aut reprobare vellet, tanto affectu alii & in primis celeberrimus ille myſticus (inter Romano-Catholicos) Ludovicus Bloyſius, Tauleri authoritatem vindicaverunt, ut ab eo tempore nullus de eo dubitaverit. Sicque partes controvertentes quoad fundamentum unanimes erant, & ſi veram pacem ſectari affectaſſent, in eſſentiali evangelii & ſenſus Jeſu Chriſti fundamento concordes & pacifici manere potuiſſent, ſi modo alius alium in adiaphoris ceremoniis & traditionibus tolerâſſet, nec tot in Chriſtiano orbe ſectas, & proprias eccleſias ædificaviſſet:* that is, "When Dr. John Eckius, "merely upon the account that Luther had com"mended and quoted Taulerus, attempted to reject "and condemn him, other Writers, and eſpecially "Lewis Bloyſius, a celebrated myſtical Divine among "the Roman Catholicks, undertook the defence of "Taulerus's Authority with ſo much vigour, that it "has

(44) Sect. 3. pag. 90, 91.

(45) Idem, pag. 92, 93, 94.

(46) Idem, pag. 96.

(47) Cap. 12. p. 209. § 3. *apud* Coler. p. 96.

perſon who is poſſeſſed of it, and that of others; we ſhall be at a loſs to find many traces of this kind of learning in his Writings (o). He aſſerts likewiſe, that he was very little ſkilled in the learned Languages, Philoſophy, and Hiſtory [Q]. He wrote a great number of books, moſt of them in the German tongue. In 1700 he publiſhed a Work, in which he gives an account of the doctrines and manners of the Chriſtians from the firſt ages of Chriſtianity, and frequently animadverts upon Dr. Cave's *Primitive Chriſtianity* [R]. But his grand performance was his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* [S], which expoſed him to

(o) Idem, pag. 98, 99.

" has remained uncontеſted ever ſince. And thus " the contending parties were agreed with reſpect to " the foundation itſelf; and if they had choſen to " follow a true ſpirit of peace, they might have con- " tinued upon good terms, being of the ſame mind " as to the eſſential foundation of the Goſpel and Doc- " trine of Jeſus Chriſt, provided they had but tole- " rated each other in indifferent points, as ceremo- " nies and traditions. By which means they might " have prevented ſuch a variety of Sects and diſtinct " Churches in the Chriſtian world." Colerus animad- verts with great ſeverity upon this paſſage; and tells us that it is an abſurd prejudice of a man, whom we might be confident knew nothing of the Hiſtory of the Reformation, nor the firſt principles of ſound Divinity. *Ineptiſſimum profecto præjudicium hominis, quem jurares, nec Hiſtoriæ Reformationis, nec ſanæ Theologiæ prima principia cognita habuiſſe.*

[Q] *That he was very little ſkilled in the learned Languages, Philoſophy and Hiſtory.*] Colerus affirms (48), that he was but a very indifferent maſter of the Latin tongue, which is the common language among Men of Letters; tho' while he was under the care of Schurtzfleiſch, he wrote in that tongue with elegance and propriety, as appears from his *Diſſertations* publiſh'd while he was at the Univerſity. He imagines therefore, that he afterwards neglected that language, upon the ſame notion perhaps, which Thomaſius ad- vanced, that it was the language of Antichriſt. His other works in Latin are very remote from the genius of that tongue. With regard to Greek, he was almoſt entirely unacquainted with it; as is evident from his tranſlation of a fragment of Theodorus con- cerning the Hereſy of the Valentinians, which he ſubjoined to his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, and which was criticized by an anonymous Author, who detected above an hundred errors in it, and obſerved that he had frequently changed the maſculine for the fœmi- nine, and miſtook the ſenſe of the Greek words. He was likewiſe cenſured on that account by Elias Veiel, a Divine of Ulm, who publiſhed a piece againſt him in the year 1701, in 4to (49). Colerus tells us, that it does not appear, that he was at all converſant in the Hebrew or any other of the Oriental Tongues; but that he was ignorant in Philoſophy, which led him into a variety of egregious miſtakes (50). Nay he proceeds ſo far as to aſſure us, that with regard to Hiſtory Ar- noldus, notwithſtanding the opinion of the world con- cerning his abilities in that reſpect, knew the leaſt of all mankind: *Sed hiſtoriarum tamen, inquis, apprimè peritus fuit: immo verò mortalium omnium, meo quidem judicio, ignariſſimus.* He tells us, that it would be an infinite labour to give a detail of his miſtakes in point of Hiſtory; which taſk had been already undertaken by ſeveral Authors, whom he mentions. He obſerves likewiſe, that Arnoldus frequently quotes Books, which are not to be found in nature. *Illud autem lepidum eſt, quod Arnoldus ſæpe libros excitat teſtimonii cauſa, quos fruſtra in rerum natura requiras* (51).

(48) Sect. 3. p. 99, 100.

(49) Idem, pag. 100, 101.

(50) Idem, pag. 101, 102.

(51) Idem, pag. 102, 103, 104.

[R] *In which he gives an account of the doctrines and manners of the Chriſtians of the firſt Ages of Chriſtianity, and frequently animadverts upon Dr. Cave's* Primitive Chriſtianity.] It is intitled *Erſte Liebe &c.* i. e. *Primitive Love*, or, *A true Image of the primitive Chriſtians.* The third Edition is enlarged by the addition of marginal references, and the Author's de- fence of the work. Francfort, 1712. It has like- wiſe been tranſlated into Low-Dutch, and was pub- liſhed at Amſterdam, in 1700, with a great number of Cuts. Since the third Edition in folio, we have had two Editions more of this work, publiſhed at Leipſick, in large quarto. It is a large work divided into VIII Books; the firſt of which treats of the Duties obſerved by the primitive Chriſtians towards God; the ſecond of their public and private manner of worſhip; the third of the Cuſtoms and the Duties practis'd by them towards others of the ſame Religion; the fourth of the Cuſtoms and Duties practiſed towards each other; the fifth of their Behaviour towards the wicked and pro- fane; the ſixth of their private and domeſtick Life; the ſeventh of their Graces and miraculous Gifts; and the eighth of the Degeneracy of Chriſtianity (52). Arnoldus tells us, that he was induced by reading Dr. Cave's *Primitive Chriſtianity, or the Religion of the ancient Chriſtians in the firſt Ages of the Goſpel*, publiſh'd in Low-Dutch at Utrecht in 1692, in 8vo, to treat that ſubject in a more extenſive and accurate manner; and he urges ſome objections againſt the Doctor's performance, which are as follow: *Having* (ſays he) *diligently peruſed this work of Dr. Cave's, I found ſeveral things in it, which certainly require a more narrow examination. . . . . In general he aſcribes many things to the primitive Chriſtianity, which were the fruits of a ſecret corruption already ſtealing in upon the Chriſtian Religion, to which he was, without doubt, miſled by the following and other the like prejudices.* 1. *Becauſe he took it for granted that the ſtate of the preſent Church, eſpecially of the Engliſh Church, had a reſemblance to the Primitive Apoſtolical Church.* 2. *Be- cauſe he had conceived a very wrong idea of the ſtate of the Church in the time of Conſtantine the Great. He ima- gines the Church was at that time, after the perſecu- tions, in a flouriſhing ſtate; and therefore draws the moſt of his arguments from the fourth Century. He approves, nay admires, the external pomp and magnificence, which was then introduced in coſtly building of Churches, Lordly Titles of Biſhops, numerous ceremonies &c. . . . . Beſides this, there ſeem to be ſeveral other things which Dr. Cave relates as belonging to Primitive Chriſtiani- ty, which require ſome animadverſions. Many things are crept in which manifeſtly partake of ſuperſtition, hypocriſy, and an abuſe of Religion; and, on the other hand, many uſeful and neceſſary things, which ap- pertain to Primitive Chriſtianity, are wanting. He ſeldom or never brings any of his evidences from the Word of God, in the New Teſtament, excepting where the matter in queſtion is ſome external ordinance. Se- veral of the moſt material points of Primitive Chriſtia- nity he has either wholly omitted, or elſe only juſt hint- ed at them, and for the reſt referred to certain writ- ings of his countrymen, which are rarely to be met with (ſc. in Germany.) And thus leaves his readers* (eſ- pecially foreigners) *in the dark. Not to mention, that in moſt things he ſets aſide the internal real eſſence of Religion, and only ſeeks to eſtabliſh the opinions and ceremonies of his own Church, as Beveridge and others have done before him. . . . . I do not* (continues Ar- noldus) *ſay this to depreciate the honour due to this ex- cellent man; but only out of a pure love to truth,* Quæ magis amica eſſe debet. *Neither will nor can I pretend to have hit the mark in all things. Many things relating to this ſubject are yet unknown to me, and many I have but known in part; but what enquiries I have been able to make, I have to the beſt of my power communicated.* Another Author forms a very different judgment of this Book of Arnoldus. *We find* (ſays he) *in this work an excellent Apparatus of extraordinary inſtances of the piety, devotion and orthodoxy of the Pri- mitive Chriſtians, which may be of excellent uſe in Ho- milies and otherwiſe. This work may likewiſe be re- garded as a proper introduction to an Eccleſiaſtical Hi- ſtory, and reading of the Fathers. Not to mention the principal aim of it, which is rightly to form our wills and manners, and to enable us to conceive a ſound judgment of ſome practices of the modern Church.*

(52) Idem, pag. 109, 110.

[S] *But his grand performance was his Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.*] It is intitled *Unpartheiiſche Kirchen- und Ketzer-Hiſtorie von Anfang des Neuen Teſtaments, biſs auf das Jahr*; i. e. " An impartial Hiſtory of the " Church and of Hereticks, from the beginning of " the New Teſtament, to the year 1688." It was printed at Francfort, in fol. 1699 and 1700, and in Low- Dutch at Amſterdam in 1701. It has ſince been re- printed three times, with the Supplements, Emenda- tions,

to the reſentments of the Divines. In 1701 he publiſhed an Apology for himſelf with relation to the public worſhip of God, and the receiving of the Lord's Supper (p). The ſame

(p) Idem, pag. 111, 112.

tions, Illuſtrations, &c. at Francfort and Leipſick, in four volumes in 4to, a very large paper and ſmall type *. The ſubject of it is very extenſive; but the three laſt parts of it are much ampler than the firſt (53); for it conſiſts of four parts. The firſt part contains fifteen Books, which include a ſhort Hiſtory of fifteen Centuries. The ſecond part which is much more copious, contains the ſixteenth and ſeventeenth Books; the former of which repreſents the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the ſixteenth Century in the following chapters. 1. Of the German Emperors and Popes of Rome. 2. Of the religious Wars and other events of that kind in that age. 3. Of the War of Smalcald. 4. Of the other Wars of the Proteſtants againſt the Emperor, and among themſelves, and alſo of one or two religious Pacifications. 5. Of the ſtate of the Papacy before Luther, and of the Inſtruments and Authors of the Reformation, and particularly of Luther. 6. Of the manner, deſign, and other circumſtances relating to the Reformation. 7. Of the other circumſtances of times and places. 8. Of the Impediments of the Reformation, eſpecially perſecutions and apoſtaſies. 9. Of the ſtate of the Lutheran Church within itſelf. 10. Of the ſcholaſtic and eccleſiaſtical Affairs of the Lutherans. 11. Of the Manner of catechizing, Sermons, and publick Worſhip of God among the Lutherans. 12. Of the eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline, Rights, and Ceremonies. 13. Of Corruptions in general ſince the Reformation. 14. Of the State and Lives of the Miniſters of the Church in particular. 15. Of the other Corruptions of the Doctors of the Church. 16. Of the Corruptions among the Hearers, as well the Civil Magiſtrates as the Subjects. 17. Of Councils. 18. Of the Creeds and Confeſſions of Faith, eſpecially among the Lutherans. 19. Of the other Sects of Chriſtians, and the ſtate of them, and firſt in general of Enthuſiaſts, and particularly Caroloſtadius. 20. Of the Swencfeldian Controverſies. 21. Of the Anabaptiſts. 22. Of Theophraſtus Paracelſus, Poſtellus, Puccius, Ochinus, Agrippa, Staupitius, Guttelius, Vergerius, B. Rhenanus, R. Agricola, Eraſmus, Caſtellio, Jerom Cardan, as they were all of them Indifferentiſts. 23. Of the divine Prophecies, Dreams, Viſions, &c. of Hilten, Mellerſtad, Weller, &c. 24. Of the Diſputes of the Lutherans among themſelves, and firſt of that of Oſiander and Stancarus. 25. Of the Antinomians. 26. Of thoſe, who embraced the Interim, and the maintainers of indifferent points. 27. Of the followers of Major. 28. Of the Synergiſts. 29. Of the followers of Flacius. 30. Of Samuel Huber and ſome others. 31. Of thoſe who are called the Reformed. 32. Of thoſe, who are called Calviniſts. 33. Of the Socinians. 34. Of the other Sects of Papiſts, Greeks, Jews, &c. Book xvii. C. 1. Of the outward ſtate of Chriſtians, and particularly of the Wars raiſed on account of Religion. 2. Of Perſecutions on account of Religion. 3. Of the ſeveral perſons, who changed their Religion, particularly Beſoldus, Hunnius, Bertius, Scioppius, Lipſius, Wowerius, Holſtenius, Lambecius, Kircher, Nihuſius, Frommius, &c. 4. Of the Conferences and Synods at Ratiſbon, Leipſic, &c. 5. Of the State of the Lutherans of that Age in general. 6. Of their Conteſts among themſelves. 7. Of the ſtate of the Reformed in that Age. 8. Of the Arminians. 9. Of the other Schiſms and Diviſions among the Reformed. 10. Of the Carteſians and Cocceians. 11. Of the Syncretiſts. 12. Of the Anabaptiſts. 13. Of the Socinians. 14. Of the Papiſts, Janſeniſts, Followers of Father Arnaud, &c. 15. Of the Religion of the Greeks, the Nations converted, and the State of the Jews. 16. Of the Atheiſts, Naturaliſts, Deiſts, and Latitudinarians. 17. Of thoſe called Enthuſiaſts, and particularly of Val. Weigelius. 18. Of the Roſæcrucians. 19. Of Jacob Behmen. 20. Of the Quakers. 21. Of the Followers of Labadee. The third and fourth parts are a continuation of the ſame work. Part iii. C. 1. Of Giles Guthman, Lautenſack, Barth, Solei, &c. 2. Of H. Cunrade, Julius Sperber, and Matth. Weier. 3. Of Paul Kaim. 4. Of Eſ. Stiefelius, and Ez. Meth. 5. Of Nagelius and Felgenhaver. 6. Of Cornhirt, Coolhaeſen, Kerbert, Stuart, Euſebius Meiſner, Torrentius, Weitſius, Boreel, &c. 7. Of Iſ. Peirerius, the Pre-Adamites, and the Illuminated. 8. Of Helmont, Browne, Campanella, &c. 9. Of J. A. Werdenhagen, Franckenberg, and Tſcheſch. 10. Of Jo. Bannier, Phil. Zeigler, Friedeborn, Giffthеil, Hogeria, Lohman, and Teting. 11. Of Peter Moritz, Kozak, Reger, and other Adepts. 12. Of Rathman, Weida, Neuwald, and Nicholas. 13. Of A. Fuhrman, A. Held, Potinius, Betkius, Howburg, and Seldenbecher. 14. Of Stenger and Amerſbach. 15. Of J. Laubenius, Th. Tant, Raſelius, Fr. Breckling, Blockius, Richter, Granendorf, Barthut, &c. 16. Of Anthoinette Bourignon, Peter Poiret, &c. 17. Of the Quietiſts. 18. Of Franc. Joſeph Borrhi, the Followers of Pajon, the Conſcientiarians, the new Manicheans, &c. 19. Of Quirinus Kuhlman. 20. Of the extraordinary events of this age in general. 21. Of the Revolutions till the year 1620. 22. Continuation of the ſame till 1630. 23. Continuation of them till 1640. 24. Continuation of them till the end of that Century, and particularly of the Prophecies of Nic. Drabitius. 25. Of the Jo. Kothius, & Ulſtadius. 26. Of the Viſions of Joachim Greulichius. 27. Of the Revelations of Anne Vetteria. Then follows the fourth part, which contains two Sections: Sect. 1. Of ſeveral fragments of the ancient Hereſies. Sect. 2. Of Supplements to the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the 16th Century. We meet here with ſeveral pieces, which were never publiſhed before, particularly *An Hiſtorical Relation concerning John Frederic the Elector, Maurice, and Auguſtus from the MS. of Ratzeburg*. Sect. 3. contains ſeveral pieces of the ſame kind. We find here *the Hiſtory of Zeaman*. To theſe are ſubjoined ſeveral Additions, among which is *an Anſwer to the Wittemberg Diſputation concerning Arnoldus's Errors in Hiſtory &c. with a Letter of Peterſen*. Arnoldus mentions the occaſion of his writing this Hiſtory in the following paſſage: *Whereupon* (ſc. after having publiſhed his True Image of the Primitive Chriſtians) *ſeveral other promoters of hiſtorical truth would admit of no denial, till I engaged in the preſent undertaking of* A regular and continued Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; *and this they thought the more neceſſary, as, in the aforementioned treatiſe I had, indeed, given the image of a true Chriſtian; but, for want of time and room, had left the anti-type, or character of a falſe depraved Chriſtian, in ſome meaſure, unfiniſhed and imperfect. I ſhould however not have been perſuaded to engage in ſo large an undertaking, as it had then pleaſed God to direct my mind more and more from ſuch a diverſity of thoughts, to the only neceſſary one, had not the chief materials, which I had been collecting for many years before, lain ready before me. This chiefly induced me to purſue this work, and, to the utmoſt of my power, to bring it to perfection at my leiſure hours; that theſe things might be illuſtrated, in their proper order of time, by a regular hiſtorical narration; and thereby the riſe, progreſs, and higheſt pitch, together with every circumſtance of the myſtery of wickedneſs, as well as of that of piety, become as viſible as evidence can make them.* See Præf. p. 1. §. VIII.

* The two laſt editions, which are ſuppoſed to be the moſt correct, are of Franckfort 1729, and Leipſick 1732.

(53) Idem, pag. 133, &c.

Cleras obſerves (54), that his method and diviſion of this work are ſo juſt, that ſcarce any objection can be made to it. We ſhall give an account of his deſign, and the execution of it in the Author's own words. *As for my method, I have thought it moſt conducive to my main end, in the Hiſtory of each Century* (excepting the two laſt, by reaſon of the number and diſparity of them) *to introduce firſt of all upon the ſtage all thoſe Authors, Teachers and Perſons themſelves, from whom I have chiefly borrowed my intelligence, and by whom theſe Comedies or Tragedies which follow were, as I may ſay, put in action, that a knowledge of them may give the neceſſary life to all that follows. I next ſhew the actions themſelves, ſo as they ſubſiſt in the œconomical or church-rites, ceremonies, ordinances, and the whole external and internal condition and fate of the Church, according to its encreaſe and decreaſe, perſecution or tranquillity, diſtreſſed or flouriſhing ſtate. I then proceed to the Synods, Councils, and other tranſactions which have had any connection with the affairs of*

(54) Sect. 5. p. 138, 139.

ſame year he publiſhed at Hall the *Lives of the Faithful*, in which he gives a particular account of Luther, Arndt, and others [T]. The year following he wrote his *Göttliche Liebes-Funcken*, &c. i. e. "Divine Sparks of Love, proceeding from the great Fire of "the Love of God in Jeſus Chriſt," printed at Francfort in 12mo, which is a myſtical or devotional piece in verſe (q). The ſame year he publiſhed his defence of *Clemens Romanus's Recognitions* [U]. His *Geheimniſs des Göttlichen Sophia, &c.* otherwiſe entitled, *Sophia, oder Geheimniſs der Göttlichen Weisſheit.* i. e. "Sophia, or, the Myſtery of "Godly Wiſdom," was printed at Leipſic in 8vo 1700, and at Amſterdam in Low-Dutch in 1702. This Work has been long out of print. In the ſecond Chapter of this book he endeavours to prove, that the Book of Wiſdom, and that of Jeſus the ſon of Sirach are parts of canonical Scripture (r). In 1702 he publiſhed his *Hiſtory of Myſtical Divinity* [W]. And the ſame year he wrote a Treatiſe concerning the celibacy and married ſtate of the primitive Chriſtians [X]. We ſhall give a Catalogue and Account of the reſt of his writings and tranſlations in the note [Y]. Colerus tells us, that ſome of his performances

(q) Idem, pag. 113.

(r) Idem, p. 114.

of Religion, with the controverſies, which have thereupon enſued, together with the whole Hiſtory of Hereticks. And, laſtly, I have not omitted an account of the ſtate and conduct of thoſe ſecular Rulers, who have had any concern in affairs of the Church, and likewiſe of thoſe of other more remote Nations and Sects, as Jews, Heathens, Turks, &c. who are not reckoned in the external Communion of the Church, as far as they can give any light to Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, *and the entire harmony and connected paralleliſm of it, with reſpect to times, places and the like.* Ibid. §. XI and XII. This work of his alarmed the Divines extremely, who immediately publiſhed a prodigious number of Books and Pamphlets in anſwer to it. Colerus in his fifth Section has given an account of the principal of them, which would be too tedious to inſert here. Arnoldus at firſt ſeemed to treat his adverſaries with contempt, and applied to them only as it were occaſionally; but afterwards he publiſhed a formal defence of himſelf at Francfort in 1703-4, and 1716, intitled, *Supplementa, Illuſtrationes, und Emendationes zur Verbeſſerung.* i. e. "Supplements, Il-"luſtrations, and Emendations for the improvement "of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, &c." This work is out of print ſeparate, but is reprinted and added to the latter editions of the *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory.* There are ſeveral new pieces inſerted in this work, as particularly *Theophraſtia, Valentiniana,* ſeveral Letters never publiſhed before, the Life of John Labbadie, &c. There are likewiſe ſubjoined, *Juſt Remarks upon the Controverſies which have ariſen concerning Arnoldus's Hiſtory of the Church and Hereticks.* And likewiſe *A Conſideration of Zacharias Gotz's Animadverſions upon Arnoldus's Hiſtory of the Church and Hereticks, in which is ſhewn, that he has but curſorily read over the whole work, and therefore has always miſſed his aim, and ſhot in the dark: and that he has every where ſhewn not only his partiality and want of reading; but has more eſpecially diſcovered, by the weakneſs of his reaſoning, that he is no competent judge of the Hiſtory of the Church and Heretics, and would therefore have done much better to have left that taſk to others, and have employed his time to more advantage otherwiſe.* In 1709 he publiſhed at Francfort a general Defence of his Hiſtory intitled *Arnoldi Hiſtoriſch-Theologiſche Betrachtungen merkwürdiger Wahrheiten, &c.* i. e. "Arnold's Hiſtorical "and Theological Obſervations on ſome memorable "Truths, &c." This work is now ſo ſcarce, that it is not to be had for any price. We have however been ſo fortunate as to procure a copy of it, which gives us a very different idea of Arnoldus from what Colerus would have his readers conceive of him. It is divided into five parts; to theſe the Author had added a VIth and a VIIth, which were found after his death, among his papers in manuſcript, and which (ſays the Author of his Life in High-German) will be made uſe of upon another occaſion.

[T] *In which he gives a particular account of Luther, Arndt, and others.*] It is intitled, *Leben der Glaubigen,* &c. i. e. "The Lives of the Faithful, in the two "laſt Centuries." Halle, 1718, and 1732. He gives an account in the piece of the Helvetian Hermit Nicholas, John a Cruce, Thereſia, Peter de Alcantara, Catharine of Genoa, Angela of Foligni, John Franc. de Chantal, Francis Sales, Luther, Arndt, John Janeway, Joſeph Allen, Theodore à Brakel, John Bunyan, Theodore Untereyck, John James Fabricius, John Thamſſen, George Freſen, Cl. Brouſſon, &c (55).

(55) Coler. Sect. 4. pag. 112.

[U] *His Defence of Clemens Romanus's Recognitions.*] It was publiſhed in a Preface to them, at Berlin, in 8vo. 1702. and intitled, *Des heiligen Clementis Hiſtorie,* &c. i. e. "The Hiſtory of St. *Clement*, or, *The Travels and Diſcourſes of* St. Peter, *the Apoſtle.* He tranſlated likewiſe all the other Works of that Father, and publiſhed them at Lunenburg in 1695. Chriſtian Thomaſius obſerves, that theſe Recognitions of Clemens are full of ſo many Fables, Abſurdities, and Impieties, that he could not but wonder, that Arnoldus could poſſibly recommend in ſo ſerious a manner the German tranſlation of them. *Certe Libri Recognitionum Clementis tot fabulis, ineptiis & impietatibus repleti ſunt, ut ſatis mirari nequeam, qua ratione Arnoldus earum verſionem Germanicam tam ſerio commendare potuerit* (36).

(56) See Coler. pag. 113.

[W] *His Hiſtory of myſtical Divinity.*] It was publiſhed at Francfort, in 8vo. 1703. and intitled, *Hiſtoria & Deſcriptio Theologiæ myſticæ ſeu Theoſophiæ arcanæ & reconditæ, itemque veterum & novorum Myſtericorum.* i. e. "The Hiſtory and Deſcription of my-"ſtical Divinity, or the ſecret and abſtruſe knowledge "of God, with an account of the ancient and mo-"dern Myſtical Divines." He tells us in a paſſage quoted by Colerus (57) that it is undeniable, that it is owing firſt and principally to the influence of God's Grace, and next to that in general to Myſtical Divinity, if one or two perſons ſave their ſouls, and attain to the Divine Wiſdom, and their own redemption or ſalvation. *Minimè negari poteſt primo & maximè gratioſiſſimo gratiæ Dei regimini, & poſt eam plerumq; Myſticæ Theologiæ tribuendum eſſe, ſi unus aut alter animum ſervet; & ad divinam ſapientiam ſuamque redemptionem ſive ſalvationem perveniat.* The Jeſuits of Trevoux have given an Extract of this Book in their *Memoirs*; but they were miſtaken in affirming, that the Author had formerly profeſſed the Roman Catholic Religion (58).

(57) Sect. 11 pag. 61.

(58) See *Journal Literaire*, for May and June 1714. p. 234.

[X] *A Treatiſe concerning the Celibacy and married State of the Primitive Chriſtians.*] It was printed at Francfort, 8vo. and intitled, *Eheliches und unverehlichtes Leben der erſten Chriſten:* i. e. "The Celibacy and "married State of the *Primitive Chriſtians*, taken from "their own Teſtimonies and Examples." The ſecond Edition with additions, 1732. He is of opinion, that marriage is merely permitted by God, and that it is a ſad monument of the fall and corruption of our firſt Parents. *Omnia vero contaminantur peſtilenti ſententiâ, matrimonium omne ſaltem tolerari à Deo, triſtiſſimumque eſſe lapſus & corruptionis protoplaſtorum monumentum* (59).

(59) Coler. pag. 115.

[Y] *We ſhall give a Catalogue and account of the reſt of his Writings and Tranſlations in the Note.*] I. *De Fratrum & Sororum appellatione ſchediaſma,* &c. i. e. "A Diſ-"ſertation concerning the appellation of brothers and "ſiſters." II. *Hiſtoria Cognationis Spiritualis inter Chriſtianos receptæ.* i. e. "An account of the ſpiri-"tual relation, received among Chriſtians." Printed 1702 in 8vo. Reprinted 1703. III. *Conſilia und reſponſa gemein gemacht von G. Arnold.* i. e. "Coun-"ſels and Anſwers publiſhed by G. Arnold," printed at Francfort in 8vo. It is ſuppoſed that he was only the Editor and not the Author of the Book, which was aſcribed to Joanna Eleonora Peterſenia. The 1ſt and 2d parts of it contain ſacred Meditations, Prayers, and rules for a Chriſtian Life. The 3d part contains letters upon aſcetical ſubjects, with ſeveral devout Poems.

In

performances are to be commended for the pains, which he has taken in collecting and comparing a great variety of arguments and opinions, and furniſhing the publick with ſeveral curious paſſages and fragments, but that we ought to be very cautious in truſting him, whenever his own hypotheſes come in queſtion. That he has introduced a great many excellent obſervations of the higheſt advantage to a religious life, tho' he has frequently taken them from Authors of no great credit, and inſerted ſeveral myſtical expreſſions, which are abſolutely impertinent and unintelligible. That ſome other works of his are full of fables and ſuperſtitions, which his prejudices raſhly led him into. In ſhort that moſt of his Books are ſtrongly tinctured with fanaticiſm (5). After having ſaid ſo much of Arnoldus chiefly from the writings of his profeſſed enemy, it will but be common juſtice to add a word or two from one, who is very well known in the *Republick of Letters*, and ſeems to be more his friend, I mean the late learned and famous Chriſtian Thomaſius L. L. Prof. at the Univerſity of Halle in Saxony, and Privy-Counſellor to the King of Pruſſia, who himſelf was known to have had a perfect knowledge of thoſe matters, and was particularly famed for his candour and impartiality. This Gentleman, tho' he profeſſes to differ from him in many particulars, and allows that his writings are not exempt from errors; yet, in the whole, gives a very favourable judgment as well of him, as of his works, and declares that he had a very great eſteem for

(5) Idem, pag. 129, 130.

In pag. 328, that Paſſage of St. Paul, wherein he enjoins the women not to aſſume the office of teaching in the Church, is explained only of men, who are effeminate (60). IV. *Geiſtliche Geſtalt eines Evangeliſchen Lehrers.* i. e. "The ſpiritual image of an Evangelical Preacher, "according to the notion and example of the Pri-"mitive *Chriſtians*, in which every Article of the "Office of a Preacher, is diſcuſſed and examined into." Printed at Halle in 8vo. 1704. Reprinted, with the addition of a ſecond Part. *Leipſick*, 1723. V. *Evangeliſche Botſchafft der Herrligkeit Gottes in Chriſto Jeſu*; i. e. "Evangelical Meſſage of the Glory of GOD in "JESUS CHRIST, or A ſhort Expoſition of the Goſ-"pels, with ſome remarks upon the Pſalms of *David*." The fourth Edition, with the addition of marginal references, and an Index. *Leipſick*, 1727. at Francfort in 4to. 1706. In the Preface he recommends allegorical explications of the Scriptures, which he was extremely fond of. This Book contains his ſermons preached at Werben, and his farewell Sermon to his Auditors at Altſted; with a Paraphraſe upon the Pſalms, and an application of them (61). VI. He tranſlated Madam Guion's myſtical Works into High-Dutch, and publiſhed them with a new Preface, at Francfort in 12° 1706. VII. *Wahres Chriſtenthum des Alten Teſtaments*; i. e. "The true Chriſtianity of the Old Teſ-"tament," taken from ſeveral paſſages of the firſt Book of *Moſes*, with a Continuation of his *Conſilia & Reſponſa*, at Francfort 1707 in 4to. VIII. He tranſlated into High-Dutch Dr. Peter Allix's *Judgment of the ancient Jewiſh Church againſt the Unitarians in the Controverſy upon the Holy Trinity and the Divinity of our bleſſed Saviour*. This Tranſlation was publiſhed at Berlin, with a new Preface, 1707 in 4to. and reprinted in 1709. IX. *Abwege oder Irrungen guttwilliger und frommer Menſchen, &c.* i. e. "Backſlidings, errors, and "temptations of well-minded, upright men," Francfort in 4to. 1708. X. *Abildung des inwendigen Chriſtenthums* &c. i. e. "A deſcription of internal Chriſtia-"nity," taken from the Teſtimonies, and Examples of the Primitive *Chriſtians*, Francfort 1709 in 4to. Reprinted, Leipſick, 1723. XI. He wrote likewiſe another piece upon the ſame ſubject, under the title of *Experimental Divinity*, being a compleat Syſtem of Divinity, *Francfort*, 1714 (62). XII. He tranſlated *Macarius's Homilies* into High-Dutch, to which he added *a Diſſertation concerning the Uſe and Abuſe of ill Examples*: Leipſick 1696 in 8vo. XIII. *Wohleingerichteter Schul-Bau*; i. e. "A proper method for erec-"ting of Schools," in 8vo. 1711. XIV. *De Corrupto Hiſtoriarum ſtudio*; i. e. "Of the corrupt Study of Hi-"ſtory;" Francfort 1698, in 8vo. XV. *Tabula Hiſtorico-Chronologica Univerſalis à C. N. ad A.* 1697. i. e. "A Chronological Table from the Nativity of "Chriſt to the Year 1697." Leipſick in Fol. Reprinted 1698. XVI. *Three Sermons concerning the myſtical Union*; *Francfort*, 1700 *in* 8vo. XVII. *Verklaerung Jeſu Chriſti*, &c. i. e. "The Glorification of JESUS "CHRIST, in the Soul, or, a ſhort Expoſition of the "Epiſtles;" The fifth Edition, with marginal notes, and a large Appendix, containing Sermons on various ſubjects. Leipſick, 1732. Francfort 1704 and 1708. XVIII. *Neuer Kern*, &c. i. e. "A new and ſelect "Collection of ſpiritual Ejaculations, taken from the "Writings of the *Primitive Chriſtians*," in 8vo. 1704. Reprinted, with alterations, Leipſick, 1718. XIX. *Kurtzgefaſte Kirchen-Hiſtorie des A. und N. T.* i. e. "An abridgment of the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the "Old and New Teſtament." Leipſick 1700, 1708, and 1722. XX. *Evangeliſche Reden über die Sonn- und Feſt-tage* &c. i. e. "Diſcourſes on the Goſpels ap-"pointed for every Sunday and Holiday throughout "the year." Leipſick 1709. The third Edition, with additions, 1732. XXI. *Evangeliſche Reden, über die Sontags Epiſteln* &c. i. e. "Diſcourſes upon the Epi-"ſtles appointed for every Sunday in the year," the third Edition, with additions, 1732. in 8vo. 1711. XXII. *Göttliche Gnaden-Heimſuchung*, &c. i. e. "Di-"vine Viſitations of Mercy, &c." in 12mo. 1713, without the Author's name. XXIII. *Geheime Betrachtungen über die Pſalmen Davids*; i. e. "Private "Remarks on *David's* Pſalms." At Caſſel. 1713 in 8vo. XXIV. *Erſtes Marterthum*; i. e. "Primitive "Martyrdom." At Lunenburg 1695. XXV. *Denckmahl des alten Chriſtenthums*, &c. i. e. "A Monu-"ment of Ancient Chriſtianity," containing the ſelect and moſt edifying Writings of *Macarius*, and other Holy Men of the Primitive Church, to which is added a caution concerning the Uſe and Abuſe of evil Examples. The third Edition, *Leipſick*, 1716. He publiſhed a new Edition of Thomas à Kempis, with a large Preface, at Leipſick, in 8vo. 1712; Reprinted, 1732. And a ſecond Edition of Rusbroch's Works, with a new Preface, at Francfort 1701 (63), Theſe are the Works publiſhed by *Arnoldus*, of which *Colerus* has thought fit to give his Readers an account, to which we have added the later Editions; and it might reaſonably be concluded that theſe were enough to employ the whole courſe of any one man's life, tho' he ſhould live to twice his age. They come, however, ſhort of the Catalogue of his Writings, added to his life written in *High-Dutch*. We ſhall ſubjoin a few of the chief of them, not mentioned, purpoſely omitting, for brevity's ſake, any account of his Prefaces to, and Emendations, Illuſtrations and new Editions of other men's Works, publiſhed under his care. 1. *The Lives of the Fathers*. The ſecond Edition, with Hernſchmidt's Summaries and Animadverſions; *Halle*, 1713. 4to. 2. *Select Epiſtles of the Primitive Chriſtians*. Quedlingburg, 1700. 8vo. 3. *Golden Epiſtles of the Primitive Chriſtians*; being a ſecond Part of the foregoing. *Budingen*, 1723. 4. *A Tranſlation of the Book of* Wiſdom, *and* Sirach; with Explications. *Halle*, 1705. 5. *The Epiſtles of S.* Clement *and* Barnabas, *Halle*, 1689. 6. *Obſervations on the preſent Times*. A new Edition, 1718. 7. *Wonders of the preſent Times*. 1698. 8. *A large collection of Prayers, for all Times, and upon all Occaſions. A new Edition with the addition of ſeventy three Prayers*. Leipſick, 1728. 9. *The ſureſt way thro' Chriſt to God*. Ib. 1726. 10. *Luther's Catechiſm explained*, &c. A new Edition, ib. 1722. With a great number of ſmall Pieces, Fragments, &c.

(60) Coler. pag. 116, 117.

(61) Idem, pag. 118.

(62) Idem, pag. 121.

(63) Idem, pag. 128, 129.

for both [Z]. To conclude, ſo various are the opinions concerning Arnoldus in Germany, that nothing is more common than to hear ſome of his own countrymen and profeſſion extol him to the ſkies, as the Saint of the laſt Century, and ſet an ineſtimable value upon his works, while others damn him almoſt beyond the poſſibility of God's mercy, as an Arch-Heretick, and condemn his writings as heterodox (*t*).

(*t*) In this article we are extremely obliged to the ingenious Mr. *Thomas Lediard*, Author of the *Hiſtory of the Naval Tranſactions*, for ſeveral curious obſervations.

[Z] *And profeſſes to have a very great eſteem for both.*] What this great man thought of Arnoldus and his works cannot be better expreſſed than in his own words, as we find them in his Notification of two Collegiate Lectures to be publickly read by him upon the *Fourth Part of his fundamental Doctrine*, p. 7, 8, 9, 10.

" It were to be wiſhed (ſays he) that we had ſo " faithful an account either of the whole, or of the " greater part, of the *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the New* " *Covenant*, as we have of the *Church Hiſtory of the* " *Old Covenant*; but the New Teſtament, as far as " it concerns the *Hiſtory of the Church*, hardly deſ- " cends in the Acts to the Deſtruction of Jeruſalem. " The tranſactions which enſued, as they are handed " down to us, are ſtuffed with fables, pretended mi- " racles, groundleſs accuſations of hereſy, and other " the like falſe relations. The *Centuriatores Magde-* " *burgenſes* and other Hiſtorians of the Proteſtant Re- " ligion, ſince the Reformation, inſtead of purging " theſe relations of all the fabulous ſtories contained " in them, have interſperſed them throughout with " new partialities of their own: every Writer aim- " ing only to juſtify the tenets and actions of his own " ſect or party, and to blacken thoſe of others. In " vain therefore did we long ſigh after an *Impartial* " *Hiſtory of the Church*, till a few years ſince, Mr. " Arnold publiſhed his *Hiſtory of the Church and of* " *Hereticks*, in two volumes in folio. But as this Au- " thor has written with a great deal of freedom, " and has very evidently diſcovered the *Ratio Status*, " and intrigues of the Clergy in every Sect, we muſt " not wonder, if it has met with many enemies, who, " *ſub ſpecie Zeli divini* (which for many Ages has " been a cover for much iniquity) have ſpoken and " diſputed againſt it; tho' hitherto, with ſo little ſuc- " ceſs, as has tended to their own ſhame and confu- " ſion. For my part I ſhall not pretend to be a " judge in the caſe; but as, in the Republick of " Letters, every man is allowed to declare his ſenti- " ments, I hope no man will impute it to an arro- " gancy in me, if upon this occaſion I give mine. " *In my opinion then the abovementioned* Eccleſiaſtical " Hiſtory *of Mr. Arnold's is, next to the Holy Scrip-* " *ture, the beſt and moſt uſeful book that ever was* " *penned of this kind*, (in hoc ſcribendi genere.) *I* " *make no manner of ſcruple therefore to recommend* " *the ſerious peruſal of it, in the moſt earneſt manner,* " *to all my auditors; even tho' their circumſtances* " *ſhould be ſo ſtreighten'd, that in order to purchaſe it* " *they ſhould be obliged to deprive themſelves of ſome* " *part of the neceſſaries of life, or be indebted for it* " *to the benevolence of ſome well-diſpoſed perſons.* And " tho' I do not wholly agree with him, in ſome points, " yet the differences between us are ſo trivial, that " I hardly eſteem them worthy of being mentioned " here, tho' I may perhaps diſcuſs them in my Lec- " tures. In the mean time, I think proper to de- " clare, that I have read whatever his Antagoniſts " have hitherto publiſhed againſt this work, and that " I find nothing in them that has any way weakened " the main deſign and eſſential points of it." *On the contrary, I am rather of opinion, that Mr. Arnold has, with great ſtrength of argument, anſwered all the objections hitherto urged againſt it. Nay, I am fully convinced, that the greater number of thoſe perſons, who perhaps at the inſtigation of others have thought this treatiſe dangerous, and tainted with a latent poiſon, will, upon a more candid peruſal of it (if they are not over-whelmed beyond recovery in the prejudice of human authority) conceive a very different and more juſt opinion of it. I deſire, however, that what I have here ſaid, may be look'd upon only as a recital of my private judgment of Mr. Arnold's work, concerning which I ſhall not enter into a diſpute with any one.* (De guſtibus non eſt diſputandum.) *If the judgment* (non ſententiam judicialem, ſed judicium intellectus) *I have formed in this particular be agreeable to the taſte of ſober and prudent men, of whatever Religion they may be, whether Clergy or Lay-men, I am ſatisfied: but if not, it will be no uneaſineſs to me; my corrupt taſte can prejudice no body but myſelf, &c.*

In another work, entitled *Dr. Melchior von Oſſe's Teſtament, &c.* reprinted in the year 1717, with Notes and Remarks, for the uſe of Thomaſius's Auditory, p 343; the ſame illuſtrious Author gives his thoughts of Arnold's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* in the following manner: *And he who has but ever ſo little inſight into the* Arcana Papiſmi Politica, *will eaſily conceive why the ſtudy of Hiſtory has been hitherto ſo neglected, till at length, in the laſt Century, it began to break thro' the cloud it had been covered with, particularly in* Prophane Hiſtory, *in Holland; and towards the concluſion of it, Arnold, in Germany, opened the eyes of the Laity by his* Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; *but, at the ſame time, it raiſed a ſpirit of indignation in ſeveral Nations and Sects againſt him, which is yet kept up amongſt them after his death. During the publication of this work, I had an opportunity of making many obſervations, which convinced me that the particular hand of Providence directed it. The pious Author obliged me with the peruſal of the firſt four Centuries, before they were printed, and, I muſt confeſs, I found ſo many truths hitherto unknown, and ſo many evidences of the politital ſupports and relicks, which remain to this day among us, that I began to be concerned, nay even anxious for the welfare of my friend. They ſeemed to me to be of ſuch a nature, that they would be a ſtumbling-block to the very Proteſtant Profeſſors; and I knew by experience, of what dangerous conſequence it was for a man to have the* Odium Theologicum *upon his back, of which Melancthon in his time juſtly complained. After he had ſhewn me what he had written of the* 16th and 17th *Centuries, my anxiety for him encreaſed. I found ſo many bitter, tho' ſalutiferous potions, as well for the Calviniſts as the Lutherans, I believed that they would never be brought to ſwallow them, and I could not be perſuaded but the publiſhing of this work muſt and would bring the Editor, as well as the Author, into trouble. Yet we ſee it has eſcaped, and the Hand of God has powerfully protected it. And tho' I do not pretend to idolize either Arnold or his work; but, on the contrary, am ſenſible they have both been liable to many human frailties; yet I look upon him to be a peculiar inſtrument of God to open our eyes, that thro' him we may evidently ſee very groſs remains of* Political Popery *amongſt us, and be ſollicitous how to aboliſh them. And thus, I verily believe, that Poſterity towards the concluſion of this Century, will celebrate a Jubilee to the honour of Arnold's memory, as they have already done to the honour of Luther, and other great Reformers of the Church. That we have reaſon to do ſo, is to me very evident, ſince our temporal and eternal welfare, as well as the real intereſt of the ſecular Magiſtrates, depends as much upon the truths diſcovered by Arnold, as upon thoſe brought to light by Luther.* T.

ARNOLDUS (NICHOLAS) Profeſſor in Divinity at Franeker, was born at Leſna, a city of Poland, December the 17th 1618. His mother being left a widow when he was but three years old, took all imaginable care of his education and devoted him to letters. He performed his ſtudies of Humanity in the College of Leſna, amongſt other Tutors, under Comenius, who taught at that time to his ſcholars his own *Janua Linguarum*. He was created Sub-Deacon (*a*) to the Synod of Oſtrorog, at the age of fifteen years: and, in that quality, he accompanied Orminius (*b*) for two years in his viſitation of the Churches of Poland; after which, he was ſent to Dantzick, in 1635, and applied

(*a*) The reformed churches of Bohemia retained that part of the ancient diſcipline.

(*b*) The Superintendant of the churches of Great Poland.

applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Eloquence and Philoſophy. He ſometimes raiſed the diſpleaſure of John Botſac, who was concerned that ſo hopeful a young man was a Calviniſt. He returned into Poland in 1638, and applied himſelf to that part of Divinity, which relates to Sermons, under the direction of Orminius; and a year after he was ſent into Podolia to be Rector of the School of Jablonow. Having exerciſed that employment three months, he performed the office of a Miniſter the two following years in a Nobleman's houſe (c). As it was obſerved that his talents might be of great ſervice to the Church, it was thought proper to give him opportunities of cultivating them in the moſt famous Academies. He began his travels in 1641. He firſt went to Franeker, and there made great progreſs under his countryman Maccovius, and under Cocceius. He was at the Univerſities of Groningen, Leyden, and Utrecht, in 1643, and in a little while returned to Franeker, and applied himſelf to the ſtudy of French and Engliſh. The next year he took a voyage into England; and not being able to go to Oxford, becauſe all the roads were filled either with the King's Troops, or thoſe of the Parliament, he went on foot to Cambridge. But he could not there hear one Lecture in Divinity, all the Profeſſors being impriſoned in Trinity College. Upon his return to Franeker he applied himſelf to preaching, even in Dutch, and his Sermons were ſo highly approved, that in order to keep him in Frieſland, he was diſſuaded from going to reviſit Poland. He was judged highly capable of the Miniſtry by the claſs of Franeker, who examined him, and the commendations which were given him, readily determined a young Gentlewoman of the country to marry him [A]. He married her in 1645, and a little after he was called to the Church of Beetgum. He ſerved it faithfully and conſtantly till the year 1651, without lending an ear to the invitations which were made to him by other Churches; but in that year he yielded to the inſtances of the eſtates of Frieſland, who made choice of him to ſucceed Cocceius in the office of Profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker (d). He diſcharged that office with great ſucceſs until his death, which happened the 15th of October 1680, after a long illneſs, in which he gave a great many inſtances of his piety and reſignation to the Divine Will (e). I ſhall ſpeak of ſome journies which he took after his promotion to the Divinity Profeſſorſhip [B]; and I ſhall not forget the books which he publiſhed [C].

(c) *Johannes de Potok Potocki Succamerarius terræ Halicienſis.*

(d) Cocceius had been called by the Univerſity of Leyden.

(e) Taken from his *Funeral Oration*, ſpoken the 22d of October 1680, by Mr. Marck, then Profeſſor in Divinity at Franeker, and afterwards at Groningen and Leyden.

☞ARNULPHUS

[A] *The Commendations which were given him readily determined a young Gentlewoman .... to marry him.*] This we learn from the Author of his Funeral Oration. *Fecit paulo poſt*, ſays he (1), *tanta omnium laus, ut nobiliſſima in Friſiis virgo Remigia à* Nitzen *facilis in conjugales ejus rueret amplexus, anno* 1645. i. e. "So univerſal a commendation had this effect, "that after a little while a young Lady of a noble fa- "mily in Frieſland, whoſe name was Remigia a Nit- "zen, readily agreed to marry him in the year 1645." This Lady was in the right to prefer merit and a good reputation to riches. There are other inſtances of a choice of that nature; for it is certain that ſeveral Miniſters ſupported merely by the reputation of their eloquence, or learning, have obtained very lucrative matches, and which were on the other hand highly advantageous by the rank of the families, into which they married. What could give more plauſible grounds for hope, that ſuch perſons might be raiſed one time or other, either to Profeſſorſhips of diſtinction, or ſuch as were conſiderable for their annual ſalaries? However that be, our Arnoldus's ſpouſe deſerved to be commended. She died at the beginning of the year 1652, and left him no children. He married again an Advocate of Leeuwarden's widow, whoſe name was Anne Pybinga, the daughter of a Burgomaſter of Franeker, by whom he had nine children, five ſons (2) and four daughters, and ſhe ſurvived him. He had but three ſons and one daughter alive, when he died (3).

(1) Marckius *in Orat. funebri N. Arnoldi* p. 28.

(2) The 2d and 3d were twins. See the *Programma of the Rector of the Academy*. It is printed before his *Funeral Oration*.

(3) Taken from this *Programma* and the *Funeral Oration*.

[B] *He took ſome journeys after his promotion to the Divinity Profeſſorſhip.*] He went to ſee his relations at Leſna, in 1652, and ſpent a Month agreeably with his Uncle by the mother's ſide, Martin Gertichius, Miniſter of the place, and famous for ſeveral works. He took another voyage, in 1656, in the retinue of the four Embaſſadors extraordinary, which the States General ſent to the King of Sweden, and the King of Poland. Their Excellencies would have him for their Preacher, and were highly ſatisfied with the Sermons which he preached in Dutch, German, or Poliſh, as occaſions offered. This journey laſted two years. Arnoldus during that time gained to himſelf very great eſteem, from the Chancellor of Poland, Stephen Corycinſki; from the Grand Marſhal of Sweden, John Oxenſtiern; from the General of the Troops, Douglas; and from the Elector of Brandenbourg, who made him an offer of the place of Preacher to the Court. He was ſent to Heidelberg in 1666, to engage Mr. Spanheim to accept of a Profeſſorſhip in Divinity, in the Academy of Franeker, and returned without ſucceſs.

[C] *I ſhall not forget the Books which he publiſhed.*] I ſhall ſay nothing of the diligence wherewith he collected and put in order Maccovius's Works, which he put to the preſs, nor of the Verſion which he made and publiſhed, of an Engliſh Book of Jeremiah Dyke (4), but I ſhall take notice of his *refutation of the Catechiſm of the Socinians*, his *Anti-Bidellus*, his *Anti-Echardus*, his *Book againſt Brevingius*, his *Apology for Arneſius againſt Erbermann* the defender of Bellarmin, his *Theological Diſputes on ſelect ſubjects*, his *Commentary on the Epiſtle to the Hebrews*, his *Lux in tenebris*, and what he publiſhed *againſt John Amos Comenius*. Read, concerning theſe Works, this paſſage of his Funeral Oration: *Quis eſt qui non .... prædicet Raccovianæ Catecheſeos, in qua religionis dicam an impietatis Socinianæ pleniſſimum eſt compendium, curatiſſimam refutationem, quæ ſupra fidem impiis ſeductoribus moleſta, doctis grata eſt? Cujus non laudem meretur tum Anti-Bidellus, quo Pneumatomachi furorem & fatuam Comenii* (5) *lucem extinxit? tum Anti-Echardus, cujus conquiſitum & male colligatum faſciculum ita diſſolvit, ut diſſolutarum ſcoparum hactenus retinuerit nomen? Imo quem non in mille detorſionum tenebris ineffabiliter delectat doctiſſimarum illa vindiciarum lux, quam publico toties recuſam dedit, & cujus ope tuta Eccleſia errorum evitat devia? ſed ne in hoc quidem labore acquieſcere potuit qui in Eccleſiæ voluit conſumi bonum. Brevingii ab eo tempore feliciter demolitus eſt tribunal, Erbermannum Bellarmino adverſus Ameſium ſuppetias ferentem confodit &c.* (6). i. e. "What man is there that does not "extol his moſt accurate refutation of the Raccovian "Catechiſm, in which is contained the fulleſt com- "pendium of the Socinian Religion ſhall I call it, or "impiety; which refutation is prodigiouſly ungrate- "ful to wicked ſeducers, and grateful to men of learn- "ing? Whoſe praiſe does not his Anti-Bidellus deſerve, "in which he has diſtinguiſhed the fury of that re- "ſiſter of the Holy Spirit, and the falſe light of Co- "menius? His Anti-Echardus likewiſe is admired, "written againſt Echardus, whoſe carefully collected "and ill put together bundle of abſurdities he has ſo "taken to pieces, that it ſtill bears the name of *Scopæ* "*diſſolutæ*;

(4) Dykii *tranſlata Euchariſtica*. Marckius *in Orat. funeb. Arnoldi*, p. 35.

(5) I quote a writing of Arnoldus againſt Comenius in the notes [D], (1), &c. of the article COMENIUS.

(6) Marckius, *in Orat. funebri Arnoldi*, pag. 35.

ARNULPHUS or ERNULPHUS, Biſhop of Rocheſter in the twelfth Century, was a Monk of St. Lucian de Beauvais, but left his monaſtry on account of the irregular lives which the Monks led there, and went to Lanfranc Archbiſhop, under whom he had ſtudied at the Abbey of Bec. He was for a long time only a private Monk in the monaſtry at Canterbury, but afterwards was made Prior of it by St. Anſelm, and then Abbot of Burck. At laſt in the year 1115 he was made Biſhop of Rocheſter, and held that See nine years. He died in 1124, being eighty four years of age (*a*). Father Luke Dacheri has publiſhed in the ſecond volume of his *Spicilegium*, two Treatiſes of this Biſhop written in the form of Letters [*A*]. There are ſeveral Letters of St. Anſelm Archbiſhop of Canterbury to him ſtill extant, and mentioned by Poſſevinus in his *Apparatus Sacer* (*b*), and by Father Dacheri in his Preface to the ſecond volume of his *Spicilegium* (*c*). Mr. Wharton in the Preface to the firſt volume of his *Anglia Sacra* (*d*) tells us, that Ernulphus,

(*a*) Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* tom. 9. p. 156. edit. Paris 1697.
(*b*) Tom. 1. pag. 514.
(*c*) P. 18. *See* Oudin's *Commentar. de Scriptor. & Script Eccleſ.* tom. 2. Col. 1065. edit. Lipſiæ 1722.
(*d* Publiſhed in 1689, in fol. num. 53.

" *diſſolutæ*, or the ſhattered reaſonings? Nay, whom " does not his *Lux in tenebris*, or his learned Vindi- " cations amidſt a thouſand Heretical darkneſſes de- " light inexpreſſibly, of which he has given ſo many " impreſſions, and by the aſſiſtance whereof the Church " ſecurely avoids the paths of errors? But this man, " who had wholly devoted himſelf to the ſervice of " the Church, could not reſt ſatisfied with having " done even ſo much, for after he demoliſhed the tri- " bunal of Brevingius, and deſtroyed Erberman, who " was giving aſſiſtance to Bellarmin againſt Ameſius, " &c." Here are ſeveral ANTI's which are not in Mr. Baillet's liſt.

[*A*] *Two Treatiſes of this Biſhop, written in the form of Letters.*] The firſt is intitled, *Tomellus ſive Epiſtola Ernulfi ex Monacho Benedictino Epiſcopi Roffenſis de inceſtis Conjugiis*; i. e. " A little Tract or the Epiſtle of " Ernulfus at firſt a Benedictine Monk, and after- " wards Biſhop of Rocheſter concerning inceſtuous mar- " riages." This letter was addreſſed to Waguelin Bp. of Windſor, in anſwer to a queſtion propoſed to him by that Biſhop in a converſation, which they had at Canterbury, upon this ſubject; *Whether a woman, who had committed adultery with her huſband's ſon by a former wife, ought to be ſeparated from her huſband.* Arnulphus maintained the affirmative, and the Biſhop to whom he wrote the negative. In this treatiſe he anſwers the objections urged by the Biſhop, by ſhewing, that all the paſſages of Scripture, in which there is a prohibition againſt ſeparating a man from his wife, ought to be underſtood only of a voluntary ſeparation between perſons, who are not guilty of adultery. He then confirms his own opinion by alledging, that the Biſhops in order to prevent diſorders, have frequently condemned adulterers to abſtain for ever after from the uſe of marriage; that this was the cuſtom of the Church; that this puniſhment is appointed in the Penitential Books: and that it is lawful to ſeparate on account of a ſpiritual alliance, tho' it be not excepted in Scripture as adultery is. He aſſerts, that it is by no means unjuſt to ſeparate an husband from his wife, tho' he be innocent of the fault, which ſhe has committed; and that there are ſeveral other cauſes, for which an husband is obliged to ſeparate himſelf from her. The ſecond Letter is addreſſed to one Lambert an Abbot, in anſwer to five queſtions propoſed to him. The *firſt* was, why the Euchariſt was then given in a different and almoſt contrary manner to that, which Jeſus Chriſt practiſed; ſince it was the cuſtom at that time to give the Hoſt dipt in the wine, whereas our Saviour gave his Body and Blood ſeparately. Arnulphus anſwers this queſtion, by alledging, that when Chriſt came into the world for the ſalvation of mankind, he preſcribed to them what was neceſſary to obtain that end, without mentioning the particular manner and circumſtances of his injunctions. Thus he did not ſay, *Baptize in ſuch or ſuch a manner*; *dip the perſon whom you baptize, three or four times*; but only *baptize them*. That by this means it is eaſy to know the things, which are abſolutely neceſſary, and thoſe, which may be ſometimes omitted or changed. That this is the reaſon why ſeveral practices, which were in uſe in the Primitive Church, had not been obſerved for a long time. That it is certain, for inſtance, that the Apoſtles received the Euchariſt after Supper, tho' now it is received faſting; that it was then celebrated upon a wooden table, tho' now it is offered upon an altar of ſtone; that the Bread then made uſe of was common Bread, but that now employed is formed into little thin cakes. There is no reaſon therefore to wonder, that the Bread is dipt in the Wine, tho' this practice was not formerly in uſe; ſince it is deſigned to prevent any accident in the diſtribution of the Wine alone, leſt any of it ſhould ſtick upon the beards of thoſe who communicate, or the Miniſter ſhould ſpill any of it. The *ſecond* queſtion is, why a fourth part of the Hoſt is put into the Chalice. He anſwers, that it was not the cuſtom to divide the Hoſt into four parts, but into three; and that the third part, which is put into the Chalice, was about as big as the fourth part of the Hoſt, tho' in ſome Churches they take care to divide the whole exactly into three. He obſerves, that this cuſtom was introduced, becauſe the Prieſt or Biſhop who celebrated, was obliged to communicate of that part, which he put into the Chalice, and to diſtribute the two others to the Deacon and Sub-deacon, who were preſent. He adds a myſtical reaſon for this practice; which is, that the Body of Jeſus Chriſt, which is offered upon the Altar, is the ſacrament or figure of the myſtical Body of Chriſt, which is the Church compoſed of three Orders, Superiors, Virgins, and married Perſons; or becauſe it repreſents the myſtery of the Trinity, or the three Eſtates of our Saviour, that of his mortality, his death, and his reſurrection. The *third* queſtion is, why the Blood of Chriſt is received ſeparately from his Body, and why it is adminiſtered without the Body. He anſwers, that thoſe, who receive the Sacrament in both kinds ſeparately, do it in imitation of Chriſt; and that tho' the Body of Chriſt is received entire under each ſpecies, yet each ſpecies is received ſeparately; becauſe our Saviour has diſtinguiſhed theſe two things, in order to repreſent to us by his Body, his Fleſh, and his Members, ſuch as they appeared ſolid and entire; and by his Blood that which was to be ſhed upon the Croſs. The *fourth* queſtion is, whether Jeſus Chriſt is received without a ſoul or animated. He anſwers firſt, that ſuch kind of queſtions are generally propoſed by perſons, who affect to appear learned, and endeavour to lay ſnares for the faith of the ſimple and unlearned, who believe with all proper humility and ſubmiſſion of mind whatever the Holy Ghoſt has taught them. That it is very proper not to engage in ſuch queſtions; that tho' we cannot comprehend how Bread and Wine are made the Body and Blood of Chriſt, yet we ought not to doubt of it, ſince Chriſt himſelf tells us, *This is my Body, and this is my Blood.* That it is a folly to endeavour to penetrate into the incomprehenſible Myſteries of our religion, eſpecially into that which is a Myſtery of faith. That it is certain, that the ſubſtance of the Bread and Wine is changed into the Body and Blood of Chriſt, tho' it appears to the ſenſe to be only Bread and Wine, and has all the qualities of thoſe ſubſtances. That as the qualities of Bread ſtill ſubſiſt in it, tho' the ſubſtance is deſtroyed, ſo we may affirm, that the qualities of Fleſh are not to be found there, tho' the ſubſtance of fleſh ſubſiſts in it. And therefore it is very improper to aſk, whether the Fleſh of Chriſt in the Euchariſt is dead or immortal; animated, or not animated. The *fifth* and laſt queſtion is, concerning the ſenſe of theſe words of the Prophet Joel, c. ii. v. 14. *Who knoweth if he will return and repent, and leave a bleſſing behind him &c.?* He tells us that the change of God's determination conſiſts in the remiſſion of ſin, which he grants to thoſe, who repent and reform themſelves; and that the meaning of the word, *leave a bleſſing behind him*, is that he will bleſs thoſe, who follow him (1).

(1) Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* tom. 9. p. 156, 157.

Ernulphus, who held the Biſhoprick of Rocheſter from the year 1114 to 1124, compiled a book *concerning the foundation, endowment, charters, laws, and other things relating to the Church of Rocheſter*, which Manuſcript is known to the Engliſh Antiquaries by the title of *Textus Roffenſis*. We ſhall give an account of the contents of it in the note [*B*] from Mr. Wharton, who obſerves, that Bale in his *Centuries* (*e*) has committed a very great miſtake in aſcribing ſeveral of the Works of Arnulphus or Arnoul Biſhop of Liſieux, and of Arnoul Abbot of Bonneval to our Arnulphus, and confounding him with Arnulphus the Preſbyter, who, as Platina tells us, was deſtroyed by the treachery of the Roman Clergy in the time of Pope Honorius II, for remonſtrating with great ſeverity againſt the vices and corruptions of the Court of Rome. For the latter was very different from our Biſhop of Rocheſter, who died before Honorius was raiſed to the See of Rome. Mr. Wharton has publiſhed the Manuſcript of Arnulphus in the firſt volume of his *Anglia Sacra* (*f*) under the following title; *Ernulfi Epiſcopi Roffenſis Collectanea de Rebus Eccleſiæ Roffenſis*; that is, "The Collection of Ernulfus Biſhop of Rocheſter concerning the affairs of the Church of Rocheſter." But Caſimir Oudin in his *Commentarius de Scriptoribus & Scriptis Eccleſiaſticis* (*g*) is of opinion, that our Arnulphus had no ſhare in this collection.

(*e*) *Centur.* 2. cap. 70.

(*f*) From p. 329 to 341.

(*g*) Tom. 2. Col. 1066.

[*B*] *We ſhall give an account of the contents of it in the note.*] It contains ſeveral pieces written both in the Latin and Saxon Tongues, particularly the Laws of the Kings Ethelbert, Alfred, Guthrun, Edward, Edmund, and Ethelred, in Saxon; the Exorciſm of Ordeal; the Laws of King Canute, the Conſtitutions of King William I; Extracts from the Decrees of the Popes; Ordinances made by King Henry I, in the year 1101; the Succeſſion of the Popes and Roman Emperors, Patriarchs of Jeruſalem and the four Patriarchal Sees; the Names of the Archbiſhops and Biſhops of England from St. Auguſtin the Monk, ranged according to their particular Sees, in Latin; Judgments of the City of London; the Genealogy of King Edward from Adam; the Genealogies of all the Kings during the Heptarchy in England, in Saxon; the Privileges, Charters, Ordinances, &c. of the Church of Rocheſter, in Latin and Saxon. There is no piece in this MS. later than the time of Arnulphus, except thirteen names in the Catalogue of the Archbiſhops of Canterbury, and fifteen names in the Catalogue of the Biſhops of Rocheſter, which were added by other hands in different Ages, as appears from the characters and ink. For ſome perſon has added the names of ſix Biſhops, who ſucceeded Arnulphus; and ſome later hand added to them thoſe of nine other Biſhops, who followed them. To theſe we may add a few paſſages concerning the Actions of John and Aſcelinus Biſhops, which we find after folio 203. All the reſt appear to be coeval with our Arnulphus. T.

ARODON (BENJAMIN D') a German Jew, Author of a book full of precepts for the women. It has been tranſlated out of the German Language into Italian by Rabbi Jacob Alpron. This verſion was reprinted at Venice in 5412, according to the calculation of the Jews (*a*), after having been carefully corrected by the Rabbi Iſaac Levita. This book is very full of ceremonies to be obſerved not only with regard to the neatneſs of the body, but likewiſe for the practice of prayers and good works. The obſervances of the firſt order often contain little niceties, or ſuperſtitious regularities; and there is ſometimes a great deal of *ſeverity* in thoſe of the ſecond order [*A*]. This

(*a*) I believe that anſwers to our year 1652.

[*A*] *There is a great deal of* ſeverity *in the rules contained in his Book.*] For inſtance, it is ordered that a man and woman ſhall not ſay one word during the conjugal duty, and that they ſhall have none but pious thoughts, without any regard to pleaſure; and it is declared to them, that if they ſhould act in any other manner, their children would be deformed. *Ogni perſona deve eſſer auvertita tanto l'huomo, come la donna, nel tempo che ſi congiungono inſieme non devono parlar, ne haver niun cattivo penſiere, ne debbano ſcoprire li luochi occulti e vergognoſi, perche quelli che parlano in quel tempo che ſi congiungono inſieme, quelle creatura che viene conceputa in quell' iſtante, riuſciſſe dal ventre della madre con qualche* מקרה *ò zoppo, ò muto, ò guercio, ò ſimili mancamenti, ò del tutto diſtrutto, e mal conditionato . . . . non devono haver intentione in quell' iſtante alli piaceri, ma ſolo per adempir il voler divino . . . .* (1): *ambidoi devono penſar in quelle iſtante, che queſto non lo fanno per il lor giovamento & adempir li lor appetiti carnali, ma ſolo per mantenir il precetto . . . ogn' huomo da bene sà quello, che devepenſare in quell' inſtante, perche ſi deve penſar ſolo à penſieri ſanti e pii* (2). This rule is excellent and very rigid at the ſame time. See what is ſaid in *the News from the Republick of Letters* (3), concerning a Book of Mr. Yvon, Miniſter of the Labadiſtes. So great a degree of purity is one of thoſe kind of bleſſings, that it is eaſier to wiſh than to hope for; but the Caſuiſts are to be commended for inſiſting upon it, and endeavouring to introduce a purity where the rage of luſt and brutal concupiſcence have but too much influence. If our Rabbin had believed, as the Church of Rome does, that Marriage is a Sacrament, he could not have required that thoſe who partake of it ſhould have had more holy diſpoſitions than thoſe which he demands. He always impoſes upon them the Law of *favete linguis* (4), the obſervation whereof the Pagans recommended in their great myſteries, and that of *ſurſum corda*, which the primitive Church never forgot to take notice of in her moſt auguſt ceremonies. In one word, it is certain, that if this man had received with an entire faith the doctrine of Jeſus Chriſt, and had been influenced by the Spirit of Grace, he could not have given advice more worthy of the evangelical purity. This is enough to ſhame thoſe teachers of looſneſs of manners, who are ſo common among Chriſtians.

(1) *Precetti da eſſer imparati dalle Donne Ebree*, cap. 70. pag. 41, 42.

(2) Idem, cap. 71. pag. 43.

(3) For the month of Nov. 1685, p. 1290.

(4) Horat. Od. 1. lib. 3. See his Commentators thereupon.

Note that the doctrine of this Rabbin does not at all agree with the advice of the Doctors in Phyſick. Theſe pretend that a child conceived under diſtractions of mind, I mean under a train of ſerious, grave, and ſpiritual contemplations, is ſimple, ſilly and weak (5); and give quite different directions to thoſe who are deſirous of children (6); but if we conſider ever ſo little, we muſt be of opinion, that they lead mankind to a very indifferent ſchool for chaſtity, their precepts are only calculated for ſuch people as are willing to confine all things to an animal, terreſtrial, ſenſual, Epicurean life. They ſhould go to ſchool to this Rabbin, who are deſirous of learning to behave themſelves in this part of their duty like creatures endowed with an immortal ſoul, and who would not render themſelves worthy of this cenſure,

(5) See the note [*C*] of the article FRANCIS D'ASSISE, in the ſecond paragraph.

(6) *See* Roderic de Caſtro *de Naturâ Mulierum*, lib. 3. cap. 5.

O curvæ in terras animæ & cœleſtium inanes (7)!

(7) Perſius, Sat. 2. ver. 61.

" O ſouls, in whom no heav'nly fire is found
" Fat minds and ever groveling on the ground!
Dryden.

A perſon

This will appear more plainly in the note which accompanies this Article.

A perſon will the better comprehend how excellent and ſublime the morality of this Jew is, if he does but recollect, that it is directly oppoſite to the maxims of thoſe teachers of corruption, who have crowded their Poems with ſo many luſcious precepts. Theſe dangerous poiſoners take care not to recommend ſilence; and it is that which has occaſioned a certain modern to find ſome proofs of an interpretation, which he has given to the words of a Greek Poet, which contain a deſcription of the Cave of the Nymphs. *As for the agreeable murmur of which Homer ſpeaks,* ſays he (8), *they are undoubtedly thoſe endearing words of lovers, that* ohi me cor mio *of the Italians, the* ζωὴ καὶ ψυχὴ *of the Greeks, and that* alma de mi alma *of the Spaniards, which accompany the moſt familiar privacies, and which occaſioned the moſt knowing of all the Poets in the Art of Love to ſay:*

(8) *Hexameron Ruſtique, IV Journée,* p. 112, & *ſeq.*

Accedant queſtus, accedat amabile murmur,
Et dulces gemitus, aptaque verba joco *.

* Ovid. lib. 2. ver. 723. *de Arte Amandi.*

" Her kind complaints, her melting accents hear,
" Whilſt with fond ſighs ſhe wounds the liſt'ning ear.

See how he ſpeaks of it in another place:

Et mihi blanditias dixit, dominumque vocavit;
Et quæ præterea publica verba juvant †.

† Lib. 3. *Amorum Eleg.* 6. ver. 2.

" The moving blandiſhments of ſound ſhe try'd,
" And my dear life, my ſoul, my all ſhe cry'd.

I need not tell you that the term juvare *is throughly* amatorial, *and conſecrated to thoſe extremeſt delights of love, which the following two verſes of the ſame Author alſo expreſs, as well as the murmur:*

Me voces audire juvat ſua gaudia faſſas
Utque morer, me, me, ſuſtineamque roget ‡.

‡ Lib. 2. *de arte Amandi.*

—— *The famous Epithalamium of the Emperor Gallienus, which Trebellius Pollio thinks preferable to the performances of an hundred Poets, who alſo ſet themſelves to work upon the ſame ſubject, gives ſtill a moſt ſurprizing repreſentation of that hollow and endearing murmur, and thoſe careſſes that are inſeparable therefrom. It is ſuppoſed that taking hold of the hands of his brother's children, which he had married, he pronounced to them theſe verſes of his own compoſing:*

Ite, ite, o pueri, pariter ſudate medullis.
Omnibus inter vos, non murmura *veſtra columbæ,*
Brachia non hederæ, non vincant oſcula conchæ.

It is certainly a difficult matter to ſay any thing more pathetick, or more paſſionate on the ſubject. To be diametrically oppoſite to theſe falſe teachers, to theſe peſts of youth, is a great encomium, and a true ſign that the precepts of morality, which are advanced, are of admirable purity. It is proper to add to all this, the judicious anſwer that was made by the famous Mr. Drelincourt to a Biſhop who had made uſe of a remark altogether unworthy, I won't ſay of a perſon of his character, but even of a layman, who had any diſlike of a wanton ſtyle. *Inſtead of ſtriking out of his devotions,* theſe are Mr. Drelincourt's words (9), *theſe ways of ſpeaking, that the Virgin Mary is* the Spirit and Life of Chriſtians, *he defends them by ſuch railleries, as it would be better to leave to the people on the ſtage.* As for you, *ſays he,* the Paſtors of the Proteſtant Church, who have dear partners; not only as accidents inſeparable from your ſubſtance, but as the bone of your bone and the fleſh of your fleſh; nay that are but one fleſh in two perſons, who are well called in other terms more endearing to thoſe ſouls of your ſouls, to thoſe lives of your lives, to thoſe lives of your hearts and your ſouls, to thoſe ſouls of your lives and your hearts, which the world underſtands not: for you are thoſe ſpiritual Beings, which judge the whole world, even the Angels; more particularly the Romans, without being capable of being judged of any. *I don't know who has taught him ſuch fine flouriſhes, nor can I anſwer for what kind of diſcourſe may paſs amongſt thoſe perſons who make uſe of Courtezans. But a grave perſonage, who lives in a chaſte marriage, does not ſtudy ſuch an extravagant kind of Rhetorick.* The Prelate replied to him in a manner as burleſque as poſſible (10).

(9) Drelincourt, *Avant-Coureur de la Replique a Mr. le Camus Eveque de Belley,* pag. 36, 37.

(10) See his *Reponſe a l'Avant-Coureur de Mr. Drelincourt,* pag. 156.

ARRERAC (JEAN D') Counſellor to the Parliament of Bourdeaux, towards the end of the ſixteenth Century was the Author of a book, of which I ſhall ſay ſomething below [*A*].

[*A*] *He was the Author of a Book, of which I ſhall ſay ſomething below.*] The title of it was, *La Philoſophie Civile & d'Eſtat, diviſée en l'Irénarchie & la Polémarchie,* and was printed at Bourdeaux, by Simon Millanges, in 1598, in 8vo. It was to conſiſt of two volumes, whereof I have only ſeen the firſt (1). See what an idea the Author gives us of it (2). " I have " undertaken my ſubject upon the laws of the firſt " Book of the Pandects, which all the Doctors have " deſpiſed, either becauſe they did not underſtand " them, or becauſe they did not think they would " furniſh them with a great deal of chicanry, to " which they were more ready to ſubmit for the ſake " of the gain, which they expected therefrom, than " they were influenced by the love of virtue and ho- " nour. I find this Book ſo rich and fertile in good " laws, that I am greatly miſtaken if I don't ſhew in " mine that it contains the greateſt part of the laws " of Nature and Moral and Civil Philoſophy, with the " Order of the Roman Magiſtracies and Juriſdictions. " I have added to this firſt Book, the two firſt titles " of the ſecond, under which I have diſcourſed of " the rights of Juriſdiction, both according to the " Roman Government, our French right, and the " right of the Church; and of this law of Nature, " *That whatſoever law a man would impoſe upon ano-* " *ther, he himſelf ſhould walk by the ſame law.*" This reſpects the firſt volume, or Irenarchy, that is to ſay the ſtate of peace: what follows, relates to his Polemarchy, that is to ſay, the ſtate of war. It was *a ſmall Volume which contained in four Books, all the qualities and perfections of a General of an army, the wiles and ſtratagems of the ancient Captains, the methods of making the beſt uſe of occurrences in war, and of remaining conquerors after a victory obtained* (3). This Author had read a great deal, and was not ſparing of quotations; but generally, he does not enlarge upon any thing: which is the reaſon that he has had room enough to ſpeak upon a great number of ſubjects. He claſhes pretty often with the greateſt Lawyers, Accurſius, Alciat, Budeus, Cujas, &c; and now and then he makes ſome very ſingular obſervations.

(1) It contains 721 pages.

(2) Jean d'Arrerac, *Epiſtre Dedicatoire au Cardinal de Joyeuſe.*

(3) Jean d'Arrerac, *Epitre Dedicatoire,* pag. 1. towards the end.

ARRIA, the name of ſeveral Roman Ladies, of which I ſhall ſpeak in the notes of the article PETUS.

☞ As Mr. Bayle has omitted to write the Article of Pætus, which he refers to for that of the celebrated ARRIA, we ſhall inſert the latter here.

☞ ARRIA, a Roman Lady of diſtinguiſhed fortitude, was the wife of Cæcina Pætus, a man of Conſular Dignity [*A*], with whom ſhe had lived many years in the moſt perfect

[*A*] *A man of Conſular Dignity.*] The text of Dion Caſſius (1), as Mr. Tillemont obſerves (2), intimates, that Cæcina, who was the husband of Arria, and who died in the year 42 of the Chriſtian Æra, was Conſul:

(1) Lib. 60.

(2) *Hiſt. des Empereurs,* tom. 1. Part 1. pag. 599. edit. 2. Bruxelles 1707.

perfect union imaginable. Pliny the Younger mentions (*a*) several instances of her incomparable resolution and greatness of mind, particularly upon the death of her son [*B*]. Her husband being afterwards engaged in the party of Camillus Scribonianus, who had taken up arms in Illyricum against the Emperor Claudius in the year 42 of the Christian Æra, was seized and put on board a ship in order to be conveyed to Rome. Arria was very importunate with the soldiers, who guarded Pætus, to suffer her to attend him; and told them, that as they could not reasonably refuse a man of his quality the liberty of having his slaves to wait upon him, she would readily undertake all that trouble herself. But the soldiers were inexorable; upon which she hired a little vessel of the fishermen, and followed the ship, in which her husband was. When they came to Rome she reproached Scribonianus's wife in very severe terms, even before Claudius himself, that she could bear to live, when her husband Scribonianus was killed but the day before in her arms. This shewed evidently, that she had formed a resolution herself not to survive Pætus; though, as Mr. Tillemont observes (*b*), she had interest enough with Messalina to live not only with security, but even in honour and credit. Thrasea her son-in-law endeavoured in the strongest manner to divert her from this design, and among other things asked her, whether she was willing, that if he was to be put to death, her daughter likewise should die with him. She answered, that she was very willing, if her daughter should live as long and with as much harmony and affection with Thrasea, as herself had done with Pætus. This discourse of her's encreased the sollicitude of all the family, and they observed her very carefully to prevent her from attempting any thing against her life. She perceived this, and told them, that their care was in vain, since they could not hinder her from killing herself; upon which she rose from her chair, and run her head with the utmost violence against the wall, and fell down as it were dead. When she had recovered her senses, she said to them, *Did not I tell you, that I could find a painful way to kill myself, if you denied me an easier method to do it?* Pliny represents this fact in a very beautiful manner [*C*]. But

(*a*) Epist. lib. 3. Epist. 16.

(*b*) *Hist. des Empereurs*, tom. 1. Part 1. p. 345. edit. 2. Bruxelles 1707.

Καικίνα ὑπάτου. And in reality Largus, who was Consul in 42, was likewise called Cæcina, according to Onuphrius, Lipsius, Goltzius, and Vorburg. And this probably was the reason, which induced Goltzius in his *Fasti Consulares* (3) to assert, that he died during his Consulship; which is also affirmed by Lipsius upon Tacitus. But Dion Cassius, who tells us that Claudius left him Consul during the whole year, δι' ἔτους, does not give us any ground to imagine, that he died as a criminal before the end of the year. He remarks it as a very extraordinary incident, that a Pretor was put to death after he had been obliged to quit his office. And therefore it is probable, that he would not have omitted to observe the same thing with regard to a Consul, especially as it was in the same affair. However, it is certain, from Pliny and Martial, that Arria's husband was Cæcina Pætus, who was then of consular dignity, tho' not actually Consul, and was brought to Rome from Illyricum; whereas those, who were Consuls, never left the city during their Consulship. For this reason, Mr. Tillemont is of opinion, that we must undoubtedly, instead of ὑπάτου in Dion Cassius, read Παίτου, which is most probable, or ὑπατικοῦ. Lipsius likewise imagines, that in the passage, which follows a little after in that Historian, instead of Παῖ ὦ κακάγαθε, it should be read Παῖτε.

(3) P. 238. edit. Antwerp 1617.

[*B*] *Particularly upon the death of her son.*] Pliny tells us, that he was informed of this by Fannia, the grand-daughter of Arria. She related several facts of her grand-mother, which he observes were not less noble than the last act of her life, tho' more obscure, and which he doubted not would appear to his friend Nepos, to whom he wrote this account, no less admirable than they did to him, when he heard them. He introduces this with a fine reflection, that with regard to the actions and sayings of great persons of both sexes, some of them have the good fortune to be more celebrated, while others of equal or greater merit are less known. *Adnotâsse videor facta dictaque virorum fœminarumque illustrium alia clariora esse, alia majora. Confirmata est opinio mea hesterno Fanniæ sermone. Neptis hæc Arriæ illius, quæ marito & solatium mortis & exemplum fuit. Multa referebat aviæ suæ non minora hoc, sed obscuriora; quæ tibi existimo tam mirabilia legenti fore, quam mihi audienti fuerunt.* Her husband and her son were both dangerously sick at the same time; and the latter who was a very beautiful youth, and of great modesty, and whose virtues endeared him to his parents as much as his relation to them, died of the disease. Arria took care of his funeral in so private a manner, that her husband knew nothing of the matter. Whenever she went into his chamber, she pretended that her son's distemper abated; and that he had rested well, and began to recover his appetite. But at last, when she could restrain the emotion of her grief no longer, and the tears would force themselves from her involuntarily, she left the room, and gave a loose to her sorrow; and having discharged it, she dry'd her eyes, and returned with a composed countenance to her husband, and with the same serenity as if her son had been still living. *Ægrotabat Cæcinna Pætus, maritus ejus, ægrotabat & filius, uterque morti ferè, ut videbatur. Filius decessit, eximiâ pulchritudine, pari verecundiâ, & parentibus non minus ob alia charus quam quod filius erat. Huic illa ita funus paravit, ita duxit exequias, ut ignoraret maritus; quinimò quoties cubiculum ejus intraret, vivere filium atque etiam commodiorem esse simulabat. Ac persæpe interroganti quid ageret puer, respondebat, Benè quievit, libenter cibum sumpsit. Deinde quum diu cohibitæ lachrymæ vincerent prorumperentque, egrediebatur; tunc se dolori dabat; satiata, siccis oculis, composito vultu redibat, tanquam orbitatem foris reliquisset.* Pliny extols this action of hers prodigiously, and observes, that tho' her resolution in stabbing herself, and then giving the dagger to her husband, with all the circumstances of that action, was very noble; yet she had then glory and immortal fame before her view; but this domestic act of hers, in suppressing the emotions of her sorrow, and acting the part of a mother even after the death of her son, is still greater than the other, as it was done without any prospect of glory. *Præclarum quidem illud ejusdem ferrum stringere, & perfodere pectus, extrahere pugionem, porrigere marito, addere vocem immortalem ac pæne divinam,* Pæte non dolet. *Sed tamen ista facienti dicentique gloria & æternitas ante oculos erat; quo majus est sine præmio æternitatis, sine præmio gloriæ abdere lacrymas, operire luctum, amissoque filio matrem adhuc agere.*

[*C*] *Pliny represents this fact in a very beautiful manner.*] We shall not deny ourselves or the reader the pleasure of transcribing some part of the passage; from whence we have extracted this account, in the elegant words of that Author. *Quinetiam quum Thrasea gener ejus deprecaretur, ne mori pergeret, interque alia dixisset,* Tu vis ergo filiam tuam, si mihi pereundum fuerit, mori mecum? *respondit;* Si tamdiu tantâque concordiâ vixerit tecum quam ego cum Pæto, volo. *Auxerat hoc responso curam suorum; attentius custodiebatur; sensit, &,* Nihil agitis, *inquit,* potestis enim efficere at malè moriar; ne moriar, non potestis. *Dum hæc dicit, exiluit Cathedram, adversoque parieti caput ingenti impetu impegit, & corruit. Refocillata,* Dixeram, *inquit,* vobis, inventuram me quamlibet duram ad mortem viam, si vos facilem negassetis.

But when Arria found that there was no hope of ſaving her huſband's life, and that he had not courage ſufficient to put an end to it himſelf, ſhe took a dagger and ſtruck it into her breaſt, and having drawn it out again, preſented it to him with theſe words; *Pætus, this gives me no pain.* Martial (*c*) has a fine Epigram upon this ſubject [*D*]. But Mr. Tillemont (*d*) excepts againſt this action of her's as indefenſible [*E*]. ARRIA her daughter, who was married to Pætus Thraſea, propoſed to imitate this example of her mother, when her huſband was condemned to death under Nero; but ſhe changed her reſolution, upon his requeſt, who deſired her to live in order to take care of their daughter (*e*).

(*c*) *Epigram.* lib. 1.

(*d*) Pag. 346.

(*e*) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 16. cap. 34.

[*D*] *Martial has a fine Epigram upon this ſubject.*]

Caſta ſuo gladium cum traderet Arria Pæto,
Quem de viſceribus traxerat ipſa ſuis;
Si qua fides, vulnus, quod feci, non dolet, inquit;
Sed quod tu facies, hoc mihi, Pæte, dolet.

That is,

" When Arria pull'd the dagger from her ſide,
" Thus to her Conſort ſpoke th' illuſtrious bride;
" The wound I gave myſelf I do not grieve:
" I die by that, which Pætus muſt receive *.

* See the *Tatler*, Vol. 2. N° 72.

[*E*] *Mr. Tillemont excepts againſt this action of hers as indefenſible.*] He obſerves, that it has been prodigiouſly celebrated, and that the Pagans have repreſented it as worthy of immortal honour; but he is of opinion, that how glorious it may appear to men, the Deity will conſider it in a very different light. And tho' it may be thought noble and great, yet it cannot poſſibly be ſaid to be prudent or good; ſince it muſt at leaſt be acknowledged, that this Lady was guilty of deſtroying an innocent perſon. Beſides, continues that Author, Pliny, who eſteemed this action as a Roman, yet thought it was by no means preferable to the reſolution, which ſhe exerted in concealing her exquiſite ſorrow upon the death of her ſon, that ſhe might not afflict her husband, who was then ſick; for he remarks, that upon this occaſion ſhe did not the leaſt conſider the immortalizing of her name, as ſhe did in the other. T.

ARRIAGA (RODERIC DE) a Spaniſh Jeſuit, was born at Lucrona the 17th of January 1592. He entered into the Society the 17th of September 1606, and taught Philoſophy with great applauſe at Valladolid, and Divinity at Salamanca; and having been informed by Letters from the General of the Company, that it would be for the greater glory of God if ſome Spaniſh Jeſuits would tranſport themſelves into Bohemia (*a*), to teach there the more exalted Sciences, he offered himſelf as ready to undertake that employment. He arrived at Prague in 1624. He there taught Scholaſtick Divinity three years, and was the Prefect General of the Studies twenty years following, and Chancellor of the Univerſity the ſpace of twelve years. He took his Doctor in Divinity's Degree in a publick manner, and gained himſelf a great deal of reputation. The Province of Bohemia deputed him thrice to Rome, to aſſiſt there at general congregations of the Order (*b*). He was exhorted ſeveral times to return into Spain, but it was in vain. He was highly eſteemed by Urban VIII, Innocent X, and the Emperor Ferdinand III. He died at Prague, the 17th of June 1667 (*c*). He publiſhed ſeveral Books [*A*], wherein he diſplayed a very ſubtil wit. It is found that he ſucceeded much better in deſtroying what he denied, than in eſtabliſhing what he affirmed, and from thence it is ſuppoſed that he became a favourer of Pyrrhoniſm [*B*], though he has given us to underſtand that he is no Pyrrhonian. It would without doubt be very

(*a*) The Jeſuits had lately made a Province of their Order in that country diſtinct from the Province of Auſtria. Sotuel, *Biblioth. Scriptor. Societ. Jeſu*, pag. 728, 729.

(*b*) At the 8th, the 10th and the 11th.

(*c*) Taken from Sotuel, *Biblioth. Scriptor. Societ. Jeſu*, pag. 728, 729.

[*A*] *He publiſhed ſeveral Books.*] *A Courſe of Philoſophy*, in one volume, and *a Courſe of Divinity*, in eight volumes. The *Courſe of Philoſophy* printed in Folio, at Antwerp, in 1632, has been reprinted ſeveral times. The Edition of Lions, in 1669, is enlarged. The firſt and ſecond volumes of his *Courſe of Divinity* were printed in 1643; the third and fourth, in 1644; the fifth, in 1649; the ſixth, in 1650; the ſeventh and eighth, in 1655. Theſe are all in Folio, printed by Balthaſar Moret at Antwerp (1). He was at work upon the ninth volume when he died: it was that *de Jure & Juſtitia* (2). Don Nicolas Antonio has aſcribed to Arriaga a Book *de Oratore*, printed at Cologn, in 1637, and *Brevis expoſitio literæ Magiſtri Sententiarum, cum Quæſtionibus quæ circa ipſam moveri poſſunt, & Autoribus qui de illis diſputant*, printed at Lyons, in 1636, in 8vo, after the other Editions (3); but as Father Sotuel does not ſpeak of theſe two works, though the former had been preſented to this Jeſuit by Alegambe, there is room to believe that Don Nicholas Antonio was miſtaken.

(1) Nicholas Antonio, *Biblioth. Hiſpan.* tom. 2. pag. 209, remarks, that ſeveral of thoſe volumes were likewiſe printed at Lyons.

(2) Taken from Sotuel, *Biblioth. Script. Soc. Jeſu*, pag. 729.

(3) Nichol. Antonio, *Biblioth. Script. Hiſpan.* tom. 2. p. 209.

[*B*] *It is ſuppoſed that he became a favourer of Pyrrhoniſm.*] It is the opinion of Mr. de Villemandy: *Sunt alii*, ſays he (4), *qui periculoſius adhuc ſollicitant* (ſacratiora fidei dogmata) *cujuſmodi Arriaga* ſuis in Thomam Diſputationibus Theologicis; *nihil enim non moliuntur, ut aliorum quorumcunque placita reflectionibus & objectionibus ſuis deſtruant, ipſi autem nihil ferè adſtruunt. . . . . Celebris eſt inter Romanenſes Scholaſticos* Rodericus ille Arriaga. . . . . *Is multis Volum. Fol. & Philoſophiam & Theologiam eſt perſecutus; jam autem ſingula quæque ſic tractat, ut aliorum ferè omnium opiniones variis rationibus infirmare ſtudeat, ſuas autem leviſſime ſuffulciat. Si ex hac methodo ingenii conditio dijudicetur, verè Pyrrhonius poteſt haberi; cum tamen placita ſua, quantum poteſt firmet, iiſque conſtanter inhæreat, non poteſt legitime eo nomine donari* (5). i. e. " There are others, who attack ſtill more dangerouſly the ſacred doctrines of the faith, as Arriaga " in his Theological Diſputations upon Thomas Aquinas; for they leave no ſtone unturned to pull " down the opinions of others with their reflections " and objections, but build up nothing in the room " of them. . . . . Roderic Arriaga is famous amongſt " the Schoolmen. . . . . He treated of Philoſophy and " Divinity in many volumes in folio, but treats of " every thing in ſuch a manner, as to endeavour to " weaken the opinions of almoſt all others by various arguments, without ſupporting his own. If " his temper may be determined by this, he may be " reckoned a true Pyrrhonian; but when he endeavours to ſtrengthen his own opinions, with a great " deal of poſitiveneſs, he cannot juſtly deſerve that " name." We may affirm, that if the reading of the writings of this Jeſuit makes one think of the character of a Pyrrhonian, it is by accident, and contrary to his intention; for he is as deciſive as another, and as warm in confirming his deciſions: but either thro' the weakneſs of the human mind, or the difficulty of the ſubjects, he is in the ſame circumſtance with a great many Authors, who admirably diſcover the weakneſs of any doctrine, but never diſcover the ſtrong ſide of it. They are like warriors, who bring fire and ſword into the enemies country, but are not able to put their own frontiers into a ſtate of reſiſtance. Mr. Ancillon thought that this Jeſuit *was pretty ſingular in his manner of writing, and* more free *than the reſt, who, thro' an unworthy ſervitude, dare not forſake the ſentiments of the Writers of the Society, but follow them ſcrupulouſly as infallible. . . . . In relating*

(4) Petrus de Villemandy *in Scepticiſmo debellato*, cap. 2. pag. 13.

(5) Idem, ibid. cap. 4. pag. 32.

very unjuſt to ſuſpect him of the leaſt prevarication, and of having been a falſe brother to the Dogmatiſts; for if he makes uſe of his whole ſtrength to confute a great number of opinions; he does the ſame alſo to ſupport thoſe which he embraces; it is eaſily perceived that he proceeds therein in earneſt, and does his beſt; and if his proofs are not inferior to his objections, it is owing to the nature of the things. The application he has uſed to confute all the ſubtilties that have been invented by the ſchoolmen, to convince that two contradictory propoſitions are ſometimes true and ſometimes falſe, is ſufficient to ſhew that he had the intereſt of the Dogmatiſts at heart in oppoſition to the Pyrrhonians. In ſeveral points of natural Philoſophy, he has quitted the moſt general opinions of the ſchool, as upon the compoſition of the *continuum*, rarefaction, &c. wherefore he has taken upon him (*d*) to juſtify the innovators in Philoſophy. It is a pity that ſo judicious and penetrating a genius had not more inſight into the true principles, for he might have been able to carry them ſtill farther. A ſmall degree of knowledge in Hydroſtatics would have ſhewn him the reaſon of an experiment [*D*], in the explication of which he tormented himſelf in vain. His efforts, his application and his dexterity thereupon make one lament, that he has travelled ſo aſſiduouſly out of the right road.

(*d*) In the Preface to his *Courſe of Philoſophy*.

the opinion of Vaſquez he ſays plainly, that upon the whole he does not much rely on the ſolution of Father Vaſquez (6). *I have obſerved*, adds Mr. Ancillon, *in reading Arriaga and Oviedo, that whenever one of theſe Jeſuits maintains the affirmative of any propoſition, the other maintains the negative; which is pretty rare, even amongſt the Doctors of the Roman Religion in general, and what I have hardly ſeen except in Cornelius à Lapide and Eſtius.* It is no ſtrange thing, that upon an infinite number of queſtions, both in Philoſophy and School-Divinity, the Jeſuits ſhould confute one another. One may even ſay it is very common. Suarez and Vaſquez are an example of it.

(6) See the *Mélange Critique de la Literature*, tom. 1. p. 208.

[*C*] *He has diligently confuted all the ſubtilties that have been invented by the School-men, to ſhew that two contradictory Propoſitions are ſometimes true and ſometimes falſe.*] He has cleared all theſe ſophiſms very well: See his ſecond Diſpute on the *Summulæ* of Logic (7). I have ſeen ſome Profeſſors at a great loſs, when theſe objections were made them, which, to ſpeak the truth, ought to be look'd upon as quibbles invented by men who had nothing to do, but did not pretend, with Heraclitus, that in reality the ſame thing was and was not. They deſigned only to exerciſe their parts. Obſerve that Ariſtotle does not believe that Heraclitus thought ſo, if he ſaid it: Ἀδύνατον γὰρ οἰήσεώς τινος τοῦτο ὑπολαμβάνειν εἶναι καὶ μὴ εἶναι, καθάπερ τινὲς οἴονται λέγειν Ἡράκλειτον· οὐ γὰρ ἀναγκαῖον ἃ τις λέγει, ταῦτα καὶ ὑπολαμβάνειν (8). i. e. "It is impoſſible that any man could think the ſame thing "to be and not to be, as ſome imagine of Heraclitus. For it is not neceſſary that a man ſhould always think as he ſpeaks."

(7) Sect. 5. Subſect. 3 and 4. p. 19, & *ſeq.* edit. Pariſinæ, an. 1639.

(8) Ariſtot. *Metaphyſ.* lib. 3. cap. 3. p. 667, C.

[*D*] *He could not diſcover the reaſon of an experiment, in the explication of which he tormented himſelf in vain.*] The experiment is this, that wood, which is lighter than water, does not float upon the water with regard to its whole thickneſs. A beam, that floats upon a river is part under the water, and part above it. This cannot be explained from the common principles of heavineſs and lightneſs: hence come the vain efforts of Arriaga (9). The new Philoſophers find no difficulty in this. See M. Gadrois's Syſtem.

(9) Arriaga, *Diſputat.* 4. *de Generat.* Sect. 5. *de Elementis*, Subſect. 6. pag. 519.

☞ **ARRIAN**, a famous Hiſtorian and Philoſopher under the Emperor Hadrian and the two Antoninus's, was born at Nicomedia in Bithynia. His great learning and eloquence procured him the character of the ſecond Xenophon, and raiſed him to the moſt conſiderable dignities at Rome, even the Conſulſhip itſelf (*a*). Mr. Tillemont is of opinion (*b*), that he is the ſame perſon with Flavius Arrianus, who was Governor of Cappadocia in the year of Chriſt 134 under the Emperor Hadrian, and ſtopp'd the incurſions of the Alani; and who ſent an account of his voyage round the Euxin Sea to that Prince [*A*]. Euſebius ſpeaks of him in his *Chronicon* under the year 146. Themiſtius in his 17th *Oration* tells us, that Trajan or Hadrian took him from the purſuit of his ſtudies, and employed him as his Miniſter in the adminiſtration of the Empire. He is ſuppoſed to have been one of the Preceptors of Marcus Antoninus Philoſophus the

(*a*) Phot. *Bibliothec.* Cod. 58. Col. 54. edit. Rothomagi, 1653.

(*b*) *Hiſt. des Empereurs*, tom. 2. Part 2. p. 453. edit. Bruxelles, 1711.

[*A*] *Sent an account of his voyage round the Euxin Sea to that Prince.*] This *Periplus Ponti Euxini* was publiſhed in Greek at Geneva 1577, and written by way of letter to the Emperor Hadrian by Arrian, who as Mr. Tillemont obſerves (1), was evidently the Governor of Cappadocia, and the ſame with our Hiſtorian. He commanded at Trebizonde and in parts adjacent, either becauſe thoſe countries were then ſubject to the Governor of Cappadocia, or becauſe he had a particular commiſſion to viſit them, or perhaps was likewiſe Governor of that part of Pontus. He begins his account with his arrival at Trebizonde, where Hadrian had ordered a temple of Mercury to be built. He embarked at Trebizonde, in order to ſail round the Eaſtern Coaſt of the Pontus Euxinus. He took care to have the Roman Soldiers, who were garriſon'd upon theſe Coaſts, exerciſed. He viſited every place which was neceſſary, and did not even omit the ſick. He informs the Emperor concerning the State, in which he found things, and gave him ſome advice with regard to thoſe affairs in a letter written in Latin. He paſſed the river Phaſis, and obſerves, that the water of it was ſo very light, that it run for a conſiderable length upon the ſurface of the ſea without mixing with it; and that it kept above ten years without ſtinking. There was a Caſtle upon that river, which was garriſoned by four hundred Roman Soldiers, and a town inhabited by Veterans and Mariners. Arrian ordered a new ditch to be dug for the ſecurity of the town. He finiſhed his voyage at Sebaſtopolis, where the laſt Roman garriſon was placed. He was ſurprized in his voyage with a prodigious ſtorm, which deſtroyed one of his ſhips. Among the barbarous people, whoſe country he coaſted along, the neareſt to Trebizonde as well as the moſt warlike were the Sanni, who are called Drilli by Xenophon. They had no King among them; and they had formerly paid tribute to the Romans; and Arrian promiſed Hadrian to oblige them to it again, or to drive them out of the country. But it is evident, that he did not do the latter; for ſeveral ages after there was mention made of the Tzani, who are undoubtedly the ſame with the Sanni. It appears, that theſe Sanni inhabited one part of Colchis, which was then diſtinguiſhed from the country of the Lazi; but afterwards they were confounded together. To this account of his voyage, he adds a deſcription of the Coaſt of Aſia from Byzantium to Trebizonde; and another of the country from Sebaſtopolis to the Cimmerian Boſphorus, and from thence to Byzantium; in order that Hadrian might take proper meaſures, if he had any intention to interpoſe with regard to Boſphorus, the King of which, whoſe name was Cotys, died a ſhort time before.

(1) *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 2. Part 2. pag. 416. edit. de Bruxelles, 1711.

the Emperor (c). We have four Books of his *Diatribæ* or *Diſſertations* upon Epictetus [B], whoſe ſcholar he had been; and it appears from Photius (d), that he compoſed likewiſe twelve Books of that Philoſopher's Diſcourſes. We are told (e), that he wrote an Account of the Life and Death of Epictetus; and Arnobius cites him for that Philoſopher's doctrine (f). There is ſtill extant his Hiſtory of Alexander the Great in ſeven Books [C], which is greatly admired by the beſt judges. He wrote alſo ſeveral other works; for Photius (g) mentions his Hiſtory of his own country Bithynia, and another concerning the Alani, and a third concerning the Parthians in ſeventeen books, which he brought down to the war, which was carried on by Trajan againſt

(c) Idem, pag. 365.
(d) *Ubi ſupra.*
(e) Jonſius, *de Scriptor. Hiſtoriæ Philoſophiæ*, lib. 3. cap. 7. p. 243. edit. Francofurti, 1659.
(f) *In Gentes* lib. 2. pag. 99. edit. Lugduni Batav. 1651.
(g) *Ubi ſupra.*

[B] *We have four Books of his* DIATRIBÆ *or* DISSERTATIONS *upon Epictetus.*] Photius tells us (2), that he wrote eight Books; and Aulus Gellius (3) quotes ſome paſſages out of the ſecond and fifth Book. La Mothe le Vayer obſerves (4), that it is difficult to determine, whether he applied himſelf to the writing of Hiſtory, before he publiſhed his diſſertations upon Epictetus or not. For as on one hand, it may be ſuppoſed according to the ordinary and natural courſe of things, that he would turn his thoughts to Philoſophical contemplations in the latter part of his life; on the other hand, we find from the Preface to his Diſſertations, that he wrote them juſt in the ſame manner as Epictetus ſpoke them, and as he heard them from that Philoſopher's mouth, when he was his ſcholar. He complains likewiſe, that they had been publiſhed contrary to his intention, and without his knowledge; which may induce us to conſider them as one of his youthful performances. Mr. Boileau in his Life of Epictetus, tranſlated by Dr. Stanhope (5), tells us, that *of all the ſcholars of Epictetus, Arrian is the only one, whoſe name has been tranſmitted with reputation to poſterity; but he is ſuch a one, as ſufficiently demonſtrates the excellency of his maſter, tho' we ſhould own that he alone had been of his forming. For this is the very perſon, who was afterwards advanced to be Preceptor to* Antonine, *ſurnamed the* Pious, *and diſtinguiſhed by the title of Xenophon, becauſe like that Philoſopher he committed to writing the dictates delivered by his Maſter in his life time, and publiſhed them in one Volume, under the name of Epictetus his* Diſcourſes *or* Diſſertations, *which at preſent we have in four Books. After this he compoſed a little Treatiſe called his* Enchiridion, *which is a ſhort Compendium of all Epictetus's Philoſophical Principles, and hath ever been acknowledged for one of the moſt valuable and beautiful Pieces of ancient Morality.* He obſerves likewiſe in another paſſage (6), that "Epictetus left nothing of his own compoſition "behind him; and if Arrian had not tranſmitted to "poſterity the maxims taken from his Maſter's mouth, "we have ſome reaſon to doubt, whether the very "name of Epictetus had not been loſt to the world."

(2) *Biblioth.* Cod. 58. Col. 53.
(3) *Noctes Attic.* lib. 1. cap. 2. and lib. 19. cap. 1.
(4) *Jugement ſur les Anciens principaux Hiſtoriens Grecs & Latins*, p. 77, 78. edit. Paris 1684.
(5) Pag. 22, 23.
(6) Pag. 6.

[C] *There is ſtill extant his Hiſtory of Alexander the Great in ſeven Books.*] La Mothe le Vayer obſerves (7), that this work of his is ſufficient to give him a place among the principal Hiſtorians; and Photius tells us (8), that he had written the life of that Conqueror in a manner ſuperior to every other Writer. It is ſaid (9), that he was induced by a divine impulſe to undertake this Work under the ſame title of the Ἀνάβασις or the *Expedition*, and in the ſame number of Books, which Xenophon made uſe of to deſcribe the conqueſts of Cyrus. And it was obſerved, that he was ſo ambitious of following that great Writer, that on account of his imitation of him in his ſtyle and other reſpects, he was generally diſtinguiſhed by the title of the ſecond Xenophon. He declares in his Preface, that he wrote upon the credit of Ariſtobulus and Ptolomy, who attended Alexander in all his enterprizes, and were ſo much the more worthy of regard, that beſides the conſideration of the Royal Dignity of the latter, they did not publiſh their accounts till after the death of Alexander, and upon no other motive but of diſcovering the truth. He acknowledges upon the occaſion of the death of Calliſthenes the Philoſopher, that there was a difference in the accounts of theſe two Authors, tho' they both were preſent with the King, when that unfortunate man was tried. Ariſtobulus ſaid, that he was carried in fetters in the rear of the army, till he died of ſickneſs. And Ptolomy aſſerted, that after he had been put to the rack he was ſtrangled, becauſe he was convicted of having been engaged in the conſpiracy of Hermolaus. So great is the difficulty of knowing the true ſtate of things, ſince the ſame fact is almoſt always differently related by thoſe, who ſaw it, on account of the particular views and intereſts, which very few can abſolutely diſengage themſelves from. However, notwithſtanding theſe particular defects, which Arrian could not remove, his Hiſtory is of great importance, eſpecially ſince thoſe of Ariſtobulus and Ptolomy are loſt. Add to this, that there are a great many paſſages in Quintus Curtius, which want to be reſtored by the text of Arrian. For when the former tells us in his ſixth Book, that Alexander departed from the country of the *Batavi*, it is very certain, that we ought to correct it, as it is in Arrian, that he departed from Ecbatane. And all the voyages, which have been made to the Eaſt Indies for theſe many years paſt, prove that the latter has been much more exact in obſerving, that the houſes or cottages of ſome of the *Ichthyophagi* were formed of the bones of whales and other fiſh, than Quintus Curtius, who only tells us, that they were built of ſhells and excrements of the ſea, *conchas & purgamenta maris*. There are indeed ſome paſſages of Arrian, which Curtius illuſtrates extremely well. And it is difficult to determine which of thoſe two Writers is the moſt exact in the name of Alexander's Phyſician, whom Arrian calls *Critodemus*, and Quintus Curtius *Critobulus*, Plutarch not having given us any light upon that ſubject. It is true, that when Pliny applauds the ſkill of the Phyſician, who drew out the arrow from the eye of Alexander's father, without any blemiſh to his face, and calls him *Critobulus*, he gives us ſome reaſon to ſuppoſe, that the ſon might make uſe of the ſame Phyſician, and conſequently that Quintus Curtius may be in the right in his account. La Mothe le Vayer (10) obſerves, that Arrian's narration is always agreeable, becauſe it is conciſe and clear at the ſame time. He never runs into impertinent digreſſions, nor is embarraſſed with long parentheſes, which render the ſtyle obſcure. There is ſcarce one miraculous event in all his Hiſtory to render it ſuſpicious, if we except ſome predictions of Ariſtander, with the ſtory of the two new ſprings, one of water, and the other of oyl, which roſe near the river Oxus, as ſoon as Alexander encamped there. The model, which, as we obſerved above, our Hiſtorian copied from, would not permit him to affect any grandeur or ſublimity of ſtyle, ſince the eloquence of Xenophon is not of that kind. However, he makes uſe of ſuch a variety of beautiful and proper figures and images, by which means at the ſame time that he has all the perſpicuity of his original, his language is very far from low and mean. He ſometimes introduces oblique ſpeeches, and ſometimes direct ones, and even inſerts at length in his ſecond Book the imperious Letter of Alexander to Darius. The Oration of Calliſthenes againſt Anaxarchus, who wanted to have Alexander adored, is the moſt conſiderable among the direct ones, with two others of that King to his ſoldiers, who began to mutiny, once in the Indies, and afterwards upon the banks of the river Tigris. The ſpeeches which he made before the battles, at the ſtraits of Amanus, and in the plains of Arbela or Gaugamela are only oblique, and very ſhort, as the occaſion required. In ſhort, to reſume the favourable judgment, which Photius paſſed upon the Hiſtory of Arrian, he is of opinion, that whoever compares it with the moſt ancient Hiſtories, which are ſo univerſally admired, will find, that there are ſeveral of them, which are not equal to it. However, it is proper to remark one paſſage, which ſeems to caſt ſome prejudice upon that performance. It is in the middle of the firſt Book, where Arrian declares, that the number and greatneſs of Alexander's actions were the motives, which induced him to undertake his Hiſtory, being conſcious of

(7) Idem, ibid. pag. 78.
(8) Cod. 58.
(9) La Mothe le Vayer, pag. 60.
(10) Pag. 82.

againſt them. He gives us likewiſe (*b*) an Abridgment of Arrian's ten books of the *Hiſtory of the Succeſſors of Alexander the Great*; and adds (*i*), that this Hiſtorian wrote an account of the Indies in one book, which is ſtill extant. When he began firſt to write, he reſolved to compile the Hiſtory of Bithynia, but wanting the proper memoirs and materials for it, he ſuſpended the execution of that deſign till he had publiſhed ſome other performances. This Hiſtory conſiſted of eight books, and was carried down till the time when King Nicomedes reſigned up Bithynia to the Romans. He obſerved in that Work that he was born and educated in Nicomedia, and that he was Prieſt of Ceres and Proſerpina, to which Goddeſſes that city was dedicated (*k*). We have nothing of this Work remaining but what is quoted in Photius and Stephanus Byzantinus (*l*). He mentioned in it the Hiſtory which he wrote of the exploits of Timoleon the Corinthian in Sicily, and of the actions of Dion of Syracuſe (*m*). He is ſaid likewiſe to have written ſome other Works [*D*]. Photius tells us (*n*), that he imitated that ſimplicity and eaſineſs of ſtyle, which is the characteriſtic of Xenophon, and at the ſame time has a great deal of beauty, ſtrength

(*b*) *Biblioth.* Cod. 92. Col. 216, *& ſeq.*
(*i*) Cod. 91. Col. 213.
(*k*) Idem, Cod. 93. Col. 233 and 234.
(*l*) Voſſ. *de Hiſt. Græcis*, lib. 2. cap. 11.
(*m*) Phot. *ubi ſupra.*
(*n*) Cod. 58. Col. 53.

of his own abilities to perform ſuch a deſign. Ἐθέλειν καὶ αὐτὸς ὀρμηθῆναι φημὶ ἐς τὴν δὲ τὴν ξυγγραφὴν, ὑπ' ἀπαξιώσας ἑωυτὸν φανῆναι καταῤῥήσιν ἐς ἀνθρώπους τὰ Ἀλεξάνδρου ἔργα. He adds, that without putting his name, which was not obſcure among mankind, and without mentioning either his country, or extraction, or quality, it was ſufficient for him to obſerve, that he had all the advantages of that kind; and that as he had been extremely fond of learning from his infancy, and as Alexander had merited the higheſt rank among the greateſt Commanders, himſelf likewiſe might juſtly expect as advantageous a place among the beſt Writers in the Greek language. La Mothe le Vayer (11) remarks that this paſſage is ſo full of vanity, that the reader muſt have an uncommon ſhare of patience not to be ſo ſhock'd with it, as to be deterred from reading any further. He tells us, that it made him recollect the impertinence of another Greek, whoſe name was Amyntianus, and who was contemporary with Arrian, ſince it appears from Photius (12), that he dedicated his work to the Emperor Marcus Antoninus. In order to gain credit, and to procure himſelf the favourable regard of his readers, he begins with promiſing that his ſtyle ſhould not be inferior in grandeur to the actions of Alexander the Great, which were the ſubject of his Book. And yet there was nothing in the world ſo cold and inſipid as his narration, nothing ſo unentertaining as his manner of expreſſing himſelf, as Photius himſelf acknowledges. It is eaſy to judge from hence, that the ambition of this man was not in the leaſt different from that of Arrian, tho' the event rendered the former much more ridiculous, becauſe he performed nothing equal to his promiſes, whereas Arrian has left us one of the fineſt works in antiquity. But notwithſtanding this, La Mothe le Vayer thinks it proper to animadvert upon this fault of his, that other Writers may avoid it, ſince there is nothing ſo inſupportable as ſelf-praiſe, which draws hatred and contempt upon the perſon, who is guilty of it, inſtead of the eſteem and reputation, which he propoſes to himſelf. However Gronovius, in his Edition of Arrian, publiſhed at Leyden in fol. 1704, p. 26. is of opinion, that our Hiſtorian has not ſhewn any degree of vanity, in the paſſage quoted above, but only ſpoken with a confidence, which was very juſt and due to his merit; *Arriani juſta nec excedens & ſtudiis honorifica gloriatio.* There have been four Latin Tranſlations of this work of Arrian. The firſt was done by *Nicholas Saguntinus*; the ſecond by *Peter Paul Vergerius*; the third by *Bartholomæus Facius*; and the fourth by *Bonaventure Volcanius*. Dr. Fabricius in his *Bibliotheca Græca* imagines, that the two firſt never appeared in publick, becauſe he could not find them in any Library, nor even ſo much as mentioned in the Catalogue of Books. Facius's Tranſlation is generally condemned for his numerous omiſſions, interpolations, miſtakes, and wilful deviations from his original; beſides which he is often guilty of paſſing lightly over whatever he did not fully underſtand. That of Vulcanius is the moſt eſteemed and for that reaſon annexed to all the beſt Editions of our Author. It was tranſlated into Italian by Leo of Modena, and printed at Venice in 1554; and into French by Claudius de Vivart, and publiſhed at Paris in 1581. Mr. D'Ablancourt gave another French Verſion of it, which has been reprinted three times, and is accounted the beſt of his performances (13).

(11) Pag. 84.
(12) Cod. 131. Col. 311.
(13) See Mr. Rooke's *Preface* to his Tranſlation of *Arrian* into Engliſh.

Mr. Rooke publiſhed an Engliſh Tranſlation of this work of Arrian in 1729 in two volumes in 8vo, with *Notes hiſtorical, geographical and critical. To which is prefixed Mr. le Clerc's Criticiſm upon* Quintus Curtius; *and ſome Remarks upon Mr. Perizonius's Vindication of that Author.* The Tranſlator in his Preface tells us, that even Ptolomy and Ariſtobulus, whom our Author chiefly copied, are not always free from ſtrange and unaccountable ſtories of Alexander the Great's exploits; but that *as Arrian was a man of ſound judgment, he took care to chooſe only what was moſt probable, and left the reſt as huſks and chaff, to be glean'd up by ſuch as were ambitious of ſwelling their works to a huge ſize by heaps of all gatherings:*

Quicquid Græcia mendax
Audet in Hiſtoriâ. Juven. Sat. 10.

He obſerves afterwards, that *no ancient Author, who ever wrote a particular Hiſtory of Alexander, now remains, except Curtius and Arrian*; that it is evident, that *Arrian is the beſt, the trueſt, and the moſt accurate of the two.* He acknowledges indeed, that this Hiſtorian *has been ſometimes overſeen thro' haſte or inadvertence; and if I add*, ſays he, *that he is not exempt from human frailty, it will be no great diminution to his credit. He has been much abuſed by ignorant tranſcribers, and tho' three or four have publiſhed Obſervations and critical Notes with their Editions, I ſtill ſuſpect ſeveral paſſages to be corrupt. However I have pointed them out, and earneſtly recommend them to his next Editor to correct by the aſſiſtance of manuſcript copies.* He concludes with remarking, that all who mention this Hiſtory, beſtow high encomiums on its Author's veracity beyond any other upon the ſubject.

[*D*] *He is ſaid likewiſe to have written ſeveral other works.*] Lucian tells us (14), that he wrote the Life of a Robber, whoſe name was Tiliborus. The paſſage of that Author is the greateſt compliment to Arrian; for the former, when he endeavours to excuſe himſelf for the pains he had taken in writing *the Life of Alexander the Impoſtor*, ſpeaks in this manner: "Let no per-
" ſon accuſe me of having employed my labour up-
" on too low and mean a ſubject, ſince Arrian, the
" worthy Diſciple of Epictetus, who is one of the
" greateſt men among the Romans, and who has paſ-
" ſed his whole life among the Muſes, has not ſcru-
" pled to condeſcend to write *the Life of Tiliborus the*
" *Robber.*" There is likewiſe under our Author's name *a Periplus of the Red-Sea*, that is, of the Eaſtern Coaſts of Africa and Aſia as far as the Indies. It is addreſſed to the Emperor Hadrian, according to the Latin Inſcription, tho' there is no mention of him in the *Periplus* itſelf. Salmaſius (15) is of opinion, that it was written in the time of Pliny the Natural Hiſtorian, or perhaps a little before him, and conſequently, that it could not be compoſed by Arrian, nor addreſſed to Hadrian. He infers this from the mention which is made of ſeveral Princes, who lived in Pliny's time; to which Mr. Tillemont adds (16) a paſſage in the *Periplus*, where it is ſaid, that they went from Luce to Petra to Malican King of the Nabatheans; for the city of Petra and all Arabia Petræa had ſubmitted to the Romans from the year 105, and were reduced afterwards into the form of a Province; whereas we have no account that Hadrian abandoned it. On the other hand we find medals of the

(14) *In Pſeudomant.*
(15) *In Solin.* p. 1186.
(16) *Notes ſur l'Empereur Adrien*, Not. 24. pag. 932.

ſtrength and elegance in his manner. Suidas ſays, that Dion Caſſius, who compiled the Roman Hiſtory, wrote the Life of this Philoſopher, who was his countryman. There were ſeveral other perſons of his name [*E*].

the city of Petra under that Emperor with the title of Metropolis. And therefore this *Periplus* muſt have been written before the year 105, and conſequently not by Arrian, who lived under M. Aurelius, that is, after the year 160. In ſhort the Author of it ſpeaks of Egypt as his own country, and ſometimes makes uſe of the Egyptian months. Mr. Tillemont (17) thinks it probable, that it might be compiled by that Arrian, to whom Pliny the younger wrote ſeveral letters, and whom he repreſents as a man of great abilities and eloquence, and who was conſidered as an imitator of Demoſthenes. Now it appears that this Arrian had retired from publick employments about the time of Nerva or the beginning of Trajan's reign, in order to live at eaſe, (which was never permitted to any Senators but thoſe, who were advanc'd in years;) and therefore he could not poſſibly be the ſame with the ſcholar of Epictetus, who was undoubtedly more ancient than Arrian the Civilian, who is ſometimes mentioned in the Digeſt, tho' ſome Writers confound them together. Beſides the works of Arrian abovementioned we have a Book of *Tactics* under his name, the beginning of which is loſt. This was written in the 20th year of the Emperor Hadrian (18). He treats in it of the Order and Arrangement of an Army, but mentions nothing of the military exerciſes of the Roman Horſe, becauſe he had written upon that ſubject before in a Treatiſe addreſſed to the Emperor himſelf. To theſe *Tactics* of Arrian is added the Order, which he gave for the marching of the Roman Army againſt the Alani, and giving them battle. This may very properly be aſcribed to our Author, who was engaged in a war againſt that people; and, as we obſerved above, wrote an Hiſtory of them, or perhaps of the war againſt them, of which this piece may have been a part.

(17) Tom. 2. Part 2. p. 454.

(18) Idem, pag. 455.

[*E*] *There were ſeveral other perſons of his name.*] Julius Capitolinus in his *Life of the Emperor Gordian* mentions a Greek Hiſtorian of that name, to prove that there were three Gordians in oppoſition to thoſe, who allowed but two. This cannot be applied to our Arrian, who lived an Age before thoſe Emperors. Suetonius in his *Life of Tiberius* mentions a Poet of the ſame name, but he was more ancient than the other two, ſince Tiberius endeavoured to imitate him in his Greek Poems. He is very probably the ſame, who, as Suidas tells us, wrote the *Alexandrias*, an Heroic Poem in twenty four Books, upon the Actions of Alexander the Great (19). T.

(19) La Mothe le Vayer, p. 87.

☞ ARSACES or ARSACIUS, (as the Greek Authors write his name (*a*),) was King of Armenia in the fourth Century. The Romans, who wanted his aſſiſtance in the war againſt the Perſians, very much courted his alliance [*A*]. The Emperor Conſtantius, in order to attach him to his intereſt, gave him Olympia in marriage. She was the daughter of Ablavius formerly Præfect of the Prætorium, and had been betrothed to Conſtans Conſtantius's brother (*b*) [*B*]. After the death of Conſtantius, the Emperor Julian wrote to Arſaces, and deſired him to meet him with an army upon the borders of Perſia (*c*). The King complied with his requeſt, or rather command, and ravaged the country called Chiliocomum, which is a very fruitful part of Media (*e*); but this coſt him very dear afterwards. For Julian having been killed in that war, Jovian his ſucceſſor made peace with Sapores King of Perſia, on this condition, amongſt others, that the Romans ſhould never aſſiſt Arſaces, who had always been true and faithful to them, againſt the Perſians (*f*). Sapores, upon the concluſion of this peace, which was ſo diſhonourable to the Romans, infeſted Armenia with his armies, and having by fair words and treacherous promiſes engaged Arſaces to come to him, he invited him to a great entertainment, took him priſoner, commanded his eyes to be put out, and having bound him with ſilver chains, which amongſt the Perſians is look'd upon as an honour done to captives, cauſed him to be put to death in the moſt cruel manner (*g*). Thus was he rewarded for his fidelity to the Romans. His wife fell ſome time after into the hands of Sapores (*b*), but we don't read in what manner he treated her. Sozomen ſays (*i*), that Arſaces was a Chriſtian [*C*]. We find another Arſaces contemporary with this

(*a*) They write it Ἀρσάκιος.

(*b*) Ammian. Marcell. lib. 20. p. m. 172.

(*c*) Sozomen. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 6. cap. 1. edit. Reading. Cantabrig. 1720. fol.

(*e*) Idem, lib. 23. pag. 240.

(*f*) Idem, lib. 25. p. m. 300.

(*g*) Idem, lib. 27. p. m. 353.

(*b*) Ibid. p. 355.

(*i*) *Ubi ſupra.*

[*A*] *The Romans courted his alliance.*] Arſaces's Kingdom bordering on one ſide upon Sapores's Dominions, and on the other upon the Roman Provinces, we ought not to be ſurprized that his friendſhip was courted by both. The Perſians employed promiſes and threatenings and all kinds of artifice to draw him over to their intereſt; not omitting the moſt valuable preſents. Conſtantius fearing leſt they ſhould at laſt prevail over him, ſent for him, received him with the utmoſt kindneſs and generoſity, and entreated him to be conſtant in his friendſhip and fidelity to the Romans. Arſaces promiſed upon oath, that he would loſe his life, rather than act contrary to their intereſt which promiſe he kept with utmoſt fidelity, notwithſtanding all the endeavours of the Perſians. Upon his return into Armenia, Conſtantius loaded him and all his attendants with preſents (1).

(1) Ammian. Marcell. lib. 20. pag. 172. *See alſo* lib. 21. pag. 186.

[*B*] *Conſtantius . . . gave him* (Arſaces) *Olympia in marriage; ſhe . . . . had been betrothed to Conſtans, Conſtantius's brother.*] Amongſt other crimes, with which Athanaſius charges Conſtantius, he reproaches him with this, as a very odious action. Here follow his own words: Οὗτος γὰρ καὶ εἰς ἀδελφὸν ἀσεβεῖν τετόλμηκε· καὶ προσποιεῖται μὲν εἰκοδομεῖν αὐτὸ μνημεῖον, τὴν δὲ μνηστὴν αὐτοῦ τῶν Ὀλυμπιάδα Βαρβάροις ἐξέδωκεν, ἣν ἐκεῖνος ἄχρι τελευτῆς ἐφύλαττε, καὶ ὡς ἰδίαν ἀνέτρεφεν ἑαυτῷ γυναῖκα (2). That is, "Thus has he (Conſtantius) dared to "be impious towards his brother (Conſtans); that when "he pretends to raiſe a monument to him, he gives "to the Barbarian his bride Olympia, whom Con"ſtans kept till his death, and whom he carefully "brought up as one whom he expected to be his "wife." But what crime was there in this? What diſhonour or injuſtice was it to Conſtans, that a woman, who had been betrothed to him, ſhould be married to a King, and eſpecially one who was a Chriſtian, ſince this procured a powerful Ally to the Romans?

(2) Athanaſius, *in Epiſt. ad Solitarios*, pag. 856. *apud* Valeſ. *in Notis ad* Ammian. Marc. lib. 20. p. 172.

[*C*] *Sozomen ſays that Arſaces was a Chriſtian.*] *Julian*, ſays he (3), *wrote to Arſaces, King of the Armenians and in alliance with the Romans, to meet him on the borders of Perſia. In this Letter the Emperor having highly extolled his own character, and repreſented himſelf as worthy of the Empire, and acceptable to the Gods whom he adored; and having blamed Conſtantius his predeceſſor as a wicked and puſillanimous man, he ſpoke to Arſaces in a very contemptuous and threatening manner. And as he had heard that he was a Chriſtian, he added, according to his cuſtom, a great many diſreſpectful things of Chriſt; telling Arſaces in the moſt haughty manner, that his God would never aſſiſt him, if he refuſed to do what he was commanded.* We ſhall not call in queſtion Sozomen's accuracy or veracity in this particular; but we cannot forbear obſerving, that if Julian really wrote to Arſaces what that Hiſtorian,

(3) *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 6. cap. 1.

this King; this ſecond Arſaces was certainly a Heathen, and Prieſt of Galatia. The Emperor Julian wrote a Letter to him, which is very much to the honour of the Chriſtian Religion [*D*].

rian relates, it was very ill policy in the Emperor; ſince this was the way to exaſperate Arſaces, and force him out of reſentment, to join with the Perſians. And ſince notwithſtanding this haughty and reproachful Letter, that King aſſiſted the Romans (5), he muſt have been of a very mild temper, and have obſerved very ſtrictly that Precept of the Goſpel, which forbids the Chriſtians to revenge themſelves.

(5) See in the text quotation (*c*) and (*d*).

[*D*] *Julian wrote a Letter to him* (Arſaces) *which is very much to the honour of the Chriſtian Religion.*] He obſerves in that Letter (6), that what moſt contributed to the ſpreading of the Chriſtian Religion was their kindneſs towards ſtrangers, their care with regard to the burying of the dead, and the ſanctity which they affected in their manners. This he recommends to Arſaces, and to all the Prieſts of Galatia. He alſo orders him to exhort all the Prieſts not to appear in publick Theatres, or in Taverns, nor to exerciſe any ſcandalous art, or do any diſhonourable buſineſs. He commands him to ſhew a particular reſpect to thoſe, who obey theſe injunctions, and to deprive of their poſts thoſe who refuſe to ſubmit. He alſo bids him to build publick Hoſpitals, where ſtrangers not only of the Heathen, but of any other Religion might be entertained, and receive money, if they wanted it, and tells him that he had provided a fund for that purpoſe. For it would be a ſhame, adds he, that no beggars ſhould be ſeen amongſt the Jews, and that the Chriſtians ſhould aſſiſt not only their own poor, but even ours, and that we ſhould be wanting in that reſpect with regard to thoſe of our own Religion. Thus he endeavoured to reſtore Paganiſm to its ancient luſtre, by grafting upon it ſome of the moſt eſſential precepts of Chriſtianity. P.

(6) Juliani, *Epiſtola* 49. *In ejus Operib.* edit. a Spanhemio, Lipſiæ, 1696, fol. pag. 429, &c.

ARSENIUS, a Deacon of the Roman Church, famous for the nobility of his family, but much more for his vaſt learning and for his piety, was choſen in order to be ſent to the Emperor Theodoſius, who wanted a Tutor for his ſon Arcadius. It was Pope Damaſus who made this choice. Arſenius arrived at Conſtantinople in the year 383. He was very well received there by the Emperor, who was angry one day, both with the ſcholar, and the maſter, becauſe he had ſeen the maſter ſtanding, and the ſcholar ſitting, during the Lecture. He ordered that his ſon, although he had already been declared Auguſtus, ſhould ſtand and be uncovered when Arſenius inſtructed him, and at that time ſhould not wear the marks of the Imperial dignity. Arſenius having uſed all his induſtry to educate his ſcholar in the ſciences and virtue, thought himſelf obliged at laſt to add correction to cenſures. The young Arcadius was ſo enraged at this, that he deſired one of his Officers to rid him of his Tutor (*a*). The Officer told Arſenius of it, who thought beſt to withdraw privately and go to the Deſerts of Egypt. He there paſſed a great many years with the Hermites of Sceté, in the exerciſes of the moſt auſtere and fervent devotion. He died there at ninety five years of age [*A*]. Theodoſius, who grieved at the retreat of Arſenius, ordered him to be ſearch'd for every where, without being able to find him (*b*). There are ſome faults in Moreri's Dictionary relating to this article [*B*]. I have alſo found ſome in other Writers [*C*].

(*a*) Taken from the *Annals of Baronius*, ann. 383. num. 22, 23. He quotes *Metaphraſtes* under the 8th of May, and *Surius* under the 19th of July.

(*b*) Fléchier, *Hiſtoire de Theodoſe*, pag. 273, 274.

There

[*A*] *He died in the deſerts of Ægypt, at ninety five years of age.*] Here follows the diviſion that Mr. Arnaud d'Andilly makes of this long life of Arſenius. *He ſpent*, ſays he (1), *forty years in the Court of the Emperor Theodoſius, forty in* Sceté, *ten at* Trohé *beyond Babylon, oppoſite to Memphis, three in* Canapé *of Alexandria, and two in the ſame place of* Trohé, *whither being returned he finiſhed his courſe in the fear of God.* This expreſſion *he ſpent forty years at the Court of Theodoſius*, is very improper, for if we would not have a notorious falſhood in it, it muſt be taken in this ſenſe, *he was forty years old when he left the Court of Theodoſius.* For if we take it in the proper and natural ſignification of the terms, Arſenius muſt have lived above ſixſcore years. There muſt be added to the ninety five all the years he had lived when he ſet out for Conſtantinople, being choſen Preceptor to Arcadius by Damaſus. This Pope would not have choſen a youth of twenty years old. Beſides Theodoſius reigned but ſixteen years, and did not receive Arſenius before the fourth year of his reign.

(1) D'Andilly, *Vies des Peres des Deſerts*, tom. 2. pag. 204. ed. 1676, in 8vo.

[*B*] *There are ſome faults in Moreri's Dictionary relating to this Article.*] I. Arſenius could not have been ſent to Theodoſius in 383, to be Preceptor to Arcadius and Honorius, for Honorius was not born till 384. Baronius had taken notice of this fault in thoſe who have written the Life of Arſenius, and had aſcribed it to ſome perſon, who knew that Theodoſius had two ſons, *aliquis, quod ſciret duos fuiſſe Theodoſio filios, adjecit Honorium* (2). This fault is continued in the Life of Arſenius, compoſed by Mr. Arnaud d'Andilly (3), who quotes Rufinus (4) for his authority. II. I acknowledge that Baronius (5) upon the authority of the lives of the Fathers (6), advances that Arſenius was Godfather to the two ſons of Theodoſius; but that does not agree with Rufinus, who ſays, they were committed to the care of Arſenius, *preſently after their Baptiſm* (7): beſides, Baronius himſelf has obſerved, that there is a miſtake in the Life of Arſenius, when it is ſaid he was ſent by Damaſus to be Preceptor to Arcadius and Honorius. The laſt was not yet born: the other was but eight years old; and it is not probable that Arſenius ſhould ſtay at the Court of Theodoſius, till the time that Honorius wanted a Tutor. III. Mr. Fléchier ſays in expreſs terms, that Theodoſius *cauſed* Arſenius *to be ſought for in all parts of the Empire.* It is not probable therefore that Arſenius ſhould not leave the Court, till after the death of Theodoſius, in 395. That I ſay, is not probable, tho' it is ſet down as a certain fact both in the firſt volume of the Dictionary, and in the third. IV. That circumſtance, which M. Fléchier has expreſly taken notice of, that Arcadius's officer, who was employed to kill Arſenius, gave the Tutor notice of it, ſhould not have been ſuppreſſed. The Supplement of the Dictionary ſuppoſes that Arſenius had *a divine intelligence of it.* V. Arcadius was not aſſociated to the Empire at ſix years of age, but at ſeven or eight, as Baronius and Mr. Fléchier obſerve. *Erat tunc Arcadius annum ætatis agens octavum, natus nimirum ſub Conſulatu Gratiani quarto & Merobaudis, triennio ante Theodoſii patris imperium* (8). i. e. "At that time "Arcadius was in his eighth year, being born under the "4th Conſulſhip of Gratian and that of Merobaudes, "three years before his Father Theodoſius was Emperor." VI. Socrates had no occaſion to be quoted; for what he has ſaid of Arſenius has hardly any relation to the Article of the ſupplement. However, the XXIIId Chapter of the IIId Book ſhould have been quoted.

(2) Baron. *ad ann.* 383. num. 22.

(3) It is in the 2d tome of the *Vies des Peres des Deſerts, par Arnauld d'Andilly*, p. 188.

(4) Lib. 3. num. 37.

(5) *Ad ann.* 395. num. 26.

(6) Part 2. cap. 36.

(7) *See* Arnauld d'Andilly, *Vies des Peres des Deſerts*, tom. 2. pag. 188.

(8) Baron. *ad ann.* 383. num. 22.

[*C*] *I have alſo found ſome faults in other Writers relating to Arſenius.*] Matthias, in his *Hiſtorical Theatre* (9), ſuppoſes all along that Arſenius was Preceptor to Honorius as well as Arcadius, and that at the ſame time. He does not conſider, that Honorius was not born, when Arſenius was ſent to Theodoſius, to inſtruct Arcadius: he does not reflect that Honorius being nine years younger than his brother, was not fit to be

(9) Pag. 713. edit. Amſterd. in 1668.

There are many actions, and many ſentences of Arſenius to be found among the *Apophthegmata Patrum*, that Mr. Cotelier has publiſhed in his *Eccleſiæ Græcæ Monumenta* (c).

(c) See the firſt volume, printed at Paris, in 1677.

be at the lectures, which were read to Arcadius during the Life of Theodoſius. Obſerve this circumſtance well, ſince Matthias was not ignorant that Arſenius made his eſcape before the death of that Emperor: for he obſerves that Theodoſius cauſed him to be ſought for diligently. He quotes the XXIIId Chapter of the IVth Book of Socrates, wherein we do not find a word of what he has related. He adds, that Arcadius, after the death of his father, learned where Arſenius was, and aſked his pardon for what was paſt, and his holy Benediction. Mr. Doujat, carried down with the ſtream, aſſociates Honorius with Arcadius (10). Charles Stephens knew our Arſenius only in the quality of a Patrician: he does not make him quit the Court, but merely his own patrimony, to ſend him into a Convent, by virtue of a voice from the clouds, which commanded him flight, ſilence and reſt. Mr. Hofman has only added the office of Preceptor to Arcadius. Mr. Lloyd has ſuppreſſed the whole Article. Note, that Nicephorus the ſon of Calliſtus affirms, that Theodoſius gave Arſenius for a Preceptor to his ſons (11).

(10) *Arſenius non ille Arcadii & Honorii Præceptor.* Doujatii *Prænotiones Canon.* pag. 429.

(11) Nicephor. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 12. cap. 23.

ARSENIUS, Patriarch of Conſtantinople in the 13th Century, was a native of that city. He was educated in a Monaſtery of Nice and was alſo Superior of it; but he renounced this office, that he might the better apply himſelf to a monaſtick life, either in the Convent of Apollonias, or in thoſe of Mount Athos. He was brought forth from this ſtate in 1255, by the Emperor Theodore Laſcaris, who made him Patriarch of Conſtantinople. The ſame Emperor four years after declared him on his death-bed one of the two Tutors of his ſon John. The other Tutor was George Muzalon, who ſhewing very pernicious deſigns with regard to the young Prince, made Arſenius diſlike his employment ſo much, that it occaſioned his returning to the Convent. But when in 1261, the Greeks had retaken Conſtantinople under the conduct of Michael Palæologus, Arſenius was called thither to reſume the Patriarchate, and to poſſeſs the ſeat, from which the Patriarchs had been excluded for above fifty years. The year after, the Emperor Michael Palæologus cauſed the eyes of John Laſcaris ſon of the Emperor Theodore to be put out. Arſenius full of indignation at ſo barbarous a treatment towards his pupil excommunicated Michael, who, to repel his eccleſiaſtical thunder, called a Council, and under falſe accuſations, cauſed Arſenius to be depoſed, and baniſhed him into the Iſle of Proconneſus. He lived very long in this baniſhment, but we do not find exactly in what year he died. He was a good man; but quite unfit for buſineſs (a). He is an Author [A].

(a) Taken from Cave, *Hiſtoria Literaria Scriptor. Eccleſ.* pag. 725.

[A] *He is an Author.*] He has written a *Nomo-Canon*, or a *Collection of Canons*, divided into CXLI Titles, to each of which he adds ſome points, or heads of the Imperial Laws. It has been inſerted in Greek and Latin, in the *Bibliotheca* of the Canon-Law publiſhed by Meſſieurs Juſtel and Voel. There is alſo the *Teſtament of Arſenius*, publiſhed in Greek and Latin by Mr. Cotelier, in the IId Tome of his *Monuments of the Greek Church* (1).

(1) Cave, *Hiſt. Liter.* pag. 726. Doujatii *Prænot. Can.* pag. 429.

ARSENIUS Archbiſhop of Monembaſia, or Malvaſia, in the Morea, in the 16th Century, has been conſidered as a learned Man. He was the particular friend of Paul III, and wrote to him ſome very elegant Letters; one amongſt the reſt, wherein he complains of the little affection of the Roman Church for the Greek Nation [A]. He ſubmitted himſelf to the Romiſh Church, which made him ſo odious to the Greek Schiſmaticks, that Pachomius, Patriarch of Conſtantinople, excommunicated him, and the Greeks ſay that Arſenius was after his death *Broukolakas*, that is, that the Devil came to hover about his corps, and animated it again (a). There are ſome works of his compoſing extant [B].

(a) *See* Guillet, *Lacedemone ancienne & nouvelle*, pag. 327. *and* Cruſius, in his *Turco-Græcia.*

[A] *He complains of the little affection of the Roman Church for the Greek Nation.*] Theſe are the words of Mr. Guillet. Arſenius *wrote very elegant letters* to Pope Paul III, *which are ſtill remaining. There is one wherein he complains ſtrongly of the little affection of the Roman Church for the Greek Nation, in not having raiſed any one to the dignity of Cardinal. Paul was created Pope in* 1535 (1). If we take this complaint in a general ſenſe, we muſt accuſe Arſenius of a falſhood; for it is certain, that Cardinal Beſſarion was a Greek. It muſt therefore be ſuppoſed that the reproaches of Arſenius were like thoſe of Muſurus, who complains bitterly, that not one Greek had a ſhare in the numerous promotions juſt made by Leo X (2). Paul III was elected Pope in October, 1534.

(1) Guillet, *Lacedemone ancienne & nouvelle*, pag. 327.

(2) See the Article MUSURUS.

I have been informed by Mr. de la Monnoie, *that there is no Letter from Arſenius to this Pope, except the Dedication to the Scholia on Euripides. It is there that he complains, that amongſt ſo many Cardinals of all nations, there are not above one or two Greeks.* Καίτοι οὐδ' εἰκοτως ἦν ἵνα ἢ δύο τῶν Ἑλλήνων ἐν τοσούτοις πανσοφωτάτοις ἀναδημάσι τῶν Καρδιναλίων. Nothing is more uſeful or more neceſſary than to go to the fountain head.

[B] *There are ſome works of his compoſing extant.*] There is a *Collection of Apophthegms*, printed at Rome, in Greek: another *Collection of Scholia or ſeven Tragedies of Euripides*, printed at Venice in 1534. He ſays in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to Pope Paul III, that he had drawn it up in Crete, at Venice and at Florence. See Geſner's *Bibliotheca*.

ARSENIUS a Greek Monk, wrote a *Letter againſt Cyril Lucaris* Patriarch of Conſtantinople, which was publiſhed in Greek and Latin at Paris, in 1643, with the Acts of the Council, wherein Parthenius Patriarch of Conſtantinople cauſed the confeſſion of this Cyril to be condemned, in the year 1642. Every body knows that this confeſſion of Cyril was conformable to the ſentiments of Geneva. Monſr. Claude has maintained, that this condemnation is a ſuppoſititious piece (a). The Catalogue of the

(a) Claude, *Reponſe à Monſ. Arnauld*, liv. 3. chap. 12. p. 473.

the Oxford Library has confounded Arſenius author of the *Nomo-Canon*, with our Greek Monk.

ARSINOE. There have been many Queens of this name. Moreri has ſpoken of the principal, not without being ſometimes deceived. He has been a little too ſhort upon Arſinoe, ſiſter to Cleopatra: we ſhall ſupply this defect, in the article of PTOLEMY AULETES (*a*).

(*a*) Note [*A*].

ARSINOE, wife of Magas, King of Cyrene [*A*], diſhonoured herſelf by her unchaſtity. Magas a little before he died, betrothed their only daughter Berenice to the ſon of Ptolemy King of Egypt. As ſoon as he was dead, Arſinoe, who had always been againſt this alliance, took meaſures to break it. She offered Berenice with the Kingdom of Cyrene, to Demetrius brother to King Antigonus (*a*). Theſe offers were accepted. Demetrius embarked immediately, and had ſo favourable a wind, that he did not wait long to ſee Berenice. He was a fine perſon, and he grew the more proud, as he quickly perceived the impreſſion that his beauty had made upon the heart of Arſinoe. He neglected the daughter, to make himſelf more agreeable to the mother: he treated the troops with contempt, and at laſt he became ſo odious, that all the people turned their deſires towards the ſon of Ptolemy. They were reſolved to get rid of Demetrius, and concerted the means with Berenice (*b*). They ſent ſome aſſaſſins to murder him, at a time that he had choſen to lie with Arſinoe [*B*]. This woman having heard her daughter, who was at the door, and commanded they ſhould ſpare her mother, covered her gallant with her body as well as ſhe could; but her endeavours were to no purpoſe. They killed him, in conſequence of which the marriage of Berenice with the ſon of Ptolemy came to its full and entire effect (*c*). Juſtin, if I do not miſtake, is the only Hiſtorian who informs us of this. I am ſurpriſed at it; for an action of that nature well deſerved to be taken notice of. What is ſtill more ſtrange, is that no body tells us what became of Arſinoe, nor from whence ſhe came, nor what became of Berenice; and they are ſo far from their relating that Ptolemy Euergetes, ſon of Ptolemy Philadelphus married her, that we are aſſured he married Cleopatra. Matthias, who ſays this (*d*), quotes no body; but you may ſee in Joſephus, in the fourth chapter of the 12th book of his Jewiſh Antiquities, that the wife of Ptolemy Euergetes was named Cleopatra. Note that Ptolemy Euergetes had a ſon called Magas (*e*), from whence we may conjecture that the father of his wife was named Magas, as Juſtin relates it. I ſhall take notice of ſome errors of Moreri [*C*], and

(*a*) He was King of Macedon.

(*b*) We may infer that from the words of Juſtin.

(*c*) *Taken from* Juſtin, lib. 26. cap. 3.

(*d*) Matth. *Theatrum Hiſtor.* pag. 363.

(*e*) Plutarch. *in Agide & Cleomene*, pag. 820.

[*A*] *She was wife of Magas, King of Cyrene.*] He is named Agas in the Editions of Juſtin; but good Criticks have obſerved long ago, that we muſt read Magas: it is thus, they add, that Pauſanias, Polyænus and Athenæus call him (1). It will be objected to them perhaps, that he, of whom Pauſanias has made mention, is not the husband of our Arſinoe; for he was brother to Ptolemy Philadelphus, whereas the huſband of Arſinoe was brother to Ptolemy Euergetes. The Hiſtory of Magas, according to Pauſanias, is as follows. He was the ſon of Berenice, and of one Philip a Macedonian, a man of low extraction. Eurydice, the daughter of Antipater, having been married to Ptolemy the ſon of Lagus, carried this Berenice into Ægypt, who lay with Ptolemy, and bore him amongſt other children Ptolemy Philadelphus, who reigned after his father. She cauſed the government of Cyrene to be given to her ſon Magas, who married Apame, the daughter of King Antiochus, and had great conteſts with Ptolemy Philadelphus. Here is the Magas of Pauſanias (2). Is it not clear, ſome will ſay, that it cannot be the Magas of Juſtin, who was Arſinoe's husband, and died about the time when the ſon of Pyrrhus was reſtored to the Kingdom of Epirus (3)? The Criticks may anſwer, that Magas King of Cyrene having reigned fifty years (4), he might very well have lived till the ſon of Pyrrhus was reſtored, which the beſt Chronologers place under the 493d year of Rome (5), which was the twenty fifth of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Inſtead therefore of ſaying according to the common notion, that Juſtin ſpeaks of Ptolemy Euergetes, in his XXVIth Book (6), we muſt determine that he ſpeaks of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and that it is he, who is there made brother to Magas King of Cyrene. But if he names Arſinoe the wife of Magas, it is not a ſign that his Magas is different from him of Pauſanias, ſince the ſame King of Cyrene might have married ſucceſſively Apame the daughter of Antiochus, and our Arſinoe. Beſides, the wars in which he engaged againſt Ptolemy Philadelphus, according to Pauſanias, agree very well with the Magas of whom Juſtin ſpeaks. *Rex Cyrenarum Agas decedit, qui ante infirmitatem Berenicen unicam filiam ad finienda cum Ptolemæo fratre certamina, filio ejus deſponderat* (7). i. e. "Agas King of Cyrene died, who before his ill-

(1) See the *Commentary on Juſtin* in Mr. Grævius's edition at Leyden, in 1683.

(2) Pauſanias, lib. 1. pag. 6.

(3) Juſtin, lib. 26. cap. 3.

(4) Athen. lib. 12. pag. 550.

(5) *See* Calviſius, *ad ann. Mundi* 3690.

(6) See the *Index* of Mr. Grævius's *Juſtin*, and obſerve that Biſſelius in the 4th Decad *Ruinarum illuſtrium*, pag. 1534, ſuppoſes that Juſtin ſpeaks of one Agas, brother to Ptolemy Euergetes.

(7) Juſtin, lib. 26. cap. 3.

"neſs, having a deſire to put an end to the wars with "his brother Ptolemy, betrothed his only daughter Be-"renice to his ſon." I confeſs, they do not ſeem to agree with the Magas of whom Athenæus has ſpoken; for he was one who enjoying peace, plunged himſelf into luxury and ſloth, and thro' much eating grew ſo fat that it choaked him (8). But this objection is not unanſwerable. Cannot a Prince, whoſe reign continues fifty years, engage in ſome wars, and afterwards give himſelf up to a long reſt?

(8) Athen. lib. 12. pag. 550.

[*B*] *They ſent ſome aſſaſſins to murder him . . . . at a time he had choſen to lie with Arſinoe.*] Biſſelius the Jeſuit has found a ſubject of admiration in this. *Adulteris autem* duobus *illis*, ſays he (9), *Berenicâ filiâ Mæchæ conſciâ, tenſæ per diſpoſitos ita ſunt inſidiæ, (quod mireris) ut in ipſo flagrantis ſceleris ardore deprehenſis ſuperveniens adulteræ filia, mæchique conjux, Berenice pro thalami nefandi foribus ſubſiſtens, &c.* i. e. "The "ambuſh was ſo laid for the *two* adulterers, with the "privity of Berenice daughter to the Adultereſs, that, "what is very ſtrange, they were caught in the very "heat of that heinous wickedneſs by Berenice the "daughter of the Adultereſs, and the wife of the "Adulterer, who ſtanding before the door of the hor-"rid Chamber, &c." Neither the circumſtance of the time, nor that of the place have any thing here to be wondered at. It was eaſy to obſerve when Demetrius went to Arſinoe's chamber, and it was the moſt plauſible opportunity that the conſpirators could take.

(9) Biſſelius, *Ruin. illuſtrium*, Decad. 4. pag. 1536. Juſtin has ſaid, *Cui* (Demetrio) *cum in lectum ſocrus conceſſiſſet, percuſſores immittuntur.* i. e. "When Demetrius was gone "to his mother-"in-law's bed, "aſſaſſins were "ſent after him.

[*C*] *I ſhall take ſome notice of the errors of Moreri.*] I. This expreſſion is not exact, Magas gave his daughter Berenice in marriage to Ptolemy: the Latin is *Berenicen . . . . filiam deſponderat* (10); "He had be-"trothed his daughter Berenice." Moreri's words conceal from us a fact that is not cleared up in the ſequel of the narration; that Berenice ſtay'd with her father and mother. We think of quite another thing, when we read that ſhe was given in marriage to a ſon of the King of Ægypt. To keep therefore his Readers from running into a miſtake, he ſhould have followed the Latin word *deſpondere* ſtrictly. This remark ſeems trifling in itſelf; but the uſes of it may be conſiderable to tranſlators. They can never be too ſcrupulous in obſerving this rule: to avoid all equi-

(10) Juſtin, lib. 26. cap. 3.

vocal

and one of M. Menage [*D*].

vocal terms, and every thing, that may hinder the Reader from having ideas beſt ſuited to the nature of each ſubject. II. It is not true, that Juſtin ſays that our Arſinoe was the daughter of Antiochus Soter. III. Nor that her husband's name was Magus (11). IV. Nor that this pretended Magus was the ſon of *Ptolemy Lagus* (12). V. Nor that ſhe cauſed her daughter to be *eſpouſed* to Demetrius. VI. Nor that ſhe had a deſign *of ſetting the crown upon his head*. VII. Nor that ſhe was driven away. Can we ſufficiently condemn ſo bold a licentiouſneſs? An Author relates whatever he has a mind to without finding it in a Writer, and then has the aſſurance to quote him. I know that when we take an Hiſtorian of ſo little judgment as Juſtin for our guide, we are obliged to ſupply a good many circumſtances: but then we ſhould mention, that we do ſupply them, and not give them for a tranſlation of Juſtin. I have ſaid that this abridger has but little judgment, and I am ſure Tragus Pompeius would curſe him a hundred times in a day, if he could know the wretched condition to which his work has been reduced by this Epitomiſer. He would even loſe himſelf in the obſcurities of his abridger. Almoſt all the Antiochi, Ptolemies and Antigoni appear there without their marks of diſtinction; one does not know whether he is ſpeaking of the father, ſon or grandſon; one muſt gueſs at it for the moſt part. He has not ſo much as given himſelf the trouble to ſay whether the marriage of Demetrius with Berenice was conſummated. A fine queſtion you will ſay! but I inſiſt upon it, he ought to have ſet down expreſly either the affirmative or the negative: for it is not improbable that a man, who was glad to find himſelf beloved by the mother, ſhould conſent to have his marriage with the daughter put off. You will ſay that Juſtin gives Arſinoe the appellation of mother in law to Demetrius, *nimis placere ſoſrui cœperat*; but I anſwer, that he afterwards gives Berenice the appellation of virgin, *quæ res ſuſpecta primo virgini:* conſequently one of theſe phraſes ſubverts the other; and one cannot help ſuſpecting that he does not make uſe of the terms in the moſt exact ſenſe. Juſtin's Index, in Mr. Grævius's Edition, gives Berenice only the title of *betrothed* (13). However, neither Juſtin nor many other abridgers know that an abridgment ought to reſemble the pygmies, who have all the parts of a human body, but every one proportionably ſmaller than thoſe of a man of a good height. Diminiſh in an abridgment the parts of a narration as much as you will; but do not cut them quite off. Let us reckon for Moreri's eighth fault, the contradiction he is fallen into. Here he would have Berenice the wife of Ptolemy Euergetes to be the daughter of Magus: in another place (14) he affirms that ſhe was this Ptolemy's own ſiſter.

(11) His name in the editions of *Juſtin* is *Agas*; his true name is *Magas*.

(12) He was the ſon of one Philip and of the miſtreſs of Ptolemy.

(13) Demetrius *a ſponſa ſua interficitur* 26, 3, 7.

CHARACTER of a good Abridgment. See the note [*A*] of the article DOMITIA.

(14) In the ſecond article BERENICE.

[*D*] *And one of Mr. Menage.*] It is in his note upon theſe words of Diogenes Laertius: Δημητρίῳ τῷ πλεύσαντος εἰς Κυρήνην, ἐπὶ πλέον ἐρασθῆναι λέγεται, (Ἀρκεσίλαος) (15). *Demetrium qui Cyrenem* (16) *navigavit amaſſe plurimum dicitur* (*Arceſilaus*): i. e. "Arceſilaus is "ſaid to have been greatly in love with Demetrius, "who ſailed to Cyrene." *I do not wonder*, ſays Mr. Menage, *that this Philoſopher who was fond of young boys, ſhould love Demetrius, who ſeems to have had a ſurprizing beauty, which at laſt proved his ruin; for he was killed in his mother-in-law's bed. In novercæ concubitu cæſus eſt.* Juſtin, whom Mr. Menage quotes, does not allow it to be ſaid, that Arſinoe had ſuch an alliance with the minion of Arceſilaus. He would have done better to take notice of the miſtake of the Latin Tranſlator (17).

(15) Diog. Laertius, *in Arceſilao* lib. 4. num. 41.

(16) It is in the editions *cum in Cyrenem navigaſſet*; i. e. "When "he had ſailed "to Cyrene," which is falſe; for Arceſilaus's love did not happen after the voyage to Cyrene.

(17) See the preceding marginal note.

☞ ARSINOE, daughter of Ptolemy, the ſon of Lagus, King of Egypt, was married to Ptolemy Philadelphus her own brother [*A*], who was extremely in love with her. She died without iſſue (*a*); and her huſband, to ſhew his love for her, not only gave her name to a diſtrict of Egypt [*B*], which he called *Arſinois* (*b*), but alſo erected a fine ſtatue [*C*] upon Mount Helicon in Bœotia (*c*), and conſecrated a temple to her (*d*) [*D*]. Pauſanias mentions another Arſinoe, who was alſo the wife to this Ptolemy, and had ſeveral children by him. She was the daughter of Lyſimachus (*e*).

(a) Pauſanias, *in Atticis*, pag. 12, 13.

(b) Idem, ibid. pag. 14.

(c) Idem *in Bœoticis*, pag. 588.

(d) Plinius, lib. 34. cap. 14. *verſus finem.*

(e) Pauſan. *in Attic.* p. 13.

☞ ARSINOE,

[*A*] *She was married to Ptolemy Philadelphus her own brother.*] Ptolemy her father having had at leaſt two wives, it might perhaps be thought that Arſinoe was but half-ſiſter to her huſband; but it is certain that ſhe was his ſiſter both by the father's and the mother's ſide. Juſtin expreſly tells us (1), that Philadelphus was Ptolemy's youngeſt ſon, and Pauſanias ſays (2), that he was born of Berenice, and not of Euridice Antipater's daughter, and Ptolemy's firſt wife. Now it is not probable that Philadelphus ſhould have been in love with a ſiſter, who muſt have been a great deal older than him, for Ptolemy had ſeveral children by his firſt wife before he married Berenice, and we do not read that he had any more by her afterwards. But what proves undeniably, that Arſinoe was Philadelphus's ſiſter by the father and mother's ſide, is Pauſanias's expreſs aſſertion: His words are, Πτολεμαῖος Ἀρσινόης ἀδελφῆς ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐρασθείς, that is, "Ptole- "my being in love with Arſinoe, his ſiſter on both "ſides;" which Amaſæus tranſlates *Ptolemæus Arſinoes* germanæ *ſororis amore victus*; upon which Sylburgius obſerves (3), that it would be more proper to tranſlate, *uterinæ pariter & germanæ ſororis*; for, continues he, the Greek words, Ἀδελφῆς ἀμφοτέρωθεν, ſignify a ſiſter by the father's and the mother's ſide: but he does not obſerve, that this is alſo the genuine ſenſe of the Latin word *germana*, ſo that he unjuſtly cenſures Amaſæus. Let us add here, that Pauſanias ſpeaking of this marriage between a brother and a ſiſter, tells us (4), that it was not according to the laws of the Macedonians, but to thoſe of the Egyptians, over whom Philadelphus reigned.

(1) *Hiſt.* lib. 16. cap. 2.

(2) *In Atticis*, p. m. 17.

(3) *In Notis ad Amaſæi Verſionem Pauſaniæ, ad* p. 12. num. 1.

(4) *Ubi ſupra.*

[*B*] *Gave her name to a diſtrict of Egypt.*] Pauſanias's words are: Νομὸς ἔστι αὐτῆς (Ἀρσινόης) Ἀρσινοίτης Αἰγυπτίοις; that is, "There is a diſtrict in E- "gypt, called Arſinois, after her name." Amaſæus tranſlates νομὸς *regio, a country*, but Sylburgius very well obſerves (5), that it ſhould be tranſlated *Præfectura*, which is the word uſed by Pliny (6), who tells us, that Egypt was divided *in Præfecturas oppidorum*, diſtricts round about the ſeveral towns, each under a particular Governor. Let us obſerve here, that Pauſanias himſelf is not exact, when he tells us this diſtrict was called Arſinous from Arſinoe; it is more probable that it was called ſo from the town, which Philadelphus built in honour of his ſiſter, and which he called by her name. Pliny ſays (7), *Arſinoen . . . conditam ſororis nomine . . . à Ptolemæo Philadelpho.* We ſhould take notice of Moreri's geographical errors, with regard to the cities called Arſinoe, but that this is foreign to our deſign.

(5) *In notis ad* pag. 13. num. 3.

(6) Lib. 5. cap. 9.

(7) Lib. 6. cap. 29.

[*C*] *A fine ſtatue.*] That ſtatue, ſays Pauſanias (8), was ſupported by a braſs oſtrich, a kind of bird, which tho' it has wings, yet through the bulk and weight of its body cannot raiſe itſelf up into the air. The ſame Author tells us (9), that there was at Athens in the theatre called *Odeum* (ᾠδεῖον) another ſtatue of Arſinoe, which ſtood near that of her huſband, among the other ſtatues of the Kings of Egypt named Ptolemy; but we are not told by whom that ſtatue was erected.

(8) *In Bœoticis*, p. m. 588.

(9) *In Atticis*, p. 14.

[*D*] *Conſecrated a Temple to her.*] The roof of that temple, according to Pliny (10), was to be of loadſtone, that Arſinoe's ſtatue, which was of iron, might hang in the air. Dinocrates (11) an Architect of Alexandria had begun the work, but his death, and that of Ptolemy prevented the finiſhing of it. But there is much reaſon to queſtion, whether the event would have anſwered their expectation, tho' Pliny does not in the leaſt ſeem to doubt of it; ſee his words: *Eodem lapide* (Magnete) *Dinocrates Architectus Alexandriæ Arſinoes Templum concamerare inchoaverat, ut in eo ſimulachrum ejus è ferro pendere in aëre videretur: interceſſit mors & ipſius, & Ptolemæi, qui id ſorori ſuæ juſſerat fieri.* This is not much unlike the fabulous ſtory of Mohammed's iron coffin being ſupported in the air by a large loadſtone fixed in the roof of the Temple where he is buried.

(10) Lib. 34. cap. 14.

(11) Or, *Timocrates*, or, *Dinocharet.*

P.

☞ ARSINOE, ſiſter to the preceding [*A*], was firſt married to Lyſimachus, King of Thracia and Macedonia, when he was already advanced in years, and had ſeveral grandchildren, the children of Agathocles and Lyſandra. This raiſed Arſinoe's fears and jealouſies, when ſhe ſaw herſelf a mother of two ſons; ſhe could not bear the thought of falling with them into the hands of Agathocles, and becoming ſubject to him after Lyſimachus's death; ſo that ſhe reſolved to deſtroy Agathocles [*B*], and procured it with Lyſimachus's conſent (*a*). Upon this Lyſandra fled with her ſons and her brothers to Seleucus, General of the Horſe (*b*), and was ſoon followed by ſeveral of Lyſimachus's Officers, who abandoned his party to join with Seleucus. This raiſed a war, in which Lyſimachus was killed, and Seleucus made himſelf maſter of almoſt the whole Kingdom of Macedonia, but he did not keep it much above ſeven months, being killed by Ptolemy Ceraunus, who by that means made himſelf maſter of Seleucus's new Kingdom. Arſinoe was then with her two ſons at Caſſandria (*c*), from whence Ptolemy very much wanted to expel them, and to put her children to death, that he might have no competitors in his Kingdom. To compaſs his deſign, he feigned to be in love with Arſinoe, and offered to marry her [*C*]. She was at firſt extremely perplexed, and did not know what reſolution to take; but at laſt ſhe was prevailed upon by the ſolemn oaths of her brother to accept his offers. She went to meet him, and their marriage was celebrated with the greateſt ſolemnity; Ptolemy himſelf put the crown on his ſiſter's head in preſence of the whole army. Arſinoe overjoyed that ſhe had now recovered what ſhe had loſt by the death of her former huſband invited Ptolemy to come to Caſſandria, the only place in which ſhe could be ſafe. But this was what Ptolemy particularly aimed at; for no ſooner was he come to the gate, but he ordered his ſoldiers to ſeize it, and to kill Arſinoe's two ſons [*D*] who were come to meet him. The young Princes took ſanctuary in their mother's arms, where they were cruelly murthered, notwithſtanding all Arſinoe's efforts to ſave them. She herſelf was ſent to Samothracia into baniſhment, attended only with two ſlaves, ſo much the more unhappy that ſhe was not permitted to die with her children (*d*). Thus ſhe was puniſhed for the murther of Agathocles, by which ſhe had not gained the leaſt advantage.

(*a*) Pauſanias, *in Atticis*, pag. 18. Juſtinus, lib. 17. cap. 1.

(*b*) Pauſanias, ibid.

(*c*) A city of Macedonia, but near the borders of Thracia.

(*d*) Juſtinus, lib. 24. cap. 2, 3.

[*A*] *Siſter to the preceding.*] This appears not only by Juſtin, who calls her (1) ſiſter of Ptolemy Ceraunus, who was the ſon of Ptolemy, the ſon of Lagus, and father to the preceding Arſinoe, but alſo by Pauſanias's account. He tells us (2), that Lyſimachus married his ſon Agathocles to Lyſandra the daughter of Ptolemy the ſon of Lagus; and afterwards (3), that Lyſimachus himſelf married Arſinoe Lyſandra's ſiſter. They were therefore both the daughters of Ptolemy, the father of Arſinoe, and conſequently her ſiſters.

(1) Lib. 24. cap. 2, &c.

(2) *In Atticis*, pag. 16.

(3) Ibid. p. 18.

[*B*] *She reſolved upon the death of Agathocles.*] Juſtin ſays (4), that Lyſimachus, having conceived an unnatural hatred againſt Agathocles, who had diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the wars, and whom he had choſen his ſucceſſor, poiſoned him with the aſſiſtance of Arſinoe: *Agathoclem filium ſuum*, ſays Juſtin, *quem in ſucceſſionem regni ordinaverat, per quem multa bella proſpere geſſerat, non ſolum patrium, verum etiam humanum ultra morem, miniſtra Arſinoe noverca, veneno interfecit.* Pauſanias is not ſo poſitive. *It is reported*, ſays he (5), *that Arſinoe meditated the death of Agathocles.* He adds, that other Authors ſay, Arſinoe was in love with Agathocles, and not being able to gain the young man's heart, ſhe reſolved out of revenge to have him killed. However that be, Pauſanias ſeems to have thought that Lyſimachus was at leaſt privy to the murther of his ſon.

(4) Lib. 17. cap. 1.

(5) *Ubi ſupra.*

[*C*] *Ptolemy . . . feigned to be in love with Arſinoe, and offered to marry her.*] Arſinoe ſuſpected her brother's wicked deſign. He wrote to her, that ſhe would admit her ſons to a partnerſhip of the Kingdom; he deſired her to ſend a proper perſon, in whoſe preſence he might bind himſelf to ſuch oaths, as ſhe ſhould preſcribe him. This put Arſinoe into great perplexity; if ſhe conſented to her brother's requeſt, ſhe was afraid, that he would not much mind his oath; and if ſhe refuſed, ſhe dreaded to provoke his fury, and to expoſe herſelf to all his cruelty. However having more regard for her children's ſafety than for her own, and thinking that by this marriage ſhe ſhould be better able to protect them, ſhe ſent one of her friends, named Chodion, to Ptolemy, who having conducted him into the Temple of Jupiter, ſwore in the moſt ſolemn manner, that it was with a ſincere heart he deſired to marry his ſiſter, that he would give her the title of Queen, that he would not marry any other woman, and that he would look upon her children as his own. This baniſhed all her fears, and filled her with the moſt agreeable hopes; ſhe went to her brother, who received her in the moſt open and chearful manner, his countenance ſhewing as much ſincerity as his oaths had done. They were married, tho' Ptolemy her ſon (6) oppoſed it, as much as lay in his power, warning her that all this was nothing but mere treachery (7).

(6) See the following remark.

(7) Juſtinus, lib. 24. cap. 2.

[*D*] *Arſinoe's two ſons.*] They were both beautiful youths, the elder, whoſe name was Lyſimachus, was ſixteen years old, the other, whoſe name was Philip, was three years younger. This is what Juſtin tells us (8) expreſly. But if Arſinoe had but two ſons, Lyſimachus and Philip, how comes the ſame Author to ſpeak of another ſon of that Princeſs, called Ptolemy? Here follow his words, which we ſhall ſet down at length: *Arſinoe poſtquam & ſpe impleta eſt, & metu ſoluta, ipſa cum fratre colloquitur, cujus vultus & blandientes oculi, cum fidem non minorem, quam jusjurandum promitterent, reclamante Ptolemæo filio fraudem ſubeſſe, in matrimonium fratris concedit* (9). Theſe words, *reclamante Ptolemæo filio fraudem ſubeſſe*, cannot poſſibly relate to a ſon of Ptolemy himſelf, for it does not appear that he had a ſon; and beſides it is not probable that a ſon would ſay, that his father's promiſes and careſſes were treacherous. The natural ſenſe of theſe words is that Ptolemy was Arſinoe's ſon, who would adviſe her not to truſt to her pretended lover. But if that be ſo, we muſt ſay that Arſinoe had three ſons, and correct Juſtin's aſſertion in one place, by what he aſſerts in another. See Mr. Bayle's obſervation in the remark [*A*] of the article ARTABANUS I.; it relates alſo to Juſtin.

(8) Ibid. cap. 3.

(9) Ibid. cap. 2.

P.

☞ ARSLAN (ABU'L MODHAFFER ZEINO'DDIN) (*a*), the 13th Soltan of that branch of the family of Seljûk which reigned in the Perſian and Arabian Iraks, was the ſon of Toghrul, and grandſon of Mohammed the ſon of Malec-Shâh. He ſucceeded his uncle Soleimân-Shâh, who had reigned but ſix months or little more, in the 555th year of the Hejra (*b*), and was proclaimed in the city of Hamadân, by the influence of the Arabee Ildighiz, who had the charge of his education, and the chief management

(*a*) Al Beidâwi gives him the ſurname of *Roſn'oddin.*

(*b*) A. C. 1160.

nagement of affairs under ſeveral of the preceding Princes [A]. Arſlân, in the beginning of his reign, had a rebellion to encounter with, raiſed in favour of his couſin Mohammed Seljûk-Shâh, by Kimâr Governour of Iſpahan, and Inbânej Governor of Rey, who marched towards Hamadân at the head of a great army. The Soltan, on his part, aſſembling his troops, met the Conſpirators near Kazwin, gave them battle, and obtained a compleat victory; Seljuk-Shâh being ſlain in the field, and his two adherents forced to make their eſcape to Rey, and thence, for greater ſecurity, into the Province of Mazenderân. In 561 (c) Inbânej, having obtained powerful ſuccours from the King of Khowarezm, entered the Perſian Irâk, and pillaged the country about Abher and Kazwin, but Arſlân and the Atabec ſuddenly attacking him, obliged him to retire a ſecond time into Mazenderan. In 563 (d) Inbânej made an attempt on Rey, and the Soltan ſent againſt him the eldeſt ſon of Ildighiz, named Mohammed; but his forces giving ground before thoſe of Inbânej, the father marched to his aſſiſtance. Ildighiz arriving at Rey, ſome overtures of peace were made, and a treaty was at length concluded, whereby Inbânej was to be reinſtated in his Government, on condition that he ſhould go with Ildighiz to make his ſubmiſſion in perſon to the Soltân, and to take an oath of fidelity to him. Inbânej accordingly ſet out with the Atabec for Hamadân, but was aſſaſſinated the night before he was to have waited on the Soltân; nor was it poſſible to diſcover by whom the deed had been committed. Arſlân, immediately on receiving the news, gave the government of Rey and its dependances to Mohammed the ſon of Ildighiz, who ſoon after married the only daughter of Inbânej, and by her had a ſon, who had a conſiderable ſhare in the tranſactions of the ſucceeding reign. In 568 (e) the Soltan's mother, a Princeſs of great virtue, died in the houſe of Ildighiz, whom ſhe had taken to her ſecond huſband; and that great man ſoon followed her: Arſlan was ſo deeply concerned for the loſs of theſe two perſons, that the Hiſtorians attribute to no other cauſe the long illneſs of which he died in the year 571 (f), at the age of forty three, after a reign of about fifteen years. This Prince is highly commended by ſeveral Writers, not only for his valour and generoſity, but alſo for his temper and humanity: he is ſaid, in particular, to have been a great enemy to backbiting; not ſuffering any perſon to ſpeak ill of another in his preſence (g).

(c) A. C. 1164.
(d) A. C. 1166.
(e) A. C. 1172.
(f) A. C. 1175.
(g) *Ex* Al Beidâwi, Nokhbat al tawârikh, & Khondemir *apud* D'Herbel. *Bibl. Orient.* pag. 129, &c.

There were ſeveral other Mohammedan Princes of this name. I ſhall only mention three of them. I. *Arſlân-Shâh*, the ſon of Maſûd, by the ſiſter of Soltân Sanjâr the Seljukian, was the 12th Soltân of the Dynaſty of Ghazna. On the death of Maſûd, which happened in the year of the Hejra 508 (b); Shirzad his eldeſt ſon ſucceeded to the crown, but hardly kept it a year, Arſlân Shâh depriving him both of that and his life, and ſeizing all his father's dominions; upon which Bahrâm-Shâh, the youngeſt brother, highly diſcontented that he had no ſhare therein, retired to his uncle Sanjar, by whom being furniſhed with an army, he made himſelf maſter of Ghazna, the capital city, and obliged his brother to fly and leave him in poſſeſſion of the crown: but the auxiliary army was no ſooner retreated, than Arſlân Shâh appeared before Ghazna, and forced his brother to fly in his turn, and to have recourſe again to Soltân Sanjar. That Prince did not deſert his nephew, but led his troops himſelf againſt Arſlân, whom he routed and took priſoner, reinſtating Bahrâm in the throne; and Arſlân died in priſon ſoon after, in the year 512 (i) having reigned about three years (k). II. *Arſlân-Shâh*, the ſon of Kirmân-Shâh the 5th Soltân of that branch of the family of Seljuk which reigned in Kirmân, ſucceeded his nephew Irân-Shâh. For fear of falling into whoſe hands he had been obliged to conceal himſelf in a Shoemaker's ſhop: But that cruel Prince having been ſlain by his own ſubjects in the year of the Hejra 494 (l), Arſlân-Shâh appeared, and was by publick conſent made Soltân in his room. The Seljukians of Perſia, who had given great diſturbance to his predeceſſors, durſt not attack this Prince; ſo that he enjoyed a peaceable reign of forty two years, dying in 536 (m), and left his crown to his ſon Mohammed-Shâh (n). III. *Arſlân-Shâh*, the ſon of Toghrul-Shâh, was the 8th Soltân of the ſame branch of the Seljukian family, and ſucceeded to the crown of Kirman on the death of his father, in the year of the Hejra 562 (o), but had the misfortune to have it diſputed with him for ſeveral years by his two brothers, Bahrâm-Shâh, and Turân-Shâh, each of them being acknowledged for Soltân as they happened at ſeveral times to prevail (p); the reigns of thoſe Princes being therefore ſo confuſed, that it is impoſſible to fix the number of years of any one of them.

(b) A. C. 1114.
(i) A. C. 1118.
(k) *Ex Hiſtoricis ſupra citatis.*
(l) A. C. 1100.
(m) A. C. 1141.
(n) *Ex Hiſtoricis ſupra citatis.*
(o) A. C. 1166.
(p) *Ex Hiſtoricis ſupra citatis.*

[A] *The Atabec Ildighiz——had the chief management of affairs under ſeveral of his Predeceſſors.*] This Ildighiz was originally a Turkiſh Slave, and raiſed to great power and authority by the favour of Soltan Masûd, uncle to Arſlan, who gave him the widow of his brother Toghrul to wife, together with the government of Adherbijân. This Power Ildighiz exerciſed under the title of Atabec (1), and tranſmitted the ſame to his poſterity, who poſſeſſed it for about 146 years. Y.

(1) See the Article ATABEC.

ARTABANUS ſon of Hyſtaſpes [A], brother of Darius I, King of Perſia, is repreſented to us by Herodotus as a wiſe man, who always adviſed againſt thoſe famous expeditions

(1) Diodorus Siculus, lib. 11. *and* Juſtin, lib. 2. *he ſhould have quoted* Juſtin, lib. 3. cap. 1.

[A] *Son of Hyſtaſpes.*] I cannot tell where Moreri read that Artabanus *was a native of Hyrcania.* The two Authors whom he has quoted (1), ſay nothing like it. Cteſias mentions for Artabanus's father a favourite of Cambyſes, whom he calls Artaſyras, who at firſt favoured the uſurpation of the Magus, and afterwards the deſign formed by ſeven great Lords to drive out the Magus (2).

(2) *In Perſic.* cap. 13, 14, 20.

ditions which were so fatal to the monarchy of the Persians (*a*). He had no mind that Darius should go to attack the Scythians (*b*), and much less that Xerxes should engage himself in a war with the Greeks. Herodotus has preserved the solid reasons upon which he founded his advice [*B*], and the judgment he made upon the prodigious army both by sea and land, with which Xerxes prepared to pass from Asia to Europe (*c*). The difficulties that Artabanus represented to him were the cause that they chose rather to send him back to Persia, to command in the absence of the King, than to let him continue in the expedition (*d*). The event will shew how judicious and faithful his counsels were. He did not always persevere in this fidelity; for he conspired against Xerxes, and slew him (*e*); and afterwards engaged Artaxerxes son of Xerxes, to make away with his brother Darius: he engaged him, I say, by making him believe that Darius was the murderer of Xerxes. But Artaxerxes knew the truth a little afterwards, and killed Artabanus as he was pulling off his cuirass (*f*). Diodorus Siculus speaks differently from Justin of the manner in which Artabanus was punished for his crime (*g*). You may see in the note [*B*] after what manner this Prince could reason upon dreams, and upon the length of our life.

(*a*) Herodot. lib. 4. cap. 83.
(*b*) Idem, ibid.
(*c*) Ibid. cap. 49, & *seq.*
(*d*) Idem, lib. 7. cap. 52, 53.
(*e*) Diodor. lib. 11. Justin, lib. 3. cap. 1.
(*f*) Justin. lib. 3. cap. 1.
(*g*) Diodor. Siculus, lib. 11.

[*B*] *Herodotus has preserved the solid reasons upon which he founded his advice* (3).] One would think, that Herodotus had made it his business to do honour to the prudence and wit of Artabanus: he never gives more scope to his imagination, than when he makes this Prince reason. Xerxes after having insulted him in his passion, submitted to his reasons, and gave up the thoughts of the expedition: but two succeeding dreams made him continue it (4). He sought for Artabanus, and told him his dreams; and added, *I would know whether you would have such. Take my cloaths, sit upon my throne, and lay upon my bed.* Artabanus answered, that he was not worthy so great an honour, and reasoned very sensibly upon dreams. He told him if there was something divine in those of Xerxes, his Majesty had reason to hope, that he should have the same, "for what would it signify, "if a God, who had a war at heart, and came by "night to give it in command to a Monarch resolved "to live in peace, should not come to order the same "thing to the Prime Minister, when he wanted to "know by this proof, whether this God is desirous "of war? But, *continues he*, do not think it is ne"cessary for that purpose, that I should take your "cloaths and lay in your bed. This I know not "what, that has appeared to you in a dream, is not "so stupid, as to conclude that I am you, because "it shall see me dressed in your cloaths; and, if it "should deign to address itself to me, your cloaths "would not oblige it to change its opinion on my "account any more than my own." Xerxes would absolutely be obeyed: Artabanus dreamed like his master, and opposed the war no longer; but became the promoter of it, tho' he still much doubted the success (5). If these things were true, ought he not to conclude that they came from that spirit, that *was a liar and a murderer from the beginning*; for Xerxes was threatned with a shameful diminution of his glory, if he desisted from the enterprise (6)? Another time Artabanus reasoned in a very uncommon manner upon the shortness of our life, a thing, which made Xerxes weep at the sight of his innumerable troops (7). *We live but too much*, says he: *our life, short as it is, is extended more than enough to make us mad, and often wish for death as a mild refuge against the miseries that fall upon us. But if life has nevertheless been seasoned with something agreeable, it is a proof that God has a love for mankind.* Where are the Greek Philosophers, who ought not to say of this way of thinking, as Pyrrhus said of the Roman Army when he had been to take a view of it: *the order of battle of these Barbarians*, says he, *and their manner of encamping, has nothing of the Barbarian in it* (8). It belongs to the Christians to rectify that. Note, that Herodotus was very well acquainted with the vanities and miseries of mankind; but he affected a little too much, to seek for the cause of them in the jealousy or malignity of the Gods. Plutarch calls him to account for it (9).

(3) Herodot. lib. 3. cap. 10.
(4) Idem, lib. 7. cap. 15, & *seq.*
(5) Herodot. lib. 7. cap. 47.
(6) Idem, ibid. cap. 14.
(7) Idem, ibid. cap. 46. See the note [*L*] of the Article PERICLES, at the end.
(8) Plutarch. *in Pyrrho*, p. 393.
(9) See the note [*K*] of the Article PERICLES, towards the end.

Artabanus's Reflection upon dreams, and the length of life.

ARTABANUS I. King of the Parthians, the seventh from Arsaces Founder of the Monarchy (*a*), was son of Priapatius, and brother of Phrahates and Mithridates [*A*], who all three reigned successively over the Parthians. He succeeded Phrahates his nephew, and died soon after, having been wounded in the arm in the war that he had with the Thogarians (*b*).

(*a*) About 240 years before Christ.
(*b*) Justin. lib. 42. cap. 2.

[*A*] *He was son of Priapatius, and brother of Phrahates and Mithridates.*] Moreri makes him son of Phrahates I, and uncle to Phrahates II: but these two relations are incompatible; for Phrahates II was son of Mithridates, who was brother to Phrahates I. How then could he make it out, that a son of Phrahates I should be uncle to Phrahates II? This is the reason that, notwithstanding Justin assigns but two sons to Priapatius, I have assigned him a third, namely, Artabanus I. When Authors are not clear, we ought to be thus free with them. Justin relates two things (1): I, that Priapatius, dying in the twenty fifth year of his reign, left two sons, of whom the eldest, whose name was Phrahates, reigned before Mithridates his younger brother; II, that Phrahates, son of Mithridates, reigned after his father, and was succeeded by Artabanus's uncle by the father's side (2). It is a great confusion; it is insinuating that Mithridates and Phrahates were the only sons of Priapatius: and it is saying that there was yet another, for otherwise Artabanus could not be uncle by the father's side, to the son of Mithridates. I have sought in vain for a solution of this difficulty, in several Commentators upon Justin, and even in the notes of the last French translator (3).

(1) Justin. lib. 41. cap. 5.
(2) Justin. lib. 42. cap. 1, 2.
(3) He calls himself Monsieur D. L. M. His translation was reprinted at Amsterdam in 1694, from the Paris edition, in 1695.

ARTABANUS II, King of the Parthians, when he was yet but King of the Medes [*A*], was invited by the Parthians to reign over them upon the exclusion of Vonones, whom they had sent for as far as Rome, and whom Tiberius had granted them very readily (*a*). Artabanus was of the race of the Arsacides, as well as Vonones, and he had likewise this advantage, that the Roman education did not render him odious to this people (*b*). Vonones was fortunate in the first battle, but he was so unsuccessful in the second, that he

(*a*) Joseph. *Antiq.* lib. 18. cap. 3.
(*b*) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 2.

[*A*] *He was King of the Medes.*] Moreri and Hofman have said that Tacitus has made him King of the Dacians. This is what that Historian never dreamed of. He only says, that Artabanus was brought up amongst the *Dahæ*, *Artabanus Arsacidarum e sanguine apud Dahas adultus excitur* (1). There is a good deal of difference between the Dahæ and the Dacians; and a man must be very inattentive (to say no worse,) when he could think a Prince of Parthia had been brought up near the Danube.

(1) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 3.

he was obliged to fly to Armenia [B]. The victorious Artabanus did not let him reſt there; and as Tiberius would not give Vonones the aſſiſtance which was neceſſary for him (c), he found himſelf obliged to leave Armenia and retire to Silanus Governor of Syria. This confirmed upon the head of Artabanus the crown, which he had obtained about the year 769 of Rome, and the 16th of the firſt Century. He was uneaſy however at his rival's being in Syria (d), for the correſpondence being more eaſy, kept up the factions; ſo he ſent an Ambaſſador to Germanicus to renew the alliance, and in the mean time demanded that Vonones ſhould be ſent out of Syria. The conſequences of this Embaſſy are not known; but it is known that after the death of Germanicus, the King of the Parthians behaved haughtily to the Romans, and cruelly towards his own people (e). The ſucceſs of the war that he had made with many nations, had inſpired him with courage; ſo that without any regard for Tiberius, whoſe grey hairs he deſpiſed, he ſeized Armenia [C], and gave it to Arſaces his eldeſt ſon [D]. He ſent to demand again all the treaſures that Vonones had left in Cyria and Cilicia (f), and in a rodomontade declared that if they did not deliver up to him all that Cyrus and Alexander had poſſeſſed, he ſhould go and take it by force. The malecontents of this court ſent ſecretly to Tiberius, to deſire Phrahates ſon to King Phrahates (g). This was readily granted them; and when it was known that this Prince, being deſirous to live after the manner of the Parthians, to which he had not been uſed for a long while, had fallen ſick and died, they ſubſtituted Tiridates in his room, who was of the Houſe of the Arſacides, and a near relation of Phrahates, and raiſed another enemy to Artabanus, Pharaſmanes King of Iberia. Here Artabanus came off with the worſt; for after his ſon the King of Armenia had been poiſoned, his other ſon Orodes, whom he ſent into Armenia, was defeated by Pharaſmanes. He was there likewiſe defeated himſelf ſometime after; and having been obliged to advance towards the provinces that Vitellius Governor of Syria had threatned (h), there was nothing that further remained to hinder Mithridates brother to Pharaſmanes from becoming King of Armenia (i). This loſs of Artabanus was ſoon followed by a greater. Vitellius by his intrigues and his money made this Monarch quit the country, and retire to Hyrcania, where he was forced to live upon what he got by hunting (k), whilſt Vitellius put Tiridates in poſſeſſion of the crown. But there was ſo formidable a party made againſt the new King, that Artabanus found it no difficult matter to be recalled, and to conſtrain Tiridates, who was a poor Prince, to withdraw (l). This paſſed in the 36th year of the firſt Century. None of Artabanus's former pride now remained: he ſought the friendſhip of Caligula of his own accord (m): and when by the diligence of Vitellius he ſaw the deſign that he had of carrying war into Syria ready to miſcarry (n), he conſented to an interview with this Roman, and to a treaty of peace; the conditions of which were to the advantage of Caligula. Ten years after, he was dethroned, and conſtrained to ſeek a retreat at the court of Izates King of Adiabene (o). He was received there in the moſt generous manner, and with more

(c) Idem, ibid. cap. 4.

(d) Idem, ibid. cap. 58.

(e) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 6. cap. 31.

(f) In the year of Rome 788.

(g) Tacit. lib. 6. cap. 32, *& ſeq.*

(h) Idem, lib. 6. cap. 36.

(i) Dio, lib. 3. *ſub fin.*

(k) *In Hyrcanis repertus eſt inſidiis obſitus, & alimenta arcu expediens.* Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 6. cap. 43.

(l) Idem, ibid. cap. 44.

(m) Sueton. *in Calig.* cap. 14. See the note [C].

(n) Dio, lib. 59.

(o) Joſeph. *Antiquit.* lib. 20. cap. 2.

[B] *Vonones .... his competitor was ſo unſucceſsful in a ſecond battle, that he was obliged to fly into Armenia.*] Moreri has related two other falſhoods. He makes Vonones obtain two victories over the Parthians, who nevertheleſs vanquiſhed his competitor but once (2); and he aſcribes to Vitellius a defeat of the army of Artabanus; a defeat, I ſay, followed with other loſſes of Artabanus about the year 36. But, 1. it is falſe that Vitellius defeated the troops of this King of the Parthians, and 2. it is certain that the miſchief Vitellius did him by intrigues and money, were after theſe *other loſſes*. Mr. Hofman aſcribes two victories alſo to Vonones, and one to Vitellius, *which was the cauſe*, ſays he, *that Artabanus abandoned Armenia*. A miſtake indeed; but a far more excuſable one, than that into which this Writer hath fallen, after Mr. Lloyd and Charles Stephens; for he ſays, that Artabanus, being a great enemy to Tiberius, ſeized upon Armenia, and was ſlain by a Perſian ſoldier, named Artaxerxes, after which there were no Kings of the Parthians, but Kings of the Perſians. A prodigious Anachroniſm! See the Article of ARTABANUS IV.

(2) Joſeph. *Antiquit.* lib. 18. cap. 3. Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 3.

[C] *Without any regard for Tiberius, ... he ſeized Armenia.*] It is impoſſible to be more inſulted, than this Emperor was by Artabanus, who no ſooner perceived that his invaſion of Armenia, was an injury that Tiberius did not revenge, than he attacked Cappadocia (3). But what can be more terrible than the letters that he wrote to him? Let us hear Suetonius: *Quin & Artabani Parthorum Regis laceratus eſt literis, parricidia, & cædes, & ignaviam, & luxuriam objicientis, monentiſque ut voluntariâ morte maximo juſtiſſimoque civium odio quam primum ſatisfaceret* (4). i. e. "He was grievouſly affronted by letters from Artabanus King of the Parthians, accuſing him of parricide, murder, ſloth and luxury, and adviſing him "to kill himſelf forthwith, to ſatisfy the hatred of "his citizens." There was ſomething perſonal in this; for Artabanus behaved very civilly, and even humbly to the ſucceſſor of Tiberius. Hear Suetonius once more: *Artabanus Parthorum Rex odium ſemper contemptumque Tiberii præ ſe ferens, amicitiam* Caligulæ *ultro petiit, venitque ad colloquium legati conſularis, & tranſgreſſus Euphratem aquilas & ſigna Romana Cæſarumque imagines adoravit* (5). i. e. "Tho' Artabanus the "King of the Parthians always ſhewed a hatred and "contempt of Tiberius, yet he ſought the friendſhip "of Caligula of his own accord, and came to a con"ference with the conſular legate, and croſſing the "Euphrates, adored the Eagles and Roman Enſigns, "and the images of the Cæſars." Dion Caſſius obſerves, that Vitellius had obliged Artabanus to ſacrifice to the ſtatues of Auguſtus and Caligula, and give his children for hoſtages, after having conſented to the treaty of peace which he directed (6). This ſhews that Joſephus was miſtaken when he thought the interview between Vitellius and Artabanus, and all that reſulted from it, happened under Tiberius (7). It was Tiberius, according to him, that made Darius the ſon of Artabanus be ſent for a hoſtage, with rich preſents, and a Giant, a Jew by nation, whoſe name was Eleazar, and who was ſeven cubits high.

(3) Dio, lib. 58. *ſub fin.*

(4) Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. 66.

(5) Idem, *in Caligula*, cap. 14.

(6) Dio, lib. 59.

(7) Joſeph. *Antiquit.* lib. 18.

[D] *He gave Armenia to Arſaces, his eldeſt ſon.*] This is his name in Tacitus and in Dion Caſſius. Joſephus calls him Orodes (8): he has confounded one of Artabanus's children with another. He whoſe name was Orodes, was not King of Armenia, but was ſent thither to avenge the death of Arſaces his eldeſt brother; and had like to have loſt his life in the attempt: for fighting hand to hand in the midſt of the battle with Pharaſmanes King of Iberia, he was wounded, but not killed, as the rumour was at the time to the great prejudice of the Parthians (9), and as Joſephus has ſince affirmed in his Jewiſh Antiquities (10).

(8) Idem, ibid. cap. 3.

(9) *Fama occiſi falſo credita exterruit Parthos, victoriamque ceſſere.* Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 6. cap. 35.

(10) Joſeph. *Antiquit.* lib. 18. cap. 3.

more than mere compliments. Izates treated in ſuch a manner with the Parthians, that he obliged them to reſtore him to the throne; and it was Cinnamus himſelf, whom they had ſet up in his room, that replaced the Diadem upon his head. It is probable that Artabanus died ſoon after; whether by the crime of his ſon Gotarzes, or his brother [*E*], or otherwiſe, is uncertain.

(12) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 11. cap. 8.

(13) *Inter Gotarzis pleraque ſæva (qui necem fratri Artabano conjugique ac filio ejus properaverat,* others read *præparaverat, unde metus ejus in cæteros) accivere Bardanem.* Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 11. cap. 8. that is, "Amidſt the "many cruelties "of Gotarzes, "who had put "to death his "brother Arta-"banus, with "his wife and "ſon, whence "the reſt were "affrighted, "they ſtirred up "Bardanes.

(14) Idem, *Annal.* lib. 12. cap. 14.

(15) Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. 20. cap. 2.

[*E*] *He died .... whether by the crime of his ſon Gotarzes, or his brother, &c.*] The manner in which the exact Mr. Tillemont has expreſſed himſelf, is fallacious. *Artabanus died ſoon after*, ſays he (11), *by the crime of Gotarzes his brother, according to Tacitus, or rather his ſon, as Joſephus affirms.* There is nobody that reads theſe words, but would imagine that Joſephus ſays, Gotarzes put his father Artabanus to death. But he ſays no ſuch thing: he ſpeaks of Artabanus, as of a man that died a natural death; he makes him to be ſucceeded by his ſon Varadan, and Varadan by Gotarzes, another ſon of Artabanus. Strange, that Tacitus and Joſephus ſhould agree ſo little in capital circumſtances, about things ſo near their own time! The latter gives Artabanus a peaceable death, and many ſons: the former makes him die together with his wife and his ſon, by the crime of his brother, which ſeems to imply that he had but one ſon. One does not know which ſide to take, when Tacitus is not free from contradictions. At firſt he mentions Gotarzes as the brother of Artabanus: but a little after, he makes him the brother of Bardanes, and inſinuates plain enough, that Bardanes was the ſon of Artabanus; for he repreſents him as greatly enraged againſt thoſe of Seleucia, not only becauſe they did not ſubmit to him, but rather becauſe they had rebelled againſt his father. *In quos ut patris ſui quoque defectores, irâ magis quam ex uſu præſenti accenſus* (12). What father is this, if it is not Artabanus? I ſhould be almoſt tempted to believe that the Artabanus of whom Tacitus ſpeaks (13), was the ſon, who had already ſucceeded, or was to ſucceed King Artabanus; and that Gotarzes, the other ſon of King Artabanus, got rid of this brother, that he might reign himſelf; and for the greater ſecurity involved the wife and the ſon in the ſame ruin with the father. This conjecture diſſipates all the contradictions. But here are other differences between Joſephus and Tacitus. The latter makes Gotarzes die a natural death, and makes Vonones ſucceed him, and his ſon Vologeſes to ſucceed him (14). Joſephus makes Gotarzes periſh by the treaſon of his ſubjects, and makes his immediate ſucceſſor his brother Vologeſes (15).

(11) Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* an. 47. pag. 367. Bruxelles edition.

ARTABANUS III, King of the Parthians, ſucceſſor and perhaps ſon of Vologeſes, of whom Suetonius ſpeaks as of a good friend of Nero and Veſpaſian, lived in the time of the Emperor Titus. This is what we learn from Zonaras in the following manner (*a*). He ſays that a man of Aſia, named Terentius Maximus, pretending to be Nero, infuſed this notion into ſome perſons in his own country, and into a greater number ſtill towards the Euphrates, and that at laſt he retired to Artabanus King of the Parthians, who then being in an ill humour againſt Titus, received this perſon very well, and prepared to reſtore him [*A*].

(*a*) Zonaras, *in Tito, ad an. circiter* 80.

[*A*] *He received Terentius Maximus very well, and prepared to reſtore him.*] Altho' there have been more than one pretended Nero, a good many people will hardly believe, that this Terentius Maximus is to be diſtinguiſhed from the impoſtor, of whom Suetonius has ſpoken. And, if it be objected, that the latter did not appear till twenty years after the death of Nero, that is, the ſeventh year of Domitian; it will be anſwered that Zonaras is not incapable of confounding two reigns with one another; and that after all it would be a little ſtrange, that two impoſtors ſhould within ſo little ſpace of time, find a great ſupport in the ſame country: or if they did, that they were not both mentioned in the Hiſtorian, who has ſpoken of one of them, as a ſingular event. That one of whom Suetonius ſpeaks, found a great deal of ſupport amongſt the Parthians. *Cum poſt viginti annos adoleſcente me extitiſſet conditionis incertæ qui ſe Neronem eſſe jactaret, tam favorabile nomen ejus apud Parthos fuit, ut vehementer adjutus & vix redditus ſit* (1). i. e. "When after twenty years, whilſt I was a youth, "there appeared one of obſcure birth, who pretended "to be Nero, he obtained ſo much favour amongſt "the Parthians, as to be greatly aſſiſted, and almoſt "reſtored by them."

(1) Sueton. *in Neron. ſub finem.*

ARTABANUS IV, was the laſt King of the Parthians; for Artaxerxes, a Perſian by nation, having deprived him of his crown and life in the year 229, aſſumed the title of King of the Perſians, which his ſucceſſor bore as long as that Monarchy laſted. The reign of Artabanus had been glorious enough, and had made the power of it felt by the Romans, who, on their turn, made their power alſo be felt by this Prince. He was ſo imprudent as not to be upon his guard, whilſt the Emperor Severus ravaged the neighbouring countries: he was ſleeping in quiet under the protection of peace, when he ſaw all on a ſudden the Roman troops fall upon his dominions. All that he could do was to ſave himſelf with a few guards (*a*); the city of Cteſiphon where he made his reſidence was ſacked; all his treaſures, and all his goods fell into the hands of the enemy (*b*). But this treachery was nothing in compariſon of that of Caracalla. He ſent Ambaſſadors to him laden with rich preſents, to deſire his daughter in marriage; and urged to him a great many advantages which would reſult from this alliance to both nations (*c*). Artabanus immediately rejected this propoſal, not foreſeeing any thing agreeable in this marriage, conſidering the difference of language and cuſtoms which would be between his daughter and a Roman Emperor. At laſt Caracalla's freſh inſtances, his oaths, his proteſtation of friendſhip for his future ſpouſe, obtained the conſent of the father. But we ſhall ſee preſently that Caracalla meditated a villany, which may be looked on as a model, or at leaſt as a repreſentation of the maſſacre on St. Bartholomew's day concerted by Catharine de Medicis. He went with his army into the country of the Parthians, and was received every where as the ſon-in-law of the King; and, as ſoon as they learnt that he was near the capital, Artabanus, accompanied with a prodigious number of people, went to meet him. The Parthians thought of nothing but to teſtify their joy; they did nothing but drink, and ſing, and dance; when Caracalla, giving the ſignal to the troops, put all this

(*a*) Herodian. lib. 3. cap. 9.

(*b*) In the year 200, according to Calviſius.

(*c*) Herodian. lib. 4. cap. 10, *& ſeq.*

this multitude of people to the ſword. They killed as many as they would, for no body was in a condition to reſiſt them. Artabanus was ſaved, but with great difficulty. From that day Caracalla did nothing but plunder and burn, till being weary of doing it, he returned to Meſopotamia, where he was ſlain. Artabanus, eager to avenge the injury that he had ſuffered, marched as ſoon as he could againſt the Roman army, who had choſen Macrinus in the room of Caracalla. The fight having laſted two days ſucceſſively, from morning till night, began again the third, and would in all probability have laſted till the entire ruin of one of the two armies, if Macrinus had not let Artabanus know the unhappy end of Caracalla, and had not declared to him that he diſapproved what was paſſed, and that he would reſtore all the priſoners to him again, and all the ſpoil which remained, and live in peace with him. Artabanus accepted theſe offers, and ſo the peace was concluded between him and the new Emperor in the year 217. He was the firſt that was called the Great King; and he wore a double diadem [*A*]. His ill fortune in 226 raiſed him a formidable enemy; I mean that Artaxerxes, who maintained his rebellion with

[*A*] *He was the firſt that was called the great King; and wore a double diadem* (1).] I have quoted my Author, and it is very true, that theſe words are in the Chapter which I have quoted from Herodian. Ἀρτάβανόν τε τὸν πρότερον καλούμενον τὸν μέγαν βασιλέα, ϛ διπλῷ διαδήματι χρώμενον ἀποκτεῖναι (2). I believe he meant, that before Artabanus IV, no King of the Parthians had aſſumed the title of Great King: and he would be grievouſly miſtaken if he ſaid abſolutely, that this was the firſt Prince who was ſo called; for it is certain, that the ancient Kings of Perſia had taken this title, and that it was even peculiar to them. See the 24th Verſe of the Perſæ of Æſchylus and Stanley's Notes upon it. He quotes the teſtimony of Dion Chryſoſtom, *Orat. III*; of Joſephus, Antiquit. *Libr. XI, Cap. VI*; of Herodotus, *Libr. VIII, and Libr. V*; of Xenophon, *Expedit. Libr. I*; of Ariſtides *in Romæ Encomio*; of Suidas, in μέγας βασιλεύς. Mr. du Rondel pointed out to me this paſſage of Stanley. We may add to theſe Authors, Plato, *in Gorgia*, pag. 321, *C*. Plutarch, *in Vitâ Cimonis*, pag. 485, *E*; the Book of Eſther, *Chap. XVI, Ver.* 1. Read alſo the Panegyric of Iſocrates; you will find there the complaint of this Orator, againſt the Greeks of his time, who, in their ordinary language, gave the Monarch of the Perſians the pompous title of the Great King. Οὐ βασιλέα τὸν μέγαν αὐτὸν προσαγορεύομεν, ὥσπερ αἰχμαλώτοις γεγονότες (3); i. e. "Do not we call him the Great King, "as if we were his captives?" Note, the Kings of Perſia were not the firſt who gave themſelves that name. The Kings of Aſſyria had borne it, as may be gathered from the XVIIIth Chapter of the IId Book of Kings (4), in the words of Sennacherib's Lieutenant. I remember the anſwer, that Father Goulu gave, when a paſſage of his tranſlation of Socrates's Apology was criticiſed. But let us firſt ſet down the words of the Critick. *I know not of what to accuſe him, unleſs it be of voluntary ignorance, in a paſſage of his apology of Socrates, wherein he makes him ſay:* I am aſſured that tho' he were the Great Lord *(le grand Seigneur)* and not a perſon of low condition, he would prefer ſuch a night as that to all the nights and all the days of his life, &c. *I would be glad to aſk him, if this* grand Seigneur *is not the Turk; and if it is, how Socrates could ſpeak of him, unleſs by Propheſy, ſeeing it cannot be eight hundred years ſince the Ottomans began their tyranny, and it is above thirteen hundred from the time of Socrates to their time, reckoning from the fourth year of the ſeventy ſeventh Olympiad, in which he was born* (5). Here follows the refutation. "An able "man would have ſaved me this anſwer, by not aſk"ing ſuch a fooliſh queſtion. But have a little pa"tience and I will anſwer this ignoramus. Yes, Pa"ladin (6), It is the Turk that is now called the "*Grand Seigneur*. But in the time of Socrates, it "was the King of the Perſians, that was ſo called, "and no otherwiſe. As for other Kings, ſays Suidas, "they have the title of the States and Countries that "are under their obedience, and thus we ſay, the "King of Macedon and the King of the Lacedæmo"nians. But the King of the Perſians is only called "the Great King, or the Great Lord, μέγας βασιλεύς, "μέγας δεσπότης. And as he bore the title of Great "Lord *(Grand Seigneur)* his ſubjects had the appel"lation of ſlaves, his Court was called the *Port*, or "the Gate, and his Courtiers οἱ ἐπιθύραις βασίλεως, "*thoſe who were at the Gate of the King*. The Em"peror of the Turks had ſucceeded him in the "title of Great Lord, as well as in the greateſt "part of his Kingdoms, and in the form of his go"vernment. So that without revelation or propheſy "Socrates might ſpeak of the *Grand Seigneur* or Great "Lord, and the Paladin could not find fault with "him, without diſcovering himſelf to be an aſs. "But to refer him to Herodotus, Thucydides, and "other good Authors, would be to no purpoſe. For "the poor creature confeſſes he has no Books nor "any money to buy them; and thoſe who have li"braries would hardly truſt him; and beſides, he un"derſtands nothing about them. I ſhall content my"ſelf therefore, to refer him to the hiſtory of the "Turks, at the end of the *Pont-neuf*, where the "pictures hang out upon the ſtalls. There he may "learn for nothing in the maps, where the Emperors "of the Turks are engraved, how long it is ſince "the Ottomans became *Grands Seigneurs:* whether it "is eight hundred years, as the Paladin ſays, or only "three hundred (7)." I have ſet down this whole long paſſage, to ſhew at an eaſy rate, and without conſulting the pieces of the famous diſpute of the General of the Fueillans, the rude and groſs behaviour of that time (8) amongſt the Authors who were at war. But I muſt not paſs over F. Goulu's artifice. Not having found his account in μέγας βασιλεύς, he falſly ſuppoſed that the words μέγας δεσπότης are in Suidas. This would not clear him amongſt learned Readers: it ſerved only to impoſe upon the ignorant; and expoſed him throughout as a falſe quoter: upon the whole it appears, that his *Grand Seigneur* was juſtly criticiſed.

Beſides the proud title of King of Kings was leſs fit to flatter the pride of the Orientals than that of Great King; for we ſee that Artabanus IV, to raiſe his character, took the title of Great King. He had already as well as his predeceſſors that of King of Kings. In the time of Pompey it was commonly given to the King of the Parthians; and if Pompey did not obſerve that form in writing to him, it was for the ſake of the other Kings, who were come to do him homage (9). Phraates aſſumed it in a letter that he wrote to Auguſtus (10). Suetonius has given it to the King of the Parthians, who was contemporary with Germanicus: it is in that place, wherein he relates his concern for the death of this illuſtrious Roman. *Regulos quoſdam barbam poſuiſſe, & uxorum capita raſiſſe ad indicium maximi luctus.* REGUM ETIAM REGEM *& exercitatione venandi & convictu Megiſtanum abſtinuiſſe, quod apud Parthos juſtitii inſtar eſt* (11): that is, "The petty Kings ſhaved their beards and "their wives heads, as a mark of the greateſt grief. "And the King of Kings abſtained from the exerciſe "of hunting, and the converſation of the Nobles, "which amongſt the Parthians is a publick vacation." I am not ſurprized at Artabanus's taſte, when I conſider that the title of King of Kings was much more common than that of the Great King. Agamemnon had the title of King of Kings (12). Diodorus Siculus affirms that Ofmanduas and Seſoſtris were ſo called, one in his Epitaph (13), the other in ſome inſcriptions on pillars (14). Both of them had reigned gloriouſly in Egypt. Cyrus had ſuch a title in his Epitaph (15); and it was given to Tigranes King of Armenia (16). The holy Scriptures give it to Nebuchodonoſor (17). Note that the Kings of Perſia, who ſucceeded the Kings of the Parthians, continued

(1) Herodian. lib. 2. cap. 2. pag. 257.

(2) Idem, ibid.

(3) Iſocrates, *in Panegyr.* pag. 96. See the article AGESILAUS II, citation (38).

(4) Ver. 19 and 28.

(5) *Diſcours d'Ariſtarque à Nicandre, ſur les fautes de Phyllarque*, p. 120, 121.

(6) This word is made uſe of, becauſe the perſon here taken to taſk was *Javerſac*, againſt whom a Satyr had been publiſhed, intitled *La Défaite du Paladin Javerſac*. See his Article.

(7) *Achates à Palemon, pour la Defenſe de Phyllarque*, pag. 43.

(8) In the year 1628.

OF the Title of King of Kings.

(9) Plutarch. *in Pompeio*, pag. 639. D.

(10) Dio, lib. 55. *ad annum* 748. p. 636.

(11) Sueton. *in Caligulâ*. cap. 5.

(12) Cicero, Ep. 14. lib. 9. *ad Familiar*. p. 31. Livius, lib. 45. cap. 27.

(13) Diodor. Siculus, lib. 1. cap. 47.

(14) Idem, ibid. cap. 55.

(15) Strabo, lib. 15. pag. 502.

(16) Plutarchus, *in Lucullo*, pag. 500, C.

(17) See the *Prophecy of Ezekiel*, chap. xxvi. ver. 7.

with ſo much good fortune and courage, that at the end of three years he put an end to the Monarchy of the Parthians.

(18) Ammian. Marcellin. lib. 17. cap. 5. pag. 163. *ad ann.* 557. Biſſelius, *Ruinarum illuſtr.* Dec. 4. pag. 445, ſays falſly that Capitolinus has ſpoken of this Letter.

nued to call themſelves Kings of Kings. See Sapore's Letter to Conſtantius in Ammianus Marcellinus (18), and the Notes of Henry Valeſius upon that place. See alſo Trebellius Pollio, in the Life of Aurelian, and the Notes of the Commentators. Some Authors will have it that the Emperors of Conſtantinople redoubled his title: *They bore on their arms four B, which we call fuſils, and mean* Βασιλὶυς Βασιλέων Βασιλεύων Βασίλευσι, that is, "King of Kings reigning "over Kings (19.)" I ſhall mention by the way that it was thro' pride, that they left the name of King to a tributary Prince.

(19) Bodin, *de la Republique*, liv. 1. chap. 9. *vers la fin*, pag. 211.

ARTABAZUS, ſon of Pharnaces, commanded the Parthians and the Choraſmians in the expedition of Xerxes (*a*). It was he, who, after the battle of Salamis, eſcorted the King his Maſter to the Helleſpont, with ſixty thouſand choſen men (*b*). As ſoon as Xerxes had repaſſed into Aſia, Artabazus followed him, and he thought himſelf obliged in his way, to puniſh the city of Potidæa, which had ſhaken off the yoke of the Perſians upon the news of their bad fortune. He beſieged it a long time without being able to take it, on account of the inundations cauſed by tempeſts. He had better ſucceſs at the ſiege of Olynthus. He diſapproved the reſolution that was taken of leaving Mardonius in Europe (*c*), and it was alſo againſt his advice, that Mardonius was engaged in the battle of Platææ, which was ſo fatal to the Perſians. Artabazus, who had foreſeen what would happen, preſerved the forty thouſand men that he commanded, and carried them back into Aſia with much prudence [*A*]. Moreri ſhews no diſcernment upon that point. See the remark.

(a) Herodot. lib. 7. cap. 66.

(b) Idem, lib. 8. cap. 126.

(c) Idem, lib. 9. cap. 65, 88.

[*A*] *He preſerved the forty thouſand men that he commanded, and carried them back into Aſia with much prudence.*] Moreri relates, that Artabazus collected the remains of his army. This is not underſtanding the Author he quotes. Herodotus gives us plainly to underſtand, that Artabazus kept theſe forty thouſand men with him as *a Corps de Reſerve*; and when he had a mind to bring them out to battle, he perceived the defeat of Mardonius, and took his flight another way. If Mardonius had ſurvived the loſs of this battle, he would not have failed to ſay in his Manifeſto, that Artabazus had ſacrificed him; that Artabazus had been nothing but a mere ſpectator of the battle, or elſe a run-away; that Artabazus, who had been againſt hazarding this battle, had contributed as much as he could to the loſs of it, to raiſe a trophy to his own prudence. Artabazus would not have been the only one who maintained by ſuch ſort of proofs his opinion in the Council of War. It is a ſtrange blunder in Moreri to ſay, that the Greeks loſt this battle. And this ſiege of Potidæa, naked and empty as it is of all kind of circumſtances, what does it ſignify? what will a reader be the better for it?

ARTAVASDES I, King of Armenia, ſon and ſucceſſor of that Tigranes, who was conquered by Lucullus and Pompey during the war of Mithridates, villanouſly deceived the Romans in the expedition of Craſſus (*a*); for after having gone to meet this General with ſix thouſand horſes, and promiſed him a ſupply of forty thouſand men, he did not keep his word, and excuſed himſelf becauſe of the war he had to maintain in his own country againſt the Parthians (*b*). Craſſus finding himſelf deceived, made uſe of great threats (*c*); but he was not in a condition to puniſh this perfidiouſneſs: on the contrary, Artavaſdes had a good ſhare in the rejoicings, which were made at the court of the King of the Parthians for the ruin of the Roman Army. He had concluded the marriage of his ſiſter with Pacorus ſon of Orodes King of the Parthians (*d*); and he was at the court of Orodes, during the exceſs of joy that ſuch a great victory cauſed there. He ſaw a thouſand diverſions filled with inſults on the Romans: he was at the feaſts and plays, and he heard ſome verſes of Euripides applied to the diſaſter of Craſſus, whoſe head was brought whilſt they repreſented the *Bacchantes* of that Poet. This was the reaſon of Plutarch's ſaying that Orodes underſtood Greek, and that Artavaſdes has compoſed Tragedies, Orations and Hiſtories [*A*], part of which were then remaining. I think I need not diſtinguiſh this Artavaſdes, from him who deceived Mark Anthony [*B*]. He perſuaded him to turn his arms againſt the King of the

(a) Dio, lib. 40.

(b) Plutarch. *in Craſſo*, pag. 554.

(c) Idem, ibid. pag. 556.

(d) Idem, ibid. pag. 564. Cicero, *Epiſt. ad Famil.* 3. lib. 15.

[*A*] *Artavaſdes compoſed* Tragedies, Orations *and* Hiſtories.] Here is a Greek Poet and Hiſtorian, who as a Poet, was forgotten by Voſſius, but not as a Hiſtorian (1), tho' Mallincrot places him in his Collection of Hiſtorians, who had eſcaped former inquiries. Mallincrot obſerves, that Appian has quoted the Hiſtory of our Artavaſdes; but that he has altered the Author's name a little. He adds, that this Prince is the firſt of his name, who reigned in Armenia (2). This might be true, even tho' the conjecture of ſeveral Criticks upon a paſſage of Juſtin ſhould be true. They pretend it ſhould be read *Artavaſdes* and not *Ortoadiſtes*, in the ſecond chapter of the forty ſecond Book. There muſt then have been a King of Armenia named Artavaſdes, in the time of Mithridates the Great, King of the Parthians. This Mithridates was driven out, and was ſucceeded by his brother Orodes, who obtained ſo memorable a victory over the Romans. Our Artavaſdes indeed reigned at the ſame time with Orodes; but notwithſtanding this he might have begun to reign before him, and his father Tigranes might have died before the depoſing of Mithridates the Great; and ſo Artavaſdes might have been engaged in war with Mithridates. It is true, that to make Juſtin agree with Plutarch (3) and Dion Caſſius (4), it muſt be ſuppoſed that his Mithridates the Great is the Phrahates, which they make to reign in the time of Tigranes.

(1) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Græcis*, pag. 154.

(2) Mallincrot, *Paralipomenon de Hiſt. Græc.* pag. 11 and 87: he calls him with Voſſius *Artuaſdes*. Mr. Ryck upon *Tacitus*, p. 28, pretends that Plutarch calls him *Artabazes*; but it is certain that he oftner calls him Ἀρταουάσδης.

(3) Plutarch. *in Pompeio.*

(4) Dio, lib. 37.

[*B*] *I think I need not diſtinguiſh this Artavaſdes from him who deceived Mark Anthony.*] Theſe are my reaſons: he who deceived Craſſus, was the ſon of Tigranes, as Dion affirms (5). He who deceived Mark Anthony, was the ſon of Tigranes according to Joſephus (6), whoſe teſtimony might be confirmed if there were occaſion, by Strabo, who affirms, not only that he who puniſhed Mark Anthony for his perfidiouſneſs reigned after Tigranes (7); but alſo that he was his ſon (8). He therefore, who put a trick upon the Romans in the time of Craſſus, is the ſame that deceived them in the expedition of Mark Antho-

(5) Idem, lib. 40.

(6) Joſephus, lib. 15. cap. 5.

(7) Strabo, lib. 11, *ſub finem.*

(8) Idem, lib. 11. pag. 363.

the Medes (*e*); and by this means engaged him in an enterprize which had very ill ſucceſs, and wherein he did not ſecond him at all (*f*). Mark Anthony, reſerving his vengeance for a more convenient opportunity, diſſembled for the preſent; but two years after, which was in the 720th year of Rome, he uſed ſo many artifices and ſo many fine promiſes, that at laſt he drew him to have an interview with him: and then he took him priſoner and loaded him with ſilver chains [C], and led him in triumph into Alexandria. The wife and the children of Artavaſdes was alſo one of the ornaments of the triumph of Mark Anthony. They were all led to Cleopatra, in the midſt of people, laden with golden chains; but they could not obtain of them, either by promiſes or threats, to kneel down before her, or make ſupplication to her: they called her only by her name; for which reaſon they were uſed the worſe. Some time after Artavaſdes was put to death, and his head was ſent to the King of the Medes. It was Cleopatra that ſent him this preſent, when ſhe was returned to Alexandria, after the loſs of the battle of Actium (*g*). She thought this head would make the King of the Medes enter into a ſtricter alliance with Mark Anthony againſt Auguſtus. You may ſee in the following article what became of the ſons of Artavaſdes. He had a daughter married to the ſon of King Dejotarus (*h*).

(*e*) His name was Artavaſdes.
(*f*) Dio, lib. 49. Strabo, lib. 11. pag. 361, and 366. Plutarch. *in Antonio*, pag. 933.
(*g*) Dio, lib. 51. See the note [G] citation (11).
(*h*) Cicero, *ad Attic.* Epiſt. 21. lib. 5.

ny. Moreri did not underſtand it thus; he would make us own two Artavaſdes. If he had ſtopped here, we ſhould not have wondered much at his opinion, but he proceeds to what we cannot forgive. He would have one Artavaſdes to be the compoſer of *Hiſtories* and *Poems*; and the other to be he, whom Mark Anthony led in triumph into Alexandria, the 720th year of Rome. He ſays that this latter *left a ſon of the ſame name, who perhaps is he of whom Plutarch ſpeaks, who had ſo much wit* (9), *and who betrayed Craſſus*. What blindneſs is here! Craſſus was betrayed in 701: he who betrayed him was actually King of Armenia: how then could he be the ſon of a King of Armenia, who was dethroned in 720? Moreri obſerves, that this dethroned Prince *died in priſon ſome time afterwards*. This is forgetting a very eſſential circumſtance; for he was killed. Ἀνῃρέθη συνάπτοντος τοῦ Ἀκτιακοῦ πολέμου (10), i. e. "He was ſlain at the time "of the fight at Actium." Cleopatra, according to Dio, was returning to Alexandria, after the battle of Actium, when this murder was committed (11). It is added that he left a ſon named Artavaſdes. This is a miſtake: his eldeſt ſon who ſucceeded him, was called Artaxias; his other ſon's name was Tigranes. And as for this other Artavaſdes, who according to Moreri's quotation of Tacitus, ſoon loſt Armenia, which Tiberius had given him, he was not the ſon of the other, and was but the third or fourth King after him. Beſides it is falſe, that Tacitus informs us Tiberius gave him Armenia. This is what he ſays: *Dein juſſu Auguſti impoſitus Artavaſdes, & non ſine clade noſtra dejectus. Tum C. Cæſar componendæ Armeniæ deligitur. Is Ariobarzanem origine Medum ob inſignem corporis formam & præclarum animum volentibus Armeniis præfecit* (12). i. e. "After this Artavaſdes was made King, and depoſed again not "without our loſs. Then C. Cæſar was choſen to "quiet Armenia. He preferred Ariobarzanes a Mede "by nation, on account of the great beauty of his "perſon and the excellence of his mind." Laſtly, what Moreri ſays of Auguſtus having deputed a ſon of Agrippa, who was ſoon driven away, is very falſe; for the ſending of Caius Cæſar, the ſon of Agrippa, was after the ruin of the laſt Artavaſdes. Caius Cæſar was not deputed to reign in Armenia, but only to put their affairs in order: he there eſtabliſhed Ariobarzanes; and afterwards continued to viſit the Eaſt with a pomp worthy of the preſumptive heir of the whole Roman Empire. If one ſhould take pains to make miſtakes, could one make more than Moreri? would one make ſeven or eight in ſixteen lines? Mr. Hofman makes but three in this article. He ſays, I, that Artavaſdes aſſiſted Craſſus againſt the Parthians (13): II, that Tiberius gave Armenia to another Artavaſdes: III, that before this, Auguſtus had given it to Artabazes the ſon of Agrippa, who was ſoon expelled. Mr. Lloyd has ſuppreſſed this whole article, tho' it was a pretty good one in Charles Stephens.

(9) Plutarch does not ſay that he had *much*, or *ſo much wit*.
(10) Strabo, lib. 11, *ſub finem*.
(11) *See* Tacitus *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 3.
(12) Idem, ibid.
(13) Charles Stephens ſays the ſame.

[C] *Mark Anthony . . . . . loaded him with ſilver chains.*] Dion Caſſius obſerves, that ſuch chains were made uſe of for fear of diſhonouring the Regal Majeſty by chains of iron (14). Paterculus ſays that to make them honourable, they were of gold. *Catenis, ſed ne quid honori deeſſet, aureis vinxit* (15). The ſame ceremony had been uſed towards Darius (16). But what ſhall we ſay to Ryckius, who has treated as a fiction a fact advanced by Louis Dorleans to make Paterculus agree with Dion (17). The fact is that Artavaſdes was loaded with ſilver chains in priſon, and golden ones on the day of triumph. Rickius affirms, that neither of theſe two Hiſtorians has ſpoken either of the poiſon, or the triumph; and that therefore they cannot be reconciled together. It is certain however, that Dion, in the ſame page, where he has ſpoken of ſilver chains, ſpeaks of golden ones for Artavaſdes and his family on the day of the triumph. What a bad thing is a treacherous memory!

(14) Dio, lib. 49. *circa finem*.
(15) Paterculus, lib 2. cap. 82.
(16) Curtius, lib. 5. cap. 12. *Vide ibi* Freinſhemium.
(17) Ryck, *Animadv. ad* Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 3. p. 28, 29.

ARTAVASDES II was eſtabliſhed King of Armenia by Auguſtus. He had been preceded after the death of Artavaſdes I, by Artaxias, by Tigranes, and by the children of Tigranes. Artaxias, eldeſt ſon of Artavaſdes I, made his eſcape, when his Father was put in chains (*a*): but not till he had tried to ſupport himſelf with his troops and by the aſſiſtance of theſe cities, which declared him King, when his Father was taken (*b*). He had the misfortune to be defeated by Mark Anthony; and then he took refuge among the Parthians, and he had ſuch ſucceſs by their aſſiſtance, that at laſt he became King of Armenia (*c*): but upon the complaints of his ſubjects, and upon the deſire they had for Tigranes his brother, who was educated at Rome, Auguſtus gave orders to Tiberius to drive out Artaxias, and confer the Kingdom on Tigranes (*d*). Artaxias was killed by his ſubjects before the arrival of Tiberius [A]: ſo it was not difficult to make Tigranes King (*e*). This happened in the 734th year of Rome. Neither Tigranes

(*a*) Joſeph. *Antiq.* lib. 15. cap. 5.
(*b*) Dio, lib. 49.
(*c*) *Arſacidarum vi ſeque regnumque tutatus eſt.* Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 3.
(*d*) Dio, lib. 54.
(*e*) Idem, ibid.

[A] *Artaxias was killed . . . . before the arrival of Tiberius.*] Dion, who informs us of this circumſtance, is miſtaken about the names; for he calls him *Artabazes* whom he ſhould have called *Artaxias* (1). Tacitus imputes the death of Artaxias only to the treachery of his relations, *occiſo Artaxiâ per dolum propinquorum* (2); but Horace aſcribes it to the valour of Tiberius,

——— *Claudi virtute Neronis*
Armenius cecidit (3).

"By Claudius Nero's courage
"Th' Armenian fell."

We muſt not be ſurprized at this: the Poets know too

(1) *See* Lipſius upon the *Annals* of Tacitus, lib. 2. cap. 3.
(2) Tacitus, ibid.
(3) Horat. Epiſt. 12. ver. 26. lib. 1.

(f) *Nec Tigrani diuturnum imperium fuit, nec liberis ejus.* Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 3.

Tigranes nor his ſons enjoyed this Kingdom long (*f*): They gave place to Artavaſdes II [*B*], who kept this poſt but a very little time (*g*). Auguſtus, who had given it him, being informed of the confuſions of Armenia, ſent thither Caius Cæſar his grandſon, to reduce it to order. This young Prince eſtabliſhed Ariobarzanes there for King, to the ſatisfaction of every body.

(g) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 3.

too well how to give a good turn to events; every thing is converted into a ſubject of praiſe in their hands; they find flowers every where to make crowns for Princes. Joſephus ſays only that Artaxias was driven out by Archelaus and Tiberius (4). Suetonius, without ſaying a word of Artaxias, contents himſelf with obſerving that Tiberius ſet Tigranes upon the throne. *Ducto ad Orientem exercitu regnum Armeniæ Tigrani reſtituit, ac pro Tribunali diadema impoſuit* (5); that is, "Having led his army to the Eaſt, he reſtor-"ed the Kingdom of Armenia to Tigranes, and "placed a crown on his head as a ſign of his autho-"rity." The word *reſtore* ſeems to have been uſed improperly in this place; for Tigranes, who was the younger brother of Artaxias, had never poſſeſſed Armenia, and had no right to do ſo during the life of his elder brother. Scaliger juſtly obſerved that Euſebius ought not to have made uſe of a word, which ſignifies that Armenia was ſubdued by Tiberius (6), ſince the Armenians deſired no better than to have Tigranes for their King, whom he brought with him. But whilſt he ſo juſtly corrects this miſtake or impropriety of Euſebius (7), he would have done well to avoid the *reſtituit* of Suetonius, and not to have given Artaxias the title of Uſurper (8). There is another impropriety or falſhood in Euſebius, and in his tranſlator St. Jerom, which has not been corrected by Scaliger. They aſſure us that Tiberius ſeized Armenia, *παρεσήσατο, occupavit Armeniam*; whereas he only gave the Armenians the King, whom they deſired. It is certain beſides that he ſet him on the throne, put the crown on his head, and that he would have aſſiſted him with force, if there had been occaſion; whence comes it then that Scaliger ſays Armenia was reſtored to Tigranes without the interpoſition of Tiberius? What does he mean by maintaining that St. Jerom having affirmed that Tiberius ſeized Armenia, *occupavit*, muſt have believed that it belonged already to the Romans? I confeſs I underſtand nothing of this conſtruction. But why did not he fall upon Paterculus, as well as upon theſe two fathers of the Church? Paterculus, a Hiſtorian, that flatters Tiberius as much as any Poet, and praiſes him for having reduced Armenia under the power of the Romans. *Redacta Armenia in poteſtatem populi Romani, regnum ejus Artavaſdi tradidit* (9). This is not his only fault: he has given the name of Artavaſdes to him, whom Tiberius crowned King of Armenia; whereas he ſhould have called him Tigranes.

(4) Joſeph. *Antiquitat.* lib. 15. cap. 5.

(5) Sueton. *in Tiberio*, cap. 9.

(6) Παρεσήσατο, *armis ſubjugavit, recepit, ad deditionem compulit.*

(7) Scalig. *in Euſeb.* pag. 170.

(8) He falſly calls him *Artabazes*, after Dion. *Fratre ejus Artabaze*, ſays he, *regni inſeſſore ab Armeniis occiſo.*

(9) Paterc. lib. 2. cap. 94.

[*B*] *Tigranes and his ſons .... gave place to Artavaſdes II.*] The Authors of the Supplement to Moreri have been no leſs faulty than Moreri himſelf. I paſs over their ſaying that our Artavaſdes was the ſon of Artaxias, and conſequently the nephew of Tigranes: there is nothing ſaid of that in the ſecond Book of the Annals of Tacitus, the only Author that they have quoted. But let that paſs. They add that the ſons of Tigranes *were called Kings by Tiberius*, and that *Artavaſdes II their couſin ſucceeded immediately to the crown by order of the ſame Emperor*. Tacitus, their only witneſs, confounds them; for he ſays expreſly, that all this was done by Auguſtus. He does not ſay with them, that the Romans made war upon this Artavaſdes, and at laſt deſtroyed him: his words are, *non ſine clade noſtra dejectus*, which may ſignify the contrary to what they ſay, namely, that they drove him out in ſpite of the Romans who ſupported him, and by the defeat of their ſuccours. See the Article of ARTAVASDES King of Media. Laſtly they ſay that Tigranes, uncle to our Artavaſdes, *had his head cut off at Rome, under the Emperor Tiberius*. This is an abſurdity; for the inſtallation of Tigranes, uncle, as they pretend, to Artavaſdes II, was in the 734th year of Rome, and his reign was very ſhort. The puniſhment of Tigranes, under Tiberius, happened in 789. Thus, according to theſe Writers, this dethroned Prince muſt have ſurvived his fall above fifty years, and have arrived to an old age, that the Hiſtorian would not have omitted, in ſpeaking of the indignity of his death. Obſerve that Tigranes, created King of Armenia in 734, had been made priſoner with his father by Mark Anthony in 720, and that he was then pretty well grown up (10). Obſerve alſo, that ſoon after his coronation, he married his children together (11), according to the cuſtom of thoſe Nations. But further. He whom Tiberius put to death, was a grandſon of Herod. Joſephus tells us that Alexander the ſon of Herod had by Glaphyra his wife, daughter of Archelaus King of Cappadocia, two ſons, of which one called Tigranes reigned in Armenia, and was accuſed before the Romans (12). This without doubt is he of whom Tacitus ſpeaks after the following manner: *Ne Tigranes quidem Armeniâ quondam potitus, ac tunc reus, nomine regio ſupplicia civium effugit* (13); that is, "Not even "Tigranes, who formerly poſſeſſed Armenia, and "was a criminal, could by means of his royal "title eſcape the puniſhment of the Citizens." Mr. de Tillemont's conjecture, that this Tigranes was King of the leſſer Armenia, which has been given by Auguſtus to Archelaus (14), would be a good one, if it could be made to agree with Joſephus, who ſays that the deſcendants of Alexander ſon of Herod and Glaphyra reigned in the greater Armenia. Ἡ δὲ Ἀλεξάνδρε γενεὰ τῆς μεγάλης Ἀρμενίας ἐβασίλευσε (15).

(10) *See* Joſephus, lib. 15. cap. 5.

(11) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 3.

(12) Joſeph. lib. 18. cap. 7.

(13) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 6. cap. 40.

(14) *Hiſt. des Emper.* tome 1. not. 11. *ſur Tibere.*

(15) Joſeph. *de Bello Jud.* lib. 2. cap. 19.

FAULTS of the Supplement to Moreri.

ARTAVASDES, King of Media, was attacked by Mark Anthony, at the ſollicitation of another Artavaſdes King of Armenia. This attempt was very fatal to Mark Anthony; who imagining, that the King, who had engaged him in it, had betrayed him, turned all his indignation upon him, and made an alliance with the King of Media. He gave him part of Armenia, when he had taken it from the other Artavaſdes; and he reſolved to cement that peace by the marriage of his ſon Alexander with Jotape the King of Media's daughter. The troops which he ſupplied him with, rendered him victorious over the Parthians, and over Artaxias the ſon of Artavaſdes King of Media; but when he had recalled them, and detained thoſe which his ally had lent him, the latter could not ſupport himſelf againſt his enemies, but was taken priſoner. Dion Caſſius relates this under the year 721 of Rome (*a*). It is probable that this Prince did not long continue priſoner, and that he was that King of Media, to whom Cleopatra ſent the head of Artavaſdes King of Armenia in the year 724 of Rome (*b*). The Supplement to Moreri is full of errors in this Article [*A*].

(a) Dion, lib. 49.

(b) Idem, lib. 51.

[*A*] *The ſupplement to Moreri is full of Errors in this Article.*] We are told there, I, that this *Artavaſdes King of the Medes, ſon and ſucceſſor of Darius, maintained vigorouſly the war againſt Artavaſdes King of Armenia and againſt Pompey:* II, *that he was at laſt defeated by the Parthians, and fled to Rome to Auguſtus, who gave him the leſſer Armenia inſtead of Media, which he had loſt.* Plutarch and Dion Caſſius L. XLIX. are quoted for this purpoſe. But to confute this in a retrograde way; is it not trifling with the world to quote Plutarch ſimply? Does not this ſhew an inclination to commit errors with impunity?

ARTAXATA

ARTAXATA [*A*], was the capital city of Armenia upon the river Araxes. Hannibal was the perſon who not only formed the plan of it, but likewiſe directed the building of it at the requeſt of Artaxias King of Armenia, to whoſe court he retired after the defeat of Antiochus (*a*). It is probable that a ſituation which was choſen by ſo great a General, was very advantageous [*B*], as well in time of war as in that of peace. This city was burnt by Corbulo in the year 811 of Rome (*b*). This great General would not have uſed ſo much rigour againſt the inhabitants, who had brought him the keys of their city when he had laid ſiege to it, if the laws of war had not in a manner obliged him to it [*C*]. It was a large city, which he could not keep without a ſtrong garriſon; and it was not poſſible for him to leave in it ſo many ſoldiers as were neceſſary, without weakening his army in ſuch a manner, as would render him incapable of undertaking any further enterpriſe; and there would have been neither profit nor glory in the conqueſt of a place which he muſt have left juſt as he had taken it. He reſolved therefore to deſtroy it, and he was encouraged in that reſolution by a great miracle [*D*], *ſi credere dignum eſt*, if we think it worth our while to credit it. The city was covered all of a ſudden with a thick cloud, from whence proceeded a prodigious many flaſhes of lightning,

(*a*) Plutarch. *in Lucullo*, p. 513. Strabo, lib. 11. pag. 364. See the article of ARTAXIAS I, quotation (*c*).

(*b*) That is in the year 59 of Chriſt.

impunity? For who would not rather chuſe to refrain from criticizing, than to read two large Volumes in folio, in order to verify an inconſiderable fact? It is certain, that Dion Caſſius in the XLIXth Book, does not at all mention, that this Artavaſdes took refuge at Rome, or that Auguſtus gave him the leſſer Armenia. I know of no Author, who aſſerts this. I find indeed in Tacitus, that Auguſtus gave the Kingdom of Armenia to one Artavaſdes, after the ſon of Tigranes; but not that he did it in order to make him ſatisfaction for the loſs of Media. It is probable, that thoſe, who compiled the third Volume of Moreri, made uſe of this paſſage of Tacitus for two purpoſes; on one hand, to aſſert that Tiberius gave Armenia to one Artavaſdes, the ſon of Artaxias, and nephew of Tigranes (1); and on the other hand, to tell us, that Auguſtus gave that Kingdom to one Artavaſdes, who had been deprived of that of Media. In ſhort, what a negligence is it, to aſſert, that he made a vigorous ſtand againſt the King of Armenia, and againſt Pompey? This war againſt the King of Armenia, who had no occaſion to be repelled with vigour, if we conſider the treachery of that Prince towards Mark Anthony, was later by about thirty years than that, which Pompey carried on in that country. I have not obſerved either in Plutarch or Appian any Artavaſdes King of Media, who was attacked by Pompey. I have only found in Appian, that Pompey ſubdued Darius King of the Medes (2).

(1) See the remark [*B*] of the article ARTAVASDES II.

(2) Appian. *in Mithridat.*

[*A*] ARTAXATA.] Plutarch obſerves, that this city took its name from that of King Artaxas (or Artaxias), to whom Hannibal propoſed the building of it (1). What Lloyd and Baudrand remark, that Tacitus calls it *Artaxia*, is not true; for he conſtantly calls it *Artaxata*. And with regard to what they add, that Strabo gives it the name of *Artaxiaſata* (2), it is not exact; for this plainly inſinuates, that he calls it only by that name, or at leaſt that it is the principal one, that he gives it. Now it is certain that he generally calls it *Artaxata*, and that he only ſays once, that it had likewiſe the Name of *Artaxiaſata*. Pinedo had reaſon to change Ἀρταξιατώτα into Ἀρταξιασάτα in the Stephanus Byzantinus, who undoubtedly did not write it in a different manner from Strabo, ſince he quotes him. It is certain at leaſt, that he did not call this city *Artaxia*, as Ortelius falſly charges him, as well as Tacitus. The omiſſion which Pinedo reproaches Stephanus with, is inexcuſable; for Hannibal's flying into Armenia, and obſerving a very advantageous ſituation for a city, which he adviſed the Prince who entertained him, to build there, and his undertaking the direction of that affair, are circumſtances, which ought not to have been ſuppreſſed in a Dictionary of cities. I am inclined to think, that Stephanus having Strabo before him, when he wrote the article of Artaxata, did not omit to take notice of what he read there concerning Hannibal; and that it was his Abbreviator, who was inferior to him in judgment, to whom we ought to impute the neglect which Pinedo juſtly complains of. There is no work perhaps, which requires more ſagacity and judgment than the abridgment of a large Book (3). I am never tired with repeating this remark, ſince I ſuffer every day a great deal from the careleſsneſs of the authors of abridgments. They are the occaſion, that I find perplexing obſcurities in an hundred places, which were probably very intelligible in the author who is abridged. See Mr. Gronovius's remark againſt the Authors of the *Synopſis Criticorum* (4).

(1) Plutarch. *in Lucullo*, p. 513.

(2) It is probably an error of the preſs, that we read *Arraxiaſata* in Mr. Baudrand.

(3) See above the end of the note [*C*] of the article ACHILLES, and of the note [*C*] N° 7 of the article ARSINOE.

(4) Gronov. *in Tractatu de Juda Proditore.* See the *Nouvelles de la Republiq. des Lettres*, May 1684. Art. 6. pag. 276.

[*B*] *Its ſituation was very advantageous.*] Strabo tells us, that Artaxata was built in a place, where the river formed a Peninſula, ſo that the walls were ſurrounded by the River, almoſt like an intire circle. The Tranſlator of that Author did not underſtand this paſſage, and Pinedo has juſtly reproached him with it (5). If we were only to conſult the Tranſlation, we ſhould imagine that this city had no walls, except where the river did not ſurround it. *Cincta muri loco flumine, niſi quà iſthmus eſt.* The Greek ſays nothing of that kind: τὸ τεῖχος κύκλῳ περιελιττόμενον τὸν ποταμὸν πλὴν τῷ ἰσθμοῦ.

(5) Pinedo *in Stephan. de Urbib.* pag. 117.

[*C*] *It was burnt by Corbulo - - - whom the laws of war in a manner forc'd to it.*] The more we conſider the inevitable conſequences of war, the more we ſhall find ourſelves inclined to deteſt thoſe, who are the occaſion of it. Here is Corbulo, who reduces to aſhes a large and beautiful city, and who involves in the moſt dreadful Deſolation an infinite number of women, children, and aged people, who had never done him any injury. Aſk thoſe, who are more converſant in military affairs, whether he acted well, they will anſwer you in the affirmative; and that if he had not done ſo, he would have acted like a very unſkilful General, as it would be eaſy to ſhew by the reaſons mentioned by Tacitus. *Artaxatis ignis immiſſus deletaque & ſolo æquata ſunt, quia nec teneri ſine valido præſidio ob magnitudinem mœnium, nec id nobis virium erat, quod firmando præſidio & capeſſendo bello divideretur, vel ſi integra & incuſtodita relinqueretur nulla in eo utilitas aut gloria, quod capta eſſent* (6). i. e. "Artaxata was ſet fire to, and levelled "with the ground, becauſe it could not be kept with- "out a ſtrong Garriſon on account of the extent of "the walls, and becauſe we had not forces enough "to ſupply that Garriſon and carry on the war; "and if it had been left entire and without a Gar- "riſon, there would have been no advantage or glory "in taking of that city." The reproaches which are caſt upon an enemy, when he abandons his conqueſts without depriving them of all power to injure him, or when he does not ſecure them by weakening his army too much, render him ſo contemptible, that in order to preſerve his reputation, which is one of the moſt conſiderable reſources of war, he is obliged never to give occaſion to ſuch reproaches. It is therefore a fatal and melancholy neceſſity, that the ſevere laws of war ſhould force a General to deprive his enemy of that, which he cannot make any advantage of himſelf.

(6) Tacit. *Ann.* lib. 13. cap. 41.

[*D*] *He was encouraged in that reſolution by a great miracle.*] Tacitus himſelf with all his great genius gave up himſelf as readily as any other man to the *Marvellous*, which people love to indulge themſelves in the ſearch and belief of. The inhabitants of Artaxata endeavoured to comfort themſelves upon the ruin of their city among other reaſons by ſome miracle, which aſſured them, that the Gods had not been pleaſed with it; and they eaſily believed whatever was invented with that view. But they have had no Hiſtorian, who has informed us, what they believed

ning, while the Sun continued to ſhine round the walls of it. This city was rebuilt ſome time after by Tiridates, who called it *Neronea* in honour of Nero (*c*), who had ſhewn him a great many civilities at Rome, when he went thither to do him homage in the year of Rome 819.

(*c*) Xiphil. *in Nerone.*

believed in this point. The Romans on the other hand did not want perſons, who turned the tables in favour of them. We are obliged to Tacitus for this account. *Adjicitur miraculum velut numine oblatum, nam cuncta extra tectis hactenus ſole inluſtria fuere, quod mœnibus cingebatur ita repente atrâ nube coopertum, fulguribuſque diſcretum eſt, ut quaſi infenſantibus Deis exitio tradi crederetur* (7). i. e. "To this was added a miracle, which was thought to have been ſhewed by the Deity; for all parts without the city were ſtill enlightened by the Sun, while all within the walls was of a ſudden covered with a black cloud, the lightning flaſhing out perpetually; ſo that the city ſeemed to be delivered up to deſtruction by the Gods themſelves, who were angry with it."

(7) Idem, ibid.

ARTAXIAS I, King of Armenia, while he was only one of Antiochus the Great's Generals, ſeized Armenia, and divided it with another of the Generals of that King [*A*]. This Prince gave both of them leave to enjoy a ſovereign command there (*a*). They did not fail of taking the advantage of this complaiſance of his; and when he was defeated by the Roman armies, they ſubmitted to the conquerors, who gave them the title of King (*b*); after which they enlarged their own dominions as much as poſſible at the expence of the adjacent countries. Tigranes, who was ſo famous during the wars of Mithridates, whoſe daughter he had married, was deſcended from Artaxias. Plutarch tells us, that Hannibal having retired to the court of Artaxias after the defeat of Antiochus, gave him a great deal of excellent counſel; and that having found a place which was neglected, though very proper to build a city in, he drew a plan of one, and carried Artaxias to the place, and adviſed him to build it. Artaxias was extremely pleaſed with the propoſal, and deſired Hannibal to undertake the care of this work, which the latter conſented to; and from hence aroſe that great and beautiful city, which was called from him Artaxata (*c*). This is all that I can find in the two authors quoted in the Supplement to Moreri's Dictionary (*d*); for with regard to Artaxias's revolt againſt his lawful Prince, occaſioned by the confidence which he had in the friendſhip of the Romans (*e*), I ſee not the leaſt ſhadow or trace of it, any more than of his employing all poſſible means to ſupport himſelf in his uſurpation, nor of his death in priſon under Antiochus Epiphanes. Theſe are mere chimeras without the leaſt authority to ſupport them.

(*a*) Strabo, lib. 11. pag. 366. See likewiſe pag. 364.

(*b*) Plutarch *and* Strabo, p. 364, *and* Stephanus *in* Ἀρταξάτα give this title to Artaxias.

(*c*) Plutarch. *in Lucullo*, p. 513. He calls it Ἀρταξίας. *See likewiſe* Strabo, pag. 364.

(*d*) Plutarch. *in Lucullo.* Strabo, lib. 11.

(*e*) Strabo ſays expreſly, ἦρχον ὅντος τοῦ Βασιλέως ἐπιτρέψαντος; i. e. "they commanded by the "King's permiſſion.

[*A*] *Seized Armenia, and divided it with another of the Generals of that King.*] In the Editions of Strabo he is called Θαριάδης in one place (1); and Ζαριάδρις or Ζαδριάδις in another (2). It was eaſy for thoſe who had the care of theſe Editions, to have given the ſame word every where; and I am ſurprized, that Caſaubon did not make a note upon it; as he has done upon ſome of leſs importance.

(1) Pag. 364. edit. ann. 1587.
(2) Pag. 366.

ARTAXIAS II, King of Media, the eldeſt ſon of Artavaſdes, as we have already obſerved (*a*), was proclaimed King by the army of his father [*A*], after the latter was taken priſoner with his wife and his other children (*b*). The eldeſt endeavoured to ſupport himſelf againſt Mark Anthony, and gave him battle; but he was defeated, and obliged to fly into the country of the Parthians. He returned afterwards to Armenia, and reigned there. This was undoubtedly after the taking of Artavaſdes King of Media; for before the Parthians had taken this King (*c*), they had been defeated, and Artaxias had a ſhare in this diſgrace. He diſpleaſed his ſubjects in ſuch a manner, that they accuſed him at Rome, and deſired Tigranes his younger brother for King (*d*). Auguſtus, who had this Tigranes with him at court, ſent him to them, and gave orders to Tiberius to crown him. Artaxias was killed by his own relations before the arrival of Tiberius.

(*a*) In the article of ARTAVASDES II.
(*b*) Dio, lib. 49.

(*c*) Idem, ibid. *ſub finem.*

(*d*) Dio, lib. 54. Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 3. See the note [*B*] of the article ARTAVASDES II.

[*A*] *He was proclaimed King by the troops of his father.*] The Continuators of Moreri repreſent Joſephus or Tacitus as ſaying, that it was Mark Anthony, who placed Artaxias upon the throne. But there is nothing more falſe than this. They add, that Artaxias having been defeated was ſent into exile among the Parthians. This is another miſtake: for he fled thither for refuge. If Mark Anthony had been in a condition to baniſh him after his victory, he would not have baniſhed him among the Parthians, but have carried him to Alexandria in Chains.

ARTAXIAS III, King of Armenia, was the ſon of Polemo King of Pontus, and was named Zeno. He was ſo highly fond from his infancy of imitating the cuſtoms of the Armenians, that he gained by that means the eſteem of that nation, for which reaſon Germanicus thought that he ought not to chooſe any other perſon to fill up the place of Vonones, whom the Armenians had baniſhed. He went therefore to Artaxata, and in the preſence of all the people gave the diadem to this Zeno in the year of Rome 771. The Aſſembly immediately proclaimed him by the name of Artaxias, after that of the capital city. Tacitus, who informs us of all theſe particulars (*a*), ſpeaks of his death under the year 788 (*b*).

(*a*) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 2. cap. 56.

(*b*) Idem, ibid. lib. 6. cap. 31.

ARTEMIDORUS, the Author of the Treatiſe of *Dreams*, was of Epheſus; though he took upon him the ſurname of *Daldianus* in that book, to do honour to his mother's country [*A*]. He gave himſelf the ſurname of the *Epheſian* in his other books. He lived under

[*A*] *He took upon him the ſurname of Daldianus in that Book, to do honour to his mother's country* (1).] "Epheſus, *ſays he*, of which city I have declared "myſelf to be a native, in the titles of many of "my Books, is ſufficiently illuſtrious of itſelf, and "by the commendations, which have been given it "by

(1) Daldia, a little town in Lydia.

under the Emperor Antoninus Pius, as he informs us himſelf, when he tells us, that he knew an Athlete, who having dreamt that he had loſt his ſight, carried the prize of the courſe in the games, which that Emperor ordered to be celebrated (*a*). Never any Author laboured more upon a ſubject founded upon reaſon, than Artemidorus did upon a ſubject very unworthy of a man of ſenſe [*B*]. He was not ſatisfied with buying all that had been written concerning the explication of dreams, which amounted to many volumes [*C*], but he ſpent likewiſe many years in travelling, in order to contract

(*a*) Artemid. lib. 1. cap. 28. *See likewiſe* cap. 66. of the ſame book.

" by a great many perſons of the moſt unexception-
" able character. But the little town of Daldia
" has continued till now in obſcurity, for want of
" ſuch Panegyriſts. Since therefore it is my country
" on my mother's ſide, I am willing to pay my ac-
" knowledgments to it in this manner." I ſhould have more ſuſpected this of vanity, if I had perceived any affectation or art in it; but the ſimplicity, with which this Author expreſſes himſelf, inclines me to think, that he ſpoke according to the cuſtom of thoſe times, without annexing the ſame ideas to his words, as we do now. Τὴν δὲ ἐπιγραφὴν μὴ θαυμάσῃς διότι Ἀρτεμιδώρῳ Δαλδιανῷ καὶ οὐχὶ Ἐφεσίῳ ἐπιγέγραπται. ὥσπερ πολλὰ τῶν ἤδη εἰς ἄλλας πραγματείας πεποιημένων μοι βιβλίων. Τὴν μὲν γὰρ Ἔφεσον συμπεπόλιται καὶ αὐτὴν δὲ εἶναι τὴν περιώνυμον εἶναι καὶ πολλῶν ἀξιολόγων κηρύκων τετυχηκέναι. Δαλδία δὲ, πόλισμα Λυδίας καὶ ἀσφόδελος ἐλλόγιμον. διὰ τὸ μὴ τοιούτων ἀνδρῶν τετυχηκέναι, ἄγνωστον τὸ μέχρι εἰς ἐμὲ μεμένηκε· διὸ θρεπτήρια ὄντι μοι πατρίδι πρὸς μητρὸς ταῦτα ἀποδίδωμι αὐτῇ (2). *At vero de inſcriptione ne mireris, quapropter Artemidori Daldiani & non Epheſii inſcriptum legis, quemadmodum multos jam alios libros diverſis argumentis à me conſcriptos habere vidiſti. Etenim Epheſum contigit ipſam per ſeipſam celebrem eſſe, inſuperque multos præclaros & fide dignos præcones nanciſci. Daldia autem Libyæ oppidulum non valdè clarum, propterea quod ejuſmodi viros non eſt nactum, uſque ad me penitus ignobile permanſit. Quapropter ipſi quod mihi à matre patria exiſtit, hæc in nutritiorum vicem rependo.* We ought to fix upon this reaſon, and not to ſeek others, as Rigaltius has done; one of which is taken from Apollo's having inſpired Artemidorus in the city of Daldia with a deſign of interpreting dreams; another is taken from this, that as there was another Artemidorus of Epheſus, the Interpreter of dreams was obliged not to aſſume the ſurname of the Epheſian, ſince that was already poſſeſſed by another (3). This latter reaſon, which is much leſs pertinent than the former, has notwithſtanding been adopted by a perſon of great merit (4). Artemidorus confutes it himſelf beyond contradiction, ſince he declares that he had ſtiled himſelf the Epheſian in a great many of his books. He had no deſign therefore to prevent his being confounded with Artemidorus the Geographer. He was undoubtedly much better known by the title of the Epheſian than by that of the Daldian (5).

(2) Artem. lib. 3. *ſub finem.* pag. 193.

(3) Rigalt. *Not. in Artemidor.* pag. 1.

(4) Mr. de Tillemont, tom. 2. of his *Hiſt. des Emper.* Part 2. pag. 731. edit. de Bruxelles.

(5) Lucian in his *Philopatr.* quotes Ἀρτεμίδωρον τὸν Ἐφέσιον; i. e. " Artemidorus " the Epheſian.

[*B*] *Artemidorus laboured upon a ſubject very unworthy of a man of ſenſe.*] If a man was not convinced by his own experience, that there is nothing more confuſed, generally ſpeaking (6), than the ideas, which are called dreams, yet he has nothing to do but to conſider the rules of this Author, and he will neceſſarily be perſuaded that his art deſerves no regard from a man of ſenſe. There is not one dream, which Artemidorus has explained in a particular manner, but what will admit of a very different explication, and that with the ſame probability, and with equal Analogy at leaſt, as thoſe, upon which our Author proceeds. I ſay nothing of the injury, which is done to thoſe intelligent Beings, to whoſe direction we muſt neceſſarily aſcribe our dreams, if we would find in them any preſage of future Events. What a ſtrange manner of acting is imputed to them! How unworthy of their ſuperior underſtanding, their gravity, and in ſhort of their real character. If they cannot inſtruct us in a better way, how great is their ignorance! If they are unwilling to do it, their want of benevolence is equally remarkable (7). Have not we a right to complain a thouſand times of our good Angel, as well as of our bad one, in theſe words of Æneas;

(6) We do not pretend to ſay any thing againſt the extraordinary dreams mentioned in Scripture.

(7) Compare this with the reflections of Artabanus. See the note [*O*] of his Article.

Quid natum toties crudelis tu quoque falſis
Ludis imaginibus (8)?

(8) Virgil. Æn. lib. 1. ver. 407.

—— " Ah whither doſt thou fly?
" Unkind and cruel, to deceive your ſon
" In borrow'd ſhapes, and his embrace to ſhun."

That which is beyond my conception is, to obſerve that Artemidorus has laboured ſo much to perſuade himſelf of the truth of an opinion, which muſt occaſion him ſo much uneaſineſs. Might not he juſtly be fearful of dreaming what his art would ſhew him to be an ill preſage. He had found by his Reſearches, that when a traveller dreams, that he has left the key of his houſe, it is a ſign, that his daughter has been debauched (9). If Artemidorus had dreamt ſuch a dream abroad, would not he have thought, that the laſt favour had been granted at his houſe? Would it have been for his advantage to have known this? Or rather would it not have been better not to have known it? He tells us, that having dreamt that his wife had inſulted him (10), he was troubled the next day, when he ſaw a man, who was not one of his friends, come to him. We ſee how by virtue of his Oneirocriticks he turned an imaginary into a real evil.

(9) Artemid. lib. 5. pag. 255. num. 17.

(10) Δέξας ὑπὸ τῆς ἑαυτῆ γυναικὸς ἐν ὕπνοις ὑβρίζεσθαι. Cornarius tranſlates it thus, *per ſomnium viſus ſum mihi ab uxore meâ vituperiis & plagis impeti.* Artemid. lib. 2. cap. 53. p. 144.

The objection which I have urged, and which I found upon the ideas, which the Chriſtian Divines give us of the Nature of Angels, appears to me very ſtrong upon the ſuppoſition of the truth of theſe ideas. But if we follow a different ſcheme from this, and ſuch an one as is not inconſiſtent with the poſſibility of things, this objection will be conſiderably weakened. We may then ſay, that there are a great many Spirits not only more limited than men in ſome reſpects, with regard to their manner of explaining themſelves; but likewiſe more fickle and capricious. Who knows whether they may not love to divert themſelves at our expence, and to make us hunt after riddles, or mix ſomething childiſh and impertinent deſignedly, in order to procure themſelves a more ridiculous ſcene? Who knows but that we may ſerve them for ſport, as the beaſts ſerve us? Who knows whether they may not find in the motion of our animal ſpirits an obſtacle, which they cannot ſurmount, when they endeavour to render themſelves intelligible to us? See the note [*D*] of the article MAJUS. However, reaſon requires that a man ſhould not make an art of this, and that he ſhould conſider ſuch an art as the moſt chimerical and impertinent of all employments.

[*C*] *He was not ſatisfied with buying all that had been written concerning the explication of dreams; which amounted to many volumes.*] I have already declared my aſtoniſhment that there ſhould be perſons, who have endeavoured to convince themſelves of the truth of the pretended ſcience of dreams. I do not at all wonder, that ſeveral perſons, who call themſelves Fortune-tellers, ſhould boaſt of poſſeſſing this art. They might ſupport themſelves by this means, and make an advantage of the dreams of others, without troubling themſelves about their own; for they might perhaps have no belief in the art which they profeſſed. But I cannot judge thus of Artemidorus, or of many other grave Authors, who have written upon the Explication of dreams (11). They were deceived firſt themſelves. Here follow thoſe mentioned by Rigaltius (12). Artemon Mileſius, Antiphon, Apollodorus Telmiſſenſis, Apollonius Attalenſis, Ariſtander Telmiſſenſis, Ariſtarchus, Alexander Myndius, Cratippus, Demetrius Phalereus, Dionyſius Rhodius, Epicharmus, Geminus Tyrius (13), Hermippus, Nicoſtratus Epheſius, Phœbus Antiochenus, Philochorus, Panyaſis Halicarnaſſus, Serapion, Strato. Theſe were all prior to Artemidorus according to Rigaltius. Tertullian names only part of them: *Quanti autem*, ſays he (14), *commentatores & adfirmatores in hanc rem, Artemon, Antiphon, Strato, Philochorus, Epicharmus, Serapion, Cratippus, & Dionyſius Rhodius, Hermippus, tota ſæculi literatura.* Andrew Schottus mentions beſides ſome of theſe Aſtrampſychus, Caſſius Maximus,

(11) See below the paſſage from Tertullian, quotation (14).

(12) Rigalt. *Not. in Artemid.* p. 5.

(13) Andrew Schottus upon the 9th *Controverſ.* of Seneca, *and* Jonſius *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſ.* p. 329. call him *Geminus Tyrius.* In Rigaltius's edit. of Artemidor. lib. 2. cap. 49. it is Γεμινὸς τῶ Τυρίω.

(14) Tertull. *de Animâ* cap. 46. *See likewiſe* Fulgent. *Mythol.* lib. 1. cap. 13, *& ibi* Munckerum.

contract an acquaintance with fortune-tellers. He had an extenſive correſpondence with thoſe in the cities and aſſemblies of Greece, in Italy, and the moſt populous Iſlands, and he collected every where the old dreams, and the events which were ſaid to have attended them (*b*). He deſpiſed the reproaches of thoſe grave and ſupercilious perſons, who treat thoſe as ſharpers, impoſtors, and jugglers, who pretend to foretel things [*D*], and without paying any regard to what ſuch Cato's ſay, he frequented thoſe Diviners for ſeveral years. In ſhort he devoted all his time and pains to the ſearch after dreams; and he imagined, that this prodigious labour had enabled him to warrant his interpretations by reaſon and experience [*E*]. He was very careful in inſtructing his ſon in the ſame Sciences, as appears by the two books which he dedicated to him. I am the leſs ſurprized, that he ſhould ſo entirely employ himſelf in this ſubject, when I conſider that he thought himſelf determined to it by the advice, and in ſome meaſure by the command of Apollo (*c*). He deſires all his readers, in a very ſerious manner, not to retrench any thing from his book, and not to add any thing to it; and he adjures them as it were to obſerve his requeſt in the name of that all-piercing eye of Providence, which ſuperintends the Univerſe [*F*]. He dedicated his three firſt books to one Caſſius Maximus [*G*], and the two others to his ſon. They were printed in Greek at Venice in 1518. Rigaltius publiſhed them at Paris in Greek and Latin in 1603, and added ſome notes. The Latin verſion, which

(*b*) Artem. *Præfat.* pag. 3. *See likewiſe* lib. 5. pag. 252.

(*c*) Idem, *ſub finem* lib. 2. p. 161.

mus, and Dionyſius Heliopolita (15). He tells us, that Artemidorus has quoted the two laſt; but with regard to Caſſius Maximus I do not find, that Artemidorus, who dedicated the three firſt Books of his work to him, ſpeaks of him but only as a man who was curious in that ſcience (16), and who might be maſter of it in a ſhort time (17). And as for Dionyſius Heliopolita, I have not found any mention of him in Artemidorus. We may rank Pappus of Alexandria among theſe upon ſure grounds; for he wrote an Explication of Dreams, as Suidas informs us. See above the article of ACHMET. Among the moderns there is one Joſua Abrech, who promiſed very great things in the title of his Book. All that I know of him is from Vander Linden (18), and Theophilus Spizelius (19). His work was printed in the year 1607. We ſhall give an account of Junianus Majus in his proper place (20). I juſt now recollect that Lyſimachus, the ſon of Ariſtides's daughter, maintained himſelf by interpreting of dreams in the publick ſtreets: Μνημονεύει Ἀριστείδου Δυσιστρώτου ἐν μάλα πένητα Λυσίμαχον, ὃς ἑαυτὸν ἐκ πινακίου τινὸς ὀνειροκριτικοῦ παρὰ τὸ ἰακχεῖον λεγόμενον καθεζόμενος ἔτρεφε (21). i. e. "Among the grandſons of Ariſtides by his daughter, "Lyſimachus was extremely poor, who ſat near the "place called Jaccheum, and ſupported himſelf by "explaining dreams by a table." Poverty had reduced him to this. He would have done leſs diſhonour to his grandfather's memory, if inſtead of following of ſuch a method of life, he had made uſe of an awl and laſt, to mend old ſhoes.

(15) And. Schott. *in hæc verba Senecæ Controverſ.* 9. *Antiphontis Libros vocabat, tantum in illis feminarum eſt.*

(16) Artem. lib. 3. *init.* pag. 164; lib. 4. *init.* pag. 197.

(17) Idem, lib. 2. *circa finem* pag. 161.

(18) *De Script. Medic.*

(19) *Specim. Biblioth.*

(20) See his Article, and the beginning of the Note [*H*] of the article of ALEXANDER AB ALEXANDRO.

(21) Phaler. *in Socratis, apud* Plutarch. *ſub fin. Vit. Ariſtid.* pag. 335.

[*D*] *He deſpiſed the reproaches of thoſe grave and ſupercilious perſons, who treat thoſe as ſharpers, who pretend to foretell things.*] Such people are ſometimes in the wrong, and it is reaſonable to go always one's own way upon ſuch occaſions, without any regard to their cenſures. But was Artemidorus in ſuch a circumſtance? Was he much leſs blameable than thoſe, who in imitation of Catullus, unreaſonably laugh at the cenſures of theſe old Dotards?

Vivamus, mea Leſbia, atque amemus,
Rumoreſque Senum ſeveriorum
Omnes unius æſtimemus aſſis (22).

(22) Catulli *Epigr.* 5.

"Let's live and love, my Leſbia, and deſpiſe
"The peeviſh cenſures of ſevere old age."

The ſagacious reader will very eaſily judge of this; and I ſhall leave that to him, and only preſent him with the words of Artemidorus: Τετὸ δὲ καὶ σφόδρα διαβέβληται τῶν ἐν ἀγορᾷ μαντέων, ὃς δὴ προίκτας τε καὶ γόητας καὶ Βωμολόχους καλοῦσιν οἱ σεμνοπροσωποῦντες, καὶ τὰς ὀφρῦς ἀνασπακότες, καταφρονήσας τῆς διαβολῆς ἔτεσι πολλοῖς ὡμίλησα (23). i. e. "And partly ſince "all Divines have been expelled the Forum, being "ſtigmatized with the titles of beggars, impoſtors, "and buffoons by thoſe who are ſupercilious and affect a ſeeming gravity; tho' I have converſed with "the former for many years without any regard to "calumnies of this kind."

(23) Artem. *in Præfat.* pag. 3.

[*E*] *He imagined, that his prodigious labour had enabled him to warrant his interpretations by reaſon and experience.*] Let us hear his own words: Αὐτὴν πεῖραν καὶ κανόνα καὶ μάρτυρα τῶν ἐμῶν λόγων ἐπιδώσομαι. Ἐγὼ μὲν οὖν πάντων ἤδη διὰ πείρας ἐλήλυθα τῷ μηδὲν ἄλλο πράττειν ἀεὶ δὲ καὶ νυκτὸς καὶ μεθ' ἡμέραν πρὸς ὀνειροκρισίαν εἶναι (24). i. e. "I always call in "experience as the rule and witneſs of my words. "I have therefore now gained an experience in all "things; for I have employed myſelf in nothing "elſe, but have night and day been converſant in the "interpretation of dreams."

(24) Idem, lib. 2. *ſub fin.* pag. 161.

[*F*] *He adjures them as it were to obſerve his requeſt in the name of that piercing Eye of Providence, which ſuperintends the univerſe.*] "If any perſon, "ſays he (25), can add any thing new to my Book, "let him keep it to himſelf; which is the moſt "proper. If he thinks that I have ſaid too much, "he has nothing elſe to do but to take what is for "his purpoſe, and leave the reſt where it is: Τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν βιβλίων μὴ ἐξαίρων Θεὸν ἐποπτὴν καὶ φύλακα πάντων νομίζων τὸν Ἀπόλλωνα. i. e. "Leaving the reſt intire "in my Books out of reverence to the God Apollo, "who is the Inſpector and Guardian of all things." He was apprehenſive of the tricks, which are common among the Bookſellers, by which an Author's whole work is thrown into confuſion, ſometimes by abridgments, and at other times by interpolations.

(25) Idem, ibid.

[*G*] *He dedicated his three firſt Books to one Caſſius Maximus.*] Rigaltius can find out no ſuch perſon; *and perhaps*, ſays he, *it ſhould be read* TABIΩ or TATIΩ MAΞIMΩ; *for Julius Capitolinus mentions one Gavius Maximus, who was Prefect of the Pretorium for twenty years in the reign of Antoninus, and was ſucceeded by Tatius Maximus.* However that be, the Patron of Artemidorus's Book was a Phœnician by nation (26), a great Orator, and a man of ſo penetrating a genius, that without reading all that Authors have ſaid, he underſtood their works (27). Andrew Schottus calls him Coſſinus Maximus, and diſtinguiſhes him from Caſſius Maximus (28). Here are two errors for one, without mentioning that in note [*C*] (29). I cannot tell whether any perſon has ever thought of this conjecture, that we ought to read Claudius Maximus inſtead of Caſſius Maximus. There was one Claudius Maximus a Proconſul of Africa under the Emperor Antoninus Pius. The charge of Magic, from which Apuleius vindicated himſelf, was brought before him in order to be tried. It appears from ſeveral paſſages of his Defence, that this Claudius Maximus was conſidered as a man of learning, and one who was very curious in Books of Philoſophy. *Bene quod apud te, Maxime, cauſa agitur, qui pro tua eruditione legiſti profecto Ariſtotelis* περὶ ζώων γενέσεως, περὶ ζώων ἀνατομῆς, περὶ ἱστορίας *multijuga volumina; præterea problemata innumera ejuſdem, tum ex eadem ſectâ cæterorum, in quibus id genus varia tractantur.* i. e. "It is fortunate for me, that the cauſe is pleaded before you, Maximus, who, as you are a maſter of extenſive learning, have read Ariſtotle's ſeveral works concerning the Generation of Animals, "their Anatomy and Hiſtory, with a great number "of

(26) Artem. lib. 2. *ſub fin.* pag. 161.

(27) Idem, *in Præfat.* pag. 4.

(28) Andr. Schott. *in Senecæ Controverſ.* 9.

(29) Quotation (13).

which he made uſe of is that which John Cornarius publiſhed at Baſil in 1539. Artemidorus wrote a Treatiſe upon *Auguries*, and another upon *Chiromancy*. They are not now extant [*H*]. Tertullian has not mentioned them in the paſſage, where he quotes ſeveral Authors in *Oneirocritics* (*d*); but Lucian has not omitted them, though he ſpeaks of but two Writers in that kind (*e*).

(*d*) That is, concerning the interpretation of dreams. See this paſſage of Tertullian above, quotation (14).

(*e*) Lucian *in Philopatr.*

" of his Problems, and the other Writers of that " Sect, who treat of a variety of things of that na- " ture." In this manner Apuleius ſpeaks to him in p. 115. A little after he addreſſes himſelf to him in this manner. *Audiſti, Maxime, quorum pleraque ſcilicet legeras apud antiquos philoſophorum.* i. e. " You " have heard, Maximus, theſe things, moſt of which " you have read in the ancient Philoſophers." In another place (30) he ſays to him: *Multa fando, Maxime, audiſti, & plura legendo didiciſti, non pauca experiendo comperiſti.* i. e. " You have heard, Maxi- " mus, many things in converſation, and you have " learned more by reading, and have diſcovered " many things by experience." As likewiſe (31): *An quod multo præſtabilius eſt, tua doctrina, Claudi Maxime, tuaque perfecta eruditione fretus, contemnam ſtultis & impolitis ad hæc reſpondere?* i. e. " Or " ſhall I (which is much better) confiding in your " perfect ſkill and learning, Claudius Maximus, " avoid anſwering ſuch fooliſh and ignorant perſons " in thoſe points?" It ſeems even probable that he had been at firſt a Philoſopher by profeſſion, and that he had raiſed himſelf by his long ſervices in the war. *Erras . . . . ſi eam fortunæ indulgentia non ex philoſophiæ cenſurâ metiris; ſi virum tam auſteræ Sectæ, tamque diutinæ militiæ non putas amiciorem eſſe coercitæ mediocritati quam delicatæ opulentiæ* (32). i. e. " You are miſtaken . . . . if you meaſure him by the " indulgence of fortune, and not the rules of Philoſo- " phy, and if you imagine that a man of ſo *ſevere* " *a Sect*, and who has ſerved ſo long in the army, " would not be more favourable to a moderate " manner of life, than to luxurious opulence."

(30) Apul. *in Apolog.* p. 149. vol. 2. edit. Lugdun. ann. 1614. in 8vo.

31) Ibid. p. 157.

(32) Apuleii *Apolog.* p. 149.

[*H*] *He wrote a treatiſe of* Auguries, *and another of* Chiromancy. *They are not now extant.*] It is a miſtake in Vander Linden, to aſſert even in Merklinus's Edition, that Aldus printed them in Greek, that Cornarius tranſlated them into Latin, and that Rigaltius publiſhed them in both theſe languages (33). We muſt trace this matter a little higher in order to diſcover the origin of this miſtake; and it will be of ſome advantage to make this obſervation. It may diſcover to thoſe, who make abridgments, the moſt fruitful ſource of the errors, into which they lead their readers. Geſner ſays: *Artemidorus . . . ſcripſit de Somniorum Interpretatione libros quatuor, item de Auguriis, & Manuum Inſpectione. Suidas. Hujus Autoris quinque libros Aldus Græcè excudit* (34). i. e. " Ar- " temidorus . . . . . wrote four Books concerning the " Interpretation of dreams; likewiſe concerning Au- " guries and Chiromancy. Suidas. Aldus printed " five Books of this Author in Greek." He had obſerved afterwards that theſe five Books relate only to dreams. Simler has abridged this paſſage in the following manner: *Artemidorus . . . ſcripſit de Somniorum Interpretatione lib.* 4. *Item de Auguriis, & Manuum Inſpectione. Eos Aldus Græcè excudit.* i. e. " Artemidorus . . . . wrote four Books concerning the " Interpretation of Dreams; and likewiſe concerning " Auguries and Chiromancy. Aldus printed them " in Greek." Is this abridging the Expreſſions of an Author, or falſifying them? It is rather the latter than the former.

(33) Vander Linden *de Script. Medicor.*

(34) Geſner, *Bibliothec.* fol. 96. verſo.

ARTEMISIA, Queen of Caria, and daughter of Lygdamis [*A*], attended in perſon King Xerxes in his expedition againſt the Greeks [*B*]. She was a Lady capable of executing great affairs, and miſtreſs of a reſolution and courage which would have abſolutely become a man. Being poſſeſſed therefore of the ſovereign authority during the preparations of Xerxes, on account of her being a widow, and of the minority of her ſon (*a*), ſhe took that opportunity of gaining herſelf a great reputation, and engaged of her own accord in that expedition. She diſtinguiſhed her ſelf very remarkably both by her council and perſonal valour. The reaſons which ſhe urged to ſupport her opinion againſt fighting the battle at Salamis (*b*), were the moſt ſenſible in the world. She extricated her ſelf very artfully out of the danger in that battle, for finding herſelf purſued by an Athenian ſhip without the leaſt poſſibility of defending herſelf, ſhe attacked a Perſian ſhip commanded by Damaſithymus King of Calyndus, with whom ſhe had before had a conteſt, and ſunk it (*c*). This made thoſe who purſued her imagine, that her ſhip was of the ſide of the Greeks [*C*], and they ceaſed their purſuit. It was fortunate for her, that there was not one perſon ſaved out of Damaſithymus's ſhip, ſo that ſhe was ſo far from being conſidered as the occaſion of that loſs, that ſhe eſcaped the enemy, and was applauded for having ſunk one of the Grecian ſhips. Xerxes was the principal perſon impoſed

(*a*) His name was *Piſyndelis*. See the remark [*E*] of the article MAUSOLUS.

(*b*) Herod. lib. 8. cap. 67.

c) Ibid. cap. 87.

[*A*] *She was the daughter of Lygdamis.*] Herodotus does not ſay what Moreri repreſents him to do; that Lygdamis was King of Halicarnaſſus (1). He only ſays that Artemiſia was of Halicarnaſſus on her father's ſide, and of Crete on that of her mother. If I had not found in the ſame Hiſtorian, that the Lygdamis, who aſſiſted Piſiſtratus, and to whom Piſiſtratus, after he had re-eſtabliſhed himſelf at Athens, gave the command of the Iſle of Naxos, was a native of that Iſle (2), I ſhould have taken him for the father and grandfather of our Artemiſia. Mr. Blancard has continued in his Edition of Harpocration (3) the error of the preceding Editions, viz. *Damis* for *Lygdamis* (4). Valeſius's Notes inform us of the correction, which ought to be made there, and which Gronovius made in his Edition of Harpocration in 1696.

(1) Herodot. lib. 7. cap. 99.

(2) Idem, lib. 1. cap. 61, 64.

(3) It is that of Leyden in 1683.

(4) In Ἀρτεμισία.

[*B*] *She attended in perſon King Xerxes in the expedition againſt Greece* (5).] Suidas tells us, that it was againſt the Perſians (6); but this paſſage muſt have been mangled; ſince the ſmart ſaying of Xerxes mentioned immediately after by Suidas, *that the men were become women, and the women men*, would have been abſurd, if Artemiſia had been in the Grecian army, ſince the men on that ſide fought like lions. Mauſſac ſuppoſes that it was in Suidas as in Harpocration, κατὰ τὰ Περσικὰ (7); i. e. " In the Perſian War."

(5) Herod. lib. 7. cap. 99.

(6) Ἠρίστευσε κατὰ Περσῶν, i. e. " She engaged " with great re- " ſolution againſt " the Perſians.

(7) Mauſſac. *Notæ in Harpocrat.*

[*C*] *This made thoſe who purſued her imagine, that her ſhip was of the ſide of the Greeks.*] Herodotus has omitted a very eſſential circumſtance, without which his account wants a great deal of probability. He does not tell us, as he ought to have done, and as Polyænus has actually done, that Artemiſia ordered the Perſian Flag to be taken down in her ſhip (8). Polyænus repreſents her as uſing the ſame conduct with thoſe pirates, who put up all kinds of flags according as they have occaſion for them. When Artemiſia purſued a Greek ſhip ſhe ſet up a flag belonging to the barbarous nations; but when it was neceſſary to fly from the Greeks, ſhe ſet up their flag. He repreſents this Queen's manner of fighting ſo very differently, that he multiplies it into three or four diſtinct actions; and he mentions a ſpindle and diſtaff, which were ſent by the King of Perſia to a Captain of a ſhip; in which account we can find no manner of ſenſe, ſince the ſhip, which was attacked by Artemiſia, was ſunk, and not one perſon eſcaped.

(8) Polyæni, *Stratagem.* lib. 8. cap. 53.

poſed upon in this affair; for he declared, that *the men had behaved like women, and the women like men* [D]. He intruſted her with the care of the young Princes of Perſia his ſons, when agreeably to her advice he abandoned Greece in order to return to Aſia. The Athenians were ſo highly incenſed that a woman ſhould make war againſt them, that they promiſed a large ſum of money to thoſe who ſhould take Artemiſia priſoner, and ordered all the commanders of their ſhips to uſe their utmoſt efforts for that purpoſe (*d*). Her ſtatue was to be ſeen at Lacedæmon among thoſe of the Perſian Generals, in the Portico, which was built from the ſpoils of that nation (*e*). The artifices which ſhe made uſe of in order to gain the poſſeſſion of Latmus was as admirable, according to the precepts of Machiavel, as it was bad according to thoſe of Chriſtianity. She placed her troops in ambuſcade, and went with all the attendance proper for a journey of devotion, attended with eunuchs, women, trumpets and drums, to celebrate the Feaſt of the Mother of the Gods in a wood, which was conſecrated to her near that city. The inhabitants being pleaſed with this zeal of her's, went out of the city in order to admire her devotion, and in the mean time Artemiſia's troops ſeized upon Latmus (*f*). Theſe great qualifications did not ſecure her from the weakneſs of love [E]. For ſhe was paſſionately fond of a man of Abydos, whoſe name was Dardanus, and was ſo enraged at his neglect of her, that ſhe put out his eyes while he lay aſleep (*g*). The Gods, in order to puniſh her for this, poſſeſſed her with a ſtill ſtronger paſſion for him, ſo that the Oracle having adviſed her to go to Leucas (*h*), which was the refuge of deſperate lovers, ſhe took the leap from thence but did not eſcape. She was interred at that place. A great many Writers erroneouſly confound her with Artemiſia the wife of Mauſolus [F], whom

(d) Ibid. lib. 8. cap. 93.

(e) Pauſan. lib. 3. pag. 93.

(f) Polyæn. *Stratagem.* lib. 8. cap. 53.

(g) Ptolom. Hæpheſtion, *apud* Phot. Cod. 190. pag. 491.

(h) See the article of LEUCAS.

[D] *He declared, that the men had acted like women, and the women like men.*] Let us ſee Herodotus's own words: Σάρδιν δὲ εἶπαι λέγεται πρὸς τὰ φραζόμενα, οἱ μὲν ἄνδρες γεγόνασί μοι γυναῖκες· αἱ δὲ γυναῖκες, ἄνδρες (9). To theſe let us add thoſe of Juſtin. *Artemiſia Regina Halicarnaſſi, quæ in auxilium Xerxi venerat, inter primos duces bellum acerrimè ciebat, quippe ut in viro muliebrem timorem, ita in muliere virilem audaciam cerneres* (10). i. e. "Artemiſia Queen of Hali-"carnaſſus, who came to the aſſiſtance of Xerxes, "appeared among the chief Captains, and animated "the fleet in the battle with very great reſolution; "ſo that there was ſeen in Xerxes a womaniſh fear, "and in the woman a manlike courage."

(9) Herod. lib. 8. cap. 88.

(10) Juſtin. lib. 2. cap. 12. *See likewiſe* Polyæn. *Stratagem.* lib. 8. cap. 53. *and* Pauſanias, lib. 3. pag. 93.

[E] *Her great qualifications did not ſecure her from the weakneſs of love.*] All the Ladies of great courage are not like Agrippina, who ſurmounted the foibles of her own ſex by employing herſelf perpetually with the buſineſs of the other ſex. *Agrippina æqui impatiens, dominandi avida, virilibus curis fœminarum vitia exuerat* (11). Semiramis, who was a woman of the moſt ambitious and warlike diſpoſition imaginable, was extremely laſcivious. It is remarkable, that the greateſt ſoldiers are generally of an amorous complexion, upon which account the myſtical Commentators may pay a compliment to Homer, who has repreſented ſo naturally the intrigues of Mars and Venus. But I am of opinion, that with regard to women this is not ſo common, and that an engagement in great affairs raiſes them much more above the ſenſibilities of love.

(11) Tacit. *Annal.* lib. 6. cap. 25.

[F] *A great many perſons erroneouſly confound her with Artemiſia, the wife of Mauſolus.*] Pliny ſeems to have been faulty in this reſpect; for he tells us, that Artemiſia, the wife of Mauſolus, gave her name to an herb, which was called *Parthenis* (12). Now ſince Herodotus mentions the herb *Artemiſia*, (it is the ſame that the French call *Armoiſe*, and which the Engliſh call *Mugwort*,) and ſince the wife of Mauſolus did not live till after Hippocrates, it follows that one of the two Artemiſia's was taken for the other in this paſſage of Pliny. If one of them gave her name to this herb, it muſt have been the daughter of Lygdamis, the prudent and courageous Artemiſia, who attended Xerxes. Mr. Chevreau, from whom I have borrowed this remark againſt Pliny, informs me, that Leo Allatius, from whom he had taken it, has very juſtly criticized Robert Stephens, who tells us (13), that *Artemiſia the wife of Mauſolus ſignalized herſelf in the war, which Xerxes carried on againſt Greece* (14). Mr. Chevreau has remarked the ſame miſtake in *the Hiſtorical Theatre of Chriſtian Mathieu.* He adds, that *it was not without ſome grounds, that Pliny in the paſſage which he quoted gave Mauſolus the title of the Wealthy.* I find indeed this Epithet in Du Pinet's tranſlation; but not in Father Hardouin's Edition of Pliny; and I only obſerve, that Pliny, deſcribing in another place (15) the magnificence of the Mauſoleum, contents himſelf with ſaying, that Mauſolus was a petty King of Caria, *Cariæ Regulus.* Father Hardouin endeavours to aſſiſt his Author by ſuppoſing, that all the Kings of Caria were called by the name of Mauſolus, as all the Kings of Egypt were called by that of Ptolemy; and that therefore Artemiſia the wife of Mauſolus, to whom Pliny aſcribes the ambition of having given her name to an herb, was the Lady who lived in the time of Xerxes. But he will give me leave to ſay, that his Author upon that ſuppoſition would be exceptionable on another account. He would have deſcribed a particular Queen by a title, which was common to her with all the other Queens of that country. Father Hardouin founds his conjectures upon a paſſage, in which the two Artemiſia's are ſtiled Queens of Caria (16). I paſs over this foundation of the conjectures; but I find, that Tzetzes is a little embarraſſed in this point (17). One of the Artemiſia's, according to him, was the wife of Mauſolus; the other that of Hecatomnus; and he tells us, that the former was ſhe who attended Xerxes. Now all the Authors are agreed, that the Lady, who built a magnificent monument for her huſband was the daughter of Hecatomnus, and the wife of Mauſolus; and that the Artemiſia, who attended Xerxes againſt the Greeks, was the daughter of Lygdamis. The great Scaliger will not eſcape cenſure here; he has too plainly taken one for the other (18), and that in a place, where it was not eaſy to miſtake thus; for it is in the extract of a Book, in which the Author expreſly tells us, that he ſpeaks of Artemiſia the daughter of Lygdamis, who took up arms for the Perſians (19). Scaliger ſuppreſſing all theſe characteriſticks has ſubſtituted that of the widow of Mauſolus, which can only be applied to the Queen of Caria, who paid ſo great honours to her huſband's memory. This great man has miſled another great man, ſince he was the occaſion of Henry Valeſius's affirming, that Artemiſia, after the death of Mauſolus, ſeeing herſelf ſlighted by Dardanus, whom ſhe was in love with, put out his eyes, and afterwards finding herſelf ſtill more enamoured of him went, and took the leap of Leucas, which proved fatal to her (20). If we do but even tranſiently compare this paſſage with that of Scaliger, we ſhall ſee evidently, that the one is copied from the other. This miſtake of Valeſius in ſo obvious a ſubject, and the difference which he obſerves between Theopompus, who tells us, that ſhe died of regret for the loſs of her huſband, and Ptolemy the ſon of Hephæſtion, who affirms, that ſhe died out of love to another man, as Valeſius pretends, are two circumſtances ſo much the more ſurprizing, as he had quoted but two lines above the ſeventh Book of this Ptolemy, in order to prove that Artemiſia's father was not named Damis, but Lygdamis. Balthaſar Bonifacius,

(12) Plin. lib. 25. cap. 7.

(13) In his *Theſaurus Linguæ Latinæ.* I have obſerved, that he has committed the ſame error in the *Dictionarium Nominum propriorum, &c.* printed at Cologne in 8vo, 1558.

(14) Chevreau, *Hiſt. du Monde*, tom. 4. pag. 33 of the firſt edition of Holland.

(15) Lib. 36. cap. 5.

(16) This paſſage is from Harpocration. But it muſt be aſcribed to Tzetzes, if we were ſcrupulouſly to follow F. Hardouin's expreſſion, tom. 4. pag. 398.

(17) Tzetzes *Chiliad.* 12. *Hiſt.* 455.

(18) Scalig. *Auſon. Var. Lection.* lib. 2. cap. 18. *See* Tollius's *Auſonius*, p. 329.

(19) Ptolem. *Hephæſt. apud* Phot. Cod. 190. pag. 491.

(20) Valeſii *Notæ in Harpocrat. Lexic.* pag. 11.

whom I am going to mention in the following Article.

nifacius, who relates the ſame falſe ſtory concerning Mauſolus's Wife (21), does not deny, that he took this from Scaliger. *Habemus confitentem reum*; i. e. "We have his own confeſſion of his guilt;" and we may ſay of this manner of propagating of errors,

(21) *Hæc Ptolemæus Hephæſtionis filius apud junierem Scaligerum recenſet.* Balthaſ. Bonifac. *Hiſt. Ludicr.* lib. 3. cap. 37.

Dedit hanc contagio labem,
Et dabit in plures; ſicut grex totus in agris
Unius ſcabie cadit, & porrigine porci;
Uvâque conſpectâ livorem ducit ab uvâ (22).

(22) Juvenal. Satyr. 2. ver. 78.

" Infections, from one ſingle caſe begun,
" Soon ſpread their poiſon, and thro' numbers run;
" So one ſheep touch'd, none of the flock eſcape,
" And the whole bunch rots from one ſmitten grape.

Mr. Menage having mentioned a great many advantageous things of Artemiſia the wife of Mauſolus, and particularly the honour which has been done her of propoſing her as *a model of conjugal affection*, proceeds in this manner: *However Ptolemy the ſon of Hephæſtion . . . . tells us that Artemiſia was ſo enamoured of one Dardanus, &c.* Having repeated the whole ſtory, he goes on thus: " There were two " Artemiſia's, both Queens of Caria, as we are in" formed by Suidas; one of whom was married to " Mauſolus, and the other was more ancient. And " if this ſtory be true, it is probable that it happen" ed to the firſt Artemiſia, and that Ptolemy the ſon " of Hephæſtion, who aſcribes it to the wife of Mau" ſolus, is miſtaken (23)." The conjecture of this learned man is very juſt; but he is miſtaken in aſſerting, that this Polemy aſcribes the adventure, which he mentions, to the wife of Mauſolus. Saraſin introducing Mr. Menage ſpeaking in his Dialogue upon this ſubject, *Whether a young man ought to be amorous*, repreſents him as ſaying, that Artemiſia, the ſame Artemiſia, who was ſo afflicted at the death of her huſband, that *ſhe drowned herſelf in tears, and reproached the Stars who could not relieve her, with*

(23) Menage, *Obſervat. ſur Malherbe*, pag. 530.

Tout ce que fait la Rage,
Quand elle eſt maitreſſe des ſens (24).

(24) Ouvr. *de Saraſin*, pag. 181.

" All that a boundleſs rage inſpires the mind with,
" When reaſon's loſt,"

Became afterwards deeply in love with Dardanus; and that *there was no profeſſed coquette, who would not have been aſhamed of the extravagancies of that Queen.* Upon this occaſion he quotes what Scaliger relates. We ſee here a very ingenious Gentleman, or rather two of them, Mr. Saraſin and Mr. Menage, both impoſed upon by the learned Scaliger. The ingenious Author of *the New Dialogues of the Dead* has ſuppoſed, that the ſame Artemiſia, who lamented ſo much her huſband's death, fell in love with a young Gentleman (25).

(25) See the *Nouveaux Dialogues des Morts*, Part 2. pag. 15. Holland edit.

We ſhould run out into a long detail, if we were to mention all thoſe, who have confounded the two Artemiſia's. Raviſius Tector (26), and the Authors of the *Theſaurus Fabri* are of this number. Olivier, who wrote a Commentary upon Valerius Maximus, is another, tho' he knew that Strabo and Herodotus do not agree concerning the Genealogy of that Artemiſia, whom they ſpeak of (27). He imagined that one of theſe two Authors was miſtaken, and did not conſider that one of them ſpoke of one, and the other of the other, and that they were both in the right. Mr. Hofman indeed has given us two articles of Artemiſia; but he has introduced very confuſedly in the former what ſhould have been related in the latter article; and he did not know, that the wife of Mauſolus, aad the daughter of Lygdamis, are the ſame perſon. Beſides he quotes Vitruvius for ſuch facts, as he never mentions. Mr. Lloyd ſet him the example in this falſe quotation, which he did not correct in copying Charles Stephens, with whom on the other hand he has taken a ſtrange liberty, by retrenching the whole article of Artemiſia, who attended Xerxes, which was a very good article.

(26) *In Officina.*

(27) *See* Valer. Maxim. *Varior.* pag. 395. of the edit. in 1665.

ARTEMISIA, Queen of Caria, daughter of Hecatomnus (*a*), ſiſter and wife of Mauſolus, has immortalized herſelf by the honours which ſhe paid to the memory of her huſband. She built for him in Halicarnaſſus a very magnificent tomb, which was called the *Mauſoleum*, and which was one of the ſeven wonders of the world, and afterwards gave the title of Mauſoleum to all the tombs, which were remarkable for the grandeur and ſumptuouſneſs of them. Pliny has given us a particular deſcription of this pompous monument (*b*). The reader may ſee it in French in M. Chevreau's *Hiſtory of the World* (*c*), and in the Supplement to Moreri. Artemiſia did not ſurvive her beloved huſband above two years (*d*), he dying without children (*e*), after having reigned twenty four years, about the end of the 106th Olympiad [*A*]. She died of regret and ſorrow (*f*) [*B*] before the Mauſoleum was finiſhed (*g*). It is ſaid that ſhe ſteeped the

(*a*) Strabo, lib. 14. pag. 451. Suidas *in* Ἀρτεμισία.

(*b*) Plin. lib. 36. cap. 5.
(*c*) Lib. 7. cap. 3.
(*d*) Diodor. Siculus, lib. 16.
(*e*) Strabo, lib. 14. p. 471.

(*f*) See the Remark [*D*].
(*g*) Plin. lib. 36. cap. 5.

[*A*] *Mauſolus her huſband died . . . . about the end of the 106th Olympiad.*] Almoſt all the editions of Pliny inform us, that Mauſolus King of Caria died in the ſecond year of the 100th Olympiad, and in the 302d of Rome (1). But Father Hardouin has given us in his edition according to the beſt Manuſcripts the ſecond year of the 106th Olympiad, and the 402d year of Rome. *Obiit Olympiadis centeſimæ ſextæ anno ſecundo, urbis anno CCCCII.* Mr. Chevreau obſerves, that Uſher was of opinion, that this paſſage of Pliny was corrupted, and that Mauſolus died the fourth year of the 106th Olympiad and in the year of the world 3651 (2). This agrees exactly with the following words of Father Hardouin, *Quid quod & Diodorus non ad Olympiadis CVI annum alterum Mauſoli obitum, ſed ad quartum refert, lib.* 16. *verſ.* 435 (3); i. e. " Dio" dorus likewiſe places the death of Mauſolus, not " under the ſecond year of the CVIth Olympiad, " but under the fourth"; and it coincides with the duration of the reigns of thoſe, who ſucceeded Mauſolus till the expedition of Alexander the Great. See the note [*A*] of the article ADA. It is certain, that Mauſolus was then dead; and that Artemiſia, who did not ſurvive him above two years, was living when Demoſthenes made an Oration for the liberty of the Rhodians. Now he pronounced his Oration in the 2d year of the 107th Olympiad, as we may collect from Dionyſius Halicarnaſſeus (4). Mauſolus therefore muſt have died in the laſt year of the 106th Olympiad; and the anonymous Writer, who has given an account of the Olympiads, is miſtaken, in placing the funeral Oration upon Mauſolus by Theopompus under the firſt year of the 103d Olympiad. Valeſius has committed the ſame error. *Hæc Artemiſia in funere mariti agones celebravit Olympiade* 103 (5). Thoſe Writers, who after the example of Calepin, Lloyd, Hofman, &c. refer us to the VIIth Book of Herodotus, to be informed there concerning the Mauſoleum, do not very carefully conſult the Chronological Tables; or they muſt have been very erroneous ones, if we ſhould find in them the death of Mauſolus before that of Herodotus.

(1) Plin. lib. 36. cap. 5. pag. 280. *and* cap. 6. pag. 288.

(2) Chevreau, *Hiſt. du Monde*, lib. 7. cap. 3.

(3) Harduin. *in Plinium*, tom. 5. pag. 280.

(4) Dion. Halicarn. *Epiſt. de ætate & ſcript. Demoſthen.*

(5) Valeſii. *Not. in Harpocration. Lexicon.* p. 99.

[*B*] *She died of regret and ſorrow.*] We have ſeveral authorities of great importance for this fact, as particularly Theopompus, Cicero and Strabo. Theopompus's expreſſions are very ſtrong: Ἡι φήσι Θεόπομπος φθινάδι νόσῳ ληφθῆναι διὰ τὴν λύπην τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καὶ ἀδελφοῦ Μαυσώλου, ἀποθανεῖν (6). i. e. " Theopompus ſays, that ſhe was ſeized with a con" ſumption, occaſioned by the ſorrow which ſhe con" ceived upon the loſs of her deceaſed huſband and " brother." Cicero's words are no leſs ſtrong. *Artemiſia*

(6) *Apud* Harpocrat.

the bones and ashes of her husband in water, and swallowed them, that she might serve as a living tomb for him (*b*). We must observe that she appointed excellent Panegyrics to be made in honour of him, and proposed a prize of great value for the person who should compose the best (*i*). Theopompus carried the prize. We are told that Isocrates his master was one of the Orators who entered the lists upon this occasion [*C*]. Theodectus of Phasalis who engaged likewise, wrote a Tragedy intitled *Mausolus*, which succeeded better than his prose Composition. But we must not forget to observe, that instead of lamentations and tears, with which the greatest part of the Writers represent Artemisia to be overwhelmed during her widowhood, there are some Authors who tell us, that she gained several conquests with great vigour [*D*].

(*b*) Aulus Gellius, lib. 10. cap. 18. Valer. Maxim. lib. 4. cap. 6.

(*i*) Aulus Gell. lib. 10. cap. 18. Plutarch. *in Vita Isocratis.*

temisia illa, says he (7), *Mausoli Cariæ Regis uxor, quæ nobile illud Halicarnassi fecit sepulcrum quamdiu vixit, vixit in luctu, eodemque etiam confecta contabuit. Huic erat illa opinio quotidie recens, quæ tum denique non appellabatur recens cum vetustate exaruit.* i. e. "Artemisia, the wife of Mausolus King of Caria, "who built the magnificent Sepulchre at Halicarnassus, lived all her life in sorrow, and at last perished with it. The same sentiment was always "new to her; and it was then only not esteemed "new, when worn out with age." It is almost beyond dispute, that Cicero did not know, that Artemisia survived her husband but two years; for if he had known this, he would not have made use of expressions, which signify a long duration of sorrow. But let us see what Strabo says: Φθίσει δ' ἀκοβαινούσης διὰ πόθος τοῦ ἀνδρὸς (8). i. e. "She pin'd away out "of sorrow for the loss of her husband."

(7) Ciceron. *Tusculan.* 3. This passage is wrong quoted in Valerius Maximus *Varior.* The last period in Roman character is without the particle *non*, which makes impenetrable nonsense.

(8) Strabo, lib. 14. pag. 452.

[*C*] *We are told, that Isocrates was one of the Orators, who entered the lists upon this occasion.*] I have quoted two good authorities (9) for this; and I can add another of great weight, which is that of Theopompus. He boasted publickly, that he had carried the prize from Isocrates his Master (10). But I am not ignorant that Suidas, without making any mention of Isocrates the Athenian, speaks of another Isocrates the scholar and successor of the latter, and who was born at Heraclea or at Apollonia upon the Euxin Sea. It was this Isocrates, according to Suidas, who disputed the prize of eloquence with Theodectus, Theopompus, and Erythræus (11). The last was of Naucrates in Egypt; so that there must be an error in Aulus Gellius in the passage, where we read that Theopompus, Theodectus, and Naucratis disputed for the prize (12). Naucrates is not the proper name of one of these competitors, but only the name of the city a little altered; for it should have been *Naucratites* (13). Olivier calls them *Theopompus*, *Theodectus*, and *Naucrates* (14). If we prefer Aulus Gellius to Suidas, which I am inclined to do, we must conclude, that there is an error in the latter passage, in which we read, ἅμα τῷ Ἐρυθραίῳ Ναυκρατίτῃ διηγωνίζατο (15); i. e. "he contended with Erythræus the Naucratite." Photius favours Aulus Gellius, since he supposes that Naucrates of Erythræa was one of the competitors with Theopompus (16). On which side soever we determine, the proper name has been mistaken for that derived from the city. We may observe that Cicero (17), Dionysius Halicarnassus (18), and Quintilian (19), mention one Socrates a scholar of Isocrates. The passage in Plutarch has been translated very differently by Amiot from what it was by Wolfius and Xylander; for the two last tell us, that the Panegyrick upon Mausolus by Isocrates is lost; whereas, according to Amiot, the case is just the reverse. *Isocrates*, says he, *contended for the prize, which Queen Artemisia appointed at the Sepulchre of her husband Mausolus, and the Oration, which he pronounced in honour of the deceased, is still extant there.* The different manner of accenting has without doubt occasioned these different translations. Some read it τὸ δὲ ἐγκώμιον οὐ σώζεται; i. e. "but that Panegyrick is not extant;" others read it τὸ δὲ ἐγκώμιον οὗ σώζεται; i. e. "but that Panegyrick is preserved there." Such is the odd fate of manuscripts; a point either removed, or added, or changed, turns the affirmatives into negatives.

(9) Plutarch. *in Vita Isocrat.* A. Gellius, lib. 10. cap. 18.

(10) *See* Euseb. *Præpar. Evangel.* lib. 10. cap. 3. pag. 464.

(11) Suidas *in* Ἰσοκράτης.

(12) Aul. Gell. lib. 10. cap. 18.

(13) Moreri *and* Hofman call him *Naucratites.*

(14) Olivar. *in Valer. Maxim.* pag. 395. edit. Lugd. Bat. *ann.* 1655.

(15) Suidas *in* Ἰσοκράτης.

(16) Photius *in Bibliotb.* Cod. 176. pag. 392.

(17) Cicero *de Orat.* lib. 3. & *in Oratore.*

(18) Dion. Halicarnass. *in Judicio de Isæo*, pag. 228.

(19) Quintil. lib. 3. cap. 6. *initio.*

[*D*] *There are some Authors, who tell us, that she made several conquests with great vigour.*] I do not speak of the Oration of Demosthenes, quoted above (20), tho' it is certain from the manner in which that Orator expresses himself, that Artemisia was not represented at Athens as a disconsolate widow, who pined away with grief, and neglected the affairs of her Kingdom, that she might give up herself entirely to the reflection on the memory of her husband. The Athenians considered her as a woman, who was capable of rendering herself formidable; for one of the reasons which Demosthenes was obliged to reply to, was taken from the commotions, which Artemisia might raise, if the Athenians should interpose in the affairs of the people of Rhodes. But I pass over this, in order to consider something more important. Vitruvius tells us, that after the death of Mausolus, the Rhodians being uneasy that a woman should govern in Caria, resolved to dethrone her (21). Their design was prevented by a stratagem of Artemisia, which was immediately followed by another, which she executed in person, with so much resolution and success, that she made herself mistress of Rhodes in a short time. She erected there a trophy of her victory, with two statues of brass, one of which represented the city of Rhodes, and the other Artemisia marking that city with an hot iron. Vitruvius adds, that the Rhodians never dared to remove that trophy from the place; for such an attempt was prohibited by their Religion; but they built a wall round it, which prevented it from being seen. Do we see here the condition of a widow, who was inconsolable, who spent her life in tears and lamentations, and indulged her sorrow so violently, that she died within two years? It will perhaps be said, that Vitruvius speaks of another Artemisia. I know very well, that Mr. Chevreau thought so (22); but two invincible reasons confute such a supposition. For first, the Artemisia of Vitruvius had been Mausolus's wife; and secondly, she seized a city, which was not built till the Peloponnesian War, when Xerxes and Artemisia were dead. Ἡ δὲ νῦν πόλις ἔκτισθη κατὰ τὰ Πελοποννησιακὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἀρχιτέκτονος, ὡς φασιν, ὑφ' ᾧ καὶ ὁ Πειραιεύς (23). i. e. "The present city was built during "the time of the Peloponnesian War by the same "Architect, it is said, who built the Piræum." Ttetzes therefore had some grounds for saying, that both the Artemisia's commanded armies, ἄμφω δὲ στρατηγέτιδας, γυναίας ἀμφοτέρας (24). One can hardly tell what judgment to pass upon Authors, when we find, that they assert such incompatible things concerning one and the same Queen. There wanted but one man, who had experienced her generosity, to persuade the world, that she died with regret for the loss of her husband. Writers would have repeated this an hundred times, and delivered it down from one hand to another as a fact not only uncommon, but likewise important enough, to be proposed as an example. The most remarkable embellishments are introduced sooner or later into such traditional stories as these.

(20) It is that *de Libertate Rhodiorum*; i. e. "Of the Liberty "of the Rhodians," pag. 78. of his Works, Geneva edition 1607, in fol.

(21) Vitruv. *de Architect.* l. b. 2. cap. 8.

(22) *Hist. du Monde*, l. 7. c. 3.

(23) Strabo, lib. 14. pag. 450.

(24) Tzetzes, *Chiliad.* 12. verf. 966. *Hist.* 455.

☞ARUNDEL (THOMAS) Archbishop of Canterbury in the fourteenth Century, was born of a noble family, and son to Robert Earl of Arundel and Warren, and brother to Richard Earl of Arundel, who was afterwards beheaded (*a*). He was raised from being a Subdeacon and Archdeacon of Taunton at twenty two years of age to the Bishoprick of Ely in the year 1375 under King Edward III. It is said, that he was appointed

(*a*) Godwin, *De Præsul. b. Angliæ Commentar.* pag. 176. edit. London 1616.

pointed by the Pope to this See, though the King had fixed upon another perſon [*A*]. In 1388 he was tranſlated by the Pope to the Archbiſhoprick of York, in which he ſpent a prodigious ſum of money in building of Palaces for that See. He was made Lord High Chancellor of England, which office he held till he was tranſlated to the Archbiſhoprick of Canterbury in 1396. He was the firſt inſtance of any perſon's ever quitting the See of York for that of Canterbury (*b*). In 1393 he removed the Term from London to York [*B*]. Upon the death of Archbiſhop Courtney he was tranſlated to the See of Canterbury by a papal proviſion. The Bull was publiſhed at Canterbury the 11th of January 1396 (*c*). In his viſitation at London he revived an old conſtitution about the payment of tythes [*C*]. But he was ſcarce fixed in his See, when he fell under King Richard IId's diſpleaſure, and was obliged to abandon it; for on September 20 1397 the Commons having the King's leave impeached him of High-Treaſon [*D*], and ſentenced him within forty days after judgment to depart the Kingdom upon pain of death. He went firſt therefore to France, and afterwards to Rome, where Pope Boniface IX entertained him with great civility, and wrote a letter to the King in his favour. But this failing of ſucceſs, he promoted him to the Archbiſhoprick of St. Andrews in Scotland, and, which was a more diſobliging ſtroke to the King, deſigned to give him ſeveral preferments in England by way of proviſion (*d*). The King hearing of this wrote an expoſtulatory letter to the Pope, which brought him to an abſolute compliance [*E*]. The Archbiſhop was

(*b*) Idem, *De Archiepiſc. Eboracenſib.* p. 56.

(*c*) Idem, *De Archiepiſcop. Cantuarienſ.* pag. 176.

(*d*) Idem, ibid. *and* Collier, *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* vol. 1. B. 6. pag. 602.

[*A*] *It is ſaid, that he was appointed by the Pope to this See, tho' the King had fixed upon another perſon.*] Biſhop Godwin tells us (1), that when the King heard of the death of Dr. John Barnet the late Biſhop, he wrote a letter in very ſtrong terms to the Chapter of Ely, to urge them to elect John Woodroff his Confeſſor Biſhop of that See. But when they met, they determined upon Henry Wakefield Treaſurer of the King's Houſhold. But this election being ſet aſide, the Pope by his own authority declared Arundel, who was then ſcarce twenty two years of age, Biſhop. This, according to Godwin, is the moſt general account of that affair. But ſome other Writers affirm, that as the papal proviſions were at that time prohibited by the authority of the Parliament, he was canonically elected, and conſecrated April 6th, 1375, by Wittleſey Archbiſhop of Oxford. *Barneti morte nunciatâ, perſcriptis ad Elienſes literis enixè petit Rex, ut Joannem Woodrovium Confeſſorem ſuum in Epiſcopum velint eligere. Illi verò coeuntes, ſuffragia ſua contulerunt in Henricum Wakefield hoſpitii regii Seneſcallum. Quâ electione caſſatâ, Pontifex ex plenitudine poteſtatis Epiſcopum Elienſem declaravit annoſum quendam, quemque virum facile credas graviſſimum Thomam Arundellium, Roberti Comitis Arundellæ & Warrennæ filium, Tauntonenſem Archidiaconum, cum jam (O capularem ſenem) ætatis annum expleviſſet fere viceſimum ſecundum, & Subdiaconus nuper factus eſſet. Sic plerique. Non deſunt tamen, qui tradant, proviſionibus papalibus authoritateque parliamentariâ hac tempeſtate prohibitis, electum canonicè Arundellum, & per Wittleſeyum Archiepiſcopum Oxfordiæ conſecratum Apr.* 6, 1375.

(1) *De Præſul. Angliæ Comment.* pag. 325. edit. London, 1616.

[*B*] *In* 1393 *he removed the Term from London to York.*] He did this in order, as he ſaid, to mortify the inhabitants of London, who at that time were greatly under the diſpleaſure of the King. The Archbiſhop pleaded a precedent for the removal of the ſeat of juſtice in his predeceſſor Corbridge, who ſate there about eighty years (2) before. But the Londoners inſiſted upon it, that he did this only with a view to gratify and enrich the people of York. However within a Term or two after the Courts of Juſtice were removed again to London. *Interea verò, anno* 1393, *ſumma Angliæ tribunalia Londino Eboracum traduxit; eo pacto optimè dicens caſtigari Londinenſium proterviam atque ſuperbiam, quibus Rex eâ tempeſtate fuit admodum infenſus. Et hoc ipſum ante annos octoginta Corbrigio ſedente factitatum memorabat. Quicquid verò ille obtenderet, Eboracenſes ſuos juvandi & locupletandi gratia hæc ipſum molitum Londinenſes affirmabant. Quocunque id fecerit conſilio, non diuturnavit ejus inſtitutum, judiciis poſt terminum unum aut alterum ad priſtinum locum revocatis* (3).

(2) Mr. Collier in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, vol. 1. B. 6. p. 596, ſays *eight years*, which is undoubtedly an error.

(3) Godwin, *de Archiep. Eboracenſ.* pag. 56.

[*C*] *He revived an old conſtitution about the payment of tythes.*] This was firſt introduced by Simon Niger, formerly Biſhop of London. By this conſtitution the inhabitants of the reſpective Pariſhes were obliged to pay to their Rector one half-penny in the pound out of the rent of their houſes (4).

(4) *Antiq. Britan in Arundel. apud* Collier, p. 601.

[*D*] *The Commons having the King's leave, impeached him of high treaſon.*] The chief article of his charge was, that when he was Bp. of Ely and Lord Chancellor, he had given his advice for a commiſſion to be directed to Thomas Duke of Gloceſter, and Richard Earl of Arundel, his Brother, and had procured himſelf as one of the Chief Miniſters of State to be put into that Commiſſion, and executed it, whereas that Commiſſion was prejudicial to the King's prerogative and dignity (5). Sir John Hayward in his *firſt Part of the Life and Reign of King Henry IV* (6) tells us, that this Commiſſion, which he was accuſed for executing, was that againſt Michael De la Poole Earl of Suffolk. The King told the Commons, that ſince the impeachment touch'd ſo great a perſon and a Peer of the Realm, he would be farther adviſed. But the Commons reſolved to proceed with vigour againſt him, and urged the proſecution the next day, and deſired the King to order ſuch judgment againſt him as the caſe required. The King replied, that the Archbiſhop had confeſſed to him before ſeveral Lords, that he was miſtaken in executing that Commiſſion, and caſt himſelf upon his mercy. Upon this the King, the Lords Temporal, and Sir Thomas Piercy proxy for the Biſhops and Clergy, declared the Article confeſſed by the Archbiſhop to be treaſon, and adjudged him a traitor. Whereupon it was order'd, that the Archbiſhop ſhould be baniſhed, and his Temporalities ſeized, and his goods and chattles forfeited to the King, who was to appoint the time for his quitting the Kingdom (7). The Archbiſhop was in the Parliament Houſe the firſt day of his impeachment, and offered to make his defence; but he was abſent the next day, when ſentence was pronounced againſt him (8). It ſeems that the King had commanded him not to come into the Houſe, having firſt made him a promiſe of his friendſhip, and given him his oath, that the Lords ſhould do nothing to his prejudice (9). The Author of *the Life of King Richard II, written in Mr. Daniel's method*, publiſhed in the firſt Volume of the *Complete Hiſtory of England* tells us (10), that Sir John Buſhy, Speaker of the Houſe of Commons, demanded judgment upon Thomas, Duke of Gloceſter, and the Earls of Arundel, and Warwick, *for treaſon, in compelling the King to grant them a Commiſſion to govern the Realm, and upon the Archbiſhop for procuring the ſaid Commiſſion, and granting their pardons. The Archbiſhop roſe up to make his defence, but the King enjoined him ſilence till the next day, and then upon his appearance in the Houſe, he commanded him by the Biſhop of Carliſle to go home; and ſo he came to the Houſe no more.* The ſame Author obſerves afterwards (11), that the Archbiſhop who had been ſummoned to anſwer for the treaſons charged upon him, but excuſed by the King, and pardoned, with the Archbiſhop of York, the Biſhop of Wincheſter, and ſome others, was, at the earneſt importunity of Sir John Buſhy and the Commons of his party, baniſhed, and his Temporalities ſeized into the King's hands, having ſix weeks limited for his departure.

(5) Collier, pag. 601.

(6) Pag. 40. ed. London, 1599.

(7) Collier, pag. 601; *and* Hayward, *ubi ſupra.*

(8) Hollinſhead, pag. 490. *apud* Collier, p. 601.

(9) Collier, pag. 601, 602.

(10) Pag. 276. 2d edit. London 1719.

(11) Pag. 277.

[*E*] *The King hearing of this, wrote an expoſtulatory Letter to the Pope, which brought him to an abſolute compliance.*] He tells the Pope, that the Archbiſhop for his treaſonable conſpiracy had been only ſentenced to perpetual

was a conſiderable inſtrument in engaging Henry of Bolingbroke, Duke of Lancaſter, and afterwards King Henry IV, to invade England, in order to dethrone Richard II [*F*]. He ſhewed

perpetual baniſhment; whereas, if he had been dealt with anſwerably to his demerits, he ought to have ſuffered the puniſhment of high treaſon. But in conſideration of his character, and out of regard to Religion, his life was granted him, and the rigour of the law abated. The King obſerves then, that ſince his going beyond ſea, himſelf and his ſubjects were much ſurprized at the turn of his fortune; ſince they underſtood that he had been invited to the Court of Rome, countenanced under his misbehaviour, taken into his Holineſs's protection, and had an expectation given him of recovering his See, or at leaſt of being promoted in the Kingdom to more preferments in value, than he enjoyed before. How deſtructive ſuch unaccountable favours as theſe muſt be to his own dignity and government, and into what apparent danger it might bring his affairs, was eaſy to imagine. *For which reaſon,* continues the King, *we are reſolved never to endure ſuch uſage, tho' the whole world were of a different opinion. For we are throughly acquainted with this man; we know him to be of a turbulent ſeditious temper; who, if he were permitted to live in our dominions, would return to his old practices, poiſon our ſubjects with miſreporting the adminiſtration, and work againſt us in the dark. For it is probable he would uſe ſufficient precaution not to fall under the laſh of the law. We deſire therefore your Holineſs would pervent theſe opportunities of miſchief, and not ſhock our intereſt and inclination by ſuch favours. For ſhould ſuch meaſures be put in execution, it is poſſible they might create ſuch miſunderſtanding between the Crown and Mitre, as might prove difficult to remove. For, to ſpeak plainly, we cannot take that perſon for our friend, who careſſes our enemies, and takes them by the hand in ſo loving a manner. However, if you have a mind to provide for him otherwiſe, we have nothing to object; only we cannot allow him to dip in our diſh. We heartily deſire you would take this matter into ſerious conſideration, as you tender our Royal regard, and expect a compliance with any future requeſt which your Holineſs may make to us* (12). This Letter had ſo great an effect upon the Pope, that he not only changed his intentions of giving Arundel preferment; but at the King's inſtance promoted Roger Walden, then Lord Treaſurer of England, to the See of Canterbury, about the beginning of February 1398. *Eundem autem a ſede Cantuarienſi tranſtulit, & tranſlato Rogerum Walden, tunc Theſaurarium ſubrogavit, a Rege rogatus, Bonifacius Papa circa initium Februarii anno ſequente* (13).

(12) See *Antiquit. Britann. in Arundel,* and Collier, pag. 602.

(13) Hen. Whartoni, *Hiſt. de Epiſcop. & Decanis Londinenſ.* p. 147. edit. London, 1695.

[*F*] *He was a conſiderable inſtrument in engaging Henry of Bolingbroke Duke of Lancaſter, and afterwards King Henry IV, to invade England, in order to dethrone King Richard II.*] The people of England being extremely uneaſy at the oppreſſion, which they ſuffered from the King and his favourites, reſolved to ſet the crown upon the head of another, who might govern them in a more eaſy and equitable manner. They determined therefore to fix upon the Duke of Lancaſter, who had all the qualifications proper to make an excellent King, as well as a lineal title to it; becauſe he was the ſon of John of Gaunt, Duke of Lancaſter, fourth ſon of King Henry III, and after the death of Roger Mortimer, lately killed in Ireland, next allied to the Crown. Henry was then in baniſhment in France; and the people reſolved to invite him over with all the ſecrecy and expedition poſſible, for which purpoſe they ſent a letter by a faithful meſſenger to be delivered to Archbiſhop Arundel who was then in Brittany, and deſired him likewiſe in another letter to ſollicit the Duke to comply with their requeſt (14). Upon this Arundel went with the meſſengers to Paris, where he made the following ſpeech to the Duke, as we find it repreſented in the firſt part of Sir *John Hayward's Life and Reign of King Henry IV* (15). *We are ſent unto you, right high and noble Prince, from the chief Lords and States of our land, not to ſeek revenge againſt our King, upon private injury and diſpleaſure, nor upon a deſperate diſcontentment to ſet the State on fire, nor to procure the ambitious advancement of any particular perſon; but to open unto you the deformities and decays of our broken eſtate, and to deſire your aid in ſtaying the ruinous downfall of the ſame. The remembrance of the honourable reputation that our country hath borne, and the noble acts which it hath atchieved, doth nothing elſe but make the baſeneſs more bitter unto us, whereunto it is now fallen. Our victorious arms have hitherto been famous and memorable, not only within the bowels of our ocean ſea, and in the iſlands adjoining to us; but alſo in France, in Spain, and in other parts of Europe, yea, in Aſia and in Africk, againſt the Infidels and Barbarians; ſo that all Chriſtian Princes have been either glad to embrace our friendſhip, or loth to provoke us to hoſtility. But now the rude Scots, whoſe ſpirits we have ſo many times broken, and brought them on their knees, do ſcornfully inſult upon us. The native and fugitive Iriſh have ſhaken off our ſhacles, and glutted themſelves upon us with maſſacres and ſpoils. With theſe we daily fight, not for glory, but to live; inſomuch that we are become a pity to our friends, and a very jeſt to our baſe and contemptible enemies. Indeed the King hath both ſent and led great armies into theſe countries, but in ſuch ſort, that they have much waſted the Realm with their maintenance, but neither revenged nor relieved it with their arms. And no marvail, for all our diligent and diſcreet Leaders, the very ſinews of the field, are either put to death, or baniſhed, or elſe lie buried in obſcurity and diſgrace; and the marſhalling of all affairs is committed, without any reſpect of ſufficiency or deſert, to the counſel and conduct of thoſe, who can beſt apply themſelves to the King's youthful delights. Among theſe ancient nobility is accounted a vain jeſt; wealth and virtue are the ready means to bring to deſtruction.*" " It grieves " me to ſpeak, but it helpeth not to hide that, which " every man ſeeth. Our anceſtors liv'd in the higheſt " pitch and perfection of liberty; but we of ſervility, " being in the nature, not of ſubjects, but of abjects " and flat ſlaves, not to one intractable Prince only, " but to many proud and diſdainful favourites; not " always the ſame, but ever new; and no ſooner " have we ſatisfied ſome, but freſh hungry maſters " are ſtraitways ſet upon us, who have more enda- " maged us by extortion and bribes, than the enemy " hath done by the ſword. What unuſual kinds of " exaction are daily put in practice? without either " meaſure or end, and oftentimes without need, " or if any be, it proceedeth rather upon riotous ex- " pences, than any neceſſary or honourable charge, " and great ſums of money are pulled and pilled from " good ſubjects to be thrown away amongſt unprofit- " able unthrifts. And if any man open his mouth " againſt theſe extorted taxations, then either by " feigned imputation of capital crimes, or by ſmall " matters aggravated, or elſe by open cruelty and " force, his life or liberty is forthwith hazarded. It " were too tedious, too odious, too frivolous to put " you in mind of particular examples, as though " your own eſtate, and the lamentable loſs of your " uncle and other noble friends could be forgotten. " Yea I ſuppoſe, that there is no Man of Quality " within the realm, who either in his own perſon or " in his near friends doth not plainly perceive, that " no man enjoyeth the ſafe-guard of his goods " and ſurety of his body; but rich men in the one, " and great men in the other are continually en- " dangered." *This then is our caſe: but what is the remedy? We have endured, and we have entreated; but our patience hath drawn on more heavy burthens, and our complaints procured more bitter blows. By the one our livings, and our lives by the other are daily devoured. And therefore we are now compelled to ſhake off our ſhoulders this importable yoke, and ſubmit ourſelves to the ſovereignty of ſome more moderate and worthy perſon; not ſo much for the grief of our miſeries, which are paſt, nor for the pain of our preſent diſtreſſes, as for fear of ſuch dangers as are moſt like to enſue. For the King hath cut away the chief of the Nobility, and the Commons he hath pared to the quick, and ſtill he harrieth us as a conquered country; whereby we are laid bare to the havock of all our enemies, and utterly diſabled, not only to recover that which is loſt, but alſo to retain even that which is left. But to whom ſhould we complain? What ſuccour, whoſe aid ſhould we deſire? You are the only man, who in right ſhould,*

(14) Life of Richard II, in the *Complete Hiſtory of England,* vol. 1. pag. 282.

(15) Pag. 62, & ſeq.

ſhewed the utmoſt zeal to procure the Duke to be elected King, and made a ſolemn ſpeech upon the chooſing of him [G]. In the year 1403, when King Henry IV deſigned an expedition againſt the Welch, but wanted money to pay his troops, ſome of his officers propoſed an expedient to him; which was, that as there were ſeveral Biſhops in the army in

ſhould, and wiſdom can, and in goodneſs will, we hope, relieve us. For you are neareſt to the King in blood; and therefore ought to have the rule of that, which his weakneſs cannot weild? Your years are well ſtayed from the light conceits of youth, and ſo ſpent, that all your actions have made proof of ability in government of greateſt charge. Nothing paſt needeth excuſe, and fear is vain for any thing to come. The pains and perils, which heretofore you have undertaken for the benefit of your country, put us alſo in good hope, that in theſe extremities you will not forſake us. We are all as in a ſhip that is ready to ſink, as in a houſe that is ready to fall; and do moſt humbly crave and call for your help. Now or elſe never ſhew your ſelf in favour of your countrymen, to free us, to free yourſelf, to free the whole State from theſe dangers and decays, by taking into your hands the ſcepter and diadem of the Realm, and reducing again the government thereof to a princely freedom, in combining the ſovereignty of one with the liberty of all. Omit not this occaſion to ſet forth to the view of the world as in a large field, and at free ſcope your virtue and courage, by relieving miſerable wretches from their oppreſſors; which action hath been ſo highly honoured, that many Heathen men for the ſame have been accounted as Gods. This we are conſtrained to offer and entreat. This is both honourable for you to accept, and eaſy to be performed; and ſo much the more, in that no Prince by any people had been deſired with greater affection, nor ſhall be with more duty obeyed. The Duke replied to this ſpeech, that he had all his life been free from ambitious attempts, and that his advanced years had now cured his mind of aſpiring thoughts. That it was extremely difficult to dethrone a King; and even ſuppoſing it poſſible, it would be generally conſidered as unlawful. " And he, continues the Duke " (16), that ſhall attain a Kingdom upon the opinion " of deſert, doth charge himſelf with great expecta- " tion, and how honourably ſoever he carried him- " ſelf, ſhall never want his deadly envyers. Beſides " this, in civil diſſenſions the faith of the whole peo- " ple is fleeting, and danger is to be doubted from " every particular perſon; ſo that it is poſſible, that " all may fall away, and impoſſible to beware of eve- " ry one. Therefore I could rather wiſh to ſpend " the courſe of my years, which yet remain in this " obſcure yet ſafe and certain ſtate, than to thruſt " myſelf upon the pikes of thoſe perils, which being " once enter'd into, are dangerous to follow, and " deadly to forſake. For in private attempts a man " may ſtep and ſtop when he pleaſe; but he that aim- " eth at a Kingdom, hath no middle cauſe between " the life of a Prince, and the death of a Traitor." The Archbiſhop, in anſwer to this, urged the neceſſity which the Duke was under, to engage in the deſign, and aſſured him of all poſſible aſſiſtance from the people of England in general. And with regard to the novelty of ſuch an attempt, which the Duke had ſuggeſted, he obſerved to him (17), that *ſuch examples were not rare, nor long ſince put in practice, nor far hence to be fetched. The Kings of Denmark and of Swedeland are oftentimes baniſhed by their ſubjects, oftentimes impriſoned and put to their fine. The Princes of Germany about an hundred years paſt depoſed Adulphus the Emperor, and are now in hand to depoſe their Emperor Wenceſlaus. The Earl of Flanders was a while ſince driven out of his Dominion by his own people for uſurping greater power than appertaineth to his eſtate. The ancient Britains chaſed away their own King Caractacus for the lewdneſs of his life and cruelty of his rule. In the time of the Saxon Heptarchy Bernredus King of Mercia for his pride and ſtoutneſs towards his people was by them depoſed. Likewiſe Aldredus and Ethelbertus Kings of Northumberland were for their diſorders expelled by their ſubjects. Since the victory of the Normans the Lords endeavoured to expell King Henry III, but they were not able. Yet were they able to depoſe King Edward II, and to conſtitute his young ſon Edward King in his ſtead. Theſe are not all, and yet enough to clear this action of rareneſs in other countries, and novelty in ours.* The Archbiſhop afterwards attended the Duke to England, and was preſent at the aſſembly of the Nobility, held at the Tower of London on Michaelmas-day, which was the day before the ſitting of the Parliament, when King Richard read the form of his reſignation (18).

(16) Sir John Hayward, pag. 65.

(17) Idem, pag. 66, 67.

(18) Idem, pag. 86; and *Complete Hiſtory of England*, vol. I. pag. 285, 286.

[G] *He ſhewed the utmoſt zeal to procure the Duke to be elected King, and made a ſolemn ſpeech upon the chooſing of him.*] The Duke made a formal claim to the Crown; but how far that prevailed in the election, does not appear. The Archbiſhop did not think fit to inſiſt much upon this title, but put it in the choice of the houſes, whom they would have for their King. For, having mentioned in order ſeveral perſons, who had a near alliance to the Crown, he aſk'd the Houſes at laſt after ſome pauſe, whether they would have the Duke of Lancaſter for their King; to which they anſwered three times, *We will have him, and none elſe* (19). Upon this the Archbiſhop took him by the hand, and placed him in the Throne of State, the Archbiſhop of York aſſiſting him (20). Arundel then began a ſhort ſpeech upon the occaſion, taking this text for his ſubject, *Vir dominabitur*, 1 Sam. ix. 17. which according to the Engliſh Tranſlation runs thus: *And when Samuel ſaw Saul, the Lord ſaid unto him, Behold the man whom I ſpake to thee of; this ſame ſhall reign over my people.* He obſerved, that in theſe words God deſcribes the qualifications of a Governor; and ſince they might be truly applied to the preſent Prince, they afforded a very agreeable proſpect. That now they had no reaſon to fear that threatning denounced againſt the Jews by the Prophet Iſaiah, *I will give children to be their Princes* (21). That God was pleaſed to remember mercy in his wrath, to viſit his people, and not, as formerly, *to ſuffer babes to rule over us* (22). That to thoſe Princes, who had lately governed the Nation, the words of St. Paul might juſtly be applied, *When I was a child, I ſpake as a child, I underſtood as a child, I thought as a child* (23). For with regard to ſpeech, it is certain that a child is very inſignificant and variable. Truth and falſhhood are almoſt indifferent to him. He is forward to promiſe; but quickly forgets the performance. But *cum Vir dominatur populo*, when the people have *a Man to reign over them*, there will be none of theſe effects in the adminiſtration. For it is the property of a man to govern his tongue. The Archbiſhop then proceeds to comment upon theſe words of St. Paul, *I underſtood as a child*; and obſerves, that a child reliſhes nothing but what pleaſes his humour, and flatters his weakneſs. But as for remonſtrance and plain dealing, ſuch freedoms are always unacceptable. That ſuch had formerly been the misfortune of this Kingdom. Whereas on the other hand a man thinks farther, and is more abſolute in his paſſions. *In the laſt*, continues he, *the Apoſtle tells us*, I thought as a child; *and what are the thoughts of a child? A child makes it his buſineſs only to follow the ſollicitations of appetite. Thus, when a child governs, reaſon is diſcarded, humour is abſolute, and will carries all before it. But where fancy reigns, and reaſon is forced to retire, the adminiſtration muſt needs be unſteady and ill directed. But now having a Man at the helm, we are reſcued from the danger of ſo unhappy a conduct. This Prince, whom we now have, being a man both in age and underſtanding, will readily acknowledge the buſineſs of his ſtation, and make no ſcruple to ſay,* I come not to do my own will, but the will of him that ſent me; *that is, God's will. And therefore we may promiſe ourſelves, that* he will be ſtaid upon wiſdom; *that he will ſeriouſly conſider the Providence of God, and govern his practice by the rules of Religion. And in ſhort manage the adminiſtration in ſuch a manner, that the promiſe in Holy Scripture may not be unapplicable to his Government,* a King ſhall reign in righteouſneſs, and do judgment and juſtice in the earth (24). He concluded with a ſhort Prayer, that the King might long and happily reign over the Kingdom, to the glory of God, and the proſperity of the Nation; which was joined by the whole Aſſembly with joyful acclamations (25).

(19) *Complete Hiſtory*, p. 287.

(20) Hayward, p. 96.

(21) Cap. 3. ver. 4.

(22) Ibid.

(23) 1 Cor. xiii. 11.

(24) *See* Cotton's *Abridgment*, pag. 389; *and* Fabian's *Chron.* fol. 154. *apud* Collier, p. 607, 608.

(25) *Complete Hiſtory*, p. 287.

in a condition to ſupply him, they ought to be ſent home on foot, and their equipage and money taken from them for the publick ſervice. But the Archbiſhop who was preſent aſſured them, that if any of the ſoldiers offered to plunder his retinue, they might expect to meet with a very vigorous reſiſtance. This reſolution of his prevented the execution of that deſign (*e*). However he procured the King a ſupply [*H*]. He exerted himſelf likewiſe with great ſpirit in the Parliament held in 1404 in defence of the revenues of the church [*I*]. In 1408 he convened the Biſhops and Clergy of his Province of Oxford. The deſign of holding this Synod was to ſtop the progreſs of the Lollards, and to prevent the Univerſity's being farther tinctured with that perſuaſion (*f*). The proviſions agreed on for that purpoſe were digeſted into thirteen chapters or conſtitutions [*K*]. In 1411 being informed, that Wickliff's opinions gained ground notwithſtanding the condemnation of them

(*e*) Walſingh. *Hypodeigm. Neuſt.* pag. 561. *apud* Collier, p. 620.

(*f*) Collier, pag. 625.

[*H*] *This reſolution of his prevented the execution of that deſign. However he procured the King a ſupply.*] The Author of *the Life and Reign of King Henry IV* (26) relates this ſtory in a manner which differs in ſome circumſtances from that of Walſingham quoted by Mr. Collier; and tells us, that the King wanting money for the expedition againſt the Welch, ſome perſons about him, *who were*, as the Hiſtorian obſerves, *more zealous for the King's ſervice, and deſirous to pleaſe him, than to chooſe out fit ways for it*, adviſed him to ſeize upon the Biſhop's treaſure and lands; but the Archbiſhop boldly told them, that none of his Province ſhould be ſpoiled by them without oppoſition. Tho' the King was not forward to meddle with the Church-men, yet this advice put him in mind of the riches of the Clergy; *which being beſtowed on perſons, whoſe beſt character it is to be deſpiſers of the world, might beſt be ſpared at this juncture. And thereupon, though he would uſe no force, yet he dealt with the Archbiſhop to procure him a ſupply in this exigency; and ſo prevailed with him, that calling a Synod of the Clergy, he obtained a tenth of them for him, and the King ſent the Prince with his army into Wales.*

(26) *Complete Hiſtory*, vol. 1. pag. 288.

[*I*] *He exerted himſelf likewiſe with great ſpirit in the Parliament held in* 1404 *in defence of the revenues of the Clergy.*] This Parliament met at Coventry Octob. 6th; and becauſe it conſiſted of ſuch perſons, as were unſkilful in the Laws of the Nation and illiterate, according to the particular Orders given by the King to the Sheriffs of Counties and Mayors of Corporations, that none but ſuch perſons ſhould be choſen, it was called *Parliamentum indoctum*, or *the Lack-learning Parliament*. The chief buſineſs of this Parliament was to raiſe a tax for the King's ſupply; in the debates about which it was concluded, that as the King's affairs ſtood in need of very great ſums of money to defend the Nation from ſo many enemies, as then appeared againſt it, viz. the Welch, Scots, Britains, Flemings and French, he could not be ſupplied by the Laity; but that it was neceſſary that he ſhould ſeize upon the temporalities of the Clergy; which being one full third part of the Nation did little ſervice to the publick, and did the Clergy themſelves no good, making them careleſs of their duty, negligent in their ſtudies, and extremely corrupt in their morals. And this they judged the more reaſonable, becauſe the Laity ſerved the King in his wars both with their perſons and eſtates; but the Clergy were exempted in their perſons, and therefore their eſtates ought to bear a greater part of the charge. Theſe Votes highly incenſed the Clergy; and the Archbiſhop replied, that the Clergy had always as well in this as the former reigns given as large ſums to ſupport the publick charge, as the Laity. And though they did not ſerve the King in perſon in his wars, they ſent their tenants to aſſiſt him, and contributed as much to his ſucceſs by their Prayers, as the Laity did by their weapons (27). Sir John Cheyney, the Speaker of the Houſe of Commons, replied immediately, that they did not value the Clergy's Prayers, ſince their lands would do the King and Nation more good. This Sir John Cheyney, as we are informed by Walſingham (28), had himſelf before taken Deacon's Orders, but deſerted that profeſſion, and turned Soldier. The Archbiſhop was greatly provoked at what he had ſaid, and told him plainly, that the King and Kingdom could not expect to proſper, where the prayers and ſuffrages of the Clergy were undervalued; but yet if they regarded not their Religion, they ſhould find their power and intereſts were not ſo inconſiderable, but that they would meet with a vigorous oppoſition, if they attempted to take away their juſt rights and poſſeſſions from them, tho' under the ſpecious pretence of a Law. And he declared, that ſo long as he was Archbiſhop of Canterbury, no man ſhould meddle with any lands belonging to his See, but he would oppoſe him with all his intereſt and power. The King was preſent at this conteſt between the Archbiſhop and Commons, and ſhewed ſo little concern for the Clergy, that he ſeemed to favour the deſign of the latter. Whereupon the Archbiſhop in ſome fear of it turned to the King, and kneeling deſired him, that he would conſider, that God had given him the Kingdom, that he ſhould be the Protector of his Church, and to that end he had ſworn at his Coronation to preſerve the Church and her Miniſters in their liberties: which oath he could not break without a great prejudice to his own conſcience and offence to God as well as injuſtice to men; and therefore he implored him to fear the God by whom he reigned, and his own conſcience. The King ſeeing the Archbiſhop's earneſtneſs and zeal, anſwered him, that tho' he could not condemn his piety, yet his fears were groundleſs as to him, for he might aſſure himſelf, that he would leave the Church in as good if not a better eſtate, than he found it. The Archbiſhop being encouraged by this promiſe told the Commons, that their wicked advice was intended more for their own, than the King's advantage; for as it happened to the King's predeceſſors, who ſeized upon the lands and goods of the Friars Aliens, which were worth many thouſand pounds, the Courtiers begged them, and left not the King ten groats of them; ſo if you, ſays he, could obtain your wicked deſigns to have our temporalities ſeized, you would find ſuch methods to gratify your covetouſneſs by them, that the King would not in a year's time be one farthing the richer. The Commons made no reply, but proſecuted their deſign with ſo much vigour, that if the Archbiſhop had not raiſed a ſtrong party againſt it in the Houſe of Lords, the Commons would have carried it. But by his courage and diligence their purpoſe was defeated, and they returned to their former manner of taxing; for the Laity were to pay two fifteens, and the Clergy a tenth and a half, but upon condition, that it ſhould be put into the hands of the Lord Furnival to be employed for the King's wars; and ſo the Parliament ended (29). Walſingham, quoted by Collier (30), tells us, that the Archbiſhop being apprehenſive, that this affair might be brought upon the board again, made an intereſt with the Lords, who declared, that the Church ſhould never be rifled in their time. And at laſt the Commons themſelves aſked the Archbiſhop's pardon, admired his courage, and confeſſed the injuſtice of their expedient.

(27) Ibid. pag. 290.

(28) *Hiſt. Angl.* pag. 371, 372.

(29) *Complete Hiſtory*, vol. 1. pag. 290, 291.

(30) Pag. 621.

[*K*] *The proviſions agreed on for that purpoſe were digeſted into thirteen Chapters or Conſtitutions.*] Mr. Collier has given a particular account of theſe Conſtitutions in his *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (31). Several of them were deſigned to reſtrain perſons unauthoriſed from preaching; and determined that all thoſe, who were qualified to preach, ſhould have regard to their audience; and when they preached to the Clergy, ſhould declaim againſt the failings of that order; when they had the Laity for their congregation, ſhould remonſtrate againſt thoſe vices, for which they were moſt remarkable. They prohibit likewiſe the reading of Wickliff's Books, or publiſhing of any Books, unleſs they were firſt examined by the Univerſity of Oxford or Cambridge. And they decree, that no unauthoriſed perſon ſhall preſume to tranſlate any part of Scripture into Engliſh or any other languages; with ſeveral other prohibitions againſt diſputing about the articles of Faith ſettled by the Church.

(31) Book 7. p. 625, 626, 627.

them in a full congregation at Oxford, and that his books became more valued than before, he reſolved to viſit the Univerſity, and to apply ſome farther remedy. He went down with the Earl of Arundel his nephew, and with a pompous retinue. When he came near the town he was met by Richard Courtney the Chancellor, the Proctors, and a numerous appearance of the Maſters and Students. The Chancellor told the Archbiſhop, that if he only came to ſee the town he was very welcome; but if he came under the character of a Viſitor, he deſired him to take notice, that the Univerſity of Oxford had enjoyed many years the privilege of the Pope's Bull, and been exempted from Epiſcopal and Archiepiſcopal Juriſdiction. The Archbiſhop reſenting this, left Oxford a day or two after, and wrote the King an account of his diſappointment (*g*), who, having the diſpute referred to his determination, gave it in favour of the Archbiſhop [*L*]. His warm zeal againſt the doctrines of Wickliff and the Lollards urged him to the greateſt ſeverities, and particularly againſt Sir John Oldcaſtle, Lord Cobham [*M*]. But he was cut off by death in the midſt of his rigours for the ſuppreſſion of what he thought hereſy on the 20th of

(*g*) Idem, pag. 629, 630.

[*L*] *Wrote an account of his diſappointment to the King, who, having the diſpute referred to his determination, gave it in favour of the Archbiſhop.*] The King upon hearing that the Univerſity had refuſed to admit the Archbiſhop's Viſitation, ordered the heads of the Univerſity to be ſent for up to Court, and the Chancellor and Proctors to be removed from their Office. The Students were ſo far diſconcerted with theſe rigours, that they diſcontinued the public lectures, and were even upon the point of breaking up and diſſolving their body. The King being informed of what paſſed, ſent them a ſevere letter at firſt, but afterwards treated them in a more gentle manner. In ſhort, after a warm conteſt between the Univerſity and the Archbiſhop, both parties agreed to refer the matter to the King; who ordered that the point ſhould reſt upon the foot, it had formerly been ſettled by King Richard II. And thus judgment was given for the Archbiſhop. This Award was afterwards confirmed by Act of Parliament (32). The Archbiſhop, in order to fortify himſelf ſtill further, procured a Bull from Pope John to revoke the privilege of exemption granted to the Univerſity by Boniface. But this Bull of revocation was afterwards vacated by Sixtus IV, who, as much as in him lay, reſtored the Univerſity to their former immunities (33). With regard to the King's deciſion, if the Univerſity did not abide by it, but diſturb the Archbiſhop or his ſucceſſors in their Viſitation, they were to forfeit a thouſand pounds, and their Franchiſes to be ſeized, and remain in the King's hands, till they ſubmitted to the Award.

(32) Fuller's *Church Hiſt.* B. 4. p. 166. *Ex Rot. in Turr. Lond. apud* Collier, p. 630.

(33) Wood, *Hiſt. Univerſ. Oxon.* p. 205. Cotton's *Abridgment*, pag. 480. *apud eund.*

[*M*] *Urged him to the greateſt ſeverities, and particularly againſt Sir John Old-Caſtle, Lord Cobham.*] The convocation of the Clergy, which according to the cuſtom of theſe times always ſat with the Parliament, being convened in St. Paul's Church, about three weeks after Eaſter, 1413, in the firſt year of the Reign of King Henry V, the Archbiſhop, who was ſenſible of that King's zeal for the Church, thought this a fit opportunity to root out Hereſy, which had ſpread itſelf very extenſively. And therefore having by twelve Inquiſitors ſent out the year before, made a full collection of the principal doctrines and opinions maintained by the Lollards, which he reduced into two hundred and forty ſix heads, and having diſcovered who were the chief maintainers of them, he repreſented the ſame to the Convocation, and deſired their advice what methods were proper to ſtop the progreſs of Hereſy. At laſt he brought them to theſe reſolutions and decrees, that it would not be poſſible to extirpate the doctrines of Wickliff, unleſs certain great men, who were the profeſſed abettors and maintainers of them, and particularly Sir John Old-Caſtle, were removed out of the way. The Archbiſhop, who had appeared peculiarly zealous in the Convocation againſt Heretics, did not abate of his heat, when it was ended, but immediately went to the King with complaints againſt the Lord Cobham, as an arch-heretic and enemy of the Church, and deſired his permiſſion to proceed againſt him according to the late decree of the Clergy, and the laws in force againſt Heretics. The King obſerving the warm zeal of the Archbiſhop, and being more moderate himſelf, replied, that tho' he had a particular deſire to ſupport the Church both in its Doctrine and Order, and was ſenſible, that unity was the life of Chriſtianity, becauſe it maintains that *love, which is the fulfilling of the law*; yet he thought that the moſt prudent courſe to reduce the erroneous was by mild perſuaſions and convincing arguments, for if the truth were on their ſide, it would prevail by its own ſtrength at laſt; which if it could be done, it would be much better than to make uſe of thoſe engines, which have been for the moſt part uſed to ſubdue and deſtroy the truth, and ſeldom do any ſervice to the Church, further than to work diſſembled union and converſion. He therefore adviſed Arundel to uſe all gentle methods to reform and reduce him, promiſing, that he himſelf would treat with the Lord Cobham about his opinions, and if he could not reclaim him, would leave him to the Church and Law. The Archbiſhop departed with this anſwer; and the King ſent ſoon after for the Lord Cobham, and having told him of the charge of Hereſy, which the Archbiſhop had brought againſt him, admoniſhed him to ſubmit to the Church. The Lord Cobham thanked him for his kindneſs, but returned him this anſwer, that by the Law of God he owed obedience to no perſon on earth but to his Majeſty, who was his natural Prince and God's Vice-gerent; but as for the Pope and his Hierarchy, he owed them no ſervice, becauſe he knew him to be the Antichriſt, and them the *Abomination ſtanding in the Holy Place*, by the deſcription given them in ſcripture. This reſolute reply ſomewhat offended the King, ſo that he diſmiſſed him without any further diſcourſe or perſuaſion. The Archbiſhop being informed by the King, of the Lord Cobham's inflexible adherence to his opinions, aſſembled a Council of the Clergy, and ſent his Somner to cite him to anſwer perſonally before him to ſuch accuſations, as ſhould be urged againſt him (34); who told the meſſenger, that he ſhould take no notice of the ſummons. When the day came, the Archbiſhop finding him as good as his word, and being informed that he had fortified his Caſtle, and declared againſt the authority of his Metropolitan, had him publickly cited in form; and at laſt, perceiving that he refuſed to appear, proceeded to excommunication. After this cenſure he ſent him another ſummons, to appear before him on the Feſtival of St. Matthew to ſhew cauſe why he ſhould not pronounce him guilty of Hereſy and Schiſm, and apply to the aid of the ſecular power. During this interval the Lord Cobham was ſeized, and at the day prefixed was brought to St. Paul's before the Archbiſhop, by Sir Robert Morley Lieutenant of the Tower (35). But there was little done at that time, becauſe he delivered in to him a ſhort paper of his opinion about the Holy Sacrament, Images, Penance, and Pilgrimages, which tho' not ſatisfactory to Arundel and the other Biſhops preſent, yet he would give no other anſwer upon thoſe points. He had therefore further time allowed him for a more diſtinct anſwer, which was till the 25th of Sept. when being again examined at the Hall of the *Black Friars* within Ludgate, he aſſerted, that in the Sacrament of the Altar, there was, after Conſecration, both the Body of Chriſt and Bread, in the ſame manner as in the Perſon of Chriſt the Divinity was united with the Humanity; that the Pope and his Prelates are Antichriſt, and not the true Church of God; that Saints are not to be worſhipped nor to be ſought to by Pilgrimages; and that Images cannot be an object of Worſhip (36). Being inflexible in theſe opinions, the Archbiſhop with great regret, as Walſingham repreſents it, declared him an Heretic convict, and left him as ſuch to the ſecular power, and excommunicated all

(34) *Complete Hiſtory*, vol. I. pag. 309, 310.

(35) Collier, pag. 632.

(36) *Complete Hiſtory*, vol. I. pag. 310.

of February 1413, having enjoyed the See of Canterbury about ſeventeen years [*N*]. It is ſaid, that as he was pronouncing the ſentence of Excommunication upon the Lord Cobham, he was ſeized with a foreneſs in his throat and at the roots of his tongue, which prevented him from ſwallowing either meat or drink, and ſo he was ſtarved to death. This was conſidered then as a judgment upon him, not only for his ſeverity to the Lollards, whom he had condemned, and cauſed to be burnt to death, but becauſe he had made a Canon the year before in a Synod held at Rocheſter againſt the Lord Cobham, in which he prohibited the tranſlation of the Scripture into the Engliſh tongue, and the preaching of the Goſpel by the Lollards (*b*). Mr. Collier tells us (*i*), that he was a perſon of a great natural capacity, well improved by ſtudy and experience; and that he did not want either learning, courage, or activity, to qualify him for his ſtation. However his conduct was exceptionable with regard to King Richard II, in joining his endeavours to dethrone him. That Hiſtorian obſerves likewiſe, that the Lollards ſeem to have given him great provocation, though his ſeverities to them were by no means juſtifiable; and he endeavours to vindicate the Archbiſhop from the charge of inconſiſtency in forbidding the tranſlation of the Scriptures [*O*]. He was interred at Canterbury.

(*b*) *Complete Hiſtory of England*, vol. 1. p. 311. 2d edition 1719. *and* Godwin, pag. 179.

(*i*) Pag. 634, 635.

all thoſe, who for the future ſhould appear in his defence, and abet his intereſt. When the Court roſe, the Archbiſhop gave the King an account of the proceedings, and deſired that the execution might be reſpited for fifty days. This requeſt was eaſily granted; for, as the Hiſtorian continues, both the King and Archbiſhop were extremely deſirous to preſerve him; ſo that being remanded to the Tower, he found an opportunity to make his eſcape (37).

(37) Collier, p. 634.

[*N*] *Cut off by death .... on the 20th of February 1413, having enjoyed the See of Canterbury about ſeventeen years.*] This is the account of Biſhop Godwin; but Mr. Collier (38) ſays, it was on the 19th of that month; and the Author of *the Life and Reign of Hen. V.* publiſhed in the *Complete Hiſtory* (39) tells us, that it was on the 20th of February the year following, and that he ſat eighteen years in the See of Canterbury.

(38) Pag. 634.

(39) Vol. 1. pag. 311.

[*O*] *Endeavours to vindicate the Archbiſhop from the charge of Inconſiſtency in forbidding the tranſlation of the Scriptures.*] Biſhop Godwin obſerves, that when he was Lord Chancellor and Archbiſhop of York, he preached Queen Anne's Funeral Sermon at Weſtminſter; in which he commended that Princeſs for employing her time in reading the four Goſpels tranſlated into Engliſh with learned Annotations upon them. But how is this commendation reconcileable to his practice afterwards? How does this agree with his Synodical Conſtitution, which prohibits the tranſlation of the Holy Scriptures? *To this it may be anſwered*, ſays Mr. Collier (40), *that the Archbiſhop's Conſtitution declares only againſt a tranſlation made by a private hand; and that no Verſion of the Holy Scriptures ſhould be uſed till it was allowed by a Provincial Synod, or at leaſt by the Biſhop of the Dioceſe* (41). *Now without doubt the Archbiſhop was ſo far in the right not to allow every private perſon the liberty of tranſlating the Scriptures. To have done otherwiſe might have been a dangerous permiſſion. It might have opened a paſſage to Hereſy and Error, and put it into the power of ignorant and deſigning people to corrupt the Holy Text, and poiſon the Fountain of Life.*

(40) Pag. 635.

(41) Lindwood, *Provincial.* lib. 5. tit. 4. p. 286.

T.

☞ASCHAM (ROGER), one of the moſt polite Writers of the ſixteenth Century, and tutor to Queen Elizabeth, was born at Kirby Wiſke or Wiche near Northallerton in Yorkſhire of a reputable family about the year 1515. His father, John Aſcham, was Steward to the family of the Scroops, and remarkable for his great probity, prudence, and modeſty. His mother Margaret was related to ſeveral good families, and a woman of an excellent character. Our Author had two brothers, whoſe names were Thomas and Anthony, and ſeveral ſiſters. His parents, after they had lived together forty ſeven years with the greateſt harmony and conjugal affection, died on the ſame day, and almoſt at the ſame hour. Before his father's death, he was taken into the noble family of the Wingfield's, and educated at the expence of Sir Anthony Wingfield with his two ſons under the care of Mr. R. Bond. While he was very young his affection for learning appeared very evident, and as ſoon as he had learned to read, he began to be extremely fond of Engliſh books. Having compleated his firſt ſtudies under his private tutor, he was ſent by his Patron to St. John's College at Cambridge about the year 1530 (*a*), where by his intenſe application he made a prodigious progreſs in polite Literature, and contracted an intimacy with perſons of the moſt diſtinguiſhed genius and learning [*A*]. He took his degree of Bachelor of Arts with univerſal applauſe the 28th of Feb. 1534, when he was but eighteen years of age; and on the 23d of March following he was elected Fellow of the

(*a*) Edwardi Grant, *Oratio de Vita & Obitu Rogeri Aſchami*, pag. 4, 5. prefixed to the edition of *Aſcham's Latin Epiſtles*, printed at Oxford 1703.

[*A*] *Made a prodigious progreſs in polite Learning, and contracted an intimacy with perſons of the moſt diſtinguiſhed genius and learning.*] His tutor was Mr. Hugh Fitzherbert, Fellow of St. John's College, a man of great merit. The College at that time was the reſidence of ſeveral perſons remarkable for their profound knowledge in Divinity, Philoſophy, and polite literature. Their example raiſed ſuch an emulation in our Author, that by his uncommon induſtry and force of genius, he equalled, if not excelled all his contemporaries in the knowledge of the Greek and Roman Languages. *Imo certe in hoc uno collegio, quod ea ætate ſingula totius orbis literarum domicilia & doctiſſimorum Theologorum numero, eruditiſſimorum philoſophorum turba, eloquentiſſimorum oratorum multitudine, vel juſtè adæquare, vel longè ſuperare poſſet, erant complurimi homines omni politiori literaturâ linguarumque cognitione præſtantiſſimi. Quorum ille provocatus exemplis, & literarum imbibendarum ardore incenſus, brevi, propter admirabilem ingenii vim, & indefeſſam in ſtudiis induſtriam, tantos in Græcis Latiniſque literis progreſſus feçit, ut omnes æquales, ſi non ſuperaret, certè unus ſingulos adæquaret* (1). Among theſe contemporaries of his were George Day, John Redman, Robert Pember, Thomas Smith, John Cheek, Nicholas Ridley, Edmund Grindal afterwards Archbiſhop of Canterbury, Thomas Watſon, Walter Haddon, James Pilkington, R. Horn, John Chriſtopherſon afterwards Biſhop of Chicheſter, Thomas Wilſon, John Seton, and ſeveral other men, who afterwards appeared to great advantage, and filled ſome of the moſt conſiderable poſts in the Kingdom. Mr. Aſcham was remarkable among his other excellent qualifications for a ſingular modeſty, which endeared him to all, who knew him. He was particularly fond of the Greek Language, to improve himſelf in which he inſtructed others in it, when he was very young himſelf. Mr. Robert Pember adviſed him to learn

(1) Edwardi Grant, *Oratio de Vita & Obitu R. Aſchami*, pag. 6.

the College by the intereſt of Dr. Nicholas Medcalf Maſter of the College at that time [*B*]. Theſe honours animated him to a ſtill greater vigour in the proſecution of his ſtudies [*C*]. At the Commencement at Cambridge held the Tueſday after the Feaſt of St. Peter and St. Paul in 1536 he was made Maſter of Arts, when he was twenty one years of age. His pupils made great advances in learning under his care, and particularly Mr. William Grindall, who was afterwards upon Mr. Aſcham's recommendation ſent for to court by Sir John Cheek, and made Tutor to the Lady Elizabeth. Our Author, tho' very young, was appointed by the Univerſity to teach the Greek tongue publickly in the ſchools, and had a conſiderable ſtipend allowed him before King Henry VIII founded his Greek Lecture at Cambridge. Afterwards he read Lectures upon that language in St. John's College for a long time (*b*). He was at firſt averſe to the new manner of pronouncing the Greek tongue introduced by Sir John Cheek [*D*], but afterwards conformed to it. In July 1542 he ſupplicated the Univerſity of Oxford under the name of Roger Haſkam to be incorporated Maſter of Arts there, as he had been at Cambridge; but whether

(*b*) Grant, pag. 5—10.

learn inſtrumental Muſic, which would prove a very agreeable entertainment to him after his ſeverer ſtudies, and was eaſy to be obtained by him, ſince he was a great maſter of vocal Muſic. In one of his letters he thank'd Mr. Aſcham for the letter, which he had written to him in Greek, with an elegance and propriety worthy Athens itſelf; and recommended to him the learning of inſtrumental Muſic; and continuing to inſtruct the youth in the Greek Language, ſince a ſingle Fable of Æſop read by himſelf would be of more ſervice to him than to hear the Latin Lectures of the moſt learned Profeſſor upon the whole Iliad of Homer. He directs him likewiſe to read Pliny, who diſplays an infinite fund of knowledge, and the whole extent and beauty of the Latin tongue. *Rogere cariſſime, ago tibi gratias pro Epiſtolâ tuâ Græcâ, quæ vel Athenis videri potuerat ſcripta, adeo ad unguem* καὶ τὸν Ἑλληνισμὸν *obſervâſti; & eſt elegantiſſimè depicta, quod in te perpetuum eſt. . . . Da operam, ut ſis perfectius, non Stoicus, ἀλλὰ* Λυρικὸς, *hoc eſt, ut bellè pulſes lyram. Perlege, ut facis, Græcum aliquid pueris; plus utilitatis allatura eſt tibi unica fabella Æſopi perlecta abs te, quam ſi audiſſes totam Iliada Latinè à doctiſſimo enarratam. Plinium lege, in quo rerum cognitio eſt maxima, & Latinæ linguæ opes floridiſſimæ* (2). As he advanced in age, he applied himſelf to the conſtant reading of the beſt Greek and Roman Authors, and to the improvement of himſelf in his private exerciſes, and was preſent at all the logical diſputations both at his own college and others, and endeavoured to make himſelf maſter of Philoſophy, Eloquence, and Hiſtory (3).

(2) Idem, p. 7.

(3) Idem, pag. 8.

[*B*] *Elected Fellow of the College by the intereſt of Dr. Nicholas Medcalf Maſter of the College at that time.*] Mr. Aſcham tells us in his Schoolmaſter (4), that Dr. Medcalf was Maſter of the College, when he came there; *A man*, ſays he, *meanly learned himſelf, but not meanly affectioned to ſet forward learning in others. He was partial to none, but indifferent to all; a Maſter of the whole, a Father to every one in that College. There was none ſo poor, if he had either will to goodneſs, or wit to learning, that could lack being there, or ſhould depart from thence for any need. . . . He was a Papiſt indeed; but would to God among all us Proteſtants I might once ſee but one, that would win like praiſe, in doing like good for the advancement of learning and virtue. And yet, tho' he were a Papiſt, if any young man, given to* New Learning (*as they termed it*) *went beyond his fellows in wit, labour, and towardneſs; even the ſame neither lacked open praiſe to encourage him, nor private exhibition to maintain him.* "I myſelf, continues our Author, one of the meaneſt "of a great number in that College, becauſe there "appeared in me ſome ſmall ſhew of towardneſs and "diligence, lacked not his favour to further me in "learning. And being a boy, new Bachelor of Arts, "I chanced among my companions to ſpeak againſt "the Pope; which matter was then in every man's "mouth, becauſe Dr. Hains and Dr. Skip were come "from the Court to debate the ſame matter by preach-"ing and diſputation in the Univerſity." *This happened the ſame time, when I ſtood to be Fellow there. My talk came to Dr. Medcalf's ear. I was called before him and the Seniors, and after grievous rebuke and ſome puniſhment, open warning was given to all the Fellows, none to be ſo hardy to give me his voice at that election. And yet, for all thoſe open threats, the good Father himſelf privily procured, that I ſhould even then be choſen Fellow. But the election being done, he made countenance of great diſcontent thereat. This good man's goodneſs and fatherly diſcretion uſed towards me that one day, ſhall never be out of my remembrance all the days of my life. And for the ſame cauſe have I put it here in this ſmall Record of learning. For next to God's Providence, ſurely that day was by that good Father's means,* Dies Natalis *to me, for the whole foundation of the poor learning I have, and of all the furtherance, that hitherto elſewhere I have obtained.*

(4) B. II. p. 165, 166, 167, of Mr. Upton's edition. London 1711.

[*C*] *Theſe honours animated him to a ſtill greater vigour in the proſecution of his ſtudies.*] He read Cicero with the utmoſt attention imaginable, and was a prodigious admirer of him and of Cæſar's Commentaries, to which two Authors he aſcribed all the purity and unaffected elegance of ſtyle, which appear in his writings. He was likewiſe particularly fond of Plato and Ariſtotle among the Philoſophers, of Thucydides and Herodotus among the Hiſtorians, and Demoſthenes and Iſocrates among the Orators; and he read Lectures upon the two laſt of theſe Authors to his pupils in private. He expounded alſo ſeveral other Philoſophers, Orators, and Poets, either publickly in the college, or privately in his own chamber; by which means, as well as by his own ſtudy and application, he gained ſo extenſive a knowledge of Literature, and ſo ready a faculty in Latin and Greek, that his reputation encreaſed perpetually. *Varios philoſophos, oratores, poetas, aut publicè in collegio, aut privatim in cubiculo exponebat. Ex quibus ſtudiis & exercitationibus tantam & eruditionis acceſſionem, & tam plenam utriuſque linguæ facultatem eſt adeptus, ut nomen ejus magis atque magis enituerit* (5).

(5) Idem, pag. 9.

[*D*] *He was at firſt averſe to the new manner of pronouncing the Greek tongue introduced by Sir John Cheek.*] This we are informed of by Mr. Grant, who approves of this new pronunciation, and tells us, that this engaged Mr. Aſcham at firſt in a diſpute with Mr. Ponet, an ingenious young Gentleman, who was Fellow of Queen's College. But he did not proceed to an open oppoſition to it, out of regard to the Authority of Sir John Cheek and Mr. Smith, afterwards Sir Thomas Smith, whom he eſteemed as his moſt valuable friends, and always acknowledged his obligations to them for their inſtructions. *Hic inprimis novam Græcæ linguæ pronunciationem ab ornatiſſimis viris totius Academiæ luminibus, Thoma Smith & Joanne Checo feliciſſimè introductam imitari & amplecti nolebat; & ob eam cauſam in initio cum Poneto juvene ingenioſo & diſerto Reginæ Collegii ſocio, velitabatur. Sed in eam graviter ac apertè invehi propter Checi & Smithi auctoritatem non audebat; quos ſuos ornatiſſimos amicos, doctiſſimos ſemper præceptores agnovit* (6). However not long after this he adopted the new pronunciation, and ſtrenuouſly defended it as long as he lived, as appears from a Letter of his to Hubert, a man of eminent learning in the Greek and Latin tongues, who was Secretary to the Count Palatine on the Rhine. This *Hubert*, as he is ſtiled in the edition of Aſcham's Letters, was the famous *Hubertus Languetus*, who is ſuppoſed to have been the Author of the *Vindiciæ contra Tyrannos*, publiſhed under the name of *Junius Brutus*. Mr. Aſcham's Letter to him upon the ſubject of the Pronunciation of the Greek Language is the 12th Letter of the 3d Book, and is dated from Bruſſels the 6th of March 1553.

(6) Idem, pag. 10, 11.

whether he was incorporated or not, does not appear by the regiſter (*c*). He was extremely fond of Archery or ſhooting with the bow, as appears by the book which he wrote upon that ſubject, and dedicated to King Henry VIII in the year 1544 [*E*], before his expedition into France to take Boulogne. He was remarkable for the neatneſs of his hand writing, and taught Prince Edward, the Lady Elizabeth, and the two brothers Henry and Charles, Dukes of Suffolk, that art; and wrote all the letters of the Univerſity to the King, and to perſons of the higheſt Quality for many years (*d*). In 1544 he ſucceeded Sir John Cheek as Orator of the Univerſity (*e*). In February 1548 he was ſent for upon the death of his former pupil Mr. Grindall to inſtruct the Lady Elizabeth, afterwards Queen, who made an uncommon progreſs in learning under him, and had a great eſteem for him [*F*]. He afterwards deſired leave to return to Cambridge, where he purſued his former ſtudies, and diſcharged his place as Orator of the Univerſity, and enjoyed a very

(*c*) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* Vol. 1. Col. 65.

(*d*) Grant, pag. 14.

(*e*) Idem, ibid. and Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

1553. He obſerves there, that the oppoſers of this pronunciation object, that it is in uſe no where but among the Engliſh; and that the modern Greeks abſolutely reject it. Mr. Aſcham remarks upon this, that uſe and cuſtom cannot now be juſtly urged, ſince the ancient and genuine Greek has ceaſed to be a living language; and that the modern Greeks are ſo extremely degenerated, that no argument can be properly drawn from their authority. He inſiſts particularly upon the letter B; which is very differently pronounced by the patrons of the new pronounciation from the oppoſers of it; ſince the latter pronounce the word χυβίρνω, *chiverno*, in which, as he obſerves, they miſtake in three letters χ, υ, β. The Latins have retained the very ſound as well as ſenſe of this word in their *guberno*, only changing the χ into a γ, as the ancient Greeks frequently did. With regard to B, he quotes the authority of Euſtathius, who in explaining this line of Homer, Βῆ δὲ κατ' Ὀλύμποιο &c. tells us the Βῆ is the peculiar ſound expreſſed by the bleating of the ſheep; and therefore it is eaſy to determine, whether it is to be pronounced as *vi* or as *be*, agreeably to the Engliſh manner; unleſs, ſays he, the Greek ſheep bleated in a different manner from thoſe of England, Germany, and Italy. *Jam utrum ulla ovis effert* Vi *ut vos, an* Be *ut nos, judicetis. Anglæ ſcio omnes, & Germanæ & Italæ pro nobis faciunt; ſed fortaſſe Græcæ oves olim non balabant, ſed vilabant.* Cicero likewiſe in the 22d Epiſtle of his 9th Book *ad Famil.* ſpeaking of obſcene words, ſays, that the Greek word Βίνει ſounds like the Latin word *bini*. *Cum loquimur terni nihil flagitii dicimus; at cum* bini *obſcœnum eſt. Græcis quidem, inquies; nihil eſt ergo in verbo, quando & ego Græcè ſcio, & tamen tibi dico,* bini, *idque tu facis, quaſi ego Græcè, non Latinè dixerim.* St. Auſtin alſo in his Book *de Doctrinâ Chriſtianâ L.* 11. *c.* 24. remarks, that *Beta* pronounced exactly in the ſame manner ſignifies a Letter among the Greeks, and an Herb among the Latins. *Et* Beta *uno eodemque ſono apud Græcos literæ, apud Latinos oleris nomen eſt.* Mr. Aſcham informs his friend, that he could produce many other teſtimonies to the ſame purpoſe; and promiſes him to conſider the pronunciation of the other letters in the future courſe of his correſpondence. Hubertus wrote him an anſwer to this dated from Heidelberg the 9th of Auguſt the ſame year, which is publiſhed among the Letters written to Aſcham (7).

(7) Epiſt. 19. p. 404. edit. Oxon. 1703.

[*E*] *The Book which he wrote upon that ſubject, and dedicated to King Henry VIII in the year* 1544.] It was entitled *Toxophilus; the School or Partitions of ſhooting, contained in two Books,* written, ſays Mr. Wood (8), in 1544, and printed at London in 4to 1571. Our Author's friend Mr. Pember wrote theſe verſes upon his Book:

(8) *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 1. fol. 65.

Non minus hic arcu eſt quam lingua clarus utraque,
Sic ornat patriam, ſic juvat ille ſuam.

Some perſons objected to his diverting himſelf with his bow, as if it was incompatible with the character and gravity of a Scholar. But he guarded againſt ſuch imputations as theſe in the firſt Book of his *Toxophilus*, and ſhewed the reaſonableneſs of relaxing the mind from graver ſtudies by proper exerciſes of the body; which was the more neceſſary for him, as he had a very infirm conſtitution (9). Henry VIII ſettled an annual penſion upon him for the Dedication of that Book, at the recommendation of Sir William Paget; which was diſcontinued upon the death of that King, but reſtored during pleaſure by Edward VI, and afterwards by Queen Mary with the addition of ten pounds a year more, at the ſollicitation of the ſame Gentleman and of the Biſhop of Wincheſter (10).

(9) Grant, pag. 11—14.

(10) Idem, pag. 21, 22.

[*F*] *Who made an uncommon progreſs under him, and had a great eſteem for him.*] He had the honour of aſſiſting her in her ſtudies for two years, and ſhe attended to him with ſo much pleaſure, that it is difficult to ſay, whether the Maſter or the Scholar had greater ſatisfaction. *Illam ille tanta diligentia, tanta experientia & ſtudio duos annos docuit, & illa illum tanta conſtantia, labore, amore, & voluptate audivit, ut ille ne majore quidem cum jucunditate & voluptate prælegerit, an illa lubentiore animo didicerit, non poſſum quidem facile ſtatuere* (11). He read with her almoſt all Cicero's works, great part of Livy, ſelect Orations of Iſocrates, the Tragedies of Sophocles, the Greek Teſtament, the *Common Places* of Philip Melancthon, and many others of the moſt conſiderable Authors. And with regard to this method, which he took in teaching that Lady, having obſerved in his *Schoolmaſter* (12), that Pliny the Younger in an Epiſtle to his Friend, *expreſſes many good ways for order in ſtudy; but beginneth with Tranſlation, and preferreth it before all the reſt*, he proceeds thus: *But a better and nearer example herein may be our moſt noble Queen Elizabeth, who never took yet Greek nor Latin Grammar in her hand after the firſt declining of a Noun and a Verb; but only by this double tranſlating of Demoſthenes and Iſocrates daily, without miſſing every forenoon, and likewiſe ſome part of Tully every afternoon, for the ſpace of a year or two, hath attained to ſuch perfect underſtanding in both the tongues, and to ſuch a ready utterance of the Latin, and that with ſuch a judgment, as they be few in number in both the Univerſities or elſewhere in England, that be in both tongues comparable with her Majeſty. And to conclude in a ſhort room the commodities of double Tranſlations, ſurely the mind by daily marking firſt, the cauſe and matter, then the words and phraſes, next the order and compoſition, after the reaſon and arguments, then the forms and figures of both the tongues, laſtly the meaſure and compaſs of every ſentence muſt needs by litile and little draw into the like ſhape of eloquence, as the Author doth uſe, which is read.* He obſerves likewiſe in his firſt Letter of the firſt Book to Sturmius, that by the uſe of the double Tranſlations from Greek into Latin, and Latin into Greek, which are recommended by L. Craſſus in Tully's firſt Book *de Oratore*, and Pliny the Younger in the Epiſtle abovementioned to Fuſcus, he had brought the Lady Elizabeth to a very accurate knowledge of both languages. *Gradus hi ſunt, primus, Linguarum Verſio. Non dico ſimplicem explicationem ignotæ linguæ, quæ in ſcholis quotidiana eſt, & ore præceptoris ſolum traditur; ſed iteratam & quaſi reciprocantem duarum linguarum, utriuſque utrobique vertendarum rationem. Nimirum ut Græca Latine, & tum ut eadem ipſa Latina Græce denuo convertantur, juſta commentatione & diligenti ſcriptione, cum proprio, non alieno ſtylo, ſemper adhibitâ. Et ſic ego intelligo utile illud imprimis & prudens conſilium, cum L. Craſſo in primo de Oratore, tum Plinii Secundi ad ſuum Fuſcum in ſeptimo. Atque vix credibile eſt, ad quam excellentem cum Latine tum Græce intelligendi facultatem ipſe divam noſtram Elizabetham hac geminatæ converſionis ratione ſcripto ſemper reddita brevi tempore perduxi.* In another Letter to the ſame Sturmius (13), dated from Greenwich Sept. 14th 1555, he tells him, that he enjoyed at court as agreeable a freedom and retirement for his ſtudies, as he had ever done

(11) Idem, pag. 16.

(12) Pag. 102, & ſeq. of Mr. Upton's edition in 1711.

(13) Epiſt. 2. lib. 1.

(f) Grant, pag. 16.

a very conſiderable penſion from King Edward (*f*). In the ſummer of the year 1550, while he was viſiting his friends in Yorkſhire, he received a letter from Sir John Cheek to come up to court, in order to attend upon Sir Richard Moryſine in his Embaſſy to the Emperor Charles V; and in his journey to London viſited the Lady Jane Grey at her father's Seat in Leiceſterſhire [*G*]. In September following he ſet ſail with the Embaſſador for Germany, where he continued three years, and contracted a friendſhip with ſeveral learned men [*H*]. In his Embaſſy he was of great uſe to the Embaſſador [*I*].

done in the Univerſity; and that he was then reading over with that Lady the Orations of Æſchines and Demoſthenes *de Corona* in Greek, and that ſhe underſtood at firſt ſight not only the force and propriety of the language and the meaning of the Orator, but the whole ſcheme of the cauſe, and the laws, cuſtoms, and manners of the Athenians. *Si aves ſcire quidnam rerum ago in Aulâ, intelligas nunquam mihi magis optatum otium conceſſum fuiſſe in Academia, quam nunc eſt in Regiâ. D. Elizabetha & ego unà legimus Græce Orationes Æſchinis & Demoſthenis περὶ Στεφάνου. Illa prælegit mihi & primo aſpectu tam ſcienter intelligit non ſolum proprietatem linguæ & oratoris ſenſum, ſed totam cauſæ contentionem, populi ſcita, conſuetudinem, & mores illius urbis, ut ſummoperè admirareris.* He extolls her likewiſe in the ſame Letter for her ſkill in the Italian and French, as well as the Greek and Roman Languages, and for her extenſive knowledge of things added to an excellent taſte and judgment. *Quantum ipſa præſtat Græca, Latina, Italica & Gallica lingua, imo quâ rerum cognitione, & quam docto & intelligente judicio prædita ſit, ipſe tibi fusè enarrabit.* Mr. Strype in his *Life of Biſhop Aylmer* (14) tells us, that among other diſcourſes, which that Biſhop, who was then Tutor to the Lady Jane Grey, had with Mr. Aſcham, the latter aſſured him, that he learned more of the Lady Elizabeth, than ſhe did of him. "I teach her words, "ſaid he, and ſhe teaches me things. I teach her "the tongues to ſpeak, and her modeſt and maidenly "looks teach me works to do; for I think ſhe is the "beſt diſpoſed of any in all Europe." We are informed by Mr. Grant (15), that ſhe had the greateſt value for him imaginable all the time he lived with her, and that he ſhewed all the reciprocal regards to her, which were due to her character. This appeared evidently, when he had left her ſervice inconſiderately, as he acknowledged afterwards, and to the great regret of that Lady. This gave him the higheſt concern imaginable, when he reflected that he might have expected the greateſt advantages to himſelf from ſuch a ſituation. *Hæc omnia apertè oſtendebat ille invitus ab illâ non ſatis conſideratus, ut ille poſtea faſſus eſt, diſceſſus; quum Domina ſua Elizabetha invitiſſima Cantabrigiam ad recolenda & celebranda vetera ſtudia reverteretur. Nec aliquid unquam magis eum dolore afflixit, quam quod, illa invita, ab illa diſcederet, à qua maximum ſui laboris fructum expectaret; ut poſtea feliciſſimè contigit, cum Domina Elizabetha ad rerum gubernacula evecta fuit.* But it appears from a paſſage in Mr. Aſcham's Letter to Dr. Martin Bucer (16) dated from Augſburg the 7th of January 1551, that when that Divine came firſt into England, and lived at Lambeth, our Author paid him a viſit, tho' then unknown to him, and acquainted him with the ill treatment, which he had received from ſome perſons of the Lady Elizabeth's family; and deſired him to write a letter in his favour to that Lady, who had conceived ſome diſpleaſure againſt him; not for any miſconduct of his, but upon the falſe repreſentations of others. Before his departure from England, he had waited upon her, and ſhe received him with great civility, and reproached him in very kind terms for leaving her, and never having employed any perſon to recover her favour. *Meminiſti quomodo olim, cum primum in Angliam veneris, & Lambethi vixeris, ego ad te acceſſi, tum quidem ignotus tibi declaravi, quam malè tractarer, non à Domina mea Elizabetha, ſed à nonnullis illarum ædium. Rogabam te tum, ut tuis literis me reponeres in gratiam Dominæ meæ, quæ nulla mea culpa teſte Deo loquar, ſed iniqua aliorum opera nonnihil à me abalienata fuit. Ante digreſſum ex Anglia adivi illuſtriſſimam Dominam. Humaniſſime me accepit, & multo humanius me objurgavit, quod ſic vellem eam relinquere, nec unquam laborarem per ullum hominem, ut redirem in illius gratiam.* He deſired therefore Dr. Bucer very earneſtly to inform that Lady by a letter how much he had ſollicited him to write to her, which he doubted not he would have done before, if that Divine had not been prevented at that time by ſickneſs. He aſſures him, that he was conſcious to himſelf, that he had not done or ſaid any thing exceptionable in her family; and that if his modeſty would ſuffer him, he could give him a ſatisfactory account of the great ſervices which he had done to that Lady. *Munitus ſum, mi Bucere, optimâ conſcientiâ rectè factorum & dictorum in illa aula; & niſi pudor me revocaret, exponerem tibi, quam præclaras res à me clariſſima Domina acceperit.* This paſſage gives us ſome light into the reaſons of his leaving his Lady in ſo abrupt a manner.

(14) Pag. 298.

(15) Pag. 16.

(16) Epiſt. 5. lib. 3.

[*G*] *In his journey to London he viſited the Lady Jane Grey at her father's ſeat in Leiceſterſhire.*] In his Letter to Sturmius (17) dated the 14th of December 1550, having informed him, that this Lady was then but fifteen years of age, that he had been very intimate with her at court, and that ſhe had written a very elegant letter to him, he obſerves, that upon his return from Yorkſhire he paid her a viſit, and found her reading of Plato's Phædo in Greek, which ſhe underſtood ſo well, that he was extremely ſurprized. That ſhe ſpoke and wrote Greek to admiration; and that ſhe had promiſed to write him a letter in that language, upon condition that he would ſend her a letter firſt from the Emperor's court. *In aula fui illi valde familiaris, & ſcripſit ad me eruditas literas. . . . Statim admiſſus ſum in cubiculum; inveni nobilem puellam, Dii boni! legentem Græcè Phædonem Platonis, quem ſic intelligit, ut mihi ipſi ſummam admirationem injiceret. Sic loquitur & ſcribit Græcè, ut vera referenti vix fides adhiberi poſſit. . . . . Mihi diſcedenti recepit ſe Græcè ſcripturam, ſi ego illam meis literis ex aula Imperatoris ſcriptis provocarem. Expecto quotidie Græcas ejus literas; cum venerint, ad te ſtatim mittam.* And in his letter to that Lady herſelf (18), he tells her, that amongſt all the agreeable variety of objects, which he had met with in his travels abroad, he had met with nothing ſo truly admirable, as the ſatisfaction which he had the Summer before of ſurprizing her reading Plato's *Phædo* in Greek, in the abſence of her Tutor, at her father's ſeat, while the reſt of the family were engaged in hunting and diverſion. And he obſerves to her, that in that reſpect ſhe was more happy, than in being deſcended both on her father's and mother's ſide from Kings and Queens. *Nihil tamen in tanta rerum varietate tam juſtam mihi admirationem adfert, quam quod hâc proximâ ſuperiori æſtate offenderim te, tam nobilem Virginem, abſente optimo præceptore, in aulâ nobiliſſimi Patris, quo tempore reliqui & reliquæ venationi & jucunditatibus ſeſe dent; offenderim, inquam, ὦ Ζεῦ καὶ Θεοὶ, divinam virginem divinum divini Platonis Phædonem Græcè, ſeduló perlegentem. Hac parte felicior es judicanda, quam quod πατρόθεν μητροθεν ex regibus reginiſque genus tuum deducis.* We have a more particular account of this in his *Schoolmaſter* (19).

(17) Epiſt. 4. lib. 1.

(18) Epiſt. 7. lib. 3.

(19) Pag. 34, 35.

[*H*] *Contracted a friendſhip with ſeveral learned men.*] He became very intimately acquainted with a great many perſons of merit in Germany and Italy, which country he likewiſe viſited in his travels. He had kept a correſpondence with the famous John Sturmius of Straſburg before he left England; but never ſaw him, that learned man being abſent, when he went to viſit him in that city. They had a prodigious regard for each other, as appears from Mr. Aſcham's firſt Book of Letters, which are entirely addreſſed to Sturmius, who in all his Letters likewiſe treats his friend with the utmoſt reſpect. Our Author was likewiſe very intimate with Jerom Wolfius, and highly eſteemed by ſeveral Princes and Cities of Germany. This, as Sturmius obſerves in a Letter to Paget, was occaſioned by his prudence, humanity, politeneſs,

ſador [*I*]. He returned to England in September 1553, upon the news of King Edward VIth's death, who had not only appointed him an annual penſion in his abſence, but likewiſe made him his Latin Secretary; ſo that he was now deſtitute of all ſupport and friends, till by the intereſt of the Lord Paget and Dr. Stephen Gardiner Biſhop of Wincheſter, he was appointed Latin Secretary to Queen Mary [*K*]. He had a great ſhare likewiſe in the eſteem of Cardinal Pool [*L*]. The firſt of June the year following he married Mrs. Margaret Howe, with whom he had a good fortune [*M*]. Upon Queen Elizabeth's acceſſion to the crown, he was not only continued in his place of Secretary, and made Tutor to her for the Greek tongue, but alſo by her favour inſtalled Prebendary of Wetwang in the Church of York, vacant by the deprivation of George Palmer L. L. D. on the 11th of March 1559 (*g*). His modeſty hindered him from making

(*g*) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

politeneſs, learning, and ſweetneſs of temper, which procured him the nobleſt recommendations from his friends, and made him ſo very acceptable, that he ſeemed worthy to be employed perpetually in embaſſies; and yet at the ſame time was ſo converſant in learning, and intent upon the purſuits of it, that it might be wiſhed, that he was conſtantly preſent in the aſſemblies of Men of Letters. *Propter prudentiam, humanitatem, elegantiam, doctrinam, ſuavitatem, quas virtutes ex ſe habuit; deinde propter amicorum commendationes, quas ejus virtus merita eſt, ita, inquam, gratus & carus fuit, ut dignus videretur, qui in perpetuis eſſet legationibus, ſed ita doctus, ita ſtudioſus, ita idoneus ad literarum ſtudia, ut Joannes Sturmius optaret eum perpetuo eſſe in ſcholis doctorum hominum* (20).

(20) Grant, pag. 17, 18.

[*I*] *He was of great ſervice to the Embaſſador.*] Sir Richard Moryſine had ſo great an opinion of his judgment, that he conſulted him upon all the important affairs, which he was employed to manage in Germany; and he placed ſuch a confidence in his fidelity and good ſenſe, that he imparted all his deſigns and reſolutions to him. He was greatly charmed likewiſe with his converſation, which was rendered extremely agreeable by his politeneſs, modeſty, and extenſive knowledge of things. Mr. Aſcham was very aſſiduous in his attendance upon the Embaſſador; and read to him while they continued at Augſburg all Herodotus, five of Sophocles's Tragedies, and ſome of Euripides, and three and twenty Orations of Demoſthenes, from their firſt arrival in Germany the 12th of October 1550 to the 12th of Auguſt 1551. He read twice a day for four days every week; and in the morning he explained three or four pages of Herodotus, and in the afternoon 212 or 213 verſes of Sophocles or Euripides. The other three days he copied the letters, which the Embaſſador ſent to England. At night he uſed to converſe among his friends, or write his private letters to England, or inſert in his Diary an account of every thing which he had heard of, or ſeen, or done, that was remarkable. When he had any leiſure from his employment, he ſpent it in viſiting the men of learning, or making obſervations upon the country, where he reſided (21).

(21) Idem, pag. 18, 19.

[*K*] *By the intereſt of the Lord Paget and Dr. Stephen Gardiner Biſhop of Wincheſter he was appointed Latin Secretary to Queen Mary.*] Upon his return from Germany, having no further expectations from the Court he went again to the Univerſity; but not long after he was ſent for up to London, and made Latin Secretary; which place had been before given him, while he was abroad in Germany, at the ſollicitation of Sr. William Cecil, Secretary of State to King Edward VI (22). He tells Sturmius in a letter (23) dated from Greenwich September 14th 1555, that all that he had enjoyed under King Henry VIII and Edward VI was reſtored him with ſeveral new advantages, and that he was appointed Latin Secretary to the King and Queen, which poſt he proteſts he would not reſign for any other. He obſerves, that the Biſhop of Wincheſter, who was likewiſe Lord Chancellor, had ſhewn him the utmoſt civility; ſo that he could not well determine whether the Lord Paget had been readier in recommending him than the Biſhop in advancing him. That ſome perſons indeed had endeavoured to ſtop the courſe of his favours to him on account of Religion. But had failed in the attempt. And therefore he was highly obliged to the Biſhop's benevolent diſpoſition towards him, as well as many other perſons, who had received marks of his generoſity. *Stephanus Epiſcopus Wintonienſis, ſummus Angliæ Cancellarius, ſumma humanitate atque favore me complexus eſt; ut paratior fuerit Pagettus ne in me commendando, an Wintonienſis in me tuendo atque ornando facilè dijudicare non queam. Non defuerunt, qui curſum benevolentiæ illius in me conati ſunt impedire, religionis causâ, ſed nihil profuerunt. Itaque plurimum debeo Wintonienſi humanitati, & libenter debeo. Neque ego ſolus, ſed multi etiam alii experti ſunt illius humanitatem.* He wrote ſeveral letters to that Biſhop, in which he thanks him in very ſtrong terms for the extraordinary favours, which he had received from him. He diſcharged his office of Latin Secretary with great applauſe, and was admired for the elegance and propriety of his ſtyle. At the beginning of the reign of King Philip and Queen Mary, in three days time he wrote ſeven and forty different letters to ſeveral Princes, the loweſt of whom in rank were Cardinals. He held his Fellowſhip of St. John's College, and his place of Orator to the Univerſity almoſt to the Feaſt of St. John in 1554, by the intereſt of the Queen and the Biſhop of Wincheſter (24).

(22) Idem, pag. 19, 20.

(23) Epiſt. 2. lib. 1.

(24) Grant, p. 22.

[*L*] *He had a great ſhare likewiſe in the eſteem of Cardinal Pool.*] The Cardinal treated him always with the utmoſt humanity and familiarity; and tho' he was a great maſter himſelf of the Latin tongue, yet he in ſome inſtances preferred Mr. Aſcham's pen to his own. Mr. Grant tells us (25), that he had in his poſſeſſion the ſpeech which the Cardinal had ſpoken in Engliſh to the Parliament, when he came over as Legate from the Pope, tranſlated into Latin at the Cardinal's requeſt by Mr. Aſcham; which tranſlation was ſent by Pool to the Pope. He tells Sturmius in a letter to him (26) dated from Greenwich, Sept. 14th 1555, that the Cardinal who he thought was ſuperior to any of the Italians in point of eloquence, was very civil to him, and that he had the honour of being admitted into a great familiarity with him. *Reverendiſſimus Cardinalis Polus valde humanus eſt, & haud ſcio an quiſquam Italus, eloquentiæ laude, cum eo comparari queat. Me utitur valde familiariter.*

(25) Pag. 24.

(26) Epiſt. 2. lib. 1.

[*M*] *He married Mrs. Margaret Howe, with whom he had a good fortune.*] She was a Lady of a very good character and family, whoſe parents were extremely pleaſed with this marriage. When Sturmius heard of his deſign to marry, he wrote to him a letter dated the 24th of June 1554, and aſked him why he concealed the agreeable news from him, ſince he would have ſent him an Epithalmium. He tells him, that he had been informed, that the young Lady was niece to the wife of Mr. Walop who was formerly Governor of Ginnes, when himſelf was at Calais. He deſires him therefore to acquaint him, whether that Lady was to be his bride, and when the day appointed for the marriage was, that if he could not be preſent himſelf, he might at leaſt ſend him his compliments upon the occaſion. *Sed quid ego? Sponſus ne factus, id nos celare vis? ut ne tibi aliquod Epithalamium mittamus Germanicum? Audio ſponſam tuam Domini Walopi, Ginenſis olim cum ego Caleti eſſem præfecti, uxorem habere materteram. Deus bone, quam pulchram & venuſtam mulierem, quam honeſtam matronam? Si ſic, hoc eſt, ſi uxorem habere illam vis, aut ſi quæ eſt alia tibi deſponſata, quæſo me fac certiorem, & ſcribe mihi quo ſint die futuræ, ut ſi ipſe non adeſſe queam, mittam Thalaſſium, qui pro me tuos amores ornet* (27). Mr. Aſcham in his anſwer to this letter dated the 14th of September 1555, tells him, that his wife was very like her aunt Walop in the face, and that ſhe was juſt ſuch a wife as his friend would wiſh him. *De uxore quod cupis ſcire, vultu valde refert materteram ſuam D. R. Walopi uxorem. Et habeo talem uxorem, qualem Joannes Sturmius Rogero Aſchamo libenter optaret.*

(27) *See* Grant, pag. 22.

making a greater uſe of the intereſt which he had in the Queen [*N*]. In the latter part of his life his health would not permit him to follow his ſtudies in the afternoon or night, but he roſe very early to them in the morning (*b*). We ſhall give his character in the note [*O*]. He

(*b*) Grant, pag. 26.

[*N*] *His modeſty hindered him from making a greater uſe of the intereſt which he had in the Queen.*] He had the honour of being with her every day, and reading ſome Greek or Latin to her. He uſed to play with her at dice or other games, and ſhe took a particular pleaſure in his converſation, which was very polite and facetious. He was never refuſed admittance to her, and had all the advantages imaginable to have gratified his ambition, if he would have indulged it. But he was very averſe by nature from aſking favours, and the utmoſt neceſſity could never induce him to it. He ſtudied much more to oblige his Queen by all the ſervices in his power, than to trouble her with his own requeſts. And he uſed frequently to tell his friends, that in all the favourable opportunities which he had of being in her preſence, he never deſired any favour of her on account of himſelf or his family. *Majore tenebatur deſiderio voluntate, fide, conſtantiâ, induſtriâ, officioque ſervitio ſuæ Principi ſatisfacere, quam audacibus & moleſtis rogatibus eidem moleſtiam exhibere. Hoc vulgo prædicare, & amicis ſæpe commemorare ſolebat, ſe nunquam in tot pulcherrimis diebus in ſuæ principis præſentia conſumptis, os ad aliquid rogandum aperuiſſe, quo ſe & ſuos ditaret, & locupletiores redderet.* The Marquis of Wincheſter, who was at that time Lord Treaſurer, and an intimate friend of Mr. Aſcham's, very often blamed him for his exceſſive modeſty in this reſpect, and told him, that he ought to be leſs aſſiduous in the diſcharge of his office, and more confident in his requeſts to the Queen. But his anſwer was to thoſe who urged him in this manner, that he had rather deſerve well of her Majeſty than obtain the greateſt rewards without any merit. However ſhe granted many conſiderable favours without his aſking for them. *Malui, reſpondit ille, mea diligentia & officio benè de meâ principe mereri, quam præclaris muneribus immerito adornari. Nihilominus tamen Regia Majeſtas multis eum & magnis beneficiis è ſua munificâ bonitate collocupletavit.* He always rejected with great indignation the preſents which were offered to him, in order to engage him to employ his intereſt with the Queen for others; and he frequently ſaid, that God had not given him the uſe of his tongue, that it might be venal and ſubſervient to his profit. And he choſe rather to live in very moderate circumſtances, than to forfeit his integrity by receiving bribes (28).

(28) Grant, pag. 25, 26.

[*O*] *We ſhall give his character in the note.*] While he lived at the Univerſity, he was remarkable for his eaſy and polite behaviour, the undiſguiſed frankneſs of his temper, and his fidelity to his friends. His integrity was unblemiſhed, and he was peculiarly formed to procure the friendſhip of men of merit and learning, and to gain the good will of mankind in general. He had all the zeal and warmth imaginable in maintaining the cauſe of his friends, and ſerving them to the utmoſt of his power. *Erat moribus facillimis, animo aperto & ſimplici; natura erat lenis & mitis, comitate affabilis, amicis fideliſſimus; vita honeſtus; homo ad amicitias cum bonis & eruditis copulandas natus; & ad conciliandas & devinciendas hominum voluntates aptiſſimus. Amicos ſumma fide, maximo ſtudio, & quibus potuit officiis, amplexus eſt, coluit, obſervavit* (29). He bore adverſity with great patience and reſignation, and was never too much elated with his good fortune. He was indeed ſtrongly affected by the treachery of ſome perſons towards him, whom he had almoſt treated in the moſt generous and diſintereſted manner. He was extremely temperate in eating and drinking, but had a natural averſion to a fiſh diet, ſo that he was obliged in King Edward the ſixth's reign, to procure a diſpenſation from Archbiſhop Cranmer, and in Queen Mary's time he was obliged to make uſe of other methods to preſerve his health. He was always ready to aſſiſt ſtudents with his advice, and generous to poor ſcholars; and his liberality to his friends was very extenſive. Theſe Verſes of Martial particularly pleaſed him:

(29) Idem, p. 9.

Extra ſortunam eſt quicquid donatur amicis:
Quas ſolus dederis, ſemper habebis opes.

That is,

" The pow'r of fortune never can extend
" To what we kindly laviſh on our friend:
" What thus we give, ſhall always be our own."

His integrity was untainted; his zeal for the Proteſtant Religion was very firm; and he had a ſupreme reverence for the Deity. His converſation had a ſtrain of unaffected piety in it; and he was regular in his private devotions. His topics of diſcourſe among his friends were of God, the iniquity and malice of mankind, the effects of God's benevolence towards them, and grand deſigns of Providence to lead men to their greateſt and ultimate happineſs. Thoſe who were familiar to him affirmed, that he was exemplary in his conduct in his family, modeſt in converſation, faithful to his Sovereign, obliging to his friends, fond of all parts of true learning, and particularly pleaſed upon all occaſions to expreſs his ſenſe of the Divine goodneſs to men (30). But he is charged by ſome Authors with having been much addicted to dicing and cock-matches, ſo that he lived and died in very mean circumſtances. This Cambden aſſures us of in his *Annals of Queen Elizabeth* (31). And we are told by Mr. Lloyd in his *State Worthies* (32), that *what he got by his ingenuity, he loſt by his gaming, viz. at dice and cock-fighting*; and by Mr. Wood (33), that *tho' he had a conſiderable fortune with his wife, yet notwithſtanding that and his place, he lived and died not according to his condition, being given to dicing and cock-fighting.* Mr. Grant likewiſe owns (34), that he uſed to take pleaſure in the latter of theſe diverſions, as well as in the exerciſe of ſhooting with his bow. *Non video quid impediret, quo minus Rogerus Aſchamus ſua haberet honeſta oblectamenta, arcu uteretur, aut Ἀλεκτρυομαχίᾳ intereſſet.* Biſhop Nicholſon in his *Engliſh Hiſtorical Library, Part III* (35) tells us, that *he knows not whence Mr. Wood was informed, that he ſpent too much of his latter days in dicing and cock-fighting.* This obſervation of his is a little ſurprizing, ſince it appears that Mr. Wood had the authority of Cambden, with that of other Writers, for his aſſertion. However the Biſhop proceeds as follows: *A. Nowel, the learned Dean of St. Paul's, who preached his Funeral Sermon, and was his Confeſſor during his laſt ſickneſs, affirms, that he never knew any man live more honeſtly, nor die more Chriſtianly. All that we have of his compoſure ſhews him to have been a maſter of ſuch accompliſhments as are rarely attainable by any of ſuch looſe diſpoſitions.* But to return to the more advantageous part of his character; Cambden repreſents him as one of the firſt perſons of our Nation, who cultivated the Latin and Greek tongues, and wrote in them with a purity and eloquence, that deſerved commendation. *Inter primos noſtræ nationis literas Latinas & Græcas, ſtylique puritatem cum eloquentiæ laude excoluit* (36). Sturmius tells him in one of his Letters, that his Epiſtles were not only agreeable but elegant, and that there is ſuch a happy mixture of wit and gaiety of expreſſion in ſome parts of them, and of dignity in others, and ſuch an harmony in the arrangement of his words and ſentences, that he ſhould have imagined them to have been written with the greateſt accuracy, but that even his *ex tempore* compoſitions were extremely correct. *Literæ tuæ non ſolum ſuaves, verum etiam elegantes ſunt; tanta enim in illis eſt flexibilitas verborum, & ad acutas comitatis, & ad graves Philoſophiæ ſententias; talis in collocando ordo, ut tum ſcriptionis ſuavitatem admirer, tum etiam intelligam à te accuratè eſſe compoſitas; niſi à te nihil proficiſcatur incompoſitum, quantumvis ſubito ſcriptum* (37). He was likewiſe greatly admired for the purity and elegance of his ſtyle by ſeveral of the moſt eminent Writers at that time, who had a correſpondence with him by letters, and particularly of the famous Jerom Oſorius a Portugueze Biſhop. Peter Nannius Profeſſor at Louvain, Michael Toxites, Poet Laureat, and Jerom Wolfius. Buchanan pays him a great compliment with regard to his learning as well as integrity in the following verſes, which he wrote upon his death:

(30) Idem, pag. 26, 27.

(31) *Ad ann.* 1568.

(32) Pag. 614. edit. London 1670.

(33) *Ubi ſupra.*

(34) Pag. 3.

(35) Pag. 245.

(36) Cambden, *ubi ſupra.*

(37) *Apud* Grant, pag. 30.

Aſchamum

He wrote ſeveral pieces, which are greatly admired [P]; eſpecially his Latin Letters, which have all the beauty and elegance imaginable. He died in a very pious and exemplary

Aſchamum extinctum patriæ Graiæque Camœnæ,
Et Latiæ verâ cum pietate dolent.
Principibus vixit carus, jucundus amicus,
Re modica; in mores dicere fama nequit (38).

(38) Buchan. *Epigram*, lib. 2.

" His country's Muſes join with thoſe of Greece
" And mighty Rome, to mourn the fate of Aſcham;
" Dear to his Prince, and valued by his friends.
" Content with humble views thro' life he paſs'd,
" While envy's ſelf ne'er dar'd to blaſt his fame."

[P] *He wrote ſeveral pieces, which are greatly admired.*] We have mentioned above in note [D] his *Toxophilus*. We ſhall proceed therefore to his other works, which are as follow. *The Schoolmaſter; or a plain and perfect way of teaching children to underſtand, write, and ſpeak the Latin tongue, &c.* in two Books. London 1570 and 1589 in 4to. It was dedicated by his widow to Sir William Cecil, Principal Secretary to the Queen. He mentions this Book to Sturmius in the firſt Letter of his firſt Book, and tells him, that as he could not leave his children a great fortune, he was deſirous to furniſh them with a good education; and therefore was preparing them a *Schoolmaſter* of his own. *Cum his meis filiis non illuſtrem fortunæ ſplendorem promittere poſſum, aliquem certæ doctrinæ cultum illis relinquere ipſe cupio. Paro igitur illis* præceptorem, *non illum foris ſumptuoſâ mercede conducendum, ſed rudi à me ſtylo domi jam delineatum.* He then gives him an account of the Method of his Book, and obſerves, that it was written in Engliſh for the greater advantage of the youth, for whoſe uſe it was deſigned; and that he was not ſo much an enemy to his own native language, as not to perceive that it was very capable of all the ornaments of ſtyle. *Neque tamen ipſe ſum tam noſtræ linguæ inimicus, quin ſentiam illam omnium ornamentorum cum dictionis tum ſententiarum admodum eſſe capacem.* Mr. Philips in the *Introduction* (39) to his *Compendious Way of teaching ancient and modern Languages* remarks, that ſeveral of Queen Elizabeth's Miniſters of State being very ſenſible of a defect in the education of youth, our Author was deſired by the Treaſurer Sir Richard Sackville to draw up a ſcheme for that purpoſe, which was publiſhed after his death, and dedicated to Sir William Cecil, principal Secretary of State to the Queen. He obſerves likewiſe, that this Book contains ſome very good hints on that ſubject, if made uſe of in ſchools for writing a good Latin ſtyle; and that the Reverend Mr. James Upton M. A. did good ſervice to Literature in publiſhing a new edition of it, with explanatory Notes at London 1711 in 8vo. In the Preface Mr. Aſcham has this remarkable paſſage (40): *Some men friendly of nature, but of ſmall judgment in learning, do think I take too much pains and ſpend too much time, in ſetting forth theſe childrens affairs. But thoſe good men were never brought up in Socrates's ſchool; who ſaith plainly, that no man goeth about a more godly purpoſe, than he that is mindful of the good bringing up both of his own and other men's children. Therefore I truſt good and wiſe men will think well of this my doing; and of others that think otherwiſe, I will think myſelf they are but men, to be pardoned for their folly, and pitied for their ignorance.* He obſerves in his *firſt Book* (41), that " ſome Wits, " moderate enough by nature, be many times marred " by overmuch ſtudy, and uſe of ſome ſciences, name- " ly Muſic, Arithmetick, and Geometry. Theſe " ſciences, as they ſharpen men's wits over much, ſo " they change men's manners over ſore, if they be " not moderately mingled, and wiſely applied to ſome " good uſe of life." *Mark*, continues he, *all mathematical heads, which be only and wholly bent to thoſe ſciences, how ſolitary they be themſelves, how unapt to ſerve in the world. This is not only known by common, experience, but uttered long before by wiſe men's judgment and ſentence. Galen ſaith,* Much Muſick marreth men's manners; *and Plato hath a notable place of the ſame thing in his Books* de Repub. *well marked alſo, and excellently tranſlated by Tully himſelf. Of this matter I wrote once more at large twenty years ago in my* Book of Shooting. The paſſage in his *Toxophilus*, which Mr. Aſcham refers to, is as follows: *Whatſoever ye judge, this I am ſure, that lutes, harps, barbitons, ſambukes, with other inſtruments, every one, which ſtandeth by fine and quick fingering, be condemned of Ariſtotle, as not to be brought in and uſed among them, which ſtudy for learning and virtue. . . .* Much Muſick marreth men's manners, *ſaith Galen. Although ſome men will ſay that it doth not ſo, but rather recreateth and maketh quick a man's mind, yet methink by reaſon it doth, as honey doth to a man's ſtomach, which at the firſt receiveth it well, but afterward it maketh it unfit to abide any ſtrong nouriſhing meat, or elſe any wholſome ſharp and quick drink. And even ſo in a manner theſe inſtruments make a man's wit ſo ſoft and ſmooth, ſo tender and quaiſy, that they be leſt able to brook ſtrong and rough ſtudy. Wits be not ſharpened, but rather dulled and made blunt with ſuch ſweet ſoftneſs, even as good edges be blunted, which men whet upon ſoft chalk-ſtones.* His Epiſtles were firſt publiſhed at London in the year 1576 by Mr. Grant (42), and in 1578 and 1590, in 8vo. Mr. Wood and Biſhop Nicholſon (43) mention an Edition at London in 1577. There are two Editions at Hanaw in 1602 and 1610, and Colon. Allobrog. in 1611. But the moſt compleat and correct Edition is that publiſhed at Oxford in 1703, by Mr. William Elſtob in 8vo, which contains ſeveral Letters never before publiſhed. The firſt Book contains thoſe, which he wrote to John Sturmius Rector of the Univerſity of Straſburg; the ſecond thoſe Letters, which he wrote while he reſided at Cambridge; and the third thoſe, which he wrote during his travels into Germany or after his return. To theſe are ſubjoined one Book of commendatory Letters and Petitions, and other pieces of that nature, which he wrote in the name of others to Princes and perſons of the higheſt rank; and another Book containing the Letters of Sturmius, Jerom Oſorius, Dr. John Chriſtopherſon, Richard Brandiſbey, Michael Toxites, John Sleidan, Peter Ramus, and other eminent men to Mr. Aſcham. Biſhop Nicholſon in his *Engliſh Hiſtorical Library* (44) having obſerved the great advantage and light, which Hiſtory receives from the epiſtolary remarks of men of ſenſe and buſineſs, tells us, that he ſhall only mention one inſtance of the uſefulneſs of ſuch papers; and can only point to a ſmall handful of theſe, the greateſt part of the ſtore being ſtill in private hands. 'Tis, ſays he, *the collection of thoſe Latin Letters, that were compoſed by R. Aſcham, and chiefly upon account of their elegancy have had ſeveral Editions. The Author was ſometime an Inſtructor in the Latin tongue, and afterwards Latin Secretary to King Edward the ſixth, Queen* (b) *Mary and Queen Elizabeth; and in this letter ſtation was frequently employed to tranſlate ſeveral Letters of the then Engliſh Miniſters of State to foreign Princes, Embaſſadors, and other great Men. In theſe we have all the fine variety of language, that is proper for the rendering of either a petition or complaint the moſt agreeable, and withal a deal of very choice hiſtorical matter, that is hardly preſerved any where elſe. Together with the Author's own Letters, we have a good many that are directed to him, both from the moſt eminent foreigners of his time, (ſuch as Sturmius, Sleidan, &c.) and the beſt Scholars, as well as the wiſeſt Stateſmen of his own country. And the* (a) *Publiſher of theſe aſſures us, that he had the peruſal of a vaſt number of others in the Engliſh tongue, which were highly valuable. His attendance on Sir Richard Moryſon, in his German Embaſſy gave him an intimate acquaintance with the affairs of that country; and the extraordinary freedom and familiarity, with which the two ſiſter Queens treated him here at home, afforded him a perfect knowledge of the moſt ſecret myſteries of State in this Kingdom. So that were the reſt of his papers retrieved, we could not perhaps have a more pleaſing view of the main* Arcana *in thoſe reigns, than his writings would have given us.* His *Poems* were printed at the end of his Epiſtles in ſeveral editions, but deſignedly omitted in that of Mr. Elſtob. Mr. Wood (47) mentions two other pieces of his writing, viz. *A Report and Diſcourſe of the affairs and ſtate of Germany,*

(39) Pag. 5. ed. London 1723.

(40) Pag. 11 and 12 of Mr. Upton's edition, London 1711.

(41) Pag. 14 of Mr. Upton's edition.

(42) See the Preface of Mr. Elſtob to his edition at Oxon 1703.

(43) *Engliſh Hiſtorical Library*, Part 3. p. 243. edit. London, 1699.

(44) *Ubi ſupra.*

(b) J. S. *Life of Sir Thomas Smith*, p. 69.

(a) E. Grant, *in Vita Authoris.*

(47) *Faſti Oxon.* Col. 65, 66.

plary manner [Q], on the 30th of December 1568, being fifty three years of age, and was interred without any pomp the 4th of January following in St. Sepulchre's Church. His funeral Sermon was preached by Dr. Alexander Nowel Dean of St. Paul's (*i*). His death was univerſally lamented; and Queen Elizabeth is reported to have ſaid, that ſhe had rather have caſt ten thouſand pounds into the ſea, than to have loſt her Aſcham (*k*). He had three ſons, Giles, Dudley, and Sturmius, the laſt of whom he named ſo out of regard to his friend John Sturmius (*l*). Giles, his eldeſt ſon, was entered as a ſcholar in Weſtminſter School under Mr. Grant, who had a great regard for him, and recommended him highly to Queen Elizabeth. He was afterwards elected a Fellow of St. John's College at Cambridge by the intereſt of the Lord Treaſurer Burghley, and was famous, as well as his father, for his excellent talent in writing Latin Letters (*m*).

(*i*) Idem, pag. 29.

(*k*) *Se malle decem librarum millia in mare projeciſſe, quam ſuum Aſchamum amiſiſſe.* Idem, pag. 29.

(*l*) R. Aſcham. *Epiſt. Famil.* lib. 1. Epiſt. 13. pag. 60. edit. Oxon. 1703.

(*m*) *Vide Præfat. Editoris*, ed. Oxon. 1703.

many, and the Emperor Charles his Court during certain years while he was there, printed in 4to. And *Apologia contra Miſſam & ejus præſtigias, &c.* i. e. "An "Apology againſt the Maſs and the Impoſture of it," printed about the year 1577 in 8vo.

[Q] *He died in a very pious and exemplary manner.*] As his life had been conducted with the utmoſt regularity, without offence to any perſon, he received the approaches of death with the greateſt calmneſs and reſolution. He had been many years before ſubject to frequent fevers, which broke his conſtitution; but in the latter part of his life he had been ſeized with an hectic, which left a weakneſs upon him, that was greatly encreaſed by a cold, which he took in ſpending ſeveral whole nights in the compoſition of a Poem, which he deſigned to addreſs to the Queen upon the occaſion of the new year, and in writing of Letters. This caſt him into a fatal ſickneſs the 23d of December 1568. He was viſited by Dr. Alexander Nowel Dean of St. Paul's, whoſe diſcourſe gave him the higheſt ſatisfaction. But his diſtemper encreaſed ſo violently, that all methods were taken in vain to procure him ſleep. He recommended to his wife the care and education of his children in the moſt pathetic manner, and waited calmly for his diſſolution. Dr. Nowel, who had been very intimate with him, and who attended him all his ſickneſs, declared, that he never ſaw or heard of any man, who had led a more exemplary life, or died with more Chriſtian fortitude and piety. *Valde illud mihi laudabile videtur, quod de eo idem vir ſanctiſſimus Alexander Nowellus commemorat, ſe nunquam vidiſſe aut audiviſſe ullum hominem aut honeſtius vixiſſe aut exſpirâſſe Chriſtianius* (48). T.

(48) Grant, p. 28.

(*a*) Φλιάσιος a Phlian: *Diog. Laert. de Vit. Philoſoph.* lib. 2. *in Menedemo circa initium*, pag. 153. edit. Amſtelod. ann. 1692.

ASCLEPIADES, a native of Phlia (*a*) in Peloponneſus, holds a conſiderable rank among the antient Philoſophers. He was a ſcholar of Stilpo (*b*), and he engaged Menedemus to frequent the ſame ſchool, and contracted ſo intimate a friendſhip with him (*c*), that it might be compared with that of Oreſtes and Pylades [A]. After they had ſtudied under Stilpo at Megara they went to Elis, and converſed with the diſciples of Phædo (*d*). They were both very poor, and obliged to ſupport themſelves by their labour [B]. However they applied themſelves to ſtudy, in order to become great Philoſophers. Menedemus was younger than his friend (*e*), but they did not regard the difference of their ages, when they were reſolved to marry. Their deſign was to live and keep houſe together, even after they were married. They thought it neceſſary therefore to chooſe their wives with ſo much care, that they might promiſe themſelves domeſtick concord, and they believed that they had found their wiſh in a family in which was a mother and daughter, both of whom were in a ſtate fit for marriage. Menedemus married the mother and Aſclepiades the daughter (*f*). The latter dying, Menedemus reſigned his wife to her friend, and married a rich young Lady, but he deſired that the whole management of the houſe ſhould continue in the hands of Aſclepiades's wife. It was not at all difficult for him to find a good match, for he had the chief authority in the city where he lived (*g*), which was Eretria, where he was born. Aſclepiades died there very old (*h*). He lived in an exceeding frugal manner amidſt the affluence of his friend's houſe (*i*), and he bore with great ſerenity the misfortune of loſing his ſight [C]. We are aſſured, that his death did not extinguiſh Menedemus's friendſhip for him [D]. As I have obſerved that

(*b*) Diog. Laert. lib. 2. pag. 153.

(*c*) Idem, *init.* pag. 159. num. 137.

(*d*) Idem, pag. 153. num. 126.

(*e*) Idem, pag. 159. num. 137.

(*f*) Idem.

(*g*) Idem.

(*h*) Idem, p. 138.

(*i*) Συζήσας τῷ Μενεδήμῳ σφόδρα ἐυτελῶς ἀπὸ μεγάλων. Diog. Laert. lib. 2. num. 138.

[A] *It might be compared to that of Oreſtes and Pylades.*] Diogenes Laertius's words are as follow: Φίλος τε ἦν μάλιστα (Μενέδημος) ὡς δῆλον ἐκ τῆς πρὸς Ἀσκληπιάδην συμπνοίας, ὑδέν τι διαφερούσης Πυλάδου φιλοσοφίας (1). i. e. "He maintained his friendſhips with the moſt "ſacred and inviolable fidelity, as is evident from "his intimacy with Aſclepiades, which was ſo remark-"able, that it was not inferior to the affection of Py-"lades." The Author tells us afterwards, that this Archepolis offering them a large ſum of money, his bounty was of no uſe to them, for there aroſe between them a laudable diſpute, who ſhould receive it laſt, and not being able to determine it, neither of them accepted of Archepolis's offer.

(1) Diog. Laert. lib. 2. num. 137.

[B] *They were obliged to ſupport themſelves by their labour.*] They were employed in aſſiſting a maſon. Aſclepiades not having ſo ſtrong a ſenſe of ſhame as Menedemus, did not regard being ſeen naked (2), carrying the mortar to the top of the houſe. But Menedemus went and hid himſelf, whenever he ſaw any perſon coming (3). Athenæus, who does not mention this fact, relates another ſtory ſtill more remarkable. *The Areopagites*, ſays he (4), *ſummoned before them Menedemus and Aſclepiades, two young men, who ſtudied Philoſophy, and were very poor, and aſked them theſe queſtions*; "*How came you to be ſo fat? You* "*have nothing to live upon; you ſpend all the day with-* "*out working, and you do nothing but hear the Philoſo-*"*phers.*" *Send for ſuch a Miller*, replied one of the two Students. Upon which the Miller being brought, he declared, that they both came every night to his mill, and worked in grinding wheat, by which they gained two drachmas. The Areopagus admiring this conduct of them, did them the honour to give them two hundred drachmas. They would certainly have been puniſhed, if they had not ſhewn how they maintained themſelves.

(2) I believe this is not to be underſtood of his being abſolutely naked, but only that he ſtripped himſelf, as labourers do in hot weather.

(5) Diog. Laert. lib. 2. num. 131.

(4) Athen. lib. 4. cap. 19. p. 168.

[C] *He bore with great ſerenity the misfortune of loſing his ſight.*] I do not doubt but that theſe words of Cicero relate to our Aſclepiades. *Aſclepiadem ferunt non ignobilem, nec inexercitum Philoſophum, quum quidam quæreret quid ei cæcitas attuliſſet, reſpondiſſe ut puero uno eſſet comitatior* (5). "The loſs of my "eyes, ſays our Philoſopher, procures me this advan-"tage, that I never walk alone; I have a boy more "than uſual to attend me."

(5) Cicero *Tuſcul. Quæſtion.* lib. 5. *circa fin.* fol. 278. C.

[D] *Death did not extinguiſh Menedemus's friendſhip for him.*] Being informed that his ſervants had ſhut the door againſt the favourite of Aſclepiades, he ordered that he ſhould be admitted: *for know*, ſays he, *that Aſclepiades, tho' he is in his grave, opens my door to him.* Ὅτι Ἀσκληπιάδης αὐτῷ ⊖ κατὰ γῆς ὢν τὰς θύρας ἀνοίγει (6). This favourite of Aſclepiades came in order to dine with Menedemus.

(6) Diog. Laert. lib. 2. pag. 138.

that he was a ſcholar of Stilpo, it is not neceſſary that I ſhould remark that he flouriſhed a little after the death of Alexander the Great. He had a ſon who behaved very ill, and whom Menedemus turned out of his houſe, without condeſcending to ſpeak a word to him. This affected the young Debauchee ſo much, that he reformed (*k*).

(*k*) Plutarch. *de Diſcrim. Adulat. & Amici*, p. 55.

ASCLEPIADES, a native of Pruſa in Bithynia, was one of the moſt celebrated Phyſicians among the Antients. He was contemporary with Mithridates, as appears by his refuſing to go to his court, whither he was invited by magnificent promiſes (*a*). He only ſent his remedies in writing (*b*). He was the head of a new Sect (*c*), and he diſcovered a method of making uſe of wine in the cure of the ſick (*d*). The uſe of this and that of cold water, which he allowed them (*e*), procured him a great reputation (*f*). Having cured a perſon, whoſe funeral was juſt preparing [*A*], he gained a prodigious character; but the wager which he laid againſt Fortune, made him talked of with ſtill greater admiration [*B*]. He engaged that he would never be conſidered as a Phyſician, if he ſhould ever fall ſick; and he won the wager, for he died by a fall when he was very old. It was at Rome that he diſtinguiſhed himſelf. He came thither in order to teach Rhetoric (*g*), but not finding this employment to be gainful enough, he applied himſelf to Phyſick; and as he did not know the medicines which were then in uſe, he reſolved to condemn them, and invent new ones. He confined himſelf to thoſe inventions, which

(*a*) *Spretis legatis & pollicitationibus Mithridatis regis.* Plin. lib. 7. cap. 37.

(*b*) Idem, lib. 25. cap. 2.

(*c*) Idem, lib. 7. cap. 37.

(*d*) Idem, ibid. lib. 26. cap. 3. pag. 444.

(*e*) *Trahebat præterea mentes artificio mirabili, vinum promittendo ægris, dandoque tempeſtivè tum aquam frigidam.* Plin. lib. 26. cap. 3. pag. 444.

(*f*) Taken from Pliny lib. 26. cap. 3. pag. 444.

(*g*) Idem, ibid.

[*A*] *Having cured a perſon whoſe funeral was juſt preparing.*] Here is what Pliny tells us: *Summa autem (fama eſt) Aſclepiadi Pruſienſi . . . . relato e funere homine & ſervato* (1). He obſerves in another place, that this kind of reſtoration from the dead was neceſſary in order to eſtabliſh the reformation, which was introduced into Phyſic, and that it is reaſonable to imagine that ſo great an innovation was not made without conſiderable motives. *Magnâ auctoritate, nec minore famâ, cum occurriſſet ignoto funeri relato homine ab rogo atque ſervato, ne quis levibus momentis tantam converſionem factam exiſtimat* (2). Celſus only mentions occaſionally this ſurpriſing cure of his. *In vicino ſæpe quædam notæ poſitæ non bonos ſed imperitos Medicos decipiunt; quod Aſclepiades ſciens funeri obvius inclamavit eum vivere qui efferebatur* (3). i. e. "Some "ſymptoms are frequently ſo alike, that they deceive "the unſkilful, tho' not the judicious Phyſician. This "being underſtood by Aſclepiades, when he met a "man carried out to his funeral, he cried out, that "he was alive." But Apuleius knew all the circumſtances of this ſtory, without forgetting, that the heirs were not well pleaſed, that Aſclepiades ſhould affirm, that the man was not dead. *Aſclepiades ille*, ſays he (4), *inter præcipuos medicorum, ſi unum Hippocratem excipias, cæteris princeps, primus etiam vino opitulari ægris reperit; ſed danda ſcilicet in tempore; cujus rei obſervationem probè callebat; ut qui diligentiſſimè animadverteret venarum pulſus incognitos vel præclaros. Is igitur cum forte in civitatem ſeſe reciperet, & rure ſuo ſuburbano rediret, aſpexit in pomariis civitatis funus ingens locatum, plurimos homines ingenti multitudine, qui exequias venerant circumſtare, omnes triſtiſſimos & obſoletiſſimos veſtitu. Proprius acceſſit, ut etiam incognoſceret, more humano ingenii, quiſnam eſſet, quoniam percontanti nemo reſponderat. At vero ipſe aliquid in illo ex arte deprehenderat. Certè quidem jacenti homini ac prope depoſito fatum abſtulit. Jam miſeri illius membra omnia aromatis perſperſa, jam os ipſius unguine odoro delibutum, jam eum pollinctum, jam ſcenæ paratum, contemplatus eum diligentiſſimè quibuſdam ſignis animadvertit; etiam atque etiam pertractavit corpus hominis, & invenit in illo vitam latentem. Confeſtim exclamavit, vivere hominem; procul ergo faces abigerent, procul ignes amolirentur, rogum demolirenter, cænam feralem à tumulo ad menſam referrent. Murmur interea exortum, partim medico credendum dicere; partim etiam irridere medicinam. Poſtremi propinquis etiam hominibus invitis, quod ne jam ipſi hæreditatem habebant, an quod adhuc illi fidem non habebant, ægrè tamen ac difficulter Aſclepiades impetravit brevem mortuo dilationem. Atque ita veſpillonum manibus extortum, velut ab inferis, poſtliminio domum retulit, confeſtimque ſpiritum recreavit, confeſtimque animam in corporis latibulis delitescentem quibuſdam medicamentis provocavit.* i. e. "Aſclepiades, "one of the chief of the Phyſicians, and the great"eſt man in that art except Hippocrates, firſt pre"ſcribed the uſe of wine to ſick perſons, by giving "it at the proper ſeaſons; for he made very accu"rate obſervations upon that ſubject, and carefully "remarked the good and bad pulſes of the veins. "This Phyſician happening to come into the city from "his country houſe, ſaw a great funeral in the or"chards of the city, and a great number of men, "who attended it, ſtanding round, all of them very "ſorrowful, and in a mourning dreſs. Aſclepiades "went near out of the curioſity common to mankind, "to ſee who the perſon was, whoſe funeral was pre"pared, becauſe nobody gave him any anſwer, when "he enquired. But he ſoon diſcovered ſomething re"markable in him by his art; and it is certain, "that he reſcued from death the man, who was go"ing to be interred. All the limbs of the unhappy "perſon were already covered with ſpices; his mouth "was already anointed with ſweet unguents; and "every thing was prepared for the funeral, when our "Phyſician upon a careful view and examination of "his body, found the remains of life in it. He im"mediately cried out, that the man was alive; that "they ſhould remove the fire, and the funeral pile, "and carry the ſupper from the tomb to the table. "In the mean while a murmur aroſe, part of the "company inſiſting that the Phyſician ought to be re"garded, others ridiculing the art of Phyſic. The "relations were likewiſe unwilling to hear Aſclepia"des, either becauſe they wanted the eſtate, or be"cauſe they did not credit him; but at laſt with great "difficulty he gained a ſhort reſpite for the dead "man. And thus he procured him to be con"veyed from the hands of the Undertaker's ſer"vants, and as it were from death itſelf, and imme"diately recovered his ſpirits, and by the application "of certain medicines reſtored life, which lay before "concealed in the ſecret receſſes of the body." The ſtory of the woman, who was twice buried, may be very pertinently introduced here. She was recovered without the uſe of Phyſic; but her husband was not very well pleaſed with it. The ſtory is as follows. "In a village in Poitou a woman was ſick of a very "dangerous diſtemper, and at laſt fell into a lethargy; "ſo that her husband, and thoſe who were about her, "thought her dead. They wrapped her up only with "a linnen-cloth, according to the cuſtom of the poor "people in that country, and carried her out to be "buried. As they were going to the church, the "man, who carried her, walked ſo near an hedge, "that the thorns pricked her, and ſhe was awakened "from her Lethargy. Fourteen years after ſhe died "again, or at leaſt was thought to do ſo. As ſhe "was carried out to be buried, and the bearers came "near the hedge, her husband cried out twice or "thrice, *Don't go near the hedge* (5).

(1) Plin. lib. 7. cap. 37. pag. 58, 59.

(2) Idem, lib. 26. cap. 3. p. 445.

(3) Celſus, *de Medicinâ*, lib. 2. cap. 6. pag. 57.

(4) *In Floridis*, pag. 362.

(5) *Menagiana*, pag. 117, 118. of the firſt edition in Holland.

[*B*] *The wager which he laid againſt Fortune, made him talk'd of with ſtill greater admiration.*] I believe that the moſt extravagant Quacks now would hardly venture upon ſuch wagers; eſpecially if they were required to depoſite a ſum of money. However that be, I am perſuaded, that the reader will be pleaſed to ſee the following paſſage of Pliny: *Summa autem Aſclepiadi Pruſienſi (fama eſt) . . . maximè ſponſione factâ cum fortunâ, ne medicus crederetur, ſi unquam invalidus ullo modo fuiſſet ipſe; & victor ſupremâ in ſenectâ lapſu ſcalarum exanimatus eſt* (6). i. e. "Aſ"clepiades of Pruſa was very famous . . . . eſpecially "after

(6) Plin. lib. 7. cap. 37. pag. 58, 59.

which were eaſy, and which every perſon might make uſe of without the aſſiſtance of a Phyſician. This made them received with pleaſure; every body had recourſe to him, and conſidered him as a perſon ſent from heaven [C]. Among the circumſtances which were favourable to him in raiſing him a reputation, we muſt not omit the abſurd credulity which prevailed at that time with regard to the magical virtues of certain herbs; for it being eaſy to ſhew that the greateſt part of theſe virtues were chimerical, it was no difficult matter for Aſclepiades to deſtroy all the credit of the antient medicines [D]. He did not think that the ſoul was diſtinct from matter (h). He wrote ſeveral books, which are all loſt. Pliny, Celſus, and Galen quote ſome of them. He had divers ſcholars, who became very famous (i). Pliny's delicacy ſeems to me carried too far, when he could not bear that ſuch a man who had ſtudied Phyſick only with a view to get money, ſhould preſcribe

(h) *See* Tertullian, *de Animâ*, cap. 15.

(i) See their names in the 46th Letter of *Reineſius to Rupertus*, pag. 395.

" after he had laid a wager with Fortune, that he " would not be conſidered as a Phyſician, if ever he " was in any manner ſick or indiſpoſed; and he gain- " ed his point, for he was killed by a fall down " ſtairs, when he was very old." This raſhneſs of our Phyſcian was extremely ſurprizing; but his good fortune in not being contradicted by the event appears to me ſtill more remarkable. I obſerve that in ſome things he had much of the Quack. He allowed the uſe of wine in ſome diſtempers, and he boaſted ſo highly of his medicine, that he affirmed the power of the Gods themſelves was ſcarce equal to that of wine. *Aſclepiades utilitatem vini æquari vix Deorum potentia pronunciavit* (7).

(7) Idem, lib. 23. cap. 1. pag. 251.

[C] *Every body had recourſe to him, and conſidered him as a perſon ſent from heaven.*] We ſhall ſee in the following paſſage of Pliny a repreſentation of the aſcendant, which ſome Phyſicians ſtill aſſume. *Torrenti ac meditata quotidie oratione blandiens omnia* (remedia) *abdicavit; totamque medicinam ad cauſam revocando conjecturæ fecit, quinque res maxime communium auxiliorum profeſſus abſtinentiam cibi, alias vini, fricationem corporis, ambulationem, geſtationes; quæ cum unuſquiſque ſemetipſum ſibi præſtare poſſe intelligeret, faventibus cunctis ut eſſent vera quæ facillima erunt, univerſum propè humanum genus circumagit in ſe non alio modo, quam ſi cælo emiſſus adveniſſet* (8). i. e. " He amuſed the people with his copious and pre- " pared diſcourſes, and rejected all medicines; and " reducing the whole art of Phyſick to the teſt of " reaſon, he proved it to be founded upon conjecture. " He declared that there were five methods of reliev- " ing the human body, abſtinence from meat, and " at other times from wine, friction of the body, " walking, and exerciſes of it by geſtation. Eve- " ry perſon finding that theſe methods could be rea- " dily practiſed by themſelves, and inclining to be- " lieve thoſe things true, which were moſt eaſy, he " drew upon him the regard of almoſt all mankind, " as if he had been ſent from heaven."

(8) Idem, lib. 26. cap. 3. pag. 444.

[D] *The greateſt part of theſe virtues being chimerical, it was eaſy for Aſclepiades to deſtroy all the credit of the ancient medicines.*] It is the general property of mankind never to keep the medium. If you do not tell them that there is an infinite number of falſhoods mixed with real facts, they will believe every thing. If you undeceive them by ſhewing them evidently how they have been impoſed upon in ſome caſes, they will doubt of every thing. By this means the impertinence of theſe medicines, which were called magical, aſſiſted Aſclepiades in deſtroying the credit even of thoſe things, which were well grounded. Pliny in the following paſſage will repreſent to us in an admirable manner this inclination to extremes, which is obſervable in the human mind. *Super omnia*, ſays he (9), *adjuvere eum* (Aſclepiadem) *magicæ vanitates in tantum evectæ, ut abrogare herbis fidem cunctis poſſent. Æthiopide herbâ amnes ac ſtagna ficcari conjectu, tactu clauſa omnia aperiri Achæmenide conjecta in aciem hoſtium, trepidare agmina, ac terga vertere. Latacen dari ſolitam à Perſarum rege legatis, ut quocunque veniſſent omnium rerum copia abundarent, ac multa ſimilia. Ubinam iſtæ fuere, cum Cimbri Teutoneſque terribili Marte ululârent, aut cum Lucullus tot reges Magorum paucis legionibus ſterneret? Curve Romani duces primam ſemper in bellis commerciorum habuere curam? Cur hercle Cæſaris miles ad Pharſaliam famem ſenſit, ſi abundantia omnis contingere unius herbæ felicitate poterat? Non ſatius fuit Æmilianum Scipionem Carthaginis portas herba patefacere, quam machinis clauſtra per tot annos quatere? Siccentur hodie Æthiopide Pontinæ paludes, tantumque agri ſuburbanæ reddatur Italiæ. Nam quæ apud eundem Democritum invenitur compoſitio medicamenti, quo pulchri bonique & fortunati gignantur liberi, cui unquam Perſarum regi tales dedit? Mirum eſſet profecto, hucuſque provectam credalitatem antiquorum, ſalubertimis ortam initiis, ſi in ullâ re modum humana ingenia noviſſent, atque non hanc ipſam medicinam ab Aſclepiade repertam, ſuo loco probaturi eſſemus evectam ultra Magos etiam. Sed hæc eſt omni in re animarum conditio, ut à neceſſariis orſu primo cuncta pervenerint ad nimium.* i. e. " Beſides all theſe things he was aſſiſted by the pre- " tended magical virtues of herbs, which were car- " ried to ſo great an exceſs, that they gave him ſuf- " ficient grounds to deſtroy all regard to plants. It " had been aſſerted that the plant Æthiops being " thrown into rivers and lakes would dry them up, and " that the touch of it would open every thing that was " ſhut. That the Achæmenis being thrown into " the enemy's army, would ſtrike ſuch a terror upon " them as would oblige them to fly. That the La- " tace uſed to be given by the King of Perſia to his " Embaſſadors, that wherever they came, they might " have a plenty of all things; with many other ſto- " ries of that kind. Where were theſe plants, when " the Cimbrians and Teutones raiſed the dreadful din " of war; or when Lucullus deſtroyed ſo many " Kings of the Magi with a few legions? Or why " have the Roman Generals in their wars taken care " at firſt of procuring ſupplies from the people about " them? Why did Cæſar's ſoldiers ſuffer hunger in " Pharſalia, if a plenty of all things could have been " procured by means of a ſingle herb? Would it not " have been more proper for Æmilianus Scipio to " have opened the gates of Carthage with a plant, " than to have taken the pains of employing his " engines againſt it for ſo many years? Let the " Pontine Marſhes be now dried up by the Æthi- " ops, and ſo great a portion of land be reſtored to " Italy? And with regard to the compoſition of the " medicine mentioned by the ſame Democritus, in " order to get beautiful, and good, and fortunate " children, did it ever procure this advantage to any " one of the Kings of Perſia? It would really appear " ſurprizing, that the credulity of the ancients, which " aroſe from a reaſonable foundation at firſt, ſhould " be carried ſo far, if the mind of man knew " how to obſerve a proper medium in any thing, " and if we could not ſhew, as we ſhall do in its pro- " per place, that even this ſcheme of Phyſic found " out by Aſclepiades, was carried to an extravagance " greater than that of the Magi. But ſuch is the " turn of the human mind in all points, that every " thing, tho' at firſt founded only upon what was ne- " ceſſary and reaſonable, afterwards degenerates into " exceſs." Father Hardouin refers this to that paſſage, wherein Pliny ſhews the authority, which ſome Phyſicians had gained, tho' they rejected each other's medicines. *Hinc illæ*, ſays he (10), *circa ægros miſeræ ſententiarum concertationes, nullo idem cenſente, ne videatur acceſſio alterius. Hinc illa infelicis monumenti inſcriptio* turba ſe medicorum periiſſe. *Mutuatur ars quotidie toties interpolis, & ingeniorum Græciæ flatu impellimur. Palamque eſt ut quiſque inter iſtos loquendo polleat, imperatorem illico vitæ noſtræ neciſque fieri.* i. e. " Hence ariſe thoſe wretched differences in judg- " ment concerning the ſick, no Phyſician being of " the ſame opinion with another, leſt he ſhould ſeem " to be a mere ſecond to him. This was the oc- " caſion of that inſcription upon the tomb of an un- " happy man, who complains, that *he periſhed by*

(9) Idem, lib. 26. cap. 4. pag. 446.

(10) Idem, lib. 29. cap. 1.

" *means*

preſcribe laws of ſuch importance to mankind [*E*]. Suidas, who has confounded our Phyſician with one Aſclepiades of Myrlea a Grammarian, has been cenſured by Moreri, agreeably to the obſervations of Voſſius. This is the reaſon why I do not ſpeak of him, and only direct my reader to the proper Authors for his ſatisfaction. I ſhall only remark the errors of ſome other Authors [*F*]. Thoſe of Moreri are not conſiderable [*G*].

" *means of too many Phyſicians.* The art changes " perpetually, and is thrown into a new form, and " we are determined by the capricious humour of the " Greeks. And it is very evident, that in proportion " as any man among them has the faculty of ſpeak- " ing fluently, he immediately becomes the arbiter " of our life and death."

[*E*] *Pliny . . . . could not bear, that a man, who had ſtudied Phyſick only with a view to get money, ſhould preſcribe laws of ſuch importance to mankind.*] His words are very remarkable: *Id ſolum poſſumus indignari, unum hominem è leviſſima gente, ſine opibus ullis orſum, vectigalis ſui causâ, repente leges ſalutis humano generi dediſſe, quas tamen poſtea abrogavere multi* (11). i. e. " We can only expreſs an indigna- " tion at this, that a ſingle man, of a nation noto- " rious for its great levity, who began without any " fortune, merely for the ſake of his profit, ſhould " give laws to mankind for their health, which " were afterwards rejected by many perſons."

(11) Idem, lib. 26. cap. 3. pag. 445.

[*F*] *I ſhall remark the errors of ſome . . Authors.*] Meurſius has been cenſured for imagining, that Aſclepiades of Myrlea, and Aſclepiades of Nice, were two perſons. *Malè Meurſius hunc Myrleanum & Nicenum tanquam duos diſtinctos recenſet* (12). Jonſius aſſerts, that this is an error, and that it was the ſame Aſclepiades, who was born at Myrlea, and was originally from Nice, and was ſurnamed *Myrleanus* and *Nicenus* indifferently. Pinedo laboured under the ſame miſtake as Meurſius (13). In the Index of the Authors quoted by Athenæus, the following words in the 10th Book are underſtood of Aſclepiades of Myrlea, Ἀσκληπιάδης ἐν τοῖς τραγῳδουμένοις (14). Dalechamp has tranſlated them thus: *Aſclepiades libro de iis, quorum nomine editæ ſunt tragœdiæ:* i. e. " Aſclepiades " in his Treatiſe concerning thoſe, under whoſe name " Tragedies have been publiſhed." Caſaubon criticizes upon this, and ſhews that the title of this work was not of the maſculine gender τραγῳδούμενοι, but of the neuter τραγῳδούμενα; and that Plutarch has quoted it in that manner (15). He does not tell us where this quotation is to be found. I ſhall therefore in order to ſupply that defect obſerve, that it is in the Life of Iſocrates, as will be ſhewn immediately. Caſaubon might have added, that the ſame Treatiſe of Aſclepiades is quoted in the neuter gender by Stephanus Byzantinus and Photius. The reader will ſee this immediately. That Critick thought, that Aſclepiades explained in that work the actions, which ſerved for ſubjects to the tragic Poets. I am not in the leaſt doubt concerning this, or Dalechamp's error. The Latin Tranſlator of Plutarch has blundered in the ſame title; for he has rendered theſe words of Plutarch, Ἀσκληπιάδης ὁ τὰ τραγῳδούμενα συγγράψας, by *Aſclepiades tragœdiæ ſcriptor* (16). i. e. " Aſclepiades " the Writer of Tragedy." This ſhews evidently without copying the reſt of this verſion (17), that he took Aſclepiades for a tragic Writer. Andrew Schottus has done the ſame thing in his tranſlation of Photius. Photius, *num. CCLX. p.* 1456, ſays this; Ἀσκληπιάδης, ὃς τὰ τραγῳδούμενα συνεγράψατο (18), that is, according to Andrew Schottus, *Aſclepiades, qui tragœdias ſcripſit*; i. e. " Aſclepiades, who wrote " Tragedies." This is a miſtake; for Aſclepiades, who is mentioned here, is not repreſented as an Author in that kind of writing. We may obſerve by the by, that he was a ſcholar of Iſocrates; as we may conclude from the time when he lived. Pinedo underſtood much better than the Tranſlator of Plutarch the ſenſe of the word τραγῳδούμενα; for in tranſlating this paſſage in Greek, Ἀσκληπιάδης ὁ τὰ τραγῳδούμενα γράψας ἐν ἓξ βιβλίοις (19), has rendered it thus: *Aſclepiades, qui de rebus in Tragœdiâ decantatis ſex libros ſcripſit.* i. e. " Aſclepiades, who wrote ſix " Books concerning the ſubjects celebrated in Trage- " dy." Theſe Greek words are extracted from a paſſage in which Stephanus Byzantinus tells us, that Aſclepiades, who wrote theſe ſix Books, was of Tragilus a town in Thrace. I wiſh that Caſaubon had cenſured Dalechamp, who imagined that Athenæus quotes Aſclepiades of Myrlea in the paſſage, which we have given above. Geſner has committed the ſame error (20). Stephanus Byzantinus would have furniſhed him with a juſtification of that cenſure. The reader will find two groſs miſtakes in Pinedo. He ſays, I: that Aſclepiades of Myrlea, the ſcholar of Apollonius, was a Grammarian, who taught at Rome under Pompey the Great, and lived at Alexandria while he was young, under Ptolemy IV: II. he leaves us to gueſs whether it was the ſame Aſclepiades, who taught Grammar in Turditania, a Province of Spain (21). I obſerve upon the firſt article, that a man, who ſhould have lived under Ptolemy IV, and taught at Rome in the time of Pompey the Great, would have been a prodigy; ſince between the laſt year of this Ptolemy, and the death of Mithridates, who was defeated by Pompey, there was no leſs than 140 years. With regard to the ſecond article I ſhall only ſay, that Strabo aſſerts expreſly, that Aſclepiades of Myrlea taught Grammar in Turditania (22). Pinedo had remark'd this in another place (23). How comes it then, that he has made a Problem of it?

(12) Jonſius, *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſ.* pag. 167.

(13) Pinedo, *in Stephan. Byzantin.* pag. 479. num. 150, and 757.

(14) Athen. lib. 10. pag. 456.

(15) Caſaub. *in Athen.* p. 769.

(16) Plutarch. *in Vita Iſocrat.* pag. 837. G.

(17) It confirms the remark, that he took *Tragœdiæ Scriptor* not for a perſon who wrote concerning Tragedy, but for a Poet who wrote Tragedies himſelf.

(18) Photii, *Bibliotb.* Cod. 260.

(19) Steph. Byzantin. *verbo* Τράγιλος.

(20) Geſner *in Bibliotb.* fol. 97.

(21) Pinedo *in Stephan. Byzantin.* pag. 757.

(22) Strabo, lib. 3. p. 108.

(23) Pinedo *in Stephan. Byzantin.* pag. 479.

Let us briefly examine a remark of Father Hardouin. He tells us, that Aſclepiades of Pruſa was a friend of Cicero, and he proves it by a paſſage from the firſt Book *de Oratore*. He quotes but a little part of it (24); but the whole paſſage is as follows: *Neque verò Aſclepiades is, quo nos medico amicoque uſi ſumus, tum quum eloquentiâ vincebat cæteros medicos, in eo ipſo quod ornatè dicebat, medicinæ facultate utebatur, non eloquentiæ* (25). i. e. " And neither did Aſcle- " piades, who was my friend and Phyſician, when " he ſhewed himſelf ſuperior to the reſt of the Phy- " ſicians in eloquence, by the elegance of his diſ- " courſe make uſe of the faculty of Phyſic, and not " of Eloquence." We muſt obſerve, that it is not Cicero, who ſays this, but the Orator Craſſus; ſo that Aſclepiades was the friend and Phyſician of Craſſus, and not of Cicero. It is proper likewiſe to remark, that Cicero ſuppoſes, that Craſſus ſpoke thus in the year 662 of Rome (26); and that he ſpeaks of Aſclepiades as a perſon, who was not then living. This furniſhes us with an objection againſt Pliny, who tells us, that Aſclepiades not making any advantage by the profeſſion of Eloquence, turned his thoughts towards Phyſic in the time of Pompey (27). It is certain, that in the year 662 Pompey was but very young. See the following note, num. IV.

(24) *Eloquens medicus dicitur Ciceroni* lib. 1. Orat. pag. 283. *qui ſe eo medico & amico uſum eſſe gloriatur*; i. e. " He is called an " *eloquent Phy-* " *ſician* by Ci- " cero, lib. 1. " *Orat.* p. 283. " who tells us " that Aſclepia- " des had been " his Phyſician " and Friend. Harduin. *in Indice Plin.* p. 99.

(25) Cicer. *de Orat.* lib. 1. fol. 61. C.

(26) *Vide* Fabricium, *in Vita Cicer. ad ann. Urb.* 662.

(27) Plinius, lib. 26. cap. 3.

Jonſius ſuppoſes, that there were two Aſclepiades's of Myrlea; that the former was the Scholar of Apollonius the Grammarian, and Author of a Book intitled Φιλοσόφων βιβλίων διορθωτικὰ, *Philoſophorum Librorum Emendationes* (28); i. e. " Corrections of the " Books of the Philoſophers;" and that the ſecond wrote ſeveral Books concerning Grammar and the Grammarians (29). I do not ſee upon what grounds he makes this diſtinction. His beſt proof would be to ſay, that Aſclepiades of Myrlea confuted in his Grammar an opinion of Dionyſius of Thrace. *In iſto opere Dionyſii Thracis de Partibus Grammaticæ ſententiam refellit, teſte Sexto Empirico* (30). This Dionyſius, according to Suidas, taught at Rome in the time of Pompey, and had been one of the Scholars of Ariſtarchus. It will be urged therefore, that the Aſclepiades, who confuted him, was a different perſon from the Scholar of Apollonius. I admit this conſequence; but I ſuſpect that there is ſome error in Suidas. It ſeems to me, that a Scholar of Ariſtarchus (31) would have been too old in the time of Pompey (32) to be capable of teaching. I conclude therefore, that Dionyſius of Thrace, the Scholar of Ariſtarchus, was not living till the time of Pompey. It is poſſible that Aſclepiades the Scholar of Apollonius might confute him; for this Apollonius having been Keeper of the Library at Alexandria after Eratoſthenes (33), who died in the beginning of the 146th Olympiad,

(28) Jonſius, *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſ.* pag. 167.

(29) Idem, ibid. pag. 205.

(30) Idem, ibid.

(31) Ariſtarchus flouriſhed in the 156th Olympiad.

(32) He concluded the Mithridatic War in the 179th Olympiad.

(33) Jonſius, *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſ.* pag. 149.

able [G]. There was another ASCLEPIADES, a famous Phyſician under the Emperor Hadrian [H].

Olympiad (34), might very well be contemporary with Ariſtarchus; and conſequently he might have Scholars contemporary with thoſe of Ariſtarchus. It is not neceſſary therefore, that the Aſclepiades, who confuted Dionyſius of Thrace, ſhould live later than Aſclepiades the Scholar of Apollonius. I cannot imagine why Voſſius ſhould ſo readily acquieſce in what Suidas tells us, that Dionyſius had been a Scholar of Ariſtarchus, and Profeſſor at Rome in the time of Pompey (35). He has been juſtly cenſured for aſſerting, that Aſclepiades of Alexandria wrote a Book concerning the People of Attica, and quoting the Scholiaſt of Ariſtophanes for his aſſertion. *Aſclepiades Alexandrinus* * τους κατα δημους ἀρχοντας *conſignavit, ut Autor eſt Scholiaſtes Ariſtophanis in nubibus* (36). Jonſius ſhews, that the Scholiaſt only ſays, that this Aſclepiades called the Demarchs τους κατα τους δημους ἀρχοντας (37).

(34) Voſſ. *de Hiſt. Græc.* pag. 108.

(35) Idem, ibid. pag. 148.

* *Populi Attici.*

(36) Voſſ. *de Hiſt. Græc.* pag. 507.

(37) Jonſius, *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſ.* pag. 207.

[G] *Thoſe of Moreri are not very conſiderable.*] I. The ancient Authors do not aſcribe to Aſclepiades of Myrlea the Hiſtory of Alexander the Great *quoted by Arrian*, as he aſſures us. II. To ſay, that *Strabo adds, that Aſclepiades of Myrlea had taught Grammar in Spain*, intimates, that he has mentioned ſeveral other facts beſides thoſe before related by Moreri, which is falſe. III. It is an error in him to repreſent it as doubtful, whether the relation to Spain does not belong to another Aſclepiades; ſince he expreſly aſcribes it to this. IV. It was wrong to affirm ſo confidently, that Mithridates *was at war with the Romans*, when he endeavoured to engage Aſclepiades the Phyſician to come to his court; for we have ſeen above (38), that Cicero ſpeaks of this Phyſician as of a perſon who was not living in the year 662 of Rome, at a time, when Mithridates had not yet made war againſt the Romans, if we would expreſs ourſelves with exactneſs. This ſhews, that Moreri muſt have been miſtaken in aſſerting, that Aſclepiades was *in great eſteem at Rome in the time of Pompey the Great..... that is, when that great man was the firſt perſon in the Commonwealth.* Does not he place the Birth of this Pompey upon *the laſt day of September, in the year* 648 *of Rome?* How can he reconcile this paſſage of Cicero, in which he ſpeaks of Aſclepiades? I know indeed, that he may defend himſelf by the authority of Pliny, and that Jonſius will furniſh him with another authority; but who told him that Pliny's credit is ſuperior to that of Cicero; or that Jonſius is not miſtaken? *Aſclepiades Medicus quidam* (here is *quidam* very improperly made uſe of; ſince Aſclepiades was too famous to deſerve ſo contemptuous an Epithet (39),) *Pruſiacus in Bithynia Philophyſicus cognomine ſub Pompeio M. vixit, teſte Strabone lib. xii* (40). i. e. "Aſclepiades, a certain "Phyſician of Pruſa in Bithynia ſurnamed *Philophyſicus*, lived in the time of Pompey the Great, as "Strabo tells us B. xii." I can only find in the xiith Book of Strabo, that Aſclepiades of Pruſa was a Phyſician (41). Father Hardouin (42) aſcribes to Strabo, whom he quotes *L.* 12. *p.* 566, the ſame thing as Jonſius has done. V. The Aſclepiades, whom Plutarch mentions in the Life of Iſocrates, was not a *Tragic Poet* (33), as Moreri aſſures us.

(38) In the quotations (25) and (26).

(39) Compare with this what has been obſerved above in the beginning of the note [F] of the article of ANTHONY ARNAUD *Doctor of Sorbonne.*

(40) Jonſius, *de Script. Hiſt. Philoſ.* pag. 207.

(41) Strabo, lib. 12. pag. 390.

(42) Harduin. *in Indice Autor.*

[H] *There was another Aſclepiades a famous Phyſician under the Emperor Hadrian.*] He was of the ſame city with the preceding (43), and flouriſhed under Trajan, Hadrian, and Antoninus. He was made free by one Calpurnius, and obtained the right of a Roman Citizen with ſeveral other privileges. We learn all theſe particulars from an inſcription. See the Letters of Reineſius (45). He wrote ſeveral Books concerning the compoſition of Medicines both internal and external (46).

(43) See the preceding note.

(44) Of Pruſa in Bithynia.

(45) *Epiſt. Reineſii ad Hofmannum & Rupertum*, pag. 394.

(46) Ibid. pag. 395.

☞ ASHMOLE (ELIAS), Founder of the Aſhmolean Muſæum at Oxford, was the only ſon of Simon Aſhmole of the city of Lichfield in Staffordſhire, Sadler, and Anne, the daughter of Mr. Anthony Bowyer of Coventry in Warwickſhire, Draper (*a*). He was born in St. Michael's pariſh in Lichfield the 23d of May 1617 (*b*). He was educated at the Grammar ſchool in that city, and having ſome inclination to Muſic, he was inſtructed in it, and admitted as a Choriſter in that Cathedral. He received his firſt encouragement from Mr. Thomas Pagit, ſecond ſon of James Pagit Eſq; formerly Puiſne Baron of the Exchequer, who married his mother's ſiſter, and *who was*, ſays Mr. Aſhmole in his *Diary* (*c*), *the chief inſtrument of my future preferments, which I acknowledge with all gratitude to his memory.* In June 1634 he loſt his father, whoſe extravagance and ill œconomy proved very injurious to himſelf and his family (*d*). At twenty years of age he married his firſt wife Eleanor, daughter of Mr. Peter Mainwaring of Smalwood in Cheſhire, who, as he informs us (*e*), *proved a virtuous good wife*, but left him a widower on the 5th of December 1641, *to his own grief, and the grief of all her friends* (*f*). He had one female child by her, who was ſtill-born the 19th of May 1640. In Michaelmas term 1638, he became a Solicitor in the High-Court of Chancery, and had good practice (*g*); and being admitted of Clement's-Inn, was ſworn an Attorney in the Court of Common-Pleas the 11th of February 1641 (*h*). In the latter end of Auguſt 1642, the City of London being involved in great conteſts and confuſion, he retired to Smalwood in Cheſhire, where he proſecuted his ſtudies; and in the latter end of 1644 he went to Oxford, the chief reſidence of the King at that time, and entered himſelf in Brazen-Noſe College, and applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Natural Philoſophy, Mathematicks, Aſtronomy, and Aſtrology (*i*). The ſame year he was made a Commiſſioner of the Exciſe; but was oppoſed in the execution of his office by Colonel Bagott, Governor of Lichfield, and was afterwards put into another Commiſſion of the Exciſe at Worceſter, the 16th of December 1645 (*k*); which Commiſſion was again renewed, and Mr. Aſhmole continued in it, and elected Regiſter to that Commiſſion the 27th of April 1646 (*l*). On the 9th of May the year before, by the intereſt of Sir George Wharton the Aſtrologer, with whom he had lately contracted an intimacy, he was appointed one of the five Gentlemen, as Mr. Wood tells us, or of the four Gentlemen, according to his own *Diary* (*m*), of the Ordinance in the garriſon at Oxford, and diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his attachment to the Royal Cauſe [A]. In July 1646 he loſt his mother [B]. October the 16th following

(*a*) Wood, *Athenæ Oxon.* vol. 2. Col. 886. and *Some Memoirs of the Life of Elias Aſhmole Eſq;* prefixed to his *Antiquities of Berkſhire*, vol. 1. pag. 3. London 1723 in 8vo, and his *Diary*, pag. 1. ed. 1717.

(*b*) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, and *Diary* pag. 2.

(*c*) Pag. 3.

(*d*) *Diary*, p. 5.

(*e*) Ibid pag. 6.

(*f*) Ibid. pag. 9.

(*g*) Ibid. pag. 6.

(*h*) Ibid. pag. 8.

(*i*) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, and *Diary*, pag. 10.

(*k*) *Diary*, p. 12.

(*l*) *Memoirs*, &c. pag. 4. and *Diary*, p. 14.

(*m*) Pag. 11.

[A] *Diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his attachment to the Royal Cauſe.*] He had the command of the *Eaſt-Lyne* and the *Dover-Piere* in that garriſon aſſigned to him; and on the 12th of March following, he was made a Captain in the regiment of foot of Jacob Lord Aſtley at Worceſter; and in June was conſtituted Comptroller of the Ordnance in that city. But upon the ſurrender of it to the Parliament the 23d of July following, he retired to Smalwood in Cheſhire (1).

[B] *In July* 1646 *he loſt his mother*] She died of the

(1) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. Col. 886.

lowing he was elected a free maſon [C]. The King's affairs being now entirely ruined, he retired in order to purſue his ſtudies [D]. We ſhall give an account of the ſeveral changes of fortune which he paſſed through till the reſtoration in the note [E]. He was introduced on the 16th of June 1660 by Mr. Thomas Chiffinch to kiſs the King's hand, with whom he had the honour of a converſation for ſeveral hours two days after, and was then conſtituted Windſor-Herald, and his patent ſigned on the 22d of the ſame month, and he took the uſual oaths of his office the 10th of Auguſt following (m). Soon after this he was ordered by the King to draw up a deſcription of his medals which were delivered into his hands, and King Henry the VIIIth's cloſet was aſſigned him for that purpoſe (n).

(m) *Diary*, pag. 36, 37.

(n) *Diary*, pag.

the plague at Lichfield; and he has given the following character of her in his *Diary* (2). *She was a diſcreet, ſober, provident woman, and with great patience endured many afflictions. Her parents had given her exceeding good breeding, and ſhe was excellent at her needle, which (my father being improvident) ſtood her in great ſtead. She was competently read in Divinity, Hiſtory, and Poetry, and was continually inſtilling into my ears ſuch religious and moral precepts as my younger years were capable of. Nor did ſhe ever fail to correct my faults; always adding ſharp reproofs and good lectures to boot. She was much eſteemed of by perſons of note, with whom ſhe was acquainted. She lived in much friendſhip among her neighbours, and left a good name behind her. In fine, ſhe was truly religious and virtuous.*

(2) Pag. 15.

[C] *He was elected a Free-Maſon.*] He was choſen in company with Colonel Henry Manwaring of Kerthingham in Cheſhire, at Warrington in Lancaſhire. This, ſays the Author of the *Memoirs* of his Life (3), prefixed to his *Antiquities of Berkſhire*, was a favour eſteemed ſo ſingular, that Kings themſelves have not diſdained to enter themſelves into this ſociety; the original foundation of which is ſaid to be as high as the reign of King Henry III, when the Pope granted a Bull, Patent, or Diploma, to a particular company of Italian Maſons and Architects to travel over all Europe to build Churches. From theſe is derived the fraternity of *Adopted Maſons*, *Accepted Maſons* or *Free Maſons*, who were known to one another all over the world by certain ſignals and watch-words known to them alone. They have ſeveral lodges in different countries for their reception; and when any of the ſociety falls into decay, the brotherhood is to relieve him. The manner of their adoption or admiſſion is very formal and ſolemn, and with the adminiſtration of an oath of ſecrecy, which has had better fate than all other oaths, and has been ever moſt religiouſly obſerved; nor has the world been yet able by the inadvertency, ſurprize, or folly of any of its members to penetrate into this myſtery, or make the leaſt diſcovery.

(3) Pag. 6.

[D] *The King's affairs being now entirely ruined, he retired in order to purſue his ſtudies.*] After the ſurrender of Worceſter, he went to Cheſhire, where he lay concealed till October following, and then removed privately to London, and by means of Mr. Jonas Moore, became acquainted with Mr. William Lilly, and Mr. J. Booker, both noted Aſtrologers, by whoſe converſation he made a great progreſs in Aſtronomy and Aſtrology, and was introduced by them to the Aſtrologers annual feaſt, and eſteemed among them as one of the fraternity. In 1647 he retired to Englefield in Berkſhire, where he lived in a very ſtudious manner, and in 1648 he entered upon the ſtudy of plants, and in a few months became an eminent Botaniſt (4). Here amidſt the pleaſures of a rural ſolitude, he prepared ſome pieces, which were afterwards publiſhed (5). He was extremely charmed with this obſcure retirement, for in his *Diary* (6), he writes as follows: *It pleaſed God to put me in mind, that I was now* (June 1647) *placed in the condition I always deſired, which was, that I might be enabled to live to myſelf and ſtudies, without being forced to take pains for a livelihood in the world. And ſeeing I am thus retired, according to my heart's deſire, I beſeech God to bleſs me in my retirement, and to proſper my ſtudies, that I may faithfully and diligently ſerve him, and in all things ſubmit to his will; and for the peace and happineſs I enjoy (in the midſt of bad times) to render him all humble thanks, and for what I attain to in the courſe of my ſtudies, to give him the Glory.*

(4) Wood, Col. 886.

(5) *Memoirs of the Life of Elias Aſhmole, Eſq;* prefixed to his *Antiquities of Berkſhire*, p. 7.

(6) Pag. 17.

[E] *An account of the variety of fortune, which he paſſed thro' till the Reſtoration.*] In the year 1648 an eſtate at Bradfield in Berkſhire, which had been ſettled upon him by a Lady of that County, whom he afterwards married, was ſequeſter'd on account of his loyalty; but this ſequeſtration was taken off at Reading the 21ſt of November following, by the intereſt which he had amongſt thoſe of the contrary party (7). November the 16th 1649 he married Mary, the only daughter of Sir William Foſter of Aldermarſton in Berkſhire, Baronet, the widow of Sir Thomas Mainwaring, Knight, late Recorder of the Corporation of Reading, and one of the Maſters in the High Court of Chancery (8). Mr. Aſhmole lived afterwards in Black Fryars at London; and in January 1651 he began to learn the method of engraving ſeals, and caſting in ſand, and Goldſmith's work (9). About this time he became very famous for his knowledge in Cheminſtry; which induced William Backhouſe of Swallowfield in Berks, Eſq; to communicate ſeveral ſecrets to him in that art. In February the ſame year he learned the Hebrew language of Rabbi Solomon Frank (10). That year his *Theatrum Chemicum Britannicum* was publiſhed, the cuts of which were engraved at Mr. Aſhmole's own houſe, by that eminent artiſt Mr. Vaughan (11). July the 25th 1653 he became acquainted with the great Mr. Selden, who finding him a man of a good genius, encouraged him in his ſtudies, and was extremely civil to him as long as he lived (12). In 1655 he entered upon the ſtudy of Engliſh Antiquities, and on the 11th of November 1657, he was admitted a member of the *Middle-Temple* (13). By the means of Sir William Foſter, who claimed a right of preſentation to the Benefice of Bradfield, our Author met with many difficulties from the Tryers, to whom he preſented three different perſons to be admitted to that living, the laſt of whom, after ſome conteſt, was connived at by the committee. His ſecond marriage proved a little unfortunate, for ſome diſputes aroſe between his Lady and himſelf, and ſhe ſued for ſeparate alimony. He writes as follows, in his *Diary* (14). *In 1657 October the 8th the cauſe between me and my wife was heard, when Mr. Serjeant Maynard obſerved to the Court, that there were eight hundred ſheets of Depoſitions of my wife's part, and not one word proved againſt me of uſing her ill, nor ever giving her a bad or provoking word.* The iſſue of this was, that the Lady was delivered to her husband, and the cauſe adjudged to be frivolous and without grounds (15). The ſame year he attended Mr. Dugdale, afterwards Sir William Dugdale, in his Survey of the Fen-Country, and was very aſſiſtant to him in that excellent undertaking, ſo much for the honour and advantage of the nation; and the effects of this journey were viſible ſometime after in a large and judicious account of thoſe marſhy countries. He likewiſe trac'd the Roman road from Weeden, called in Antoninus's *Itinerarium Bennevenna*, on Watling-ſtreet to Lichfield, of which he ſent ſome account to his inſeparable friend Mr. Dugdale, in a letter dated April 20 (16). In May 1658 he began his firſt collection of materials for his Hiſtory of the *Order of the Garter* (17); which, as Mr. Wood tells us (18), he ſearched for among the Records of the Tower of London. In September following he took a journey to Oxford, and on the 10th of that month he began to make a deſcription of the coins given to the public library by Dr. Laud Archbiſhop of Canterbury and others; which deſcription was of great uſe to him in ſeveral of his works (19). Upon Auguſt the 21ſt 1659, his ſtudy was broke open by the ſoldiers on pretence of ſearching for King Charles II (20). And on the 16th of December following, Mr. John Tredeſcant and his wife ſealed and deliver'd a deed of gift of all their various collections, which were then preſerved at South Lambeth in Surrey (21).

(7) *Memoirs*, pag. 8. Wood, *ubi ſupra*, and *Diary*, pag. 20.

(8) *Memoirs*, p. 8. and *Diary*, pag. 21.

(9) *Diary*, pag. 24.

(10) Wood, Col. 887.

(11) *Diary*, pag. 25.

(12) Ibid. pag. 30.

(13) Wood, *ubi ſupra*, and *Diary*, pag. 34.

(14) Pag. 34.

(15) *Memoirs*, pag. 9.

(16) See *Miſcellanies on ſeveral curious Subjects, publiſhed from their reſpective Originals*, London 1714, in 8°.

(17) *Diary*, pag. 35.

(18) Col. 887.

(19) Idem, ibid.

(20) *Diary*, pag. 35.

(21) Ibid. pag. 36.

pose (*n*). At the same time a commission was issued out for the examination of Hugh Peters, concerning the disposal of the pictures, jewels, &c. belonging to the Royal Family [*F*]. August the 26th 1660, he presented to the King the three books which he had published during the usurpation, viz. *Fasciculus Chemicus*, *Theatrum Chemicum*, and *The Way to Bliss*, which the King received very graciously, and on the third of September following appointed him Comptroller of the Excise (*o*). November the 2d 1660, he was called to the bar in the Middle Temple, and admitted the 7th following (*p*), but he never pleaded or practised his profession. January the 15th 1661 he was admitted one of the Fellows of the Royal Society, and in February he was appointed Secretary of Surinam in the West-Indies (*q*). April the 13th the same year the King gave orders to the Lord Chamberlain to settle him as the first Herald, in case any dispute should happen (*r*). In June 1664, the *White Office* being opened, he was made Comptroller thereof (*s*); and on the 9th of June 1668 he was appointed by the Lords Commissioners of the Treasury to execute the office of Accomptant General in the Excise, and Country Accomptant (*t*). Upon the decease of his second wife, the Lady Mainwaring, who died April the first 1668, he married Elizabeth, daughter to Sir William Dugdale, Garter King at Arms, the third of November following (*u*). July the 9th 1669 he was created Doctor of Physick by the University of Oxford, and his Diploma was presented to him the 3d of November following (*x*). In 1672 May the 8th, he presented his *Institution, Laws, and Ceremonies of the most noble Order of the Garter* [*G*] to the King, who gave him as a reward for his labours four hundred pounds out of the custom of paper. January the 29th 1675 (*y*) he surrendered his place of Windsor-Herald, and afterwards might have been preferred to that of Garter Principal King at Arms upon the decease of Sir Edward Walker, if he would have sollicited for it [*H*]. January the 26th 1679 (*z*) his lodgings in the Middle-Temple were destroyed by fire, by which accident he sustained a prodigious loss [*I*]. In 1683 he bestowed on the University of Oxford, (who had erected a beautiful Repository near the Theatre,) a noble collection

(*n*) Ibid. pag. 36.
(*o*) Ibid. pag. 37.
(*p*) Ibid. pag. 37. *and* Wood, Col. 887.
(*q*) *Diary* and Wood, *ubi supra*.
(*r*) *Diary*, pag. 40.
(*s*) Wood, *ubi supra*.
(*t*) Idem, ibid. and *Diary*, pag. 42.
(*u*) *Diary*, pag. 43.
(*x*) Ibid.
(*y*) *Diary*, pag. 52.
(*z*) *Diary*, pag. 60. Mr. Wood says it was on January 28.

[*F*] *A commission was issued out for the examination of Hugh Peters, concerning the disposal of the pictures, jewels, &c. belonging to the Royal Family.*] These, as we are informed by the Author of the *Memoirs* (22) abovementioned, had been committed chiefly to his care, but were sold and dispersed over Europe; and are still in the closets of several Princes, who, continues that Author, *then connived at, nay, encouraged the depredations made on the Royal Exile, and enriched their own cabinets with the invaluable curiosities of England at a very cheap rate, which neither generosity, honour, nor justice has ever induced them to restore, though they well knew the invalidity of the title upon which they purchased. But crowned heads have as little regard to honour or justice, when they interfere with their interest, as the vulgar; else how shall we account for their courting the Usurper, conceding to the most unreasonable demands, and sacrificing all, even to the most sanguine expectations he could entertain? This Commission was soon brought to a conclusion by the obstinacy or ignorance of their criminal, who either would not or was not able to give the desired satisfaction. Thus was this matter dropt, and every one left, if their own consciences permitted, to enjoy without any molestation the plunder they had collected.*

(22) Pag. 10 and 11.

[G] *He presented his* Institution, Laws, and Ceremonies of the most noble Order of the Garter.] It was printed at London in 1672 in fol. adorn'd and illustrated with beautiful Cuts at the charge of the Author; who was soon after informed that a copy of it was reposited in the Vatican Library at Rome. He presented it likewise to the several companions of that noble Order, and particularly to Christiern King of Denmark, who returned him in 1674 by the hands of Thomas Henshaw Esq; Agent from King Charles II at that Court, a gold chain and medal, which he wore upon some public solemnities by the King's command. Frederic William Elector of Brandenburg likewise sent him a present of the same kind, and ordered his Book to be translated into High Dutch (23). This performance of his raised his character prodigiously, and he was afterwards visited and complimented at his lodgings in the Middle Temple, and at his house at South Lambeth by the Embassadors and Envoys of those Kings and Princes, to whom he had sent his Book (24).

(23) Wood, Col. 890.
(24) Idem, Col. 888.

[*H*] *He might have been preferred to that of Garter principal King at Arms . . . . if he would have sollicited for it.*] Upon the death of Sir Edward Walker, Garter, on Feb. the 20th 1677, a controversy arising between the King and the Earl-Marshal, concerning the right of the disposal of this office, Mr. Ashmole was of opinion that the right was vested in the King, which was confirmed March 30th following, at an hearing before some Lords of the Council and several Knights of the Garter. Upon the determination of this affair, Mr. Ashmole was very much importuned to accept of this high office, which he declined in order to prevent the suspicion of partiality in giving his opinion at first for the King, and to gratify his father-in-law, Sir William Dugdale, who was created Garter Principal King at Arms, May the 24th following. In the management of this affair, tho' he asserted the King's right, yet he behaved himself with so much circumspection and prudence, that he gave no umbrage to the Earl Marshal, who himself publickly applauded his behaviour (25). The Author of the *Memoirs* of his Life (26) has given us in his own words the reasons, which he alledged, why he was unwilling to sue for the Garter's place; which he concludes in this manner: *God having taken from me both ambition and covetousness, I set more value upon the retired life I was entered into, than all the advantage and honour I should reap by that office* (27).

(25) *Diary*, pag. 57.
(26) Pag. 14, & *seq.*
(27) Ibid. pag. 20.

[*I*] *By which accident he sustained a prodigious loss.*] Mr. Wood tells us (28), that he was informed by Sir William Dugdale in a Letter dated the 13th of May 1679, that *Mr. Ashmole's losses were exceeding great, all his Library of printed Books, which was very large, was consumed, and many other things of value. But all his chief manuscripts escaped, he having them at South-Lambeth. So likewise his gold coins and gold medals; but those of silver were all melted, and have cost him as much as the worth of them in weight in digging among the ruins, sifting the rubbish, and hiring the Silver-Smiths to wash the dust. The copper coins are found, but miserably defaced &c.* The same Historian likewise acquaints us, that he was informed by Mr. Ashmole's Letter, which he received by the hands of Dr. Plot the latter end of December 1683, that *his chambers in the Middle-Temple were burnt in the great fire there in Jan.* 1678, *wherein was a Library of Books; the collection of thirty three years, mostly from abroad; a collection of near nine thousand coins ancient and modern, being the gathering of thirty two years. Also a large collection of ancient evidences and seals of the English Nobility and Gentry. All the great seals of England from the Conquest hitherto, with many of the Religious Houses both in England Scotland; those of England hanging at their several instruments. That he lost also there his observations upon History, coins, medals, heraldry and some other subjects, being the effects of his studies for about thirty years, which lay there in his said chambers for improvement as he had leisure*

(28) Col. 888.

lection of natural and artificial curioſities, which was conſiderably augmented at his death [*K*], which happened at Lambeth (*aa*) the 18th of May 1692, in the ſeventy ſixth year of his age. He was interred in the church of Great Lambeth in Surry the 26th following, and a black marble ſtone laid over his grave with a Latin inſcription upon it [*L*]. We ſhall give a catalogue of his Works in the note [*M*]. Mr. Wood in his *Athenæ Oxonienſes* (*bb*) gives him the following character; *That he was the greateſt Virtuoſo and Curioſo that ever was known or read of in England before his time.* Uxor Solis

(*aa*) Wood, Col. 891, ſays the 26th of May.

(*bb*) Vol. 2. Col. 889.

leiſure. And alſo divers valuable pieces of antiquity, and ſundry curioſities both of art and nature, &c. Mr. Wood likewiſe informs us, that he had ſeen a large paper book near a yard long, containing on each ſide of the leaves two, three or more cuts of eminent perſons in England and other countries, which were collected with great pains, but deſtroyed by this fire; with another large Folio, containing the cuts of proceſſions at coronations, marriages, interviews, funerals, &c; and a third containing proſpects of cities, towns, houſes, &c. He loſt alſo a great number of natural curioſities, foſſils, and Britiſh antiquities, &c.

[*K*] *In* 1683 *he beſtowed on the Univerſity of Oxford, who had erected a beautiful repoſitory near the Theatre, a noble collection of natural and artificial curioſities, which was conſiderably augmented at his death.*] About the latter end of October 1677 he made a motion to ſeveral Heads of that Univerſity, that he would beſtow on it all his curioſities, which he had obtained of a famous Gardiner, whoſe name was John Tredeſcant (29) a Dutchman, and his wife, with all his coins, medals, and manuſcripts, on condition that they would build a Theatre to receive them; which offer they readily agreed to. May 15th 1679 the firſt ſtone of that noble ſtructure, now called *Aſhmole's Muſæum*, was laid; and the whole building finiſhed in the beginning of March 1682 (30); upon which the 20th of the ſame month he ſent about twelve cart-loads of curioſities thither, which were fixed in their proper places by Dr. Robert Plot, who was intruſted with the care of that Muſæum. The Univerſity returned him thanks for this valuable preſent in a Latin Letter. December 10th 1677 Dr. Robert Plot abovementioned came with recommendations by Mr. John Evelyn dated from Whitehall Decemb. 7th 1677 to Mr. Aſhmole, who promiſed him his intereſt to be choſen Reader of Natural Philoſophy. *This Lecture*, ſays that Author of the Memoirs of Mr. Aſhmole's Life, *has been by many ſaid to have been founded and endowed by our Author, Mr. Aſhmole; but this miſtake is built upon the notion generally conceived, that he deſigned ſuch a benefaction and an ample and generous allowance to the Keeper of his* Muſæum *at Oxford; but this publick principle was ſtifled in Embryo by the influence of a perſon, who was poſſeſſed of an eminent poſt in the Church, and in ſome of his elegant and polite writings had dropt ſome expreſſions favouring of Socinianiſm, which being not undeſervedly and unanſwerably attacked by a Member of this Univerſity, it was ſo highly reſented that his intereſt with our Author ſtopt the deſign, and the place ſtill remains unendowed.* In July 1690 he viſited that Univerſity with his wife, and was received with all imaginable honour, and entertained at a noble dinner in his *Muſæum*; upon which occaſion Mr. Edward Hannes the Chymical Profeſſor, afterwards an eminent Phyſician, made an elegant Oration to him (31). His benefaction to the Univerſity was very conſiderably enlarged at his death, by the addition of his Library (32), which conſiſted chiefly of manuſcripts and ſome printed books relating to Engliſh Hiſtory, Heraldry, Aſtronomy, and Chymiſtry, with a great variety of Pamphlets, part of which had been aſſorted by himſelf, and the reſt are methodized ſince, and a double catalogue made, one claſſical according to their various ſubjects, and another alphabetical. He bequeathed alſo to the ſame place two gold chains and a medal, the one a philigreen chain of ninety links, weighing twenty two ounces, with a medal of the Elector of Brandenburg, upon which is the effigies of that Elector, and on the reverſe a view of Straelſund, ſtruck upon the ſurrender of that important city; a collar of S. S. with a medal of the King of Denmark; and a gold medal of the Elector Palatine, and a George of the Duke of Norfolk, worn by his grandfather, when he was Embaſſador in Germany. All thoſe he had received as acknowledgments of the honour, which he had done the Garter by his labours on that ſubject (32).

(29) Wood, col. 889. The Author of the *Memoirs* ſays, that theſe Collections were made by the two *Tradeſcants*, father and ſon, both ſucceſſively Phyſic Gardiners at Lambeth.

(30) Wood, Col. 889.

(31) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(32) Mr. Wood, Col. 891, ſays that he left the Univerſity 1758 books, of which 620 where MSS. and of them 311 folios.

(32) *Memoirs*, pag. 22, 23.

[*L*] *With a Latin inſcription upon it.*] It is as follows: *Hic jacet inclytus ille & eruditiſſimus* Elias Ashmole Lichfeldenſis, *Armiger, inter alia in Republicâ munera, Tributi in cereviſias Contra-Rotulator, Fœcialis autem* Windſorienſis *titulo per annos plurimos dignatus. Qui poſt duo connubia in Uxorem duxit tertiam* Elizabetham Gulielmi Dugdale, *Militis, Garteri, Principalis Regis Armorum filiam. Mortem obiit* 18 *Maii* 1692. *Anno Ætatis* 76, *ſed durante* Muſæo Aſhmoleano Oxon. *nunquam moriturus.* That is, "Here lies the famous and moſt learned Elias "Ashmole of Lichfield Eſq; who among other "offices which he held, was Comptroller of the Ex-"ciſe, and Windſor Herald for many years; and "married for his third Wife Elizabeth the daughter "of Sir William Dugdale, Garter, principal King at "Arms. He deceaſed the 18th of May 1692, in "the 76th year of his age. But as long as his Mu-"ſæum at Oxford ſhall continue, he can never die."

[*M*] *We ſhall give a Catalogue of his works.*] I. *Annotations upon ſeveral poetical pieces of our famous Engliſh Philoſophers, who have written the* Hermetique Myſteries *in their own ancient language*; illuſtrated with Figures. London 1652 in 4to. This work bears the general title of *Theatrum Chemicum Britannicum*; and contains *The Ordinal of Alchymy written by Thomas Norton of Briſtol*; *The Compound of Alchymy by Sir George Ripley*, with ſeveral other pieces by Richard Carpenter, Abraham Andrews, Thomas Charnock, William Bloomefield, Sir Edward Kelly, Dr. John Dee, Thomas Robinſon, John Gower, Geoffry Chaucer, John Lidgate, William Redman, Peirce the Black Monk, and divers anonymous Writers. Mr. Aſhmole wrote the *Prolegomena* to theſe Authors, which Mr. Wood tells us (33) *is excellently well done, if not too much in the canting or Roſacrucian language, as there is in ſome of the Annotations.* The *Prolegomena* is addreſſed *to all ingeniouſly elaborate Students in the moſt divine myſteries of Hermetique Learning.* He obſerves, that *the ſubject of the enſuing work is a philoſophical account of that eminent ſecret treaſured up in the boſom of nature, which hath been ſought for of many but found by a few, notwithſtanding experienced antiquity hath afforded faithful (though not frequent) diſcoveries thereof. Paſt Ages have like rivers conveyed downe to us (upon the floate) the more light and ſophiſtical part of learning; but what were profound and myſterious, the weight and ſolidity thereof ſunke to the bottom; whence every one, who attempts to dive, cannot eaſily fetch them up. So that what our Saviour ſaid to his Diſciples, may (I hope without offence) be ſpoken to the elected Sons of Art:* Unto you it is given to know the myſteries of the Kingdome of God; but to others in parables, that ſeeing they might not ſee, and hearing they might not underſtand. He tells us afterwards, that *he does not expect that all his readers ſhould come with an engagement to believe what he writes here, or that there was ever any ſuch thing* in rerum naturâ *as what we call a* Philosopher's Stone. *Nor will I,* continues he, *perſuade them to it, (though I muſt tell them I have not the vanity to publiſh theſe* ſacred *and* ſerious myſteries *and* arcana *as romances.) 'Tis enough that I know incredulity is given to the world as a puniſhment. Yet I'll tell them what one of our ancient poetical Philoſophers ſayes;*

(33) Col. 889.

If you wyle liſten to my Lay,
Something thereby you may find,
That may content your minde.
I will not ſweare to make you give credence,
For a Philoſopher will find herein evidence
Of the truth; and to men that be lay,
I ſkill not greatly what they ſay.

I muſt

Solis *took up its habitation in his breaſt, and in his boſom the great God did abundantly ſtore up the treaſures of all ſorts of wiſdom and knowledge. Much of his time, when he was in the prime of his years, was ſpent in Chymiſtry; in which faculty being accounted famous, he did worthily deſerve the title of* Mercuriophilus Anglicus. *And being eminent for Botany, ſeveral*

I muſt profeſs I know enough to hold my tongue, but not enough to ſpeake. And the no leſs real *than* miraculous fruits *I have found in my diligent enquiry into theſe Arcana, lead me on to ſuch degrees of admiration, they command ſilence, and force me to loſe my tongue. Yet as one greatly affecting my native country and the ſatisfaction of all ingenious Artiſts, I have publiſhed (for their uſe) the enſuing collected Antiquities.* He then gives account of the *Mineral Stone*, "the which, *ſays* "*he*, is wrought up to the degree only, that hath "power of tranſmuting any imperfect earthy matter "into its utmoſt degree of perfection: that is, to "convert the baſeſt of metals into perfect gold and "ſilver; flints into all manner of precious ſtones, as "rubies, ſaphirs, emeralds, and diamonds, &c; and "many more experiments of the like nature. But "as this is but a part, ſo it is the leaſt ſhare of that "bleſſing, which may be acquired by the *Philoſopher's* "*Materia*, if the full virtue thereof were knowne." He proceeds next to the *vegetable, magical*, and *angelical Stones. By the* vegetable, ſays he, *may be perfectly known the nature of man, beaſts, fowls, fiſhes, together with all kinds of trees, plants, flowers, &c. and how to produce and make them grow, flouriſh, and bear fruit; how to encreaſe them in colour and ſmell, and when and where we pleaſe, and all this not only at an inſtant,* experimenti gratia, *but daily, monthly, yearly, at any time, at any ſeaſon; yea in the depth of winter.* He mentions likewiſe other virtues of this ſtone. *By the* magical *or* proſpective Stone *it is poſſible to diſcover any perſon in what part of the world ſoever, although never ſo ſecretly concealed or hid, in chambers, cloſets, or caverns of the earth; for there it makes a ſtrict inquiſition. In a word, it fairly preſents to your view even the whole world, wherein to behold, hear, or ſee your deſire. Nay more, it enables man to underſtand the language of the creatures, as the chirping of birds, lowing of beaſts, &c. to convey a ſpirit into an image, which by obſerving the influence of heavenly Bodies ſhall become a true Oracle; and yet this, as E. A. aſſures us, is not any ways* necromantical *or* deviliſh, *but eaſy, wonderous eaſy, natural and honeſt.* Laſtly as touching the *Angelical Stone*, "it is ſubtil, ſaith the aforeſaid Author, that it can "neither be ſeen, felt, or weighed, but taſted only. "The voice of man, (which bears ſome proportion "to theſe ſubtil properties,) comes ſhort in compariſon; "nay the air itſelf is not ſo penetrable, and yet (oh my-"ſterious wonder!) a *Stone* that will lodge in the fire to "eternity without being prejudiced. It hath a divine "power, celeſtial and inviſible above the reſt; and "endows the poſſeſſor with divine gifts. It affords "the apparition of Angels, and gives a power of "converſing with them by dreams and revelations; "nor dare any evil Spirit approach the place, where "it lodgeth; becauſe it is *a quinteſſence, wherein there* "*is no corruptible thing; and where the elements are* "*not corrupt, no Devil can ſtay or abide.*" He tells us immediately after, that by means of this ſtone the human body is preſerved from corruption, being enabled thereby to live a long time without food; nay it is made a queſtion, whether any man can die, who uſes it. *Which I do not*, ſays he, *ſo much admire, as to think* why the poſſeſſors of it ſhould deſire to live, *that have thoſe manifeſtations of glory and eternity, preſented unto their fleſhly eyes; but rather deſire to be diſſolved, and to enjoy the full fruition, than live where they muſt be content with the bare ſpeculation.* He obſerves at the concluſion of his *Prolegomena*, that *his Annotations are limited within the bounds of what is hiſtorical, or what occaſionally muſt needs intrench on the confines of other arts; and all gloſſes upon the philoſophical work purpoſely omitted; for the ſame reaſons, that I choſe to ſend forth other men's children into the world, rather than my own.* II. *The Proceedings on the Day of the Coronation of King Charles II.* Mr. Wood obſerves, that he never ſaw this. III. *The Inſtitutions, Laws, and Ceremonies of the moſt noble Order of the Garter.* London 1671 (34), in folio. Biſhop Nicholſon in his *Engliſh Hiſtorical Library* (35) ſtiles this *a moſt elaborate and perfect work upon the ſubject:* and in another place (36) he tells us, that the caſtle and chapel of Windſor have been at large treated upon *by the excellent pen of Elias Aſhmole Eſq;* *in his* Hiſtory of the Garter. IV. *Familiarum illuſtrium Imperatorumque Romanorum numiſmata, Oxoniæ in Bodleianæ Bibliothecæ archivis deſcripta & explanata*; i. e. "The medals of the illuſtrious Families "and Roman Emperors, which are preſerved in the "Bodleian Library at Oxford, deſcribed and explain-"ed." This work, which is contained in three folio manuſcripts, was finiſhed by the Author in 1659, and given by him to the publick Library at Oxford in 1666. The originals or copies of theſe are in his *Muſæum* (37). The Author of the *Memoirs* of his Life (38) obſerves, that this work was prepared for the preſs, as appears by the Preface to it (39). V. *A Deſcription and Explanation of the Coins and Medals belonging to King Charles II.* This is a manuſcript in one volume in folio, and was depoſited in the King's cabinet of coins and medals (40). VI. *The Arms, Epitaphs, feneſtral Inſcriptions, with the Draughts of the Tombs, &c. in all the churches in Berkſhire.* This Book, which, as Mr. Wood informs us, is a large folio written by Mr. Aſhmole in 1666, was collected by him in 1664, 1665, after he had been appointed Deputy Marſhal to Sir Edward Byſhe Clarencieux King at Arms, to viſit that county. The original is in the Library in his *Muſæum* N°. 850; and the original of the viſitation, which he made of that county, N°. 851, and a copy of both bound together in the Herald's Office at London (41). This work of his was publiſhed at London in three volumes in 8vo in 1723 with the title of *The Antiquities of Berkſhire by Elias Aſhmole Eſq; with a large Appendix of many valuable original papers, pedigrees of the moſt conſiderable Families in the ſaid county, and a particular Account of the Caſtle, College, and Town of Windſor.* VII. *The Arms, Epitaphs, feneſtral Inſcriptions, with the Draughts of ſome Tombs, &c. in ſome churches and houſes in Staffordſhire.* This Book, which is in folio, written for the moſt part by Mr. Aſhmole's own hand, was collected partly when he accompanied William Dugdale Eſq; Norroy King of Arms in the viſitation of his province in 1662, 1663. It is in Mr. Aſhmole's *Muſæum* N°. 853 (42). VIII. *The Arms, Epitaphs, feneſtral Inſcriptions, with the Draughts of Tombs, &c. in ſeveral churches in Cheſhire, Shropſhire, Derbyſhire, Nottinghamſhire, &c.* This Book, which is in folio, written by our Author, was collected when he attended Mr. Dugdale in the viſitation of his province in 1662 and 1663. It is preſerved in the *Muſæum*, N°. 854. IX. *Hiſtory of the Antiquities of the caſtle, chapel, college, and town of Windſor* (43). This was publiſhed at the end of *the Antiquities of Berkſhire*, as we obſerved above. X. Divers *Collections, Remarks, Notes on Books*, and *MSS.* in his *Muſæum*. Biſhop Nicholſon in his *Hiſtorical Library, Part II* (44) tells us, that *the little, that was to be ſaved out of the ruins, into which the Cathedral of Lichfield fell in our late days of confuſion, was picked up by (one of the great Preſervers of our Engliſh Antiquities)* Elias Aſhmole, Eſq; *late Garter King at Arms, and is now amongſt many other of his precious remains in his Muſæum at Oxford. This excellent Perſon*, continues he, *had a deſign to have honoured the place of his nativity with the writing a Hiſtory and Deſcription of its ancient and preſent State, and had collected a good number of choice materials for that purpoſe.* We have likewiſe ſeveral tranſlations done by our Author; as particularly, 1. *De Mundi Cataſtrophe* written by Joh. Franc. Spina. But Mr. Wood tells us (45), that he was not informed by Mr. Aſhmole's letter when or where his tranſlation of this Book was printed, or in what form; but only that he ſubjoined to it a tranſlation of *Ambr. Merlin's Prophecy.* II. *Faſciculus Chymicus* &c. written by Arthur Dee. This tranſlation is intitled, *Chemical Collections, expreſſing the ingreſs and egreſs of the ſecret Hermetic Science out of the choiceſt and moſt famous Authors.* To this tranſlation is added another made by our Author, entitled,

(34) *Memoirs*, pag. 23. Wood, Col. 889, ſays it was printed in 1672.

(35) Part 1. ch. 1. pag. 22. edit. London, in 8vo.

(36) Pag. 25.

(37) Wood, Col. 890.

(38) Pag. 24.

(39) See *Appendix* to his *Diary*, pag. 88.

(40) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(41) Idem, ibid.

(42) Idem, ibid.

(43) Idem, ibid.

(44) Edit. London 1697, pag. 140.

(45) Idem, ibid.

ſeveral books of that ſubject were dedicated to him, as others of Aſtrology, &c. were. He was a great Patron of Men of Letters; and the world is particularly obliged to him for the education and ſupport of the learned and eloquent Dr. Smallridge, Dean of Chriſt Church and Biſhop of Briſtol.

Arcanum, or the Grand Secret of Hermetic Philoſophy &c. written by an anonymous author. Both theſe were printed at London in one volume in 8vo, in the year 1650, and ſaid in the title to be made Engliſh by *James Haſolle* (Elias Aſhmole) Eſq; *qui eſt Mercuriophilus Anglicus.* Before the title is a cut or buſt of our Author placed upon an altar, upon which is written *Mercuriophilus Anglicus*, and above the picture is a hand coming out of the clouds, and holding before the Tranſlator's face a ſcrowl of paper with an aſtrological ſcheme upon it; and under all are four Engliſh verſes, partly deſcribing the picture which were compoſed by his friend Thomas Wharton, Dr. of Phyſic. Mr. Aſhmole wrote *Prolegomena* to theſe two tranſlations, full of the Roſicrucian language, and dedicated *to all ingenious elaborate Students in the moſt divine myſteries of Hermetic learning* (46). He publiſhed likewiſe a learned treatiſe of the Philoſopher's Stone, intitled, *The way to Bliſs, in three Books*; London, 1658 in 4to, which was written by an unknown Author in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. He had received the copy of it from William Backhouſe, Eſq; abovementioned, who deſired him to publiſh it, to do juſtice to the Author, becauſe they both had met with a pretended copy of that Book prepared for the preſs; which upon examination Mr. Aſhmole found mutilated, and injured by ſeveral impertinent additions, and form'd from ſome ſcattered fragments collected from the whole work. Beſides it was intended, that the world ſhould receive it as the performance of *Eugenius Theodidactus*, that is, of John Heydon, who had then lately married the widow of Nicholas Culpepper the Aſtrologer; and the title of it was altered into that of *the Wiſe Man's Crown, or Roſy-crucian Phyſic*; under which title John Gadbury in his Almanack for the year 1658 obſerv'd that it was ready to be publiſhed. Mr. Aſhmole therefore out of zeal for the art of Chemiſtry, and regard to the author of this work, took care to preſent the world with a perfect copy of it. This was highly reſented by Mr. Heydon abovementioned, who publiſhed a piece at London 1660 in 8vo, intitled, *The Idea of the Law, characteriſed from Moſes to King Charles II.* &c. in the Preface to which he tells the Reader that Mr. Aſhmole had printed a Book, called, *The Way to Bliſs, in three Books*, in a very defective manner, ſince his own Edition of it had four Books (47). Mr. Aſhmole tells us in his Preface, that the true Author of this Book was unknown, but, ſays he, *I have heard ſome notable ſtories, and thoſe back'd with perſuaſive circumſtances to make an eaſy faith think the providence very obſervable, that not only furniſhed a laborious ſearcher into this myſterious learning with the original itſelf, but moſt fortunately directed him to three grains of the powder cloſed up between two leaves thereof with which he made projection. But I affect not to fly-blow the ears of my Readers; only this I can modeſtly aver, that my copy was a tranſcript of that original. The work ſeems to be written about the beginning of the laſt (or end of the former) Century; the main drift of the Author being from weighty and ſerious arguments and examples to prove the poſſibility of the* Philoſopher's Stone; *whereby is largely manifeſted that nature has exhibited greater wonders to the view of the world, and as great things have been (and conſequently may be) performed by the weaker and leſſer means, where a due, friendly, and philoſophical conjunction of nature and art itſelf is fully underſtood. And yet howbeit, becauſe ſuch are familiar unto, and ordinary among us, we conſider them not. 'Tis a diſcourſe fraught with variety of excellent rational matter, and fitted to the learned as well as meaner capacities; nay, ſuch as I boldly perſuade myſelf will ſatisfy both beyond any thing yet extant of this nature; and I believe many captious arguments heretofore uſed and urged againſt the truth of this ſo infallible a Science, will here meet with ſatisfactory ſolution, and henceforth find no further place in any diſcourſe favouring but of ſobriety.* The *Diary* of his *Life*, written by himſelf, was publiſhed at London, 1717, in 12mo with the following title, *Memoirs of the life of that learned antiquary*, Elias Aſhmole, Eſq; *drawn up by himſelf by way of Diary; with an appendix of original letters publiſhed by* Charles Burman, Eſq; The Editor tells us in the Preface, that the copy from whence thoſe papers were publiſhed, was in the hand-writing of Dr. *Robert Plot*, Chief Keeper of the Aſhmolean Muſeum at Oxford, and Secretary of the Royal Society, and was tranſcribed by him for the uſe of a near relation of Mr. *Aſhmole's*, a private Gentleman in Staffordſhire. That they had been collated a few years before by David Perry, M. A. of Jeſus College in Oxford, and Chief Keeper of the *Muſeum*, who corrected from the original manuſcript (48) ſome few literal errors. The Editor concludes with obſerving, that *he ſhall not deſcant upon the uſefulneſs of this kind of works; but only ſay thus much, that they let us into the ſecret Hiſtory of the affairs of their ſeveral times; diſcover the ſprings of motion, and diſplay many valuable, tho' minute circumſtances overlooked, or unknown to our general Hiſtorians; and, to conclude all, ſatiate our largeſt curioſity.* The *Appendix* contains a letter of thanks, dated January 26, 1666. from the corporation of Lichfield upon the receipt of a ſilver bowl, preſented to them by Mr. Aſhmole; a Preface to the catalogue of Archbiſhop *Laud*'s medals, drawn up by Mr. Aſhmole, and preſerved in the public library at Oxford; a letter from Dr. Thomas Barlow, afterwards Biſhop of Lincoln, to Mr. Aſhmole, dated December 28, 1668, on the preſent of his Books, deſcribing Archbiſhop *Laud*'s Cabinet of Medals; a letter from John Evelyn, Eſq; to recommend Dr. Plott to him for Reader in Natural Philoſophy; and another from Mr. Joſhua Barnes dated from Emanuel College, Cambridge, October 15, 1688, wherein he deſires Mr. Aſhmole's pardon for having reflected upon his *Order of the Garter* in his own Hiſtory of King Edward III. with Mr. Aſhmole's anſwer to that letter, dated October the 23d following.

T.

(46) Idem, Col. 890, 891.

(47) Idem, Col. 891.

(48) *Inter M. S. Aſhmol. Oxon.* num. 1136.

☞ASHWELL (GEORGE) Author of ſeveral books [*A*], was ſon to Robert Aſhwell of Harrow on the Hill in Middleſex, and was born in the pariſh of St. Martin Ludgate in London the 8th of November 1612. He was entered a ſcholar in Wadham College in Oxford in 1627, where he took the degrees of Bachelor and Maſter of Arts, and was elected Fellow of that College, and became a famous Tutor there. After the breaking out of the civil wars he continued at Oxford, where he preached ſeveral times before

[*A*] *Author of ſeveral Books.*] I. *Fides Apoſtolica*; or *a Diſcourſe aſſerting the received Authors and Authority of the Apoſtles Creed.* Oxford, 1653, in 8vo. II. *A double Appendix, the firſt touching the Athanaſian, the ſecond touching the Nicene Creed.* Publiſhed with his *Fides Apoſtolica*. Mr. Wood tells us (1), that Mr. Richard Baxter having cenſured ſome things in the *Fides Apoſtolica* in his *Gildas Salvianus* or *Reformed Paſtor*, publiſhed at London in 1656 (2) in 8vo, expreſſes his regret in the Preface to his *Catholic Theology* printed at London in fol. 1675 on account of the exceptions, which he publickly made to Mr. Aſhwell's Book abovementioned. III. *Geſtus Euchariſticus; concerning the Geſture to be uſed at the receiving of the Sacrament.* Oxford 1663 in 8vo. IV. *De Socino & Socinianiſmo Diſſertatio:* i. e. "A Diſſertation concern-" ing Socinus and the Socinians." Oxford 1680 in 8vo. 'Tis but a ſmall part of a large work, which he had finiſhed, the title of which was *De Judice Controverſiarum & Catholicæ Veritatis Regula*; i. e. "Of " the

(1) *Athen. Oxon.* Col. 911.

(2) Mr. Wood ſays 1657, which is a miſtake.

before the King, and had therefore the degree of Bachelor of Divinity conferred upon him June the 23d 1646, a little before the ſurrender of the garriſon of Oxford (*a*). He ſubmitted afterwards to the authority of the Viſitors appointed by the Parliament in 1648, and obtained the Rectory of Hanwell near Banbury in Oxfordſhire upon the deceaſe of Dr. Robert Harris, in the latter end of the year 1658, having before been Chaplain in the family of Sir Anthony Cope Lord of the Mannor of Hanwell, where our Author died on the 8th of February 1693, and was buried in the church there (*b*). He was a man of a ſerene peaceable temper, and in all reſpects worthy of his function. He was an excellent Logician, and maſter of a peculiar ſagacity and clearneſs in reaſoning, and very converſant in the Fathers and School-Men, which gained him a great eſteem among thoſe Divines who had an inclination to thoſe ſtudies (*c*).

(a) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* Vol. 2. Col. 911. and *Faſti* Col. 55.

(b) Idem *Athen.* Col. 911, 912.

(c) Idem, Col. 911.

" the Judge of Controverſies and the Rule of Ca-
" tholick Truth." He publiſhed that *Diſſertation* only as a ſpecimen of his performance, and to try whether he ſhould meet with proper encouragement to print the whole. V. *De Eccleſia Romana Diſſertatio, pars operis multo majoris, De Judice Controverſiarum, &c.* i. e. " A Diſſertation concerning the Church
" of Rome? being a part of a much larger work
" concerning the Judge of Controverſies &c." Oxford 1688 in 4to. This was publiſhed at the requeſt of Dr. Gilbert Ironſide, Warden of Wadham College. VI. *An Anſwer to Plato Redivivus, written by Henry Nevill.* This, as Mr. Wood tells us, was in MS. in the Author's own hand. He tranſlated alſo from Latin into Engliſh, *Philoſophus Autodidactus, ſive Epiſtola Abi Giaaphar Ebn Tophail de Hai Ebn Yokdan &c.* London 1686 in 8vo. This Epiſtle ſhews from the Hiſtory of Ebn Yokdan by what ſteps and degrees human reaſon, improved by diligent obſervation and experience, may arrive at the knowledge of the moſt ſublime objects, and eſpecially of the Deity and Religion. T.

ASPASIA of Miletus, the miſtreſs of Pericles. We ſhall give her hiſtory in the note [*M*] of the Article PERICLES.

ASPASIA of Phocea, the miſtreſs of the younger Cyrus. We ſhall give her hiſtory in the note [*C*] of the Article of that Prince.

☞ASPILCUETA (MARTIN DE) commonly called the Doctor of Navarre (*Navarrus*, or *Doctor Navarrus*) becauſe he was of that country, was born of a noble family [*A*] the 13th of December 1491, at Varaſayn, a ſmall city of the Kingdom of Navarre, not far from Pampeluna. He entered very young into the monaſtery of Regular Canons at Roncevaux (*a*), where he took the habit, which he wore all his life-time, though he left the Convent. He went afterwards to Alcala (*b*), where he ſtudied Polite Literature, Natural and Moral Philoſophy, and Divinity, applying himſelf chiefly to the Syſtem of Peter Lombard, commonly called the *Maſter of the Sentences*. Having made a conſiderable progreſs in theſe Sciences, he retired to Ferrara [*B*], and there ſtudied the Law with ſuch ſucceſs, that he was ſoon thought capable of teaching it to others, which he did with applauſe [*C*] at Toulouſe and Cahors. Some time after he returned to Spain, and was made firſt Profeſſor of Canon Law at Salamanca (*c*), where he gained a great reputation, by endeavouring to inſtill good principles into the minds of the youth under his care, and encouraging them to the ſtudy of the Canon Law, which before his time was almoſt entirely neglected in that Univerſity. He continued there fourteen years, and intended, after he ſhould have finiſhed a courſe of twenty years, to be diſcharged from his functions, that he might be at liberty to apply himſelf to other ſtudies. But he could not accompliſh this deſign; for John the Third, King of Portugal, choſe him to be Profeſſor of Law at Coimbra (*d*), where he had lately founded an Univerſity. He gave Aſpilcueta a larger ſalary than what had ever been given to Profeſſors, either in Spain or in France, which might perhaps be thought the reaſon why Aſpilcueta complied with the King's deſire [*D*]. He ſtaid there ſixteen years, when having

(a) *Roncevallis*, or *Roncifvallis*, in the Kingdom of Navarre, ſituate between Pampeluna and St. Jean de Pié-de-Port.

(b) In New Caſtile.

(c) In the Kingdom of Leon.

(d) Or, *Conimbra*, in Latin *Conimbrica*.

[*A*] *Of a noble Family.*] His father's family was diſtinguiſhed not only becauſe it was very ancient, but alſo becauſe Francis Xavier the Apoſtle of the Indies was of that family, as our Aſpilcueta himſelf tells us (1). His mother was of the family of Jaureguiçar, otherwiſe called Baſtan, anciently ſettled in the Pyrenean Mountains (2).

(1) *In Miſcell. ult. de Oratione, apud* Nic. Ant. *Bibl. Hiſp.* tom. 2. pag. 74.
(2) Nic. Ant. ibid.

[*B*] *He retired into France.*] The occaſion of it was as follows: John d'Albret, King of Navarre, having been excommunicated with his wife Catherine de Foix by Pope Julius II, as favourers and abettors of Lewis XII King of France, whom the Pope had declared an enemy of the Church, Ferdinand King of Spain, who had procured that excommunication, invaded the Kingdom of Navarre, which obliged John d'Albret to take refuge in thoſe eſtates, which he poſſeſſed in France. Peter of Navarre his great Marſhal, and Francis his brother, who adhered to the King, attended him; and Aſpilcueta, who was Francis's Companion and Divine, (*cum Comes tum Doctor*) was obliged to follow him, and continued with him twelve years (3).

(3) Idem, ibid.

[*C*] *He taught the Law with great applauſe.*] His chief Lectures were upon Canon Law, which Father Niceron ſhould have obſerved (4); whereas he ſpeaks in general terms, as if Aſpilcueta had alſo taught the Civil Law. It appears however that our Author ſometimes inſiſted upon the principles of common morality: an inſtance of which we find in Nic. Antonio, who tells us (5), that Aſpilcueta proved in an elaborate diſcourſe, that we ought not to love or hate a man, merely becauſe he is our fellow-citizen, or a ſtranger, of the ſame nation with us, or of another, but that we are only to conſider his moral principles, and his virtue and good qualities. It were to be wiſhed, that Aſpilcueta had added, without any regard to his private opinions: but this is more than could be expected from a Roman Catholick Divine, and is not always to be met with even in thoſe, who have ſhaken off all human authority in religious ſubjects.

(4) See his *Memoirs, &c.* tom. 5. pag. 3.

(5) *Ubi ſupra.*

[*D*] *This might perhaps be thought the reaſon, why Aſpilcueta complied with the King* (of Portugal's) *deſire.*] When a man's conduct may proceed either from a good or bad principle, and we have no particular reaſons to aſcribe it to the one rather than to the other, the general corruption of men will eaſily lead us to impute their actions to an evil motive; tho' Chriſtian charity

having by his continual labours well deſerved to enjoy ſome repoſe, he was permitted to reſign his Profeſſorſhip, and retire into his own country, where he took care of his nieces, the daughters of his brothers who were dead. He alſo went into Caſtile, and during his ſtay there he was Confeſſor to Jane the widow of the Prince of Portugal, and to the Princes of Bohemia her nephews, the ſons of the Empreſs Mary. Aſpilcueta deſigned at laſt to return into Portugal [*E*], but he was obliged to go to Rome to plead the cauſe of Bartholomeo de Caranza Archbiſhop of Toledo [*F*], who was accuſed of hereſy before the Tribunal of the Inquiſition, and whoſe cauſe having firſt been pleaded in Spain, was by the Pope's order to be tried at Rome (*e*). Aſpilcueta pleaded this cauſe for Caranza with the utmoſt zeal, but without ſucceſs [*G*]. As his writings had gained him a very great reputation, we are not to wonder at his being received at Rome in the moſt honourable manner. Pope Pius V made him Aſſiſtant to Cardinal Francis Alciat his Vice-Penitentiary; and Gregory XIII never paſſed by Aſpilcueta's door, but he called for him, and ſtopped ſometimes a whole hour to talk with him in the ſtreet, nay he did not diſdain to pay him a viſit, even when he was attended with ſeveral Cardinals. Theſe honours did not raiſe his vanity, for he was always very modeſt and humble, an inſtance of which we ſhall give in the note [*H*]. His name became ſo famous, that even in his time the higheſt encomium that could be given to a learned man, was to call him a *Navarrus*, that name, which Aſpilcueta bore, implying the utmoſt perfection in all kind of Sciences, as that of a *Roſcius* was anciently given to the moſt accompliſhed Players. Aſpilcueta, according to Erythreus (*f*), was conſidered as the Oracle, not of one city only, but of the whole world; all ſorts of people reſorted to him, as to an Apollo, to have their doubts reſolved; and whatever he ſaid was received as an anſwer from ſome Deity. Such was the authority he had acquired, not only by his learning, but alſo by his virtue and ſincerity. He was very regular in the practice of all the Chriſtian duties, according to the rites and ceremonies of the church of Rome. His temperance and frugality not only preſerved his health and ſtrength in ſuch a manner, that even in a very advanced age, he had all the liberty of mind neceſſary to apply himſelf to ſtudy, but he was alſo capable of giving to the poor ſubſtantial proofs of his liberality, for he was always very charitable [*I*]. His humility and the ſtrong inclination he had for ſtudy, made

(*e*) See the Article of CARANZA.

(*f*) *Apud* Nic. Anton. *Bibl. Hiſp.* tom. 2. pag. 76.

charity ſhould oblige us to judge otherwiſe. And as it is very cuſtomary with Profeſſors to prefer thoſe Univerſities, where they have the greateſt ſalary, Aſpilcueta might very probably be accuſed of leaving his chair at Salamanca for that of Coimbra, only becauſe the latter was more profitable. It ſeems that he had been accuſed of this, for he defends himſelf in ſeveral places of his works (6), and ſhews, that the King of Portugal John III had prevailed over the Emperor Charles V by the interceſſion of Iſabella his ſiſter, to ſend him Aſpilcueta into Portugal, that that part of the world might alſo enjoy his learned Lectures (7); ſo that it was not the love of gain that obliged him to leave Salamanca, but the intreaties of his ſuperiors, which, with regard to a private man, have the force of a command. Add to this, that he refuſed ſeveral poſts of honour, which a covetous man will always make his advantage of.

(6) *In Repet. ad cap Inter verba* 21 *Quæſt. iii. Præf. ad Comment. in ſeptem de Pœnitentia diſtinctiones; & in Epiſt. Apologetica. Apud* Nic. Ant. *ubi ſupra*, pag. 75.

(7) Nic. Ant. ibid.

[*E*] *He deſigned—to return into Portugal.*] It was either out of gratitude to Queen Catherine, who had beſtowed great favours upon him, or becauſe maintaining himſelf with the money he had got there during his Profeſſorſhip, he thought that if it was not unjuſt in him, yet it was ungrateful to convey to another place the fruits of his counſels and learning. This I take to be the ſenſe of Nicholas Antonio's Latin. *Tandem cum Portugalliam denuo cogitaret, forſan conſcientia tactus beneficiorum ſibi à Catharina Regina olim collatorum, aut quod ejus regni pecuniis ſeſe exhibens opimos conſilii & doctrinæ fructus alibi reddere, ſi non iniquum ſaltem ingratum exiſtimabat* (8). The words *exhibere ſeſe* often ſignify among the Civilians, *to maintain one's ſelf*; and in this ſenſe I ſuppoſe Nicholas Antonio employed them.

(8) Idem, ibid.

[*F*] *To plead the cauſe of Bartholomeo de Caranza Archbiſhop of Toledo.*] As this Archbiſhop was a man of a very eminent character, it was proper that he ſhould be defended by a perſon of the greateſt merit and learning, and none could be found but Aſpilcueta. This is what Nicholas Antonio ſays (9). Thuanus adds (10), that Aſpilcueta, being then eighty years old, neglected the care of his own health to aſſiſt his friend; he attended Caranza to Rome, and defended him very courageouſly notwithſtanding the oppoſition of King Philip and his Miniſters. *Navarrus, quanquam octogenari proximus omnem ætatis & valetudinis curam amici periculo poſthabuit, & Carançam* (11) *Romam ductum comitatus, ejus innocentiam, averſo Philippo & ejus Miniſtris, conſtantiſſime tutatus eſt.*

(9) Idem, ibid.

(10) *Hiſtor.* lib. 84. pag. 3. tom. 4. edit. 1620, fol.

(11) Thus Thuanus writes this Archbiſhop's name. Nic. Antonio writes it *Carranza*.

[*G*] *Without ſucceſs.*] We learn from Thuanus (12), that tho' nothing could be proved againſt Caranza, yet he languiſhed in priſon, where he at laſt died very miſerable; whence it appears, that all Aſpilcueta's endeavours and eloquence in his behalf proved unſucceſsful. We are not to wonder at this, ſince he had againſt him the King and his Council, and, what is a thouſand times more terrible, the formidable Tribunal of the Inquiſition.

(12) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 112.

[*H*] *An inſtance of his modeſty and humility.*] Thuanus furniſhes us with it, and is ſo much the more to be credited, as he was an eye-witneſs of what he relates on this occaſion. "I remember, ſays he (13), "that when Paul de Foix was Embaſſador at Rome "for the King of France, whither I accompanied him, "Aſpilcueta came to viſit him; and not finding him "at home, he went to meet him at the entrance of the "Church of the Trinity. There with his head bare, "he proſtrated himſelf to the ground, and kiſſed the "Embaſſador's feet. De Foix ſurprized at this hu"mility refuſed the honour, which Aſpilcueta intend"ed him, and entreated the venerable old man to "riſe. Aſpilcueta anſwered, that he owed theſe marks "of reſpect and veneration to a nation, from which "his Kings were deſcended. At laſt he was prevail"ed upon to ſtand up; but neither the prayers nor "repeated commands of the Embaſſador could oblige "him to cover his head, tho' he walked with him "in an open place, expoſed to all the injuries of the "ſeaſon, which was then very cold." Thuanus adds a circumſtance which is very much to the glory of Aſpilcueta. As he was extremely well verſed in the doctrine, which relates to caſes of conſcience, and likewiſe a very honeſt man, he had been ſometimes conſulted by the Emperor Charles the fifth, and by Philip his ſon, with regard to the Kingdom of Navarre, which had been uſurped by King Ferdinand; and he always adviſed them either to reſtore it, or to give an equivalent for it, if they would act in a conſcientious manner (14).

(13) Ibid.

(14) Idem, ibid.

[*I*] *He was very charitable.*] Being very old he uſed to ride on a mule thro' the city, and aſſiſted all the poor he met; to which his mule was ſo well accuſtomed, that ſhe ſtopped of her own accord at the ſight of every poor man, till her maſter had relieved him (15).

(15) Nic. Ant. *ubi ſupra*, p. 76.

made him decline all the honourable posts in Church and State which were offered him [K]. This great man died the 21st of June 1586, being then ninety four years, six months, and eight days old, as we learn from the inscription on his tomb, which we shall give in the note [L], and not above an hundred years, as some Authors have said (g). Aspilcueta has been extremely celebrated [M] by his contemporaries, and by the Authors who lived after him (h); the Casuists and Writers on Canon Law quote his authority very often, yet Mr. Du Pin observes, that he is sometimes too remiss with regard to morality, and that his stile is neither polite nor entertaining (i). As he had always his pen in hand, we are not to be surprized that he wrote a vast number of works, which are all either on Morality, or Canon Law. We shall give a catalogue of them in the note [N].

(g) Jac. Menochius, *Præsumpt.* lib. 3. cap. 1. Pancirol. lib. *de Clar. Leg. Interpret. Th. Correa, in Orat. ipso Die Funeris habita. Apud* Nic. Anton. *ubi supra.*

(h) Nic. Anton. *Bibliath. Hist.* tom. 2. pag. 74-76.

(i) *Apud* Niceron, *Mem. pour servir à l'Hist. des Hom. Illust.* tom. 5. pag. 7.

ASSERIUS

[K] *He declined all the honourable posts in Church and State, that were offered him.*] Before he was made Professor at Salamanca, the King offered him a place in the Council of the Kingdom of Navarre, which is held at Pampeluna, with a Prebend in the Cathedral of that city, but he preferred a Professorship and his private studies to the care of publick business; and after his return from Portugal, he refused to be admitted amongst the Senators of the great Council of Castile, as also amongst the supreme Judges of the Inquisition, which places King Philip II would have conferred upon him. He chose rather to employ his time in correcting and improving the works he had already written, and in composing others. The same reason made him refuse a Bishoprick which was offered him by the King and Queen of Portugal, who had a very great love and esteem for him (16).

(16) Idem, ibid.

[L] *The inscription on his tomb.*] It is as follows: *D. O. M. Martinus ab Aspilcueta Navarrus, H. S. E. divini humanique juris consultiss. Qui Salamanticæ primum, deinde Conimbricæ faventibus Portugalliæ Regibus Jus pontif. docuit; Romam profectus Pio Quinto, Gregorio XIII, Sixto V, PP. MM. carus, omnibus nationibus gratus, huic Xenodochio beneficus* (17), *Obiit xi Kal. Jul. MDLXXXVI, ætatis anno* 94, *Mense* 6, *Die* 8. *multis Doctrinæ suæ pervulgatis monumentis, Martinus Zuria Avunculo benemerenti posuit.*

(17) It appears by this that he had given something to an Hospital, but we are not told to what Hospital, nor whether it was before or after his death.

Marmore sub gelido Navarri arentia membra
Stant clausa in cineres non abitura leves;
Ast animus puris purus sese intulit Astris,
Cujus perpetuò fama superstes erit.
Ille quidem dignus, cujus non stamina Clotho
Solveret, est vitæ quo duce aperta via.
Ut tamen in terris æquavit Nestoris annos,
Sic illi in Cælo stet sine fine quies.

He was buried in a very solemn manner, the Monks, Priests, Auditors of the Rota, and the Prelates, who were then at Rome, attending his corps, by the express order of the Pope. His remains were deposited in the Church of St. Antony belonging to the Portugueze, where his bust was also placed. He had no very agreeable countenance; he had a Roman nose (18), and was so meagre and thin, that he seemed rather to be a breathing image, than a real man (19). But the qualities of his mind abundantly made amends for the disadvantage of his person.

(18) *Naso aquilino.*

(19) Nic. Ant. *ubi supra.*

[M] *Aspilcueta has been extremely celebrated.*] Andrew Resendius and Emanuel Costa, who had been Aspilcueta's Scholars in Portugal, place him above all the Doctors and Canonists of his age. *Doctorum Conimbricensium*, says the former (20), *facile & sine controversia Princeps. Doctorum Juris Canonici*, says the latter (21), *facile Princeps.* Francis Sarmiento, tho' his antagonist, speaks after the same manner; and Rhoderic Arriaga tells us (22), that Aspilcueta's decision must be of great weight, when he declares any action innocent, because he was a man of great learning and eminent piety, whose conscience was not only timorous, but even scrupulous. This is very different from Mr. du Pin's opinion (23); but we must observe, that Mr. du Pin passed for a Jansenist, and Arriaga was a Jesuit; which is sufficient to account for the difference of their opinion in this particular. We may add here, that Aspilcueta's life has been written by Simon Magus a Canon of St. Peter at Liege, who had been an intimate friend of our Author's. This life was prefixed to his Manual printed before his death at Rome, and at Cologn. But he was not well pleased with it, as he testifyed himself in a letter to Simon, according to Valerius Andreas. There is another life of Aspilcueta, written by Roscius Hortinus a very eloquent writer; which life is prefixed to the Edition of our Author, published at Rome by Michael Aspilcueta his nephew, in the year 1690. This life, says Nic. Antonio (24), is more to be depended upon than the former, as having been printed under the inspection of the deceased's relation, by whom the writer might be informed of the truth, and prevented from mixing it with errors and falshood. Besides these lives, there is a funeral oration in a panegyrical style, composed by Thomas Correa a Portugueze, and a famous Professor of eloquence and rhetoric at Rome. He pronounced that oration in the church of St. Anthony on the day in which Aspilcueta was buried; it was printed that same year by James Tornesius. We need not mention the several elogies and other verses that have been composed in praise of our Author by the most eminent Poets of his time, either in Latin, or the modern languages (25).

(20) *Apud* Nic. Ant. *ubi supra*, pag. 77.

(21) *Apud eund.* ibid.

(22) *Tract. de Legibus, Disp.* xxii. Sect. 1. num. 2. *apud* Nic. Ant. ibid.

(23) See the text of this Article, quotation (*i*).

(24) *Ubi supra.*

(25) *See* Nic. Antonio, ibid.

[N] *A catalogue of his works.*] There is an Edition published at Rome in three volumes by James Tornesius in 1590, which does not contain the work, intitled, *Consilia*, i. e. *The advices.* These have been added with some other pieces to the Edition printed at Venice in 1602 (26). There is another Edition published at Lyons in 1591, from that of Rome (27). The first volume of the Roman Edition, contains, 1. *Manuale, sive, Enchiridion Confessariorum & Pœnitentium.* i. e. "A Manual for Confessors and Penitents." The Author had first composed that work in Spanish, in which language it was printed at Salamanca in 1557, in 4to. It wanted a treatise concerning usury and simony, which the Author added by way of supplement in the same language, and printed it in 1569. He afterwards translated it into Latin, in which tongue it bore several impressions. Simon Magnus having corrected the style, and made some additions to it, published it at Paris in 8vo in 1587. Francis de Sese made also some additions to it, and had it printed at Venice in 1573, in 4to. Andrew Victorelli also enlarged it; his Edition was published in the same city, and in the same form. Other writers have abridged that work, as Cominio Ventura, whose abridgment was printed at Bergamo in 1593, in 24mo. Stephen d'Avila a Jesuit published his at Lyons in 1608, 24mo (28). It has also been translated into Italian (29). 2. *De horis Canonicis & oratione.* i. e. "Of Canonical "hours, and of Prayer," first printed in Spanish in 1560, in 8vo, then translated into Latin, and printed at Lyons in 1580, and at Rome in 1586. 3. *Miscellanea centum de Oratione, præsertim Psalterio, & Rosario Virginis Mariæ, & de Institutione recta Oratorum, & actis quibusdam eorum, & de pertinentibus ad illa.* i. e. "An hundred miscellaneous *observations* concern-"ing Prayer, especially the Psalter and Rosary, &c." The second volume contains 1. *Commentarius de Silentio in Divinis officiis, præsertim in choro servando*, i. e. "a "Commentary concerning the Silence to be kept dur-"ing Divine Service, especially in the choir." This little work, says F. Niceron (30), is almost entirely extracted from the *Manuale.* 2. *Commentarius in caput, Inter verba XI. Quæst. III. in quo de gloria, honore, laude, ac bona fama, deque ingloria, vituperio, infamia, & detractione tractatur.* i. e. "A Commentary ... which treats "of glory, honour, praise, and a good name, and "of their contraries." This work was first composed in Spanish, and printed at Coimbra, in 1544, in fol. and at Valladolid in 1572; it was afterwards translated into Latin, and published at Rome in 1584, in 4to. 3. *De regularibus Commentarii tres*, i. e. "Three "Commentaries

(26) Idem, ibid.

(27) Niceron, *Mem. des Hom. Illust.* tom. 5. pag. 7.

(28) Idem, ibid. pag. 8.

(29) Nic. Ant. *ubi supra*, p. 78.

(30) *Ubi supra*, pag. 9.

ASSERIUS MENEVENSIS, Author of the Life of King Alfred [*A*], and Biſhop of Shirburn in the ninth Century, was born at St. David's in Wales, where he entered himſelf into the Order of Benedictine Monks. He is ſaid to have been a ſcholar of John Scotus Erigena, under whom he made a great progreſs in learning (*a*). Dr. Cave tells us (*b*), that he was a relation and Chancellor of Aſſerius Archbiſhop of St. David's; and Mr. Hearne in his notes upon Sir John Spelman's *Life of King Ælfred the Great* (*c*) aſſures us, that he was nephew to the Archbiſhop, who, according to him, was really the Author of the *Hiſtoria de rebus Geſtis Alfredi Regis*, generally aſcribed to the Biſhop of Shirburn. His reaſon for this aſſertion is, that in the book itſelf it is ſaid that he wrote *ann.* 893, which was ten years after the death of the former, as appears from William of Malmſbury. Having met with ſome ill treatment from Hemydus, who was a man of authority in his country, and being invited by King Alfred to his court, he went thither, and gained ſo great a ſhare in that Prince's favour, that he gave him the Biſhoprick of Shirburn, and made him Abbot of the Monaſteries of Amerſbury and Banwel (*d*), and, as Sir John Spelman tells us (*e*), of Exeter. Dr. Cave obſerves, that it was he who perſuaded Alfred to found the Univerſity of Oxford, and ſettle annual ſtipends

(*a*) Oudin. *Commentar. de Script. Eccl.* tom. 2. Sæc. 9. Col. 405. edit. Lipſiæ 1722.

(*b*) *Hiſt. Liter. ad ann.* 890. pag. 476. edit. Colon. Allobrog. 1720.

(*c*) Pag. 136. ed. Oxford 1709.

(*d*) Cave, *ubi ſupra.*

(*e*) *Life of Ælfred the Great*, B. 2. p. 136.

" Commentaries concerning the Regulars," firſt printed at Rome in 1576, in 4to, and afterwards reviſed by the Author. 4. *De Alienatione rerum Eccleſiaſticarum, ac de ſpoliis Clericorum Commentarius, in principium & Gloſſ. Summæ XII. Quæſt. II De ſpoliis Clericorum ſuper caput, Non liceat Papæ eadem cauſa & quæſtione.* i. e. " A Commentary concerning the " alienation of Church Goods, and the robbing of the " Clergy &c." Printed at Rome in 1573, in 8vo, and afterwards reviſed by the Author. 5. *Commentarius reſolutivus de Uſuris*, i. e. " A Commentary con- " cerning Uſury," firſt publiſhed in Spaniſh with the additions to the *Manuale*, at Valladolid in 1569, and afterwards in Latin at Rome in 1585, in 4to, and at Antwerp in 1600, in 8vo. 6. *De reditibus beneficiorum Eccleſiaſticorum Commentarius, quo docetur quibus uſibus ſint impendendi, & quibus perſonis dandi aut relinquendi.* i. e. " A Commentary concerning the re- " venue of Eccleſiaſtical Benefices, ſhewing in what it " ought to be ſpent, and to whom it muſt be given " or left." Printed in Spaniſh in 1566, and dedicated to King Philip II. afterwards in Latin in 1568, and in 1574 dedicated to Pope Pius V. The Author undertakes to prove in that piece, that an incumbent ought to give to the poor all the income of his living, except what is neceſſary for his ſuſtenance. Such a deciſion ſeemed too ſevere to Francis Sarmiento, Auditor of the Rota; he attacked our Author, who defended himſelf in the following work. 7. *Apologeticus pro libro de reditibus Eccleſiaſticis.* i. e. " A de- " fence of the Book concerning Eccleſiaſtical revenues," printed at Rome in 1570, and at Antwerp in 1574. This work occaſioned two famous men to write concerning Aſpilcueta's opinion, and to confirm it by their authority. The firſt was Francis Turrianus a Jeſuit, who wrote to Gonſalvo Herrera, Biſhop of Laodicea; the ſecond was Achilles Statius, a Portugueſe, who addreſſed his letter to our Author. Theſe letters were afterwards added to a new Edition of Aſpilcueta's Commentary concerning Eccleſiaſtical Benefices. 8. *Commentarius in Cap. Humanæ Aures XXII. quæſt. V. De veritate reſponſi partim verbo expreſſo, partim mente concepto redditi.* i. e. " A Commentary . . . . concern- " ing the truth of an anſwer partly expreſſed, partly " intended." 9. *De finibus humanarum actionum commentarius*, i. e. " A Commentary upon the end of " human actions;" printed at Lyons in 1573, in 8vo, and at Rome 1585. 10. *Epiſtola Apologetica ad illuſtriſs. excellentiſſimumque Dom. Gabrielem a Cueva, Ducem Albuquerquenſem, Gubernatoremque Mediolani.* i. e. " An apologetical Epiſtle to Gabriel a Cueva, Duke " of Albuquerque, and Viceroy of Milan." He wrote this Letter to defend himſelf againſt thoſe, who pretended and endeavoured to prove, that he ſtayed at Rome, becauſe King Philip II was exaſperated againſt him. This Letter contains the Hiſtory of his life. II. *Commentarius in ſeptem diſtinctiones de Pœnitentia.* i. e. " A Commentary upon the ſeven diſ- " tinctions concerning Penitence." 12. *Commentarius de Anno Jubilæo, & Indulgentiis omnibus.* i. e. " A " Commentary upon the Jubilee year, and upon all " the Indulgences;" printed firſt at Coimbra in 1550, afterwards with additions at Rome in 1576, in 4to, and at Milan 1579, in 8vo. In the third Volume we find 1, 2. *Relectiones duæ de Reſcriptis.* 3. *Commentarius in Rubricam de Judiciis.* 4. *Relectio Cap. Nov. de Judiciis.* 5. *Relectio de Reſtitutione Spoliatorum* (31). 6. *Relectio Cap. Ita quorundum, de Judæis, in quo de rebus ad Saracenos deferri prohibitis, & cenſuris ob id latis.* i. e. " A lecture . . . . concerning the Jews, " which treats of thoſe affairs which it is not permitted " to bring before the Saracens, and of cenſures pro- " nounced on that account." Printed at Coimbra, in 1550, in 8vo. 6. *Commentarius de datis & promiſſis pro juſtitia vel gratia obtinendis.* i. e. " A Commen- " tary concerning gifts, or promiſes made in order to " obtain either juſtice or favour," printed at Rome " in 1576, in 4to. Beſides theſe pieces, the Venice " Edition publiſhed in 1602 contains, *De Cambiis. De Simonia mentali.* i. e. " Of intended Simony." *De Furto notabili.* i. e. " Of hotorious theft." *De neceſſitate defendendi proximum ab injuria.* i. e. " Of the " obligation to defend one's neighbour againſt injury." *De homicidio caſuali.* i. e. " Of accidental manſlaugh- " ter." *De incompatibilitate Beneficiorum.* i. e. " Of " the incompatibility of Benefices." *De Eleemoſyna.* i. e. " Of Alms." *De lege pœnali.* i. e. " Of pe- " nal law." Beſides theſe treatiſes, there is another intitled, *Conſiliorum ſeu Reſponſionum Lib. V.* i. e. " Five Books of Counſels or Anſwers," diſpoſed according to the order in which the decretals ſtand, and divided into two volumes in 4to. James Caſtellanus has abridged all Aſpilcueta's works, and publiſhed his abridgment at Venice in 1598, in 4to; it was afterwards corrected and publiſhed with ſome additions by Peter Anthony de Lazzaro (32).

(31) The reaſon why we don't tranſlate theſe titles is, becauſe it is almoſt impoſſible to find proper words in our language to expreſs them by.

(32) From Nic. Antonio, *ubi ſupra*, p. 77--79. Niceron, *ubi ſupra*, p. 7--13.

P.

[*A*] *Author of the Life of King Alfred.*] Dr. Nicholſon in his *Engliſh Hiſtorical Library* (1) obſerves, that Aſſerius wrote this King's Life no further than the 45th year of his age, which, according to his computation, fell in the year of our Lord 893. So that tho' the Book, as it is publiſhed, continues the Hiſtory to Alfred's Death, yet that part is borrowed from Authors, who lived later; and particularly the Verſes in the manner of an Epitaph upon him were written by Henry of Huntingdon. He ſhews thro' the whole, continues that learned Author (2), a great deal of modeſty, eſpecially in the account which he gives of his own being invited to court, and his reception there. He mentions nothing of the viſionary Dialogue between King Alfred and St. Cuthbert, which all the reſt of the Hiſtorians largely inſiſt upon, together with the good effects, which it had upon the Dioceſe of Lindisfern. He is exactly copied by Florence of Worceſter and other Writers, when they treat of the affairs of that reign. This Book of Aſſerius was firſt publiſhed by Dr. Parker Archbiſhop of Canterbury in the old Saxon character at the end of his edition of Thomas Walſingham's Hiſtory printed at London in fol. 1574. He choſe to print it in that character in order to engage his Engliſh Readers in the ſtudy of the language of their anceſtors, and the antiquities of their own country (3). It was publiſhed again in a collection of the Engliſh Hiſtorians by Cambden at Francfort in folio, 1602 (4). Mr. Wiſe of Oxford publiſhed a very beautiful edition of it at Oxford 1722 in 8vo.

(1) Vol. 1. pag. 119. edit. London in 8vo.

(2) Ibid. p. 120.

(3) Idem, pag. 119.

(4) Cave, *Hiſt. Liter.* pag. 476. *and* Olear. *biblioth.* tom. 1. pag. 83.

pends upon the Profeſſors of the ſeveral Sciences. We have a *Chronicle* or *Annals* aſcribed to him [*B*]. Dr. Gerard Langbain remarked from a manuſcript that our Aſſerius was the Author of the tranſlation of *Boetius de Conſolatione* aſcribed to King Alfred (*f*). Pitſeus (*g*) ſays, that he wrote likewiſe ſeveral *Homilies*; *Aurearum Sententiarum Enchiridion*; i. e. "A Manual of Golden Sentences." *Comment. in Boethium de Conſolatione*; i. e. "A Commentary upon Boethius *de Conſolatione*, &c. And Balæus (*h*) obſerves, that he wrote the *Annals of Britain*. Brian Twyne in his *Antiquities of Oxford* (*i*) aſſures us, that he is a Writer, whoſe authority was never in the leaſt called in queſtion. He died, according to Mr. Du Pin (*k*), Dr. Cave, Olearius, and Oudin, in the year 909; but Mr. Hearne places his death much ſooner [*C*].

(*f*) *See* Mr. Hearne's Notes on Sir John Spelman's *Life of King Ælfred*, p. 211, 212.
(*g*) *De Script. Angl.* fol. 172. *apud* Olear. *Biblioth. Script. Eccleſ.* tom. 1. pag. 83. edit. Jenæ 1711.
(*h*) *Apud* Cave, *ubi ſupra.*
(*i*) Lib. 2. pag. 341. *apud* Cave, *ubi ſupra.*
(*k*) *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* tom. 7. p. 200. edit. de Paris 1696.

[*B*] *We have a Chronicle or Annals aſcribed to him.*] Theſe Annals were publiſhed by Dr. Thomas Gale in his *Hiſtoriæ Britannicæ, Saxonicæ, & Anglodanicæ Scriptores decem*, printed at Oxford in fol. 1691, under the following title; *Chronicon Favi S. Neoti, ſive Annales Joannis Aſſerii, ut nonnullis videtur.* They begin with theſe words: *Igitur Britannia Romanis uſque ad Caium Julium Cæſarem inceſſa atque incognita fuit*; i. e. "Britain therefore was unknown to "the Romans, till the time of Caius Julius Cæſar," and they end in the year 914 with theſe words, *Anno DCCCCXIV facta eſt pax inter Carolum Regem Francorum & Rollonem Ducem Normanniæ*; i. e. "A peace was concluded in the year 914 between "Charles King of the Franks and Rollo Duke of "Normandy (5)." Dr. Gale tells us, that the manuſcript copy, which he made uſe of, was in the Library of Trinity College in Cambridge. Dr. Nicholſon obſerves (6), that John Brompton (7) cites ſeveral things relating to the Hiſtory of King Offa out of the writings of Aſſerius, which are not to be found in his Life of Alfred. Hence ſome perſons have concluded, that he might have been impoſed upon by thoſe that have given the name of that Author to ſuch anonymous Collections, as they could not aſſign to any particular Author. And this ſuſpicion may ſtill continue, for any thing which this Book diſcovers to the contrary. For King Offa is ſcarce named in it; and therefore Brompton muſt have fallen upon a ſpurious piece (8), how genuine ſoever this may prove. However Dr. Gale was of opinion (9), that it was really written by Aſſerius, which notion ſeems to be favoured by its inſiſting chiefly upon the fortunes of King Alfred. Caſimir Oudin in his *Commentarius de Scriptoribus & Scriptis Eccleſiaſticis* (10) thinks the contrary opinion moſt probable, ſince the *Annals* extend to the year 914; whereas Aſſerius died at fartheſt in 909, and there is no mark of any Appendix to it. Beſides there is the expreſs mention in it of the Death of Aſſerius Menevenſis Biſhop of Shirburn under the year 909; *Anno* 909 *Aſſerius Shirburnenſis obiit, & Friteſtanus ſuſcepit Epiſcopatum Wintoniæ.* Leland in the ſecond volume of his MS. Collect. f. 191. b. quoted by Mr. Hearne in his Notes upon Sir John Spelman's *Life of King Ælfred the Great* (11) profeſſes himſelf ignorant of the name of the Author of this Chronicle, and calls it *the Chronicle of St. Neots*, becauſe, as Dr. Nicholſon obſerves (12), he found it in that Monaſtery. Marianus Scotus had alſo met with it ſome where; for he tranſcribes it very frequently in his own Chronicle.

(5) Oudin. *Comment.* tom. 2. Col. 406.
(6) Pag. 121.
(7) *Inter Decem Scriptores*, pag. 753.
(8) *See* Wharton's *Anglia Sacra*, Part 1. pag. 330. *apud* Nicholſon, p. 122.
(9) *Præfat.* pag. 10.
(10) Tom. 2. Col. 406, 407.
(11) Pag. 52.
(12) Pag. 122.

[*C*] *Mr. Hearne places his death much ſooner.*] Having obſerved in his Notes upon Sir John Spelman (13), as we remark'd in the text of this article, that *the Life of Alfred was not written by Aſſer Biſhop of Shirburn, but by Aſſer his uncle, Archbiſhop of St. Davids*, he endeavours to prove it from this conſideration, that *it is ſaid in the Book itſelf, that he wrote an.* 893, *which was ten years after the death of the former, as appears from William of Malmſbury*; and conſequently that the Biſhop of Shirburn died in the year 883. "I know indeed, continues he, that in another Book "of Aſſer's, called his *Annals*, publiſhed by Dr. Gale "in the ſecond volume of his Oxford Hiſtorians, "'tis expreſly ſaid, that Aſſer Biſhop of Shirburn died "*ann.* 909; but that being an addition of a later hand, "I ſuppoſe it to be an ignorant miſtake for Aſſer Archbiſhop of St. David's." T.

(13) Pag. 136.

ASSHETON (WILLIAM) was deſcended from an antient and good family of that name in Lancaſhire, and born in the beginning of the year 1641. His father was Rector of Middleton in that county (*a*). Our Author was admitted a Student of Brazen-Noſe-College in Oxford the 3d of July 1658 (*b*), and placed under the care of a Tutor, who was of the Preſbyterian party [*A*]. Here he diſtinguiſhed himſelf ſo much by his application to his ſtudies, and the progreſs which he made in all parts of learning, that he was elected into a Fellowſhip in that College in the year 1663, being then Bachelor of Arts (*c*). In this ſtation he was ſo highly eſteemed, that he had a voluntary offer ſent him of the Headſhip of the College a few years before his death; which he declined (*d*). He afterwards took his degree of Maſter of Arts, and entered into Holy Orders (*e*). In 1670 he publiſhed at Oxford a Treatiſe in 4to againſt *Toleration* [*B*]. Being afterwards appointed

(*a*) See *The Life of Dr. William Aſſheton* by Thomas Watts, M. A. printed at London in 8vo, 1714. p. 6.
(*b*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* Vol. 2. Col. 1025. edit. 2d London 1721.
(*c*) Idem, ibid. and *The Life of Dr. Aſſheton*, pag. 8.
(*d*) See his *Life*, pag. 8.
(*e*) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

[*A*] *Placed under the care of a Tutor, who was of the Preſbyterian party.*] Mr. Wood tells us (1), in his uſual rough ſtyle, that *he was put under a Preſbyterian Tutor, and frequented with Sam. Parker* (afterwards Bp. of Oxford) *the religious meetings in the houſe of Beſſe Hampton, an old decrepit Laundreſs living in Holywell, in the North Suburb of Oxon; but his mind being altered as to thoſe matters after the reſtoration of his Majeſty King Charles II, he was made Fellow of his College in* 1663. But we have a little different account of the conduct of our Divine before the reſtoration in the life of him publiſhed by Thomas Watts, A. M. in 1714. p. 6, and 7. where we are informed, that "he was providentially bleſſed in ſome orthodox "and loyal inſtructors, ſuch as ſecured him from "the general contagion. So early, even then, did "he imbibe the ſound principles of our pure and "undefiled religion, that kept him unſpotted from "the world. However, he fell into ſome dangerous "hands at ſchool and the univerſity, and lay under "many temptations, where the leavens of error and "hypocriſy prevailed. And tho' in his childhood he "could not be ſenſible of the moſt aſtoniſhing tragical act in the Royal Martyr's fall; yet every year, "as he grew up, preſented ſuch horrid ſcenes before "him, that he could not but receive the proper antidote in his youth, and dread the villanies of that "age, till the glorious Reſtoration-Day, which fixed "him in all good principles, and made him always "zealous for our excellent conſtitution both in Church "and State. Beſides, as it pleaſed God to endow him "with a moſt compaſſionate good nature, a very "ſtudious humble mind, and modeſt behaviour, as "with all virtuous inclinations and ſpecial graces; "ſo he could never be ſo much as tainted with ill "notions of any kind, nor ever be drawn into the "party of any furious zealots, libertines, &c. whom "he wanted not ſpirit to oppoſe upon all due occaſions, and in proper ſeaſons throughout his life, "which diſtinguiſhed him even in the Country-"School, but more eminently in Brazen-Noſe-College, "Oxon, &c."

(1) *Athenæ Oxonienſes*, vol. 2. Col. 1025. edit. 2. London 1721.

[*B*] *A Treatiſe againſt Toleration.*] It was intitled, *Toleration diſapproved and condemned by the authority*

appointed Chaplain to James Duke of Ormond Chancellor of that Univerſity, he took his degrees of Divinity, that of Doctor being conferred upon him in January 1673 (*f*). He ſucceeded Dr. Benjamin Parry in the Prebend of Knareſburgh in the Church of York in February following (*g*). He ſerved his Patron as Chaplain both in Ireland and England, modeſtly declining all preferment. His attendance brought him to the Engliſh Court and the City of London, where he enjoyed the living of St. Antholin's for ſome time, till by the Duke of Ormond's intereſt with the family of St. John, he was preſented to the Rectory of Beckenham in Kent in 1676 (*h*). In 1674 he publiſhed at London his *Caſes of Scandal and Perſecution* [C], in which he expreſſed a warm zeal both againſt the Papiſts and the Diſſenters from the eſtabliſhed church. This piece of his was animadverted upon by Mr. Richard Baxter in his *Apology for the Non-Conformiſts Miniſtry*, &c. printed at London in 1681 in 4to (*i*). In 1685 our Author publiſhed his *Royal Apology*,

(*f*) Idem, ibid.

(*g*) Idem, Col. 621.

(*h*) See his *Life*, pag. 14.

(*i*) Wood, Col. 1026.

and convincing reaſons of, I. That wiſe and learned King James and his Privy Council, anno Reg. 2do. II. The honourable Houſe of Commons aſſembled in this preſent Parliament in their Votes &c. Febr. the 25th 1662. III. The Preſbyterian Miniſters in the city of London met at Sion College, Decem. the 18th 1645. IV. Twenty eminent Divines, moſt (if not all) of them members of the late aſſembly, in their Sermons before the Two Houſes of Parliament on ſolemn occaſions. Faithfully collected by a very moderate hand, and humbly preſented to the ſerious conſideration of all diſſenting parties. In the next page are ſet down the names of the eminent Non-conformiſt Divines, whoſe teſtimonies are cited; which are added again at the end of his Preface, and the beginning of his Collection; and likewiſe in the concluſion of his ſecond Edition of this Book, which he publiſhed at Oxford the ſame year, containing eighty ſix pages in 4to with his name prefixed to it, and the Pro-Vice-Chancellor of Oxford's *Imprimatur* before it. The title was the ſame with the former, with this addition to it; *faithfully collected by William Aſheton Maſter of Arts, and Fellow of Brazen-Noſe-College in Oxford. The ſecond Edition corrected and enlarged, with an additional Preface, wherein the nature of perſecution in general, and the unjuſt complaints of the diſſenting parties concerning it in particular, are diſtinctly conſidered,* But the former Preface is likewiſe added, with this advertiſement before it: *There are ſome paſſages (particularly page two and four) will ſeem impertinent till the Reader is informed, that in the firſt Edition the Author's name (for reaſons beſt known to ſome, whoſe judgment he highly values) was concealed, but is now (by the ſame advice) prefixed.* He addreſſes himſelf to the Diſſenters, and vindicates himſelf from their cenſures, ſhewing the occaſion of this work; how he became diſſatisfied about *Toleration*, which he liked at firſt, but now endeavours to prove impracticable by their petitioners for it, whom he could not find intelligible in their Propoſals, and whom he attempts to confute from the teſtimonies of their own friends againſt Toleration, whoſe names he ſets down as follows: Dr. Cornelius Burgeſſe, Mr. John Ward, Mr. Will. Good, Mr. Tho. Thorowgood, Mr. Humphry Hardwich, Mr. Arthur Salway, Mr. William Reynor, Mr. Thomas Caſe, Mr. John Lightfoot, Mr. Thomas Watſon, Mr. George Hughes, Mr. Edmund Calamy, Mr. Richard Baxter, Mr. Thomas Horton, Mr. Lazarus Seaman, Mr. Matthew Newcomen, Mr. Richard Vines, Mr. Simeon Aſh, Mr. James Cranford, Mr. Thomas Edwards. Our Author has added a few marginal notes to his Collections, and concludes his Book with ſeveral reflections, which ariſe from the premiſes (2). Mr. Wood informs us (3), that there was an Edition of this piece printed without the Author's knowledge at London.

(2) See his *Life*, pag. 10, 11, 12.

(3) Col. 1026.

[C] *His caſes of ſcandal and perſecution.*] This Book was dedicated to the Duke of Ormond, and intitled, *The caſes of Scandal and Perſecution, being a ſeaſonable enquiry into theſe two things: I. Whether the Non-Conformiſts, who otherwiſe think Subſcription lawful, are therefore obliged to forbear it, becauſe the weak Brethren do judge it unlawful? II. Whether the execution of Penal Laws upon Diſſenters for Non-Communion with the Church of England, be perſecution? Wherein they are pathetically exhorted to return into the boſom of the Church, the likelieſt expedient to ſtop the growth of Popery. By* William Aſheton, *D. D. Domeſtic Chaplain to his Grace the Duke of Ormond.* He mentions in his *Dedication* and *Introduction* the reaſons, which induced him to the publication of this Treatiſe; as particularly *Compaſſion to their deluded Proſelytes*; and ſecondly, *a due Care*, as he tells us, *of our own people, to ſecure them as far as poſſible, from the inſinuating arts* of ſuch as lie in wait to deceive. He proceeds in his Introduction to enquire into the cauſes of the encreaſe of Popery; and expreſſes himſelf in this manner. *The late, and I think, juſt apprehenſions of the growth of Popery having awakened authority into ſome ſeaſonable endeavours for ſuppreſſing it, the Clergy of this nation have thought themſelves obliged both in preſs and pulpit to encourage ſo good a work. For tho' our people are ſo highly prejudiced againſt her doctrine, that many of them know no other rule, whereby to judge of the ſoundneſs of their Tenets, than by the greater or leſſer diſtance they have from Popery; yet being deſirous that Religion ſhould be the object of their choice, not chance, and that the practice of it ſhould be grounded upon the clear evidence of truth and reaſon, as well as cuſtom and education, to which the greateſt part of mankind owe their particular perſuaſions; ſeveral Treatiſes have been lately written, wherein the* Proteſtant Catholic Doctrine *is fully eſtabliſhed, and the Romiſh objections or rather flouriſhes (for indeed they are no better) are as ſolidly anſwered; an undertaking not altogether ſo unſeaſonable as ſome perſons, who would be thought wiſer than their Brethren, are pleaſed to judge.* He then tells us, that he had made a collection of ſome ſuitable materials againſt the Church of Rome, with a reſolution to reduce them into a proper form, and publiſh them as ſoon as poſſible, when he occaſionally met with the following of Dr. Sanderſon, Biſhop of Lichfield. *Prudent Statiſts forbear to advance againſt a potent enemy abroad, till they have compoſed ſmaller quarrels and mutinies at home. We think it therefore more needful, ſeaſonable, and expedient to clear thoſe points in difference betwixt us and our Brethren at home, than to handle any of the controverſies in debate betwixt us and thoſe of Rome; both becauſe the people are in more danger of being miſled by thoſe, than of being ſeduced by Papiſts; and becauſe the Papiſts make a great advantage (indeed the greateſt, and in a manner the whole advantage they have againſt us) of theſe home-bred differences.* He then ſtates the caſe of *Scandal*, and the miſtakes therein, in a full objection about giving offence, to which he anſwers; *firſt, from their own admired* Mr. Baxter's Cure of Church Diviſions, *p.* 113. *and ſecondly, from our great and learned Hooker,* Eccleſiaſtical Polity, *p.* 115. *and Biſhop Sanderſon in his* Five Caſes of Conſcience, *p.* 111; *proving how many ways a man may become guilty of ſcandalizing another by his example; as the former denotes how men are ſcandalized, when they are moved, led, or provoked unto ſin. Wherein we are not ſo much to look at the event, what that is or may be, as the cauſe whence it cometh; for no man is concerned in any ſcandal that happeneth to another by occaſion of any thing done by him; neither is chargeable further with it, than he is guilty of having given it.* From theſe authorities, Dr. Aſheton argues for the Subſcription and Conformity of thoſe Diſſenters, who thought it neither ſinful nor unlawful. Theſe were the points in diſpute at that time, which he further preſſes upon their conſciences, both from Mr. Baxter again in his *Prince of Love, p.* 87, and Mr. Jeans's *Mixture of Scholaſtic and practical Divinity, 2d part, page* 133, 135; from whoſe words, continues our Author, " it appears, that my Brethren " are not *eo nomine* obliged to neglect *Conformity*, be- " cauſe their Proſelytes may think fit to be offended " at them; but only (according to the Biſhop's fourth " rule)

Apology [*D*], in defence of the doctrine of abſolute ſubmiſſion to Kings. This book of his expoſed him to the cenſures of two parties, one of which reproached him for carrying his notions of the power of Kings too high; and the other, for his conduct afterwards under the Revolution (*k*). To juſtify himſelf from the imputations of the latter, he wrote a piece in defence of King William and Queen Mary under the title of *A ſeaſonable*

(*k*) See his *Life*, pag. 36, 37.

" rule) they are ſo to manage their ſubmiſſion to " the Church with ſuch Chriſtian Deportment, where- " by it may appear to others as well as themſelves, " that Conſcience, not Intereſt, hath occaſioned their " Subſcription." He proceeds next to prove the Non-Conformiſt highly guilty of ſcandal by this Syllogiſm; *Men are ſcandalized, when they are led, moved, or provoked nuto ſin. But the Non-Conformiſts by their ſeparation do lead, move, and provoke their Proſelytes to ſin. Therefore they are beyond excuſe guilty of ſin.* The *major* of theſe propoſitions he is certain will be readily granted him; and the *minor* admits of this *ſad Confirmation.* " The " Non-Conformiſts do provoke their Proſelytes to ſin " theſe two ways. *Firſt*, by error in judgment. *Se-* " *condly*, by occaſioning them to neglect their duty " in *Praxi*." He then concludes his proofs by deſiring every impartial Reader to judge between the Church of England and the Diſſenters. *Theſe men pretend they cannot lawfully and with a good conſcience ſubmit to the conſtitutions of the Church. But why all this niceneſs? Is there any law either natural or poſitive, which doth either directly and* in terminis, *or by good Logical inference and immediate deduction, condemn any of them as unlawful? If ſo, let ſuch law be produced, and the controverſy is at an end. But they have been ſo infinitely baffled in ſuch vain attempts, that this procedure of late hath not been much pretended, but inſtead of ſuch plain and candid entertainment, we have been ſhuffled off with the empty pretences of an accidental unlawfulneſs, ariſing from the diſſatisfaction of their Proſelytes, who yet imbibed thoſe ſcruples from the repeated clamours of their diſſenting Teachers.* He conſiders next, *the Caſe of Perſecution*, and repeats the ſame anſwer, which he ſays was never yet refuted, that he gave in the Preface to his ſecond Edition of *Toleration diſapproved*, p. 4. in which, after having exploded the falſe, vulgar, and dangerous conceit of men's learning and piety, or holding their perſons in admiration, and proved the moderation and ſincerity of our firſt Reformers from Popery, he proceeds to fix the notion of perſecution, as it is an eager, violent, or any inflicting of outward evils for the exerciſe of true Religion; and ſums up the argument in this manner. *Preaching and Prayer are neceſſary duties, which cannot be performed without circumſtances. Theſe are determined in Scripture, nor muſt be left undetermined therefore by the ſupreme Magiſtrate: who to effect this makes laws and conſtitutions, that have penalties annexed to be inflicted on the diſobedient. The infliction of theſe penalties is the execution of juſtice and the Magiſtrate's duty, but no perſecution. Therefore thoſe perſons, that ſuffer theſe penalties, are not injuriouſly perſecuted, but juſtly puniſhed.* From hence he endeavours to prove, as well as from the judgment of Biſhop Sanderſon in his 7th Sermon *ad populum*, p. 354 and from the arguments of their own famous Calamy, Newcomen, and Baxter, that the Diſſenters from the Church of England have never ſuffered any perſecution, ſince they were the aggreſſors. This he partly inſinuates, by reminding them of other ſorts of perſecution with St. Auſtin *De Unit. Eccleſ. contra Petil. Epiſt. c.* 17. who obſerves that there is a perſecution of the tongue and of an irregular life, as well as of the hand: *Gravius perſequitur filius patrem malè vivendo, quam pater filium caſtigando; & gravius ancilla Saram perſequuta eſt per iniquam ſuperbiam, quam eam Sara per debitam diſciplinam; & gravius Dominum perſequebantur, propter quos dictum eſt, Zelus domus tuæ comedit me, quam eos ipſe, cum eorum menſas everſit, & eos de flagello de templo expulit.* i. e. " A ſon perſecutes " the father more by his ill life, than the father does " the ſon by chaſtiſing him. The ſervant Hagar per- " ſecuted Sarah more with her unreaſonable haughti- " neſs, than Sarah did Hagar with the diſcipline, " which was requiſite towards her. And theſe per- " ſons, upon whoſe account it was ſaid, *The zeal of* " *thy houſe hath eaten me up*, perſecuted our Lord " much more, than he did them, when he over-turn'd " their tables, and drove them out of the Temple." To this Piece our Author has ſubjoined the following poſtſcript. *A Proteſtant Gentlewoman being married to a Roman Catholic, was highly ſollicitous (and her charity is very commendable) about her eternal State. Whereupon ſhe applied herſelf for ſatisfaction to ſome Preſbyterian Divines, (which party ſhe then much favoured,) who amongſt ſome other unſuitable diſcourſes moſt undutifully reflected upon the Church of England, calling her Ceremonies Popiſh and ſuperſtitious, telling this Gentlewoman, that a ſet-form of Prayer was Popiſh; particularly, that our Liturgy is Popiſh, and taken out of the Maſs-Book. Whereupon having peruſed the ſervice of the Church, (which formerly either out of prejudice, or the direction of thoſe guides, ſhe wholly neglected,) ſhe is now fully ſatisfied, that there is nothing contained in it, but what is ſound, orthodox, and agreeable to Holy Scripture; and therefore, if that be Popery, ſhe thought it moſt rational to be a Papiſt; and accordingly (being quite wearied and even diſtracted with their impertinent diſcourſes) embracing the Roman, hath ever ſince refuſed the Proteſtant Communion.* " This matter of fact, *con-* " *tinues he*, (which is no feigned but a real caſe) doth " make it more reaſonable to tranſcribe the words " of the learned Biſhop Sanderſon, relating to our an- " ti-ceremonial Brethren, and their falſe imputations " of Popiſh and Popery; whereof he gives the true " definitions, and ſhews how far any doctrine or prac- " tice may be truly called *Popiſh*, vindicating the " Reformation of our Church from it, in *Pref. Serm.* " *XIV.* 9. 14. and *Preface* before Serm. XX. 8. 11. " and again in his Preface before Serm. XIV. 8. 17. " and at laſt referring the Reader to that clear and " ſatisfactory account given by the Church in one of " the Prefaces uſually prefixed before the Book of Com- " mon-Prayer."

[*D*] *His Royal Apology.*] The whole title is as follows: *The Royal Apology; or an Anſwer to the Rebels-Plea; wherein are the moſt noted anti-monarchical Tenents:* Firſt, *publiſhed by Doleman the Jeſuit to promote a* Bill of Excluſion *againſt King James I.* Secondly, *practiſed by Bradſhaw and the Regicides, in the actual murder of King Charles I.* Thirdly, *republiſhed by Sidney and the Aſſociators to depoſe and murder his preſent Majeſty. The ſecond Edition.* London 1685. In his *Preface* he obſerves, that in the year 1594 the Jeſuit Parſons publiſhed a Conference under the name of Doleman; the deſign of which was to promote a Bill of Excluſion againſt King James I; and that tho' the Jeſuit's malice was defeated with regard to the perſon of that King, yet it had a great effect in the ſufferings of his ſon King Charles I; *for he who ſhall peruſe the many virulent Libels, which firſt occaſioned and then fomented that unnatural rebellion, will eaſily be inſtructed how that conference was tranſcribed and tranſpoſed by the patrons of the faction; and, to ſpeak in our modern language, he cannot but obſerve, that the* Popiſh Doleman *is the Oracle of the true* Proteſtant Party. " Now that this may not be rejected as a " ſlandering deſign, only to make them odious to " authority, as is commonly objected, I have here " drawn for the reader's ſatisfaction a ſhort parallel " between Doleman, Bradſhaw, Sidney, and ſome " others; upon peruſal of which it will plainly ap- " pear, that the Jeſuits principles, as managed by " Bradſhaw and the Regicides, did cut off the head " of King Charles I. And ſince the ſame principles " have been tranſcribed by the brethren of the As- " ſociation, we have juſt reaſon to ſuſpect the ſame " practices likewiſe; and that thoſe, who defended " the murder of King Charles I, would doubtleſs, if " they had power in their hands, depoſe and murder " King Charles II. If any Republican ſhall think " fit to doubt, that the following Diſcourſe is either " partial or unconcluding; *i. e.* that I have either ſaid " ſomething that is falſe, or elſe have omitted in any " inſtance the very ſtrength of their caſe, let him " make known his grievance; and I do here pro- " miſe upon ſuch notice given, I will (thro' Divine

ſonable Vindication of their preſent Majeſties [*E*]. In 1685 he publiſhed in 4to *An Admonition to a Deiſt, occaſioned by ſome paſſages in a Diſcourſe with the ſame perſon* (*l*). He always declared himſelf averſe to the engaging abſolutely in any party [*F*]. During the controverſy between the Proteſtant Divines and the Papiſts in the reign of King James II, he exerted himſelf with great zeal in oppoſition to Popery by four Tracts, which he publiſhed [*G*]. After the Revolution, in obedience to their Majeſties injunctions againſt blaſphemy,

(*l*) Wood, Col. 1026.

" Aſſiſtance) endeavour his ſatisfaction." Our Author endeavours in this Treatiſe to ſhew, that the Government of England is not a mixed Monarchy, nor the King one of the three Eſtates; and in what ſenſe the King of England is an abſolute Monarch, and how limited. He proceeds then to conſider in what ſenſe that celebrated ſaying of Bracton, *Lex facit Regem*; i. e. " The Law makes the King," is to be underſtood, and to examine the other controverted paſſage, *Rex habet Superiorem, Deum & Legem, etiam & Curiam*; i. e. " The King has ſuperior to him God " and the Law, and likewiſe the Court." He conſiders alſo the nature of the coronation-oath, and the extent of the King's prerogative; and concludes his Diſcourſe with the following argument: *The ſupream power muſt not be reſiſted. But the King of England hath ſupream power. Therefore his Majeſty cannot be reſiſted. The propoſition is the voice of nature; there can be no order nor government, unleſs this truth be admitted. Reaſon tells us*, Par in parem non habet poteſtatem; *much leſs hath an inferior a coercive power over his ſuperior.*

[*E*] *He wrote a piece in defence of King William and Queen Mary under the title of* A ſeaſonable Vindication of their preſent Majeſties.] He was reproached at the Revolution for having deſerted his own declared principles in point of Government; and therefore he wrote this piece in his own defence, in which, as the Author of his Life obſerves (3), *he publiſhed his own convictions for the ſatisfaction of others, who might, as he did, ſwear allegiance to King William and Queen Mary with a good conſcience, upon the ſurprizing merciful deliverance of theſe Kingdoms from Popery and Arbitrary Power.* His chief argument was drawn from the Statute of the 25th of Edward III; with Sir Edward Coke's Expoſition of that Statute concerning the Kings *de facto* & *de jure*. He obſerves likewiſe, that this is not only the ſingle Gloſs of Sir Edward Coke, but that all others, who write of the Pleas of the Crown, give the ſame expoſition. And therefore ſince it is moſt reaſonable to think that to be the ſenſe of the Law, which learned Lawyers and Judges have agreed to be the ſenſe of it, private perſons, who are of a different opinion, ſhould be modeſt in their cenſures, and ſuſpect their own judgments, and reſt ſatisfied, that there is ſome weighty reaſon, (tho' perhaps their prejudice will not yet ſuffer them to comprehend it,) why thoſe Judges of the Law determine in this manner.

(3) Pag. 37.

[*F*] *He always declared himſelf averſe to the engaging abſolutely in any party.*] The Author of his Life tells us (4), that he had obſerved enough of the intrigues of Courts, of the plots of Cities and deluſions of Countries; that he ſaw too much in every reign both of Popiſh and Diſſenting Parties in the bowels of the Church; he knew the madneſs of the people; and how deſigning men can ſeduce them to proclaim hoſannas at one time, and demand crucifixion at another. He ſaw the mean ſelfiſhneſs, ambition, and violence of the beſt parties; which gave him the ſame idea of parties in general, and conſequently the precautions recommended by Archbiſhop Dawes in his Sermon upon the Martyrdom of King Charles I, *that we ought to take care not to liſt ourſelves, as thorough members of any party.* However, as the Author quoted obſerves (5), he was averſe to all innovations and alterations in the Liturgy, unleſs for improvement, as in the Office for the Sick, &c. imagining all other condeſcenſions to be vain and dangerous, and that the chief Diſſenters would never conform but at the expence of Epiſcopacy.

(4) Pag. 39.

(5) Pag. 41.

[*G*] *Exerted himſelf with great zeal in oppoſition to Popery by four Tracts, which he publiſhed.*] He firſt publiſhed in 1686 *The Country Parſon's Admonition to his Pariſhioners againſt Popery; with Directions how to behave themſelves when any one deſigns to ſeduce them from the Church of England.* He obſerves here the reſtleſs importunity of the Romiſh Clergy to gain proſelytes to their Church, and that they have different terms of addreſs, very plauſible and inſinuating, adapted to the capacities of all ſorts of people; and therefore that they may not be ſurprized with their clamours, nor impoſed upon by their methods of deceit, he gives his people the following directions; 1. To ſhew their faith by their works; 2. A modeſt dependance on their ſpiritual Guides or their miniſterial Functions; 3. To avoid, as far as poſſible, all diſputes about Religion; 4. To deſire the arguments of the perſon, who attempts to pervert them, in writing; which if he refuſes, they are to ſuſpect him as an impoſtor; but if he grants them, to carry the paper to their Miniſter. This piece was followed the next year with a Defence againſt a Popiſh Tract called *The plain man's Anſwer to his general and ſpecial Exceptions.* This Defence of his was entitled *The plain man's Reply to the Catholic Miſſionaries, &c*; in which he tells us, that *he found their arguments weak and trifling, only full of boaſting and pretenſions to Infallibility in the Church and Prieſts of Rome above any other; tho' there is greater uncertainty, more diviſions and diverſity of opinions, even in matters of faith, in their own Church, than ours; and their Prieſts are ſo far from interpreting Scripture infallibly, that there is nothing more fallible and contradicting than the vaſt volumes of Popiſh Commentators, publiſhed with the uſual approbations and* permiſſu Superiorum. He concludes with an Expoſtulation with the Miſſionary, whom he engaged more cloſely the year following in a Diſcourſe againſt *the Infallibility of the Church.* He addreſſed it to the Romiſh Miſſionaries. He examines what this Infallibility ſignifies, whether in the firſt place *Indefectibility* or *Duration*, which he proves neither to be true nor ſufficient, nor anſwering thoſe ends, for which this privilege is pretended, if they could apply all the promiſes of protection and preſervation to the Roman Church, as if it were the Catholick Church. But this he ſhews to be a miſtake in their Writers, without any ſhadow of proof, ſince it is evident, that a particular cannot be an univerſal; and no Church can be termed Catholick, but ſo far as it is orthodox, and holds the Catholick Faith, as the Church of England does. He proceeds then to examine their other notion of Infallibility, as the infallible direction of the Church of Rome, as if they had an infallible Judge among them, which they imagine to be neceſſary in order to interpret the Scriptures, and determine controverſies. Upon this he demands, *Who is the infallible Judge? Who this unerring Guide? Where may he be found to be conſulted and followed? Is he ſome authorized perſon or perſons repreſenting the whole Body? Then he muſt be either the Pope, which the moſt ſober and learned Papiſts uſually reject, as a weak and ungrounded opinion: Or they agree ſecondly in a General Council, tho' there be none now ſitting in any part of the Chriſtian World; and thoſe that have been, and confirmed by their Popes, have actually erred, have condemned each other, and made contradictory Definitions and Decrees, which cannot determine themſelves, nor explain their own meaning; a privilege (if granted to any writing) moſt peculiar to the Holy Scriptures, as written by infallible Inſpiration.* In this manner he endeavours to explode their pretended *Infallibility*, and in the concluſion demands again, " What it ſignifies, " whence they had it, or where we Proteſtants, who " are ſo much upbraided with the want of it, may " find it? What controverſies it hath decided? What " texts of Scripture hath it explained? What diffe- " rences hath it compoſed?" In 1688 he publiſhed *A full Defence of the former Diſcourſe againſt the Miſſionaries Anſwer. Being a further examination of the pretended Infallibility of the Church of Rome*, or as it is intitled in the firſt impreſſion, *A Defence of the plain Man's Reply to the Catholick Miſſionaries, &c.* He prefaces this Book with an Advertiſement concerning

blaſphemy, ſwearing and curſing, perjuries, drunkenneſs and prophanation of the Lord's Day, he wrote ſeveral pieces in order to ſtop the courſe of debauchery and prophaneneſs [*H*]. In 1695 he publiſhed the firſt part of his *Conference with an Anabaptiſt* [*I*], occaſioned by a diſpute which he was challenged to by one of the Teachers of that denomination of Diſſenters, who had a meeting in his pariſh, but afterwards broke it up, and did not provoke him to a ſecond part (*m*). This induced him to return from controverſial Divinity to the more agreeable and uſeful part of it, which relates to practice; upon which in 1696 he formed a treatiſe from a Sermon which he had preached at court before the late Queen Mary, and dedicated it to her Royal Conſort, with the title of *A Diſcourſe concerning a Death-bed Repentance* [*K*]. The ſame year he publiſhed *A Theological Diſcourſe of Laſt Wills and Teſtaments* [*L*]. The controverſy with the Socinians being afterwards

(m) *Life*, pag. 65-68.

(n) Ibid. 91.

cerning the occaſion of theſe papers, which paſſed between a Romiſh Miſſionary and Country Miniſter, on account of an honeſt Farmer of his pariſh, whom a Romiſh Prieſt endeavoured to pervert with this ſuggeſtion, that, *as without faith there is no ſalvation, ſo without infallibility there is no faith; and that this is only to be found in the Church of Rome*; for which the former demanded his proofs in writing, and then carried them to his Miniſter, which occaſioned the whole diſpute. Our Doctor enlarges againſt the Infallibility and Supremacy of the Pope, and anſwers all their preſumptions of Catholiciſm, and pretences to a Succeſſion of St. Peter, as Prince of the Apoſtles, clearing the ſeveral prophecies and promiſes in Scripture concerning the Jewiſh and Chriſtian Church, without their Infallibility, referring them to Dr. Cave's *Diſſertation of the Government of the ancient Church*; and to Archbiſhop Bramhal for the exemption of the Britiſh Churches from all foreign juriſdiction; as likewiſe to Dr. Barrow's Treatiſe of the Pope's Supremacy. This Supremacy he obſerves is oppoſed by the greateſt part of the Catholick Church or company of Believers profeſſing the faith of Chriſt diſperſed over the face of the whole world, who refuſe communion with the Biſhop of Rome, and proteſt againſt his uſurpations and errors. He remarks, that they urge their claims of Infallibility with a kind of Diffidence and caution, and can never find even their laſt refuge, in a General Council, of an unerring Guide, as they have no ſuch Judge now in being. He ſhews likewiſe the preſumption of General Councils in their Decrees, and particularly that of the Councils of Conſtance and Trent in denying the Cup to the Laity, notwithſtanding our Saviour's poſitive command. *Altho' our Redeemer hath inſtituted the Sacrament in his laſt Supper, and delivered it unto the Apoſtles in both kinds; yet the Synod hath decreed that it ſhould be received for a Law, that the Sacrament be adminiſtred in one kind; and whoſoever ſhall ſay, that by the command of God all the faithful ought to receive in both kinds, let him be accurſed.* Concil. Conſt. *Seſſ.* 13. Concil. Trident. *Seſſ.* 21. *cap.* 2, 3. *can.* 1. Mr. Wood mentions (6) another Tract of our Author's, intitled, *The Child's Monitor againſt Popery*, written to preſerve the child of a Perſon of Quality from being ſeduced by his Popiſh Parents.

(6) Col. 1026.

[*H*] *He wrote ſeveral Tracts, in order to ſtop the courſe of debauchery and profaneneſs.*] He publiſhed in 1695 *A ſhort Diſcourſe againſt Blaſphemy*, being a conference with M. S. concerning 1. *The Rudeneſs of Atheiſtical Diſcourſe.* 2. *The Certainty and Eternity of Hell Torments.* 3. *The Truth and Authority of the Holy Scriptures.* This piece was occaſioned by a profane diſcourſe of a perſon, whom he met with at a Gentleman's Table. In 1692 he publiſhed *A Diſcourſe againſt Drunkenneſs*; and another *againſt Swearing and Curſing*; which he ſhews to be 1. *rude and boiſterous in reſpect of men*; 2. *daring and provoking in reſpect to God*; 3. *vain and unprofitable with reſpect to themſelves.* In 1693 he publiſhed *Directions in order to the ſuppreſſing of debauchery and profaneneſs*; in which he obſerves, "that tho' there are large complaints "againſt the debauchery of the preſent Age; yet "bleſſed be God, wickedneſs is ſo far from being "eſtabliſhed by a Law, that the ſtricteſt legal me"thods are employed to reſtrain it. Their Majeſties "do not only diſcountenance vice by the virtuous "example of their own ſacred perſons, but alſo by "their authority in the letters, proclamations, and "repeated orders, iſſued thereupon. But, *quid Leges "ſine Moribus?* The beſt conſtituted Laws will be of "no uſe without a due execution. If the penalties of "our Laws, thro' the cowardice or contrivance of "inferior Magiſtrates, ſhall not be inflicted, offenders "will ſoon be inſolent, but never reformed. This "very conſideration hath awakened the zeal of ma"ny pious men, who, out of a ſenſe of their duty "to God and their Country, are deſigning a method to "reform theſe abuſes." Our Author means here the *Society for the Reformation of Manners*, whom he admoniſhes of their duty in four inſtances, innocency, induſtry, courage, and caution; with regard to the laſt of which particulars he adviſes them to *avoid popularity, and not value themſelves upon the character of Reformers*; and *to avoid affectations in their language, looks, &c.* to be *moderate in their proceedings, and not raſh and violent in their methods of Reformation*; and to be *unanimous, and not ſuffer their difference in opinion to diſorder their proceedings.* This he obſerves in particular reference to thoſe of the Church of England and the Diſſenters, both joining in ſo good a work; as there are good men of all perſuaſions, whoſe diviſions and diſtinctions he laments, and concludes his addreſs to them in theſe words: *It were indeed heartily to be wiſhed, that theſe diſtinguiſhing names were utterly aboliſhed, that all Proteſtants were perfectly united, and that ſuch an expedient could be found, as might effectually do it. We hope and breath for it.*

[*I*] *His conference with an Anabaptiſt.*] It is intitled, *A Conference with an Anabaptiſt. Part I. Concerning the Subject of Baptiſm.* This Book he dedicated to his Pariſhioners at Beckenham; and obſerves in it, that the pretence of the Anabaptiſts to an expreſs command is impertinent and unreaſonable, and grounded upon a falſe principle, that nothing ought to be done in the worſhip of God without expreſs command in Scripture; which principle he ſhews to be contradicted by their own practice in three inſtances, obſervation of the Lord's day, taking an oath, and communicating women. He endeavours to ſhew likewiſe, that tho' there is no expreſs command, yet there is a virtual, implicit, and conſequential one; and that the Anabaptiſts acknowledge this to be ſufficient. He obſerves likewiſe that the Baptiſm of infants is proved from their Church-Membership, the notion of which he explains.

[*K*] *A Diſcourſe concerning a Death-bed Repentance.*] He obſerves in this Diſcourſe, that the ſoul is immortal, and ſhall be eternally either happy or miſerable; and that this life is the only time to prepare ourſelves for our future ſtate. He explains what is meant by a Death-bed Repentance; and remarks, that wicked men, when they come to die, may remember their ſins, and be ſorry and beg pardon for them, with ſerious reſolutions of amendment, and even make reſtitution; yet all this may fall ſhort of a real repentance.

[*L*] *A Theological Diſcourſe of laſt Wills and Teſtaments.*] He dedicated this Diſcourſe to the Duke of Ormond; in which he gives the following directions, that men ſhould make their Wills in their health, with a Chriſtian and charitable temper, with prudence, and juſtice in making reſtitution for injuries, which they have done. He excites the Clergy likewiſe to urge the ſick perſon to be liberal to the poor, and confutes the pleas and pretences made uſe of to excuſe the neglect of charitable diſtributions, as particularly that charity is Popiſh; that the Laws have provided for the poor; that our circumſtances will not admit of it; that the objects are ſo numerous, that we may give away our whole eſtate; that we deſign to remember the poor when we die: that charity is often abuſed, and legacies perverted. He recommends

terwards warmly agitated, he publiſhed two Treatiſes in oppoſition to their ſchemes [*M*], and about the ſame time he wrote a practical piece intitled *The Plain Man's Devotion, Part I.* In 1698 he brought to perfection the ſcheme which he had formed for the benefit not only of Clergymens widows, as it was at firſt deſigned, but of all ranks and profeſſions, by ſettled jointures and annuities at the rate of 30 *per cent.* which ſcheme we ſhall give an account of in the note [*N*]. He was far from having a view to his own intereſt in this affair, ſince he was at a conſiderable expence in bringing it to perfection (*n*). In 1699 December the fifth he preached a Sermon before the ſons of the Clergy at St. Paul's [*O*]; and November the 21ſt the year following before the Society of the Natives of the county of Kent at St. Mary Le Bow in London [*P*]. In 1701 he publiſhed the

(*n*) Ibid. pag. 91.

in a particular manner the poor widows and children of Clergymen, and gives an abſtract of the Charter for relief of them.

[*M*] *Publiſhed two Treatiſes in oppoſition to their ſcheme.*] He publiſhed the firſt in 1697 under the title of *A ſeaſonable Vindication of the Bleſſed Trinity. Being an anſwer to this queſtion,* Why do you believe the Doctrine of the Trinity? *Collected from the works of the moſt Reverend Dr. John Tillotſon, late Lord Archbiſhop of Canterbury, and the Right Reverend Dr. Edward Stillingfleet, now Lord Biſhop of Worceſter.* In this Tract he endeavours to ſhew, that the doctrine of the Trinity is a very rational doctrine, and to explain what is meant by the word Trinity, and what doctrines concerning it are propoſed to our Belief; what is faith or belief in general; why we believe the Doctrine of the Trinity; and how it can be proved, that God hath revealed it. He proceeds then to anſwer the objections, which are urged againſt it. The year following he publiſhed another ſmall Collection from Dr. Iſaac Barrow, intitled *A brief State of the Socinian Controverſy concerning a Trinity in Unity.* He concludes, that the proper employment of our minds about theſe myſteries, is not to ſearch and ſpeculate into them, or to diſcourſe elegantly and boldly about them, but with a pious ſubmiſſion to embrace and adore them.

[*N*] *Which ſcheme we ſhall give an account of in the note*] We ſhall extract this from a Book printed at London in 1713, intitled *A full Account of the Riſe, Progreſs, and Advantages of Dr. Aſſheton's Propoſal (as now improved and managed by the worſhipful Company of Mercers, London,) for the benefit of widows of Clergymen and others, by ſettled jointures and annuities at the rate of thirty* per Cent. *With Directions for the widow how to receive her annuity without any delay, charges, or deductions.* Plead for the widow. *Iſa.* i. 17. The *Advertiſement* informs us, that this propoſal being firſt projected for the benefit of thoſe who have ſmall eſtates, the words *poverty* and *poor* ſometimes occur in the explication of it, and therefore that perſons of honour and quality may not be prejudiced againſt it, as if it nothing concerned them, they may be informed, that this propoſal, as now modelled and improved, may be ſerviceable to thoſe of quality and eſtate; 1. by enabling them to ſettle or enlarge jointures without clogging their eſtates; 2. by encouraging them to demand larger portions, than otherwiſe without the help of this propoſal they could rationally expect. The ſettling of this exerciſed Dr. Aſſheton's thoughts for many years. For tho' he was aſſured by ſeveral judicious perſons, that the deſign was practicable, yet where to fix it, or how to provide ſuch a fund as might ſecure the ſubſcribers, was the difficulty. As to himſelf, he was fully convinced not only of the trouble and charge in managing ſuch a work, but alſo the hazard to his reputation, if it ſhould not ſucceed. For the generality of men are very unjuſt in their cenſures, and will allow nothing to be well deſigned, that ſhall want ſucceſs. However he reſolved to proceed, and, if poſſible, to finiſh what he had ſo long projected. His firſt addreſs was to *the Corporation of the Clergy*, who received him with great reſpect, but declared that they were not capable of accepting his propoſal. His next application was to *the Royal Bank of England*, which likewiſe refuſed it; upon which he applied to the *Mercer's Company*, who agreed with him upon certain orders and rules, with ſubſequent conceſſions; of which the moſt remarkable are as follows: That the Company will not take in ſubſcriptions beyond the ſum of a hundred thouſand pounds; that all married men not exceeding the age of thirty years or under may ſubſcribe any ſum not exceeding one thouſand pounds: that all married men not exceeding the age of forty years may ſubſcribe any ſum not exceeding five hundred pounds: and that all married men not exceeding the age of ſixty years, may ſubſcribe any ſum not exceeding three hundred pounds. And that the widows of all perſons ſubſcribing according to theſe limitations ſhall receive the benefit of thirty pounds *per Cent per annum* free of all taxes and charges, at the two uſual feaſts of the Annunciation of the Bleſſed Virgin Mary and St. Michael the Archangel; and that the firſt of theſe payments ſhall be made at the firſt of the ſaid Feaſt-days, which ſhall happen four months or more after the deceaſe of the perſon or perſons ſo ſubſcribing; excepting ſuch as ſhall voluntarily make away themſelves, or by any act of theirs occaſion their own death either by duelling or committing any crime, whereby they ſhall be ſentenced and put to death by juſtice. In any or either of thoſe caſes, the widows to receive no annuity; but upon delivering up the Company's Bond, to have the ſubſcription-money paid to them. 3. That no ſea-faring men may ſubſcribe, who follow it as their buſineſs or vocation; nor others, who go farther than Holland, Ireland, or the Coaſts of England; and that any perſon may ſubſcribe for any others, whom he ſhall nominate in his laſt Will, during the natural life of his wife, if ſhe ſurvive, and his intention be declared in his ſubſcription.

[*O*] *A Sermon before the Sons of the Clergy at St. Paul's.*] In the Dedication of this Sermon to Sir Nathan Wright and the other Stewards of the Feaſt of the Sons of the Clergy, he declares his ſatisfaction, that one chief deſign in compoſing that Sermon was ſo acceptable to them, viz. *the promoting a general ſubſcription for the relief of the poor widows and children of Clergymen. Having obſerved,* ſays he, *that ſeveral other Orders and Profeſſions do maintain their own poor, I thought it ſeaſonable to remind you, that it is at leaſt decent, to ſay no more, that the Clergy likewiſe ſhould attempt the ſame; and I have great cauſe to hope, with a little application, the thing will be found very practicable. For if every Clergyman, whoſe preferment is two hundred pounds* per annum, *would ſubſcribe ten ſhillings yearly; if he who hath one hundred pounds* per annum, *would ſubſcribe five ſhillings yearly; this, I am confident, would anſwer the expectation.* The Text of his Sermon is from *Eccleſ.* ix. 10. *Whatſoever thy hand findeth to do, do it with all thy might; for there is no work, nor device, nor knowledge, nor wiſdom in the grave, whither thou goeſt.* He ſhews, that our great work in this world is to adorn our ſouls with thoſe divine virtues and graces, whereby we are made like unto, and qualified for, the converſation of good Beings in another world; and to employ our talents for the benefit of others. He obſerves then, that the deſign of that day's ſolemnity was to honour and own their profeſſion; and to relieve and provide for poor dependants, both widows and orphans. And this charity he urges by ſeveral important motives.

[*P*] *Before the ſociety of the natives of the County of Kent at St. Mary le Bow in London.*] His text was, 1 *Corinth. x.* 31. *Whether therefore ye eat or drink, or whatſoever ye do, do all to the glory of God.* He ſhews firſt, that when God's wiſdom, power, mercy, and other attributes are acknowledged by any of our actions, then in Scripture language God is glorified; and that thoſe natural actions of eating and drinking may be done from theſe their own ends, the nouriſhing of our bodies, the refreſhing our ſpirits, and preſerving our health. He then proceeds to enlarge upon the reaſons

the firſt Part of his *Expoſition of the Church Catechiſm* [Q]; and the year following *Directions for Prayer* [R]. The ſame year he printed a propoſal for a charity-fund to be ſettled in each dioceſe, and diſpoſed of by the Biſhop, &c. for the benefit of ſuch Clergymen as have ſmall preferments (o). In 1703 he publiſhed his *Vindication of the Immortality of the Soul, and a Future State* [S]. Having thus cleared the grounds of all religion, and fixed the hopes and principles of men upon the moſt ſolid foundation, he publiſhed in 1704 a *Method of Devotion in times of Trouble and Affliction*, collected chiefly out of the holy Scriptures and publick Offices of the Church; and the year following, *A brief Exhortation to the holy Communion, with the Nature and Meaſures of Preparation concerning it, fitted to the meaneſt Capacities.* It appears, that he believed this Sacrament to be an euchariſtical, repreſentative, and commemorative ſacrifice [T]. As devotion was the great Object of his mind he finiſhed his moſt conſiderable work of that kind in 1706, which he publiſhed under the title of *A Method of Devotion for ſick and dying Perſons; with particular Directions from the beginning of Sickneſs to the hour of Death.* In the ſame year he took occaſion from the remarkable ſtory of Mrs. Veale, who died at Dover, and was ſaid to have appeared to her friend Mrs. Bargrave at Canterbury, to publiſh his opinion of *The Poſſibility of Apparitions* [U]. After this he publiſhed ſome occaſional prayers from Biſhop Taylor, Biſhop Coſins, Biſhop Kenn, &c, and then a devout collection of Divine Hymns and Poems on ſeveral occaſions, printed at London in 1708. The year following he publiſhed a piece in oppoſition to *the Rights of the Chriſtian Church aſſerted, &c.* [W]; and in 1710 *Directions for the Converſation of the Clergy*;

(o) Ibid. pag. 213.

(q) Ibid. 188.

(r) Ibid. 193.

reaſons of the preſent ſolemnity; which he ſhews to be, 1. to maintain friendſhip, by improving the underſtanding and rectifying the judgment; by regulating and compoſing the paſſions; and aſſiſting us in our uſeful deſigns, and relieving us in our wants: 2. To promote charity, from two conſiderations, as it is the beſt and ſureſt expedient to preſerve our eſtates in this life, and to ſecure a reward in the future.

[Q] *His Expoſition of the Church Catechiſm.*] The whole title is, *An Expoſition of the Church Catechiſm. Part I. Containing an Explication of the preliminary queſtions and anſwers of the Apoſtle's Creed.* He dedicated this to his pariſhioners of Beckenham. He obſerves in his Preface, that he has ſet down the proofs out of Scripture in the body of the Cathechiſm, in words at length; that he has divided the Expoſition into ſeveral Sections, ſeveral of which are not to be repeated by the children in Church; and that he has endeavoured, as far as the words of the Catechiſm gave him occaſion, to vindicate and explain the doctrine and diſcipline of the Church of England.

[R] *Directions for Prayer.*] This was the ſubſtance of a Sermon, occaſionally heard by one, who was a Diſſenter, but afterwards conformed to the Church of England, and publiſhed at his requeſt. He ſhews, that a ſet form of Prayer is both lawful and expedient, and diſcourſes concerning zeal and fervency in Prayer. In the firſt inſtance he obſerves, that our Saviour did both commend and practiſe a form of Prayer; and in the ſecond, that we ought to pray with an earneſt deſire, and yet with decency; with a fervent zeal, and yet without rudeneſs.

[S] *His vindication of the Immortality of the Soul.*] He dedicated this Book to the Duke of Ormond. In his *Introduction* he obſerves, that the chief cauſe of all the wickedneſs and profaneneſs, that abounds in the world, is the not believing, or not conſidering the Immortality of the Soul; and therefore for the ſatisfaction of thoſe, who are in doubt concerning this grand article of Religion, he endeavours a clear and full proof of it. He obſerves, that ſuch a kind of evidence is to be received in this point, as the nature of the thing will admit; and that in this diſpute the exiſtence of a God is to be pre-ſuppoſed. He explains then what is meant by the Soul, and what by the Immortality of it. He ſhews a future ſtate of exiſtence to be deſirable, poſſible, and probable; and this probability appears from the creation, providence, and the inclination and perfection of man's nature. That it is certain, tho' not with the certainty of ſenſe and experience, but that of faith, and confirmed by Scripture, and demonſtrated by the reſurrection and aſcenſion of our Saviour. He confutes likewiſe the notion of the ſleep of the Soul, from *Phil.* i. 21, 22, &c.

[T] *He believed this Sacrament to be an euchariſtical, repreſentative, and commemorative ſacrifice.*] The Author of his *Life* tells us (7), that he carefully read upon the ſubject of the Sacrament, Dr. Hickes and Dr. Hancock, Mr. Johnſon on the *Chriſtian Oblation*, Mr. Scandret, Mr. Leſly, and Mr. Nelſon on the *Chriſtian Sacrifice*; as before Mr. Mead and Dr. Cudworth, to whoſe notion he ſeem'd inclined. *Yet he would not differ, nor have the peace of the Church troubled about words and names, which antiquity hath uſed, and might uſe in a lawful ſenſe. He believed this Sacrament to be an euchariſtical, a repreſentative and commemorative Sacrifice, and wiſhed that authority might order a credential, and the memorial or prayer of Oblation (as in the Liturgy of Edward VI) to be inſerted again in our Communion-Office.*

(7) Pag. 125.

[U] *His opinion of the poſſibility of apparitions.*] It is an anſwer to this queſtion, *Whether can departed ſouls, (ſouls ſeparated from their bodies) ſo appear, as to be viſibly ſeen and converſe here on earth?* In this piece he ſhews, that there are ſpirits and incorporeal beings, as well as men, which none but a Sadducee or an Atheiſt will pretend to deny. And that there is an inviſible world, as well as a viſible one, is rational, and convincing. He obſerves, that there are ſpirits and immortal ſouls of the ſame nature with Angels, who are miniſtring ſpirits, and have often appeared in viſible forms. Human ſouls therefore, as well inclined, or divinely permitted for the good of others here, may appear in the like manner, tho' not reunited to their groſs terreſtrial bodies, but aſſuming certain ætherial ſhapes in reſemblance thereof, or airy vehicles, as Philoſophy calls them. He concludes from theſe conſiderations, that ſuch apparitions may be true, tho' we are not able to explain the manner of them. And tho' many of theſe reports have been mere impoſture and colluſion, or the impreſſions of fear, and a melancholy imagination; yet ſome of theſe appearances have been ſo publicly viſible, and ſo well atteſted, that if there is ſuch a thing as *Fides Hiſtorica*, and if we may believe a thing, which we ourſelves did not ſee, the truth of ſuch apparitions is not to be diſputed.

[W] *A piece in oppoſition to the Rights of the Chriſtian Church aſſerted.*] It is intitled, *A ſeaſonable Vindication of the Clergy. Being an anſwer to ſome reflections in a late Book intitled,* The Rights of the Chriſtian Church aſſerted, *&c. Humbly ſubmitted to the ſerious conſideration of the nobility and gentry of Great Britain. By a Divine of the Church of England.* He obſerves, that tho' an unſeaſonable vindication is uſually rejected as a ſuſpicion of guilt, yet where ſilence againſt foul and falſe imputations may be interpreted a confeſſion, there the proteſtation of a man's own innocency is ever juſt, and ſometimes neceſſary; and when others do the Clergy open wrong, it is not then vanity, but charity to do themſelves open right. And whatever appearance of folly, or vain boaſting there is in doing ſo, they are chargeable with it, who

gy; collected from the Viſitation Charges of the Right Reverend Father in God, Edward Stillingfleet, D. D. late Lord Biſhop of Worceſter. His conduct in the ſeveral relations of Life was very juſt; and he was particularly eſteemed by Dr. Teniſon, the late Archbiſhop of Canterbury, and Dr. Sharp, the late Archbiſhop of York, whoſe predeceſſor conferred upon him a Prebend in his Cathedral, ſolely on account of his merit (*p*). He was particularly pleaſed in the latter part of his life with reading Seneca and Tully *de Senectute* (*q*). He died in his pariſh of Beckenham, and was interred in the chancel of that church September the 17th 1711, in the 70th year of his age (*r*).

(*p*) Ibid. pag. 186.

(*q*) Ibid. pag. 188.

(*r*) Ibid. pag. 193.

ASTYANAX

compel them to do it, and not the Clergy themſelves. He proceeds then in the following manner. *Amongſt the many afflictions, which the orthodox Clergy are ſure to meet with in the world, this is not the leaſt, that they are to wreſtle with the unjuſt and bitter upbraidings of unreaſonable and malicious men, whoſe tongues being ſet on fire of hell, are thereby unhappy inſtruments of the Devil, (that great accuſer of the Brethren,) whoſe known deſign it is, by villifying their perſons, to enervate their function, and by falſe ſuggeſtions, to make their labours ineffectual. The pride, ambition, and covetouſneſs of the Clergy, their careleſs non-reſidence, their encroaching pluralities, their pragmatical intermeddling with ſecular affairs; theſe are the noted topics of ſome men's enlargement; wherein with what virulency they expreſs themſelves, it were a happy thing, if the frequent practice of ſuch perſons would ſuffer us to be ignorant. There is a ſtrange fondneſs in ſome men to reflect upon their ſuperiors in Church and State, and the fluency of their zeal on ſuch occaſions is very remarkable. But their conceits are never ſo raiſed, ſo ſparkling, and triumphant, as when they encounter the tribe of Levi.* He endeavours then to ſhew, that the Clergy are the lights of the world, and to have not only ability, (which is not ſufficient, ſince God *is a God of Order*, and we muſt not run before we are ſent) but likewiſe a commiſſion (John xx. 21. *As my Father hath ſent me, even ſo ſend I you*) to perform their miniſterial acts, whereby, thro' the divine inſtitution and bleſſing, they convey grace into the ſoul; and to be Embaſſadors of reconciliation for Chriſt, 2 *Cor.* v. 20. who receive their credentials from the King of Kings; and therefore ought in that view to be maintained and honoured. Upon this occaſion, he ſhews the neceſſity and dignity of a well conſtituted miniſtry. And the *entertainment*, ſays he, *we find in the world, doth make it ſeaſonable ſo far to magnify our office, as to remind you how much you are obliged to that deſpiſed order of men, called the Clergy, who are yet miſrepreſented and oppreſſed by many falſe reflexions. As when their acceptance of theſe honours, with which the Queen, who is the fountain of honour, may as prudently encourage Divinity as any other profeſſion, ſhall be voted pride. When modeſt endeavours for the bettering of our fortunes ſhall be ſtiled ambition. When an honeſt care to provide for our families (no leſs requiſite in Church-men, than in any other men) ſhall be branded as covetouſneſs. When legal proceedings to ſecure our rights and privileges from the encroachment of others, ſhall be condemned not only as covetouſneſs, but contention alſo. When falſe vizards ſhould be put upon the face of things, no wonder tho' we take up the prophet Iſaiah's complaint,* Lord, who hath believed our report? *as truth itſelf ſhall loſe its credit, &c. And therefore it concerns us, as we value our own reputation or the welfare of people committed to our charge, to wipe off that dirt, which malice on the one hand, and ſenſuality on the other (tho' with different deſigns) have thrown upon us.* Our Author proceeds then to collect their ſeveral calumnies and cenſures into one entire objection, and to return the proper anſwer to them. He ſhews the neceſſity of a well-ſettled revenue, upon the conſideration of thoſe duties particularly required of the Clergy, *to be given to hoſpitality, apt to teach.* He vindicates likewiſe the Biſhops and dignified perſons from ſome texts objected to them, obſerving, that *thoſe, who interpret the Scriptures by the corrupt gloſſes of their own partial reflections, may pretend to prove what they pleaſe; but they who are humble and modeſt, and unbiaſſed in their judgments, do eaſily obſerve, that it is not power and authority, or the title of Lord, that is here condemned, but the abuſe of them by ambition, tyranny, and oppreſſion, we are admoniſhed againſt. But thoſe places of Scripture have been on all occaſions ſo fully cleared from the exceptions of Noveliſts by ſundry of our learned men, that to inſiſt farther upon them would be wholly needleſs. In ſhort, we do not find any where in Scripture, that the Prieſthood of the Goſpel doth render a man incapable of any thing, whereunto he hath either a natural or civil liberty. And therefore as a Clergyman, notwithſtanding his ſpiritual function, may lawfully enjoy temporal land, if an heir to it from his father; ſo he may as lawfully exerciſe temporal power and authority, or be made noble with ſecular titles of honour, when they are given him by his Prince. And the reaſon is this, becauſe tho' the ſpiritual power doth not include the temporal, yet neither doth it ſo exclude it, but that they may, without any incongruity, concur and reſide both together in the ſame perſon.* "The lawfulneſs of the thing, continues he, "being once granted, the expediency of it is very "eaſily thus eſtabliſhed. That ſince a Clergyman is "a member, not only of the Church, but alſo of "the ſtate; and ſince a Sovereign Prince hath a juſt "right and title to the parts and abilities of all his "ſubjects (to employ them when, and how he pleaſeth "for the good of the public,) let any man now re"ſolve me, why the Queen muſt be deprived of her "ſubject's ſervice, or the Clergy of ſuch opportunities "of expreſſing their duty? And therefore ſince the "former Kings and Queens of England out of a due "ſenſe and apprehenſion of the learning, prudence, "and integrity of the Biſhops, have ſummoned them "to their Parliaments, called them to their private "councils, commiſſioned them to be judges of their "Courts of Conſcience, entruſted them with the ma"nagement of their Treaſury, and other principal "offices of the Kingdom, (all which, as experience "proves, they have diſcharged with very good ſuc"ceſs;) and for their better ſupport and encourage"ment herein, to bring a juſt awe and authority to "their perſons, and to ſecure them from contempt, "have given honours and revenues ſuitable to ſuch "high employments. This being ſo, I am to ad"moniſh the adverſaries of the Church, that, if they "pleaſe, it will much better become them to amend "their own faults, rather than out of envy at the "preferment of Church-men, thus to preſume to cen"ſure the diſcretion of their Sovereign." He then conſiders the objection, that whilſt Biſhops are incumbered with temporal honours and employments, they neglect the neceſſary duty of preaching; to which he replies, that *there are ſeveral duties to be performed by the Clergy, of which preaching is but one. Unleſs therefore, they can make it appear, that all theſe duties are to be diſcharged by one and the ſame perſon, there is little force in the objection. A Lecturer, tho' he ſeldom reads the public Prayers of the Church, or adminiſters the Sacraments, or catechiſeth the ignorant, or viſiteth the ſick, or comforteth the afflicted, or abſolveth the penitent; yet if he is conſtant in preaching, (tho' he neglects all the other offices of the Miniſterial Function,) he ſhall have the character of a painful Divine, a faithful labourer in the Lord's vineyard. I demand therefore, ſince government is as neceſſary as preaching, (for Preachers muſt be governed, or they will ruin the Church,) why a Biſhop, who faithfully governs his dioceſe, who furniſheth all his Churches with able Preachers by due and regular ordination; who encourageth thoſe, that are diligent and deſerving; and reproves, corrects, and reclaims the extravagant; I ſay let malice itſelf reſolve me, why ſuch a one, when the great Biſhop of our ſouls ſhall call us all to our laſt account, may not then comfortably expect a Prophet's reward, tho' he ſeldom comes into the pulpit?*

T.

ASTYANAX, the only ſon of Hector and Andromache [*A*], was the occaſion of very uneaſy apprehenſions to the Greeks in the midſt of their victory, though he was then but an infant. Contrary winds preventing them from returning to their own country after the deſtruction of Troy, Calchas declared that it was neceſſary for them to caſt Aſtyanax headlong from the top of the walls, becauſe if he grew up, he would certainly revenge the death of his father, and prove more valiant even than he. Upon this Ulyſſes endeavoured to diſcover him; and having found him, notwithſtanding the care which his mother took to conceal him, he threw him down from the walls (*a*). Others tell us, that it was Menelaus who performed this execution (*b*). Others aſcribe his death to Pyrrhus alone, without any mention, that the Greeks or Calchas judged it neceſſary (*c*). However that be, the Poets and Writers of Romances have raiſed him from the dead, or rather made him eſcape the hands of the Greeks [*B*].

(*a*) Servius *in Æneid.* lib. 3. verſ. 489.

(*b*) Idem, *Æn.* lib. 2. ver. 457.

(*c*) Pauſan. lib. 10.

[*A*] *The only ſon of Hector and Andromache.*] Homer ſays this expreſly; for there is no manner of doubt, but that thoſe, who tranſlate Ἑκτορίδην ἀγαπητὸν (1) by *the only ſon of Hector*, are in the right; the Scholiaſt underſtands it in this ſenſe. The ſorrow of Andromache in the XXIIth Book of the Iliad ſhew evidently, that ſhe had but this one. Hector gave him the name of *Scamandrius*, and the Trojans called him *Aſtyanax*, becauſe Hector was the only defence of the city (2).

(1) Homer. Iliad. lib. 6. ver. 401.

(2) Ibid. ver. 403. and lib. 22. ver. 507.

[*B*] *The Poets and Writers of Romances have raiſed him from the dead, or rather made him eſcape the hands of the Greeks.*] They tell us, that the ſame ſon of Hector, who was named Aſtyanax or Scamander, was likewiſe called Francion, and that he was the ſtock, from which the Kings of France are deſcended (3). Annius of Viterbo's Manetho aſſerts, that Francus, the ſon of Hector, was King of the Celtæ, that is of the Gauls. The impoſtor, who forged this piece, quotes in his Notes Vincent de Beauvais, who tells us, that this Francus having retired into Gaul after the Deſtruction of Troy, gained ſo great a ſhare in the King's favour, that he married his daughter, and ſucceeded him in his Kingdom. I have not found in Manetho (4) what Du Pleix aſcribes to him; that Francus ſucceeded Rhemus King of the Gauls, whoſe daughter he had married (5). I cannot diſcover any thing of this kind even in the Commentator upon Manetho. Du Pleix adds, that Trithemius, *quoting for his Author Hunnibald, who lived under Clovis I, and who alledges for his authorities Dorac and Waſthald, Scythian Hiſtorians*, tells us, that Hector had two ſons, one of whom, whoſe name was Aſtyanax or Scamander, periſhed at the taking of Troy, *the other named Laodamas* (6) *or Francion, eſcaped from the hands of the enemy, and fled with a conſiderable number of Trojans into Pæonia, which was afterwards called Pannonia*; and that having been courteouſly entertained by *the King of the Pæonians, he continued in that country* upon the Frontiers of Scythia, and built there the city of Sicambria, where he and his poſterity reigned till the time of King Antenor, who was ſlain by the Goths 420 years before Chriſt. The cruelties of the Goths obliged the Trojans or Sicambrians to retire into Germany, where they divided themſelves into two branches; one of which at laſt founded the French Monarchy in Gaul; the other ſtaid in Germany, and founded there Franconia or Eaſtern France. What chimeras are theſe! Moreri not conſidering that the Authors of thoſe Legends have falſities of their own to anſwer for, has aſcribed to them what they have not ſaid. He tells us, that *the ſpurious Manetho and other Authors of that ſtamp have repreſented Francion or Francis* (7) *the ſon of Hector, as the firſt King of the Gauls.* But they do not pretend this, ſince they tell us, that the King of the Gauls gave his daughter to him. Beſides, what a careleſsneſs is it to repreſent Andromache only as the mother of this Francion, when there might have been aſcribed to her a more real ſon, I mean, Aſtyanax? Theſe are two errors of Moreri; and here follows a third. He tells us, that Aſtyanax was thrown down headlong from the walls by Ulyſſes's order, and he quotes Virgil's *Æneid*. Now this Poet has ſaid nothing to that purpoſe in any of his works.

(3) *See* Ronſard in the beginning of his *Franciad.*

(4) Antwerp edit. in 8vo 1552.

(5) Du Pleix, *Memoires des Gaules*, lib. 2. cap. 24.

(6) Dictys Cretenſis, in his 6th book, tells us, that Pyrrhus carried Laodamas, the ſon of Hector and Andromache, priſoner with him.

(7) This is an ill tranſlation of the proper name *Francus*.

ATHENAGORAS, an Athenian Philoſopher, flouriſhed after the middle of the ſecond Century, and was remarkable for his zeal for Chriſtianity, and his great learning. All this appears evident from the *Apology*, which he addreſſed to the Emperors Marcus Aurelius Antoninus, and Lucius Aurelius Commodus. This was done in the year 179, if we credit Baronius (*a*), or in the 168th, according to Mr. Dodwel (*b*). It is not eaſy to prove in any ſolid manner that the latter opinion is more probable than the former [*A*]. I do not find any perſon but ſuppoſes, that he was ſent by the Chriſtians to the court of the

(*a*) Baronii *Annal. Eccleſ.* tom. 2. pag. 226. *ad ann.* 179. num. 39, 40.

(*b*) Dodwel, *Diſſert. Cyprian. xi.* num. 37, 38. pag. 261, & *ſeq.*

[*A*] *He addreſſed his* Apology *in the year* 179 . . . *or in* 168. *It is not eaſy to prove in any ſolid manner, that the latter opinion is more probable than the former.*] Several reaſons are urged on both ſides the queſtion. Thoſe of Mr. Dodwell are as follow (1). Athenagoras's Apology was addreſſed to two Emperors, to whom the Author gives the titles of *Armeniacis, Sarmaticis, & quod maximum eſt, Philoſophis.* This is applicable to Marcus Aurelius, and Lucius Aurelius his brother; but not to Lucius Aurelius his ſon. The latter was never ſtiled the Philoſopher; and it appears by the ſecond Apology of Juſtin Martyr, that this title was common to Lucius Aurelius and Marcus Aurelius his brother. *Hunc titulum cum Marco Lucium Verum habuiſſe communem conſtat è ſecundâ Apologiâ Juſtini* (2). Father Pagi, *Diſſert. Hypat. p.* 216. makes uſe of the ſame argument, and quotes Euſebius, *L. IV. c. xii.* Now this Lucius died about the end of the year 169. The Apology muſt therefore have been preſented before that time. I omit the particular reaſons, which induced Mr. Dodwel to fix upon the year 168 for the Epocha of that work. It is objected to him, that the Epithet of Sarmaticus is not ſuitable to Lucius Aurelius, who died before the Sarmatians were attacked; but he anſwers, that this Epithet was inſerted by a miſtake of the Tranſcribers, inſtead of that of Parthicus, which was given to the two brothers with that of Armeniacus, after the war againſt Armenia (3). He adds, that the profound peace, upon which Athenagoras congratulates the Emperors (4), does not at all agree with the time, when Marcus Aurelius and his ſon reigned together. He ſays nothing with regard to the principal objection; and yet ſome reply might be given to it, as we ſhall ſee immediately. We muſt not forget, that Athenagoras intimates, that his Apology was written in the ſame Olympiad, in which Peregrinus burnt himſelf (5). This action of Peregrinus happened, according to Mr. Dodwel and Tillemont (6), under the year 165; but Scaliger has placed it under the year 168 (7). He grounds it upon this conſideration, that Peregrinus did this act during the celebration of the Olympic Games. He is of opinion, that Athenagoras's Apology was preſented to the Emperors the ſame Olympiad. His reaſon is, that Peregrinus caſt himſelf into the fire three years before the death of Lucius Verus, one of theſe Emperors. This argument is better than the proof, which Mr. Dodwel has drawn from the words of Athenagoras; for they only mention the place where, and not the time when, he burnt himſelf.

(1) *Diſſert. Cyprian.* 11. num. 37.

(2) Idem, ibid. pag. 262.

(3) Capitol. *in Vita Marci Aurel.* cap. 9. pag. 325.

(4) Ἡ σύμπασα οἰκουμένη τῇ ὑμετέρᾳ συνέσει βαθείας εἰρήνης ἀπολαύουσιν; i. e. "The whole "world enjoys a "profound peace "by means of "your prudent "conduct." *Athenag.* p. 14.

(5) It was the 236th Olympiad.

(6) Tillem. *Hiſt. des Empereurs*, tom. 2. p. 758.

(7) Scalig. *Animadverſ. in Euſeb.* num. 2182. pag. 229.

the Emperor, and actually preſented an apology for them [*B*]; but there is ſome reaſon to doubt of theſe facts; and there is great probability to ſuppoſe, that it was the ſame caſe

ſelf. Περὶ τὴν Ὀλυμπίαν (8). i. e. "Near the city "Olympia." See Mr. Tillemont (9). The argument drawn from the profound peace of the Empire is of ſuch a kind, that it ſerves both parties; for Cardinal Baronius urges this fact as a reaſon, that the Apology could not be preſented under the reign of Marcus Aurelius's brother, or at any other time but in the year 179 (10). Mr. Tillemont did not well underſtand the Cardinal's meaning, ſince he charges him with having *concluded that this Apology was not written till the year* [176, or] 177, *from its having mentioned, that the Empire was then in a profound peace* (11).

I ſhall now mention the principal reaſons of thoſe, who aſſert that Athenagoras's Apology was not preſented till the year 177, when Commodus, the ſon of Marcus Aurelius, was advanced to the dignity of Auguſtus (12). They affirm, that the perſon, who is the collegue of Marcus Aurelius in the inſcription of the Apology, was the ſon and not the brother of that Emperor; and they prove it from the paſſage, in which theſe two Princes are compared to God the Father and God the Son. *Ipſa quidem oratio longe validius nobis præbet argumentum:* Vos quidem, *ſubjicit vir diſertus*, in ſummâ Imperii Majeſtate adeo conjunctis animis orbem regitis, ut inde cœleſtis etiam regni contemplationem animo quis complecti queat. Ut vobis enim Patri & Filio in poteſtate ſunt omnia, regno in vos divinitùs collocato, (Regis enim Anima, inquit Spiritus Propheticus, in manu Dei eſt,) ſic uni Deo & Filio ejus, hoc eſt Verbo, ſubjecta ſunt omnia. *Nullus hic eſt cavillationibus locus. Imperatores non tantum alloquitur, ſed etiam comparationem inſtituit duos inter terrenos Reges, quibus omnia humanitùs loquendo parebant, ac ſummum cœli & terræ Dominum, qui ſimul cum ſuo Unigenito imperii orbis univerſi habenas moderatur* (13). i. e. "The Apology itſelf affords us an argument ſtill more convincing; for "the eloquent Writer of it proceeds thus: *You indeed amidſt the ſupreme Majeſty of the Empire govern "the world with ſuch harmony and union, that we "may from thence form an idea of the Kingdom of "Heaven. For as you being Father and Son enjoy "the ſovereign authority over all things, the Empire "being given you by Heaven, (for the heart of the "King is in the hand of the Lord, as the Prophet "tells us,) ſo all things are ſubject to the one God and "his Son, who is the Word.* Here is no manner "of room for objections; for the Author not only "addreſſes himſelf to the Emperors, but even makes "a compariſon between two earthly Princes, to "whom all things, humanly ſpeaking, were ſubject, and the ſupreme Lord of heaven and earth, "who with his only begotten Son governs the Uni"verſe." In this manner Mr. de Larroque repreſents the force of his proof. Mr. Tillemont has added another paſſage. "Athenagoras * expreſſes "his wiſh to theſe two Princes, that the Father "might ſucceed the ſon: ἵνα παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς διαδέχηται τὴν βασιλείαν. He addreſſes himſelf therefore "to a Father and ſon, one of whom enjoyed the "Empire, tho' the other might have the title of "Emperor; that is, he addreſſes himſelf to Marcus "Aurelius, and Commodus his ſon, and not to two "brothers, who reigned in conjunction. He expreſſes "himſelf ſtill more plainly in another paſſage †, where "he ſays, *All things are ſubject to you, who are Father "and Son*; ὡς υἱῷ Πατρὶ καὶ Υἱῷ πάντα ὑποτάσσεται. Father Pagi ‡ could not evade this, but by ſaying, "that Athenagoras conſidered Lucius as the ſon of "Marcus Aurelius, tho' he was his brother, in order "to make a more exact alluſion to the two Perſons "of the Trinity, the Father and Son (14)." Father Pagi would have made uſe of a ſubterfuge in this caſe, which was not at all proper to impoſe upon the reader. He would have done much better to have defended himſelf by ſaying, that Athenagoras knew, that Lucius Aurelius had married the daughter of Marcus Aurelius; and that therefore, as he addreſſed himſelf to a father-in-law and his ſon-in-law, he might conſider them as father and ſon. It is thus in effect that Father Pagi has anſwered this objection (15). He obſerves likewiſe, that this was the opinion of Mr. Toinard. The other paſſage, which Mr. Tillemont quotes, is by no means concluſive. It may be underſtood in this ſenſe: *We offer up our prayers for your Empire, that the ſon may receive it of the Father, as juſtice requires.* Περὶ μὲν τῆς ἀρχῆς τῆς ὑμετέρας διαδέχηται, ἵνα παῖς μὲν παρὰ πατρὸς κατὰ τὸ δικαιότατον διαδέχηται τὴν Βασιλείαν (16). *Pro imperio veſtro oramus, ut & filius à patre, ſicut æquiſſimum eſt, imperium per manus accipiatis.* This diſcourſe is very reaſonable, whether we ſuppoſe, that the Apology was preſented to Marcus Aurelius and his brother, or to Marcus Aurelius and his ſon. This is a wiſh, which upon the hypotheſis of Baronius, would relate leſs to Commodus, who was already aſſociated in the Empire, than to the deſcendants of Commodus. It is a wiſh, that the family of Marcus Aurelius might always poſſeſs the Imperial Majeſty according to the order of the lawful ſucceſſion in a direct line. We may obſerve, that Father Pagi quotes this wiſh as a proof, that the ſon of Marcus Aurelius was not then Emperor. I ſhall refute in another place (17) the inference, which is drawn from what Athenagoras has ſaid of one Alexander.

We may conclude two things from all this; the firſt is, that the foundation of the controverſy turns upon this; that one ſide ſuppoſes Marcus Aurelius's collegue to be his brother, and the other that it was his ſon. The ſecond is, that neither of them have urged any thing clear and evident upon the ſubject, ſince the diviſion ſtill continues. Scaliger (18), Father Labbe (19), Father Pagi, Mr. Dodwel, Mr. Chevreau (20), &c. are for the brother; Suffridus Petri (21), Baronius, Father Petavius (22), Mr. Du Pin (23), Mr. de Larroque, Mr. Tillemont, and ſeveral other learned men, are for the ſon.

We may remark by the bye an error of Grotius. *Floruit Athenagoras*, ſays he (24), *circa annum Chriſti* 190, *ut ex libri inſcriptione apparet.* This is not juſt; for Marcus Aurelius dying in 180, the title of a Book, which was dedicated to him, does not prove, that the Author muſt have flouriſhed about the year 190.

[*B*] *That he was ſent by the Chriſtians to the Court of the Emperor, and actually preſented an apology for them; but there is ſome reaſon to doubt of theſe facts.*] Baronius's words are as follow: *Orientis quoque Eccleſias eâdem eſſe clade vexatas,* LEGATIO *pro illis ab Athenagora Athenienſi . . . . tunc ad Imperatores ſuſcepta, & Apologia pro eiſdem tunc ſcripta ac dictis principibus,* OBLATA, *manifeſtum certamque fidem faciunt* (25). i. e. "It is evident that the Churches of the Eaſt were in"volved in the ſame calamity, from Athenagoras "the Athenian's being ſent at that time to the Em"perors on their account, and from his apology, "which was written then in their defence, and pre"ſented to the ſame Emperors." Father Labbe, expreſſes himſelf in as full a manner to the ſame purpoſe: LEGATIONEM SUSCEPIT, *pro Chriſtianis inter annum* 165 . . . *& annum* 170 . . . *non deſunt tamen, qui anno duntaxat* 177 OBLATUM *librum illum Imperatoribus aſſerant* (26). i. e. "He undertook an Em"baſſy for the Chriſtians between the year 165 . . . "and the year 170 . . . but there are ſome who aſſert, "that this Book was not preſented to the Emperors "till the year 177." Moreri in tranſlating this paſſage of Father Labbe, has made uſe of theſe words; *He preſented an excellent apology in favour of the* faithful *to the Emperor Marcus Aurelius Antoninus. . . . He had been ſent to Rome by the Chriſtians, and this happened from the year* 165 *to* 170. He did not well underſtand the original; for Father Labbe's expreſſions ſignify, not that Athenagoras's Embaſſy continued from the year 165 to the year 170; but that it ought to be placed under ſome part of that interval of time. Thoſe, who know how frequent the journies of the Roman Emperors were in thoſe times, would not eaſily venture to ſay without very good grounds, that ſuch or ſuch a perſon was ſent to them at Rome. We muſt conclude therefore, that Moreri has a little raſhly left his guide; and has determined the duration and place of this Embaſſy, which Father Labbe has not done. Mr. Dodwel who conjectures that Athenagoras executed

(8) Athenag. p. 244.
(9) *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 2. pag. 1067.
(10) Baron. *ad ann.* 179. num. 40. pag. 226.
(11) Tillem. *Hiſt. des Emper.* pag. 1066.
(12) Mr. de Larroque following Euſebius, has placed this advancement of Commodus under the year 179. Daniel Larroquanus Matthiæ filius, *Diſſert. de Legione Fulminatrice*, p. 648.
(13) Idem, ibid. pag. 649.
* Athenag. *Legat.* pag. 40. a.
† Pag. 17, d.
‡ Pagi, 177. § 8.
(14) Tillem. *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 2. p. 1066.
(15) Pagi, *in Baron. ad ann.* 177.
(16) Athenag. *ſub finem*, pag. 318.
(17) In the article of PARIS.
(18) Scalig. *Animadverſ. in Euſeb. num.* 1282. pag. 820.
(19) *De Script. Eccleſ.* tom. 1. pag. 123.
(20) *Hiſt. de Monde*, tom. 2. pag. 353 of the 1ſt edit. of Holland. He tells us that the Apology was preſented in 165. Mr. de Larroque in his *Diſſertat. de Legione Fulminatrice*, p. 648. informs us, that Mr. Chevreau placed this fact under 175. He perhaps made uſe of another edition.
(21) *Comment. in Athen.* p. 100. He has fixed upon the year 179.
(22) *Apud* Pagi, *Diſſert. Hypat.* p. 116. He fixes upon the year 177.
(23) *Biblioth.* pag. 176. *apud* Larroque, *Diſſert. de Legion. fulminat.* pag. 648. He determines upon the year 178.
(24) *De Veritate Relig. Chriſtianæ*, pag. 128. *apud* Larroquan. ibid.
(25) Baron. *ad ann.* 179. num. 39. pag. 226.
(26) *Diſſert. de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. 1. pag. 123, 124.

case with this apology, as with a prodigious number of petitions of the Proteſtants in France which were printed without ever having been preſented to the King [C]. I cannot tell upon what grounds it is ſaid, that Athenagoras was a Prieſt (c). There is ſome reaſon

(c) Labbe, *Diſſert. de Script. Eccleſ.* tom. 1. pag. 65. aſſures us of this fact; and Moreri affirms the ſame.

(27) *Legatum egit pro Chriſtianis.* Dodwel, *Diſſert. Cyprian.* XI. num. 37. pag. 261.

(28) Idem, ibid.

cuted this Embaſſy (27), when the Emperor Lucius Verus returned to Rome to celebrate his triumph there (28), has no ſhare in our little cenſure, becauſe he has determined the place; for this limitation of his is a conſequence of the Hypotheſis, which he has followed after a laborious examination of the circumſtances. But I am not eaſily inclined to believe, that he is right in affirming, that this Chriſtian Philoſopher performed really the functions of an Embaſſador.

My firſt reaſon is drawn from the ſilence of all the Antients. Is it poſſible, that no writer ſhould have ſaid ſomething of ſuch an Embaſſy, which would have been ſo remarkable from the circumſtances of the time, the merits of the Embaſſador, and the force of the apology preſented to the Emperors? In the ſecond place I cannot think it at all probable, that when the Chriſtian name was ſo odious, and ſo highly perſecuted, Athenagoras ſhould have appeared at the imperial Court, as a Deputy from the body of Chriſtians, and obtained an audience there, and even preſented to the Emperor a long diſcourſe, in which notwithſtanding the reſpectful moderation which he ſhews in it, he repreſents the moſt abſurd enormities of the Pagan Religion, and animadverts upon thoſe points, which were moſt capable of exciting the reſentments of the perſecutors. I add to this, that the title of this diſcourſe, which is the ſtrongeſt proof, that can be oppoſed to me, is no proof. Ἀθηναγόρου Ἀθηναίου φιλοσόφου Χριστιανῶν πρεσβεία περὶ Χριστιανῶν. i. e. "The Embaſſy of Athenagoras the Athenian, a Chriſtian Philoſopher, in favour of the Chriſtians." This is the title of the piece. But we may remark, I. that there are ſome manuſcripts, in which after πρεσβεία we find ἢ ἀπολογία, i. e. "or the apology (29)," and that there are others, in which inſtead of πρεσβεία we read ἀπολογία. II. That the word πρεσβεία ſignifies not only an Embaſſy or deputation, but likewiſe a requeſt or petition, Τὴν πρεσβείαν *non modo* Legationem, *ſed & Deprecationem ac* Supplicationem *apud Græcos ſignificare notum eſt* (30). III. That the title of Embaſſy is not given to an Embaſſador's ſpeech, but to the whole relation, which is drawn up of his negotiations. It would therefore be a great impropriety, to take the word πρεσβεία here for an Embaſſy. Laſtly, I obſerve, that Mr. Tillemont does not expreſs himſelf as the other writers have done. *We ſee plainly*, ſays he (31), *that the Chriſtian Religion was then perſecuted in the Eaſt, ſince Athenagoras was obliged to write an apology under the title of* an Embaſſy *for the Chriſtians. He addreſſed it to the Emperors.* He does not mention any journey, or deputation, or apology preſented to the Emperors; he only ſpeaks of a diſcourſe written by the Author in his ſtudy, and addreſſed to Marcus Aurelius, &c. Every one knows the difference between a writing, which is actually preſented to a Prince, and one, which is only addreſſed to him. I own, that Mr. Tillemont's authority appears to me in this caſe of conſiderable importance; for he has laid it down for a rule of his conduct, not to ſtretch the teſtimonies of Authors beyond the clear and evident ſenſe of them; and confines himſelf very ſcrupulouſly within the limits of his proofs. I infer from hence, that he thought there was no foundation for this Embaſſy of Athenagoras or for ſuppoſing, that he actually preſented his apology.

(29) *See* Suffridus Petri's *Commentar. in Athenag. Apolog.* pag. 91.

(30) Adam. Rechenberg. *Notæ in Athenag.* p. 2.

(31) *Hiſt. des Empcr.* tom. 2. pag. 756, 757, edit. de Bruxelles.

I ſhall reduce my ſentiments upon this point to a few words, and venture to aſſert, that Athenagoras is to be compared to thoſe modern writers, who without quitting their cloſet, publiſh every where their writings under the title of *A petition of the Proteſtants preſented to the King*. Thoſe, who ſhall read theſe pieces a hundred years hence, will not doubt but that they were actually preſented; but we, who live at this time, know well enough that this is falſe; we know, that in the year 1680 there was diſperſed a pamphlet, which was written with all the air of a petition actually preſented to the King of France by thoſe of the Reformed Religion (32). A prodigious number of people thought ſo in foreign countries, and in thoſe Provinces, which are remote from Paris. And yet I have been informed, that it was never preſented, and it is certain, that the deputies of the churches, who had drawn it up, diſowned the publication of it. There was publiſhed a piece of the ſame kind, during the conferences at Ryſwick in the year 1697. It was a looſe piece without any name; and yet ſome time or other it may be placed among the authentic acts, ſince there is nothing in it, to inform us, but it was actually preſented to Lewis XIV. The primitive Chriſtians probably acted in the ſame manner. They wrote pieces addreſſed to the Emperors, and publiſhed them in hopes, that ſome copy of them might fall into the hands of thoſe Princes, and incline the Court to remove thoſe violences, which were exerciſed towards the Chriſtians, who were unjuſtly accuſed. Once more, I perſuade myſelf, that Athenagoras did in the IId Century, what Calvin did in the XVIth. Calvin, who lay concealed at Baſil in a little room, dedicated to Francis I, his Chriſtian Inſtitutions, which neither himſelf nor any other perſon ever preſented to that Prince.

(32) See the following note.

I muſt not omit obſerving, that the ſame day, in which I wrote this remark, I communicated it to Dr. Cockburn (33), who immediately promiſed me to conſult Mr. Dodwel upon this point. He did me the favour to ſhew me the anſwer, which he received, and which is full of exquiſite learning, from whence ſeveral conſequences are drawn in favour of the opinion, which I have attacked. The letter of that learned man deſerves to be printed. I ſhould have been glad to inſert it here, if I had been permitted; but not being allowed that liberty, I am obliged likewiſe to deny myſelf the liberty of proſecuting the diſpute.

(33) He is a Scots Gentleman, a Doctor of Divinity, and Author of ſome books in Engliſh againſt Madam Bourignon's opinions.

[C] *A prodigious number of petitions of the Proteſtants in France, have been printed without ever having been preſented to the King.*] The public is ſo well aſſured of this, that I ſhould undertake a very ſuperfluous taſk, if I were to amuſe myſelf by a formal proof of it. But with regard to the petition, which was diſperſed in 1680. I have reaſon to believe, that my readers will imagine, that I have proceeded too far in denying that it was preſented. It is proper therefore to propoſe my reaſons. I ſhall begin with diſtinguiſhing this petition from ſeveral others, which were drawn up at different times; and I ſhall obſerve, that it is that, which was anſwered by a Prieſt, whoſe name was *Soulier*. The anſwer which he wrote, was publiſhed without his name. This anſwer is mentioned in the ſixth page of *The laſt efforts of oppreſſed innocence*, and in page 305 of *the Hiſtory of the Edicts of Pacification* (34), and in the third volume of *the hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes* (35). We find in this laſt Book an abſtract of that anſwer, and it is mentioned there as a piece, the author of which was not known. The writer of *the hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes* aſſures us, that the petition was preſented. *It happened, I cannot tell by what means*, continues he, *that ſome time after it was printed and ſold publickly*. I believe that this writer is miſtaken, and that it was printed and ſold before it could be preſented. Now after it was publiſhed, to be ſure the King had not received it. See in the life of Mr. *du Boſc* an account of the reſentment of the council, becauſe the deputies of the Reformed Churches had publiſhed a petition, which they had preſented, but which the King had not then returned any anſwer to (37). This Prince *was ſo highly incenſed at the printing of that petition, that he condemned it without having ſeen it*, and ordered two of the deputies to be ſent to the Baſtile (38). This happened about the year 1671. How is it probable, that nine years after, at a time when affairs were in a much worſe ſituation, the Deputies of the Churches ſhould preſume to publiſh a petition after they had preſented it to the King, and before they knew his anſwer. The author of *the hiſtory of the Edicts of Nantes* might elude this, by aſſerting that the Miſſionaries procured the publication of the petition of the Proteſtants. This, tho' poſſible, is contrary to all probability. But here follows a fact, which is ſtill more direct to the purpoſe. Mr. Jurieu wrote a Book very ſoon after this Petition was publiſhed, and he mentions it only as a petition, which *was deſigned to*

(34) Of the Holland edit. 1682. Mr. Soulier is the Author of that *Hiſtory*, and he has put his name to it. He acknowledges himſelf to be the Author of the *Anſwer to the Petition*, in page 305 of the Hiſtory.

(35) Lib. 16. p. 404, *& ſeq.*

(36) Ibid.

(37) See the *Life of Mr. du Boſc*, pag. 81.

(38) Ibid.

reaſon to be ſurprized, that he was not known to Euſebius, St. Jerom, and almoſt all the other Fathers; for we find him quoted only in one of St. Epiphanius's works [*D*]. He was not wholly free from Heterodoxy [*E*]; but excluſive of this conſideration, the two books which we have of him are of conſiderable importance (*d*). The ſtyle of them is excellent

(*d*) The other is a Treatiſe upon the *Reſurrection.*

to be preſented (39). Does not he deſerve more credit upon ſuch points, than the author *of the hiſtory of the Edict of Nantes*, who did not write till ſeveral years after this event? When I perceived the oppoſition between theſe two writers, I procured the three chief Deputies of the Churches, and particularly him, who is thought to be the author of the petition, to be conſulted. The anſwers, which I have obtained, agree entirely in this, that they are not certain, whether it was preſented or not. They excuſed their forgetfulneſs in this point on account of the multitude of affairs, which paſſed thro' their hands then, and upon the length of time, and the variety of troubles, which they have paſſed thro' ſince. I have no grounds therefore to apprehend, that equitable perſons will charge me with raſhneſs, for determining in the manner, in which I have done; for beſides the proofs, which I have urged, I remember that the moſt freſh and almoſt original report was that which Mr. Jurieu has followed; and which was, that the petition was publiſhed without having been preſented by the Deputies.

(39) See the *Derniers Efforts de l'Innocence opprimée*, p. 6.

[*D*] *We find him quoted only in one of St. Epiphanius's works.*] We muſt likewiſe correct the text of that Father, in order to find the following quotation in him: Τί ἦν ὁ Διάβολος λέξεται; πνεῦμα περὶ τὴν ὕλην ἔχον, καθάπερ ἐλέχθη, ὦ Ἀθηναγόρα, γινόμενον ὑπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ (40). i. e. "What therefore at laſt ſhall we determine the Devil to be? A ſpirit, who is converſant about matter, as it is ſaid, O Athenagoras, and produced by God." Thus ſtands this paſſage in the editions of Epiphanius; and according to this we muſt aſſert, that he treats here of another Athenagoras, who muſt have been an interlocutor in the dialogue, of which Epiphanius has given us ſome extracts. Now this is a dialogue written by Methodius againſt Origen, in which Methodius is one of the interlocutors. But the critics have juſtly conjectured, that inſtead of ὦ Ἀθηναγόρα, we ought to read τῷ Ἀθηναγόρᾳ, *ab Athenagora*, i. e. "by Athenagoras (41)."

(40) Epiphan. *adverſ. Hær.* num. 64. p. 544. tom. 1.

(41) Paulus Leopardus *Emendat.* lib. 19. cap. 9. Petav. *in Epiphan. ad Hæreſ.* 64. num. 21. pag. 260, 261.

[*E*] *He was not wholly free from Heterodoxy.*] He admits of two kinds of evil angels; the one contains thoſe, whom God created, and who executed amiſs the commiſſion, which they had received to govern matter, and to preſide over the production of forms. The other includes thoſe, whom the former begot by carnal converſation with women; that is the ſouls of the giants, who were produced by this commerce (42). Suffridus Petri obſerves, that Athenagoras founds his hypotheſis upon two paſſages of Scripture miſunderſtood. *Teſtimonia ſunt potiſſimum duo, ſed malè intellecta, quibus niti videtur Athenagoras* (43). He is likewiſe miſtaken in the ſenſe and application of a paſſage in the goſpel, which condemns thoſe, who divorce one wife in order to marry another; for he makes uſe of it to condemn ſecond marriages, which he calls without any reſerve a ſpecious adultery. Ἂν οἷος τὶς ἐτύχθη, μόνοις, ἢ ἐφ' ἑνὶ γάμῳ. ὁ γὰρ δεύτερος, ἐυπρεπὴς ἔξι μοιχεία. ὃς γὰρ ἂν ἀπολύσῃ, φησὶ, τὴν γυναῖκα αὐτοῦ, ἢ γαμήσῃ ἄλλην, μοιχᾶται. εἴτε ἀπολύειν ἐπιτρέπων ἧς ἔπαυσε τὶς τὴν παρθενίαν, οὔτε ἐπιγαμεῖν. ὁ γὰρ ἀποστερῶν ἑαυτὸν τῆς προτέρας γυναικὸς, καὶ εἰ τέθνηκε, μοιχὸς ἐξὶ παρακεκαλυμμένος, παραβαίνων μὲν τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ Θεοῦ, ὅτι ἐν ἀρχῇ ὁ Θεὸς ἕνα ἄνδρα ἔπλασε καὶ μίαν γυναῖκα (44). i. e. "Either let every one continue as he was born, or be contented with being once married, for a ſecond marriage is a ſpecious adultery. *For whoever*, ſays Chriſt, *ſhall put away his wife, and marry another, committeth adultery*; he neither ſuffering you to put away her, whoſe virginity you have firſt enjoyed, nor to marry another. For he, who deprives himſelf of his former wife, tho' ſhe be dead, is a ſecret adulterer, as ſoon as ever he tranſgreſſes the command of God; becauſe God in the beginning created one man and one woman." We ſee that he lays upon all men in general the ſame law, which God laid only upon the High-Prieſt (45). He would inſiſt upon it, that if they will marry, it ſhould be but one wife. And he is not contented, that themſelves ſhould have been abſolutely chaſt and free from any commerce with women before, but he would have them likewiſe chooſe virgins for their wives. This is erring conſiſtently; for if ſecond marriages are criminal, a youth, who ſhould marry a widow, would be guilty, and commit a new crime every time that he diſcharged the matrimonial duties, ſince he would occaſion his wife to be guilty of a crime. Now, according to the rules of morality, whoever cauſes another to ſin, ſins himſelf. We may ſay the ſame thing of a *virgin*, who ſhall marry a widower. *I cannot tell*, ſays Mr. Tillemont (46), *whether the expreſſion* *, *which Athenagoras makes uſe of with regard to the prophets at a time, when the ecſtacies of Montanus began to diſturb the Church, might not give occaſion to apprehend, that he was engaged in that party. However, neither Scultetus, nor Mr. Du Pin* † *have remark'd that this paſſage is capable of a bad ſenſe.* I do not find, that there is the leaſt reaſon to ſuſpect him of being a Montaniſt upon ſuch an account. How many orthodox perſons are there, who aſſert, that the ancient prophets were ſeized with an ecſtaſy, and that their tongues or pens were the inſtruments of the Holy Ghoſt? What then can he find exceptionable in theſe words of Athenagoras, Νομίζω καὶ ὑμᾶς.... ἐκ ἀκοήτους γεγονέναι οὔτε τῶν Μωσέως, οὔτε τῶν Ἡσαΐου καὶ Ἱερεμίου, καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν προφητῶν, οἱ κατ' ἔκςασιν τῶν ἐν αὐτοῖς λογισμῶν κινήσαντος, αὐτοὺς τοῦ Θείου πνεύματος, ἃ ἐνηργοῦντο ἐξεφώνησαν· συγχεησαμένου τοῦ πνεύματος, ὡσεὶ καὶ αὐλητοῦ, αὐλὸν ἐμπνεύσαι (47). i. e. "I think alſo .... that you are not ignorant of thoſe writings, which Moſes, Iſaiah, and Jeremiah, and the reſt of the Prophets have left. Who in their ecſtaſies, being moved by the divine Spirit, ſpoke thoſe things, which they received; the Spirit working by them in the ſame manner, as a piper blows his pipe." It is true that the compariſon of the Holy Ghoſt with a player upon the pipe or flute, is low; but at the bottom it is no error.

(42) Athenag. pag. 227, & *ſeq.*

(43) Suff. Petri, *in Athenag.* pag. 318.

(44) Athenag. pag. 298.

(45) Levitic. cap. xxi. ver. 13, 14.

(46) *Hiſt. des Empereurs.* tom. 2. pag. 759.

* Athenag. *Leg.* pag. 9. d.

† Scultet. pag. 52. Du Pin, tom. 1. p. 175.

(47) Athenag. pag. 72, 74.

What I have obſerved concerning the law, which was preſcribed to the High-Prieſt of the Jews, ſuggeſts to me a conjecture, which I ſhall venture to propoſe to the Reader. The primitive Chriſtians, who declared ſo ſtrongly againſt ſecond marriages, were perhaps led into this opinion by the conſideration, that we are obliged to be more perfect under the law of the Goſpel, than under that of Moſes; ſo that lay-Chriſtians are obliged to obſerve the ſtricteſt rules, which were in uſe among the Prieſts of the Synagogue. In ſhort, it ſeems that in ſome reſpects all Chriſtians are initiated into the Prieſthood (48). If it was thought proper therefore to prohibit the High-Prieſt of the Jews from marrying a widow, in order that ſuch a prohibition might make him reflect upon the obligation he was under to purity, is not there ſome reaſon to think, that all Chriſtians ſhould be put under the ſame yoke? It was in this manner perhaps that they reaſoned; and perhaps likewiſe the firſt ſource of this ſevere morality was the view of fully removing that kind of polygamy, which divorce rendered frequent. The falſe wits would appear more than ridiculous, if they ſhould pretend to criticiſe the law preſcribed to the High-Prieſt. *He ought to have been ſubjected to a burdenſome law*, it will be ſaid, *whereas on the contrary he was obliged to indulge himſelf in a more delicious reliſh, and not to take up with a diſh at ſecond hand. The reſt were to be contented with the leavings of others; he alone was obliged to be more difficult in his gratifications, and of a taſte much more delicate.* This is trifling and low raillery; for in reality it is a ſlaviſh condition for a man not to be permitted to marry when he pleaſes; and how many ſenſual perſons are there, who, tho' they have a full liberty of choice, prefer widows to any other miſtreſſes? Beſides, is it not mere blindneſs not to ſee the wiſdom of the legiſlator in this prohibition? Did not this law direct the High-Prieſt to avoid more ſtrictly than others the leaſt irregularities? For if a woman was not worthy of him, when ſhe ceaſed to aſpire to that excellent degree of perfection and glory, which ſhe might obtain by preferring a chaſt widowhood to a ſecond marriage; if the mere want of this ſublime virtue, which want is not

A REFLECTION upon the High Prieſt of the Jews being reſtrained from marrying above once.

(48) See the 1ſt Epiſtle of St. Peter ch. ii. verſ. 5 and 9.

excellent and truly Attic, but a little too full of tranſpoſitions and parentheſes. They have been printed a great many times, as we may find in Mr. Du Pin, who has omitted ſome editions [*F*]. I ſhall ſpeak of a Romance which has been publiſhed under the name of Athenagoras [*G*], If I could but have conſulted the Diſſertation which Father le Nourry publiſhed (*e*), I ſhould undoubtedly have extracted ſome good materials for this Article; but his book has not reached us (*f*), though it was printed in 1697. I have ſeen ſome account of it in the *Journal des Savans* (*g*), and in the *Acta Eruditorum* of Leipſic (*h*).

(*e*) It is the 3d of the 2d volume of his *Apparatus ad Bibliothecam maximam veterum Patrum.*

(*f*) I write this in April 1699.
(*g*) Of the 13th of May 1697, pag. 331.
(*h*) Of Dec. 1698, pag. 554.

not ſo much a real crime as the mere privation of a diſtinguiſhed merit, was ſufficient to render her unworthy of the marriage of the High-Prieſt, was it not a proof, that God required of him a peculiar abhorrence for impurity, and a particular care and ſtrictneſs in the regulation of his conduct? Read the following words of a great man: *Quin & illa ad declarandam inſignem vitæ mundiciem pertinent, quod ſi quis de ſtirpe Aaron teneatur profluvio ſanguinis, vetatur ad ſacerdotis menſam accedere, ſacriſque veſci panibus. Item quod quicunque vicio maculâve corporis eſſent deformati, ſubmoventur à ſacris miniſteriis. Rurſus quod ipſe pontifex jubetur virginem ſuæ gentis ducere, à viduâ, repudiatâ, ac proſtitutâ, abſtinere. Non ſtatim quod plebi licet, licet & ſacerdoti. Multitudini multa conceduntur, à ſacerdote ſumma requiritur puritas in omni vitæ portione* (49). i. e. "Beſides theſe rules were deſigned to "point out a peculiar ſtrictneſs and purity of life; "that if any perſon of the tribe of Aaron was troubled with a flux of blood, he was forbid to approach the Prieſt's table, or eat of the ſacred bread. "And likewiſe, that whoever were deformed and had "any blemiſh in their bodies, ſhould be removed from "the ſacred offices. And again, that the High-Prieſt "himſelf was commanded to marry a virgin of his "own nation, and to abſtain from a widow, and from "one, who had been divorced or proſtitute. What "was lawful for the common people, was not at the "ſame time lawful for the Prieſt. Many things were "granted to the multitude; but the greateſt purity "in every part of life, was required of the Prieſt." The ſame ſpirit reigned in the diſcipline of the Chriſtians, even at the time when they did not exclude married perſons from the Prieſthood (50); for they excluded thoſe, who had two wives ſucceſſively, or who had married a widow, or had been diſhonoured by the adultery of their wives; and if this diſhonour happened to them while they were in orders, they were obliged either to deliver themſelves by divorce, or to renounce their ſtate as Clergymen. *Verba ſynodi Neocæſar. cap.* 8. *hæc ſunt: Si cujus uxorem adulterium commiſiſſe, cum eſſet laicus, evidenter fuerit probatum, hic ad miniſterium Eccleſiaſticum admitti non poteſt. Quod ſi in clericatu eo jam conſtituto adulteravit, dato repudio dimittere eam debet; ſi vero retinere ejus conſortium velit, non poteſt ſuſcepto miniſterio perfrui. Cap. ſi cujus.* 34 *diſtinc.* (51). i. e. "The words of the "Synod of Neo-cæſarea are as follow: If it be evi-"dently proved, that the wife of any perſon had com-"mitted adultery, while he was a Lay-man, he can-"not be admitted into Orders. And if ſhe has been "guilty in that reſpect, after he was in Orders, he "ought to divorce her; but if he ſtill retain her, he "cannot diſcharge the duties of his function. *Cap. ſi "cujus*, 34. *diſtinct.*" See the diſſertation of Mr. Morin, or the extract of it in the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (52).

(49) Eraſm. *in Eccleſiaſt.* lib. 1. pag. 46, 47.

(50) *See* Duaren. *de Sacris Eccleſ. Miniſter. ac Benefic.* lib. 4. cap. 8. pag. 386.

(51) Idem, pag. 387.

(52) For July 1684. Art. 6. pag. 517.

[*F*] *Mr. Du Pin has omitted ſome Editions.*] His Catalogue is very large (53); but it is not always well pointed in the Amſterdam Edition (54). This occaſions great confuſion in the mind of the reader. There is no mention of the edition of Oxford, nor of that of Leipſic; the former was publiſhed in 1682 in 12mo by Dr. Fell, Biſhop of Oxford, and the latter in 1684 in 8vo by Adam Rechenberg. Both theſe Editions are in Greek and Latin, and illuſtrated with Notes. Mr. Du Pin has not mentioned likewiſe Mr. Kortholt's Commentary upon Athenagoras's Treatiſes. This work was printed at Kiel in 1675 in fol. and inſerted with Additions in the Edition of Juſtin Martyr, Athenagoras, &c. at Leipſic in 1686. We may obſerve, that Guy Gauſſart, Prior of Sainćte Foy at Coulommiers, tranſlated Athenagoras's Apology into French; to which he added the Notes of Suffridus Petri. This Tranſlation was printed at Paris in 8vo 1574. Du Verdier Vau-Privas, who informs us of this (55), mentions a French Tranſlation of the two Treatiſes of Athenagoras, done by Arnaud du Ferron (56); but he does not tell us either where or when it was printed (57).

(53) See the 1ſt volume of his *Nouvelle Biblioth.* printed in 1686.

(54) I write this becauſe I have not that of Paris.

(55) *Biblioth. Françoiſe*, pag. 533.

(56) It was he, who wrote in Latin *A Continuation of Paulus Æmilius.*

(57) De Verdier, pag. 87, 88.

[*G*] *A Romance publiſhed under the name of Athenagoras.*] According to Dr. Cave, there has only been ſeen the French Tranſlation printed at Paris by Daniel Guillemot in 1612, with the following title: *Du vrai & parfait Amour, eſcrit en Grec par Athenagoras Philoſophe Athenien, contenant les Amours honeſtes de Theogone & de Charide, de Pherecides & de Melangenie:* i. e. "Of true and perfect Love, written in Greek "by Athenagoras, an Athenian Philoſopher; con-"taining the chaſt Loves of Theogonus and Chari-"dea, of Pherecides and Melangenia." Martin Fumée, Lord of Genille, had made this Tranſlation, and ſent it in 1569 to Mr. de Lamané, Secretary to Cardinal d'Armagnac. It was found in the papers of Bernard de San-Jorry, who publiſhed it in 1612 (58). Conſult Huetius, who ſpeaks very largely of this Book, and conjectures, that Philander was the real Author of it (59). He tells us, that this Fumée boaſted, that he had the original Greek by means of Lamané, Protonotary to Cardinal d'Armagnac.

(58) Taken from Dr. Cave, *Hiſt. Litter.* pag. 49.

(59) Huet, *de Origine des Romans*, pag. 42, *& ſeq.*

We may remark, that the Edition mentioned by Dr. Cave, which he ſaw in Dr. Voſſius's Library, was not the firſt. I have one printed at Paris by Michael Sonnius in 1599 in 12mo. The title is almoſt exactly the ſame with that of the Edition mentioned above (60). The Preface was written by Bernard de San-Jorry, and dated from Caſtres the firſt of October 1596. It informs us, that San-Jorry, who was *almoſt ſeventy years of age*, had found amongſt his papers a copy of this work, which *he had procured to be tranſcribed from that, which had been ſent to Mr. de Lamané*, and that he deſired *Mr. de Fonbouzart, who was going to court on account of his own affairs, to do him the pleaſure to take the charge of this work, and communicate it to ſome Printer, as he paſſed thro' Paris.*

(60) Inſtead of *Theogonus* my edition reads it *Theogenes*; and inſtead of *Pherecides* it has *Pherecydes.*

ATHENÆUM [*A*] was a publick edifice of Rome, built by the Emperor Hadrian,

[*A*] *ATHENÆUM.*] This name being derived from Minerva, who in Greek is called Ἀθηνᾶ, the Goddeſs of polite Arts and Sciences; it was thought juſt, that a building erected in favour of the Men of learning ſhould bear the name of that Goddeſs. Some Writers have imagined that it was a Temple conſecrated to her; but Aurelius Victor does not give us this idea of it. *Gymnaſia*, ſays he (1) ſpeaking of the Emperor Hadrian, *Doctoreſque curare occæpit, adeo quidem ut etiam ludum ingenuarum artium, quod Athenæum vocant, conſtitueret:* i. e. "He began to take "care of the ſchools and profeſſors, ſo that he built "a college for the liberal Arts, which is called A-"thenæum." The other Hiſtorians, who ſpeak of it, only repreſent it as a place for Declamations and Lectures. *Ad Athenæum audiendorum & Græcorum & Latinorum Rhetorum vel Poetarum cauſſâ frequenter proceſſit:* i. e. "He frequently went to the "Athenæum in order to hear the Greek and Latin "Rhetoricians and Poets." Thus Lampridius ſpeaks of Alexander Severus. This paſſage is quoted in Calepin immediately after we are told there, that the Athenæum was conſecrated to Minerva, and that the Poets and other Greek Writers brought their works thither, as the Latin Writers carried their compoſitions to the temple of Apollo. We may judge

(1) *In Hadriano.*

Hadrian [*B*], in order to ſerve for an Hall to the Doctors, and thoſe, who wanted to read their writings before a conſiderable number of people. It appears from the beginning of Juvenal's Satyrs, that this manner of reading in publick was very common, and that Fronto lent the uſe of his houſe and gardens to the Poets, who had occaſion to recite their verſes before a numerous audience (*a*). Several other perſons granted the uſe of their houſes for that purpoſe (*b*); but it happened unfortunately for the Poets, that they often left them very conſiderable expences to defray [*C*]. It belonged to the perſon who was to read his compoſitions, to furniſh the room, and to pay the charge of the ſeats. There is ſome probability that the Emperor Hadrian, who had a great regard and good taſte

(*a*) *Frontonis platani convulſaque marmora clamant, Semper & aſſiduo ruptæ lectore columnæ.*

(*b*) *Stella in Martial* Epig. VI. of the 4th book. Titinnius Capito *in Pliny*, Letter XII of Book 8. Quadratus *in Epictet. Arriani*, lib. 3. cap. 23.

from hence of the accuracy of thoſe, who compiled or corrected that great Dictionary. Cruquius made uſe of the ſame diviſion; he ſends the Latin Poets to the temple of Apollo, and the Greek Poets to the temple of Minerva; which he calls *Athenæum* (2). But let us continue to examine what the ancients have ſaid concerning the place in queſtion. *Cum Pertinax eo die proceſſionem, quam ad Athenæum paraverat, ut audiret Poetam, ob ſacrificii præſagium diſtuliſſet* (3): i. e. "When Pertinax deferred going "that day, as he had reſolved, to the Athenæum, "to hear the Poet, on account of the omen at the "ſacrifice." Another Hiſtorian tells us, that Gordian, who was Emperor, had declaimed in the Athenæum; *Ubi adolevit, in Athenæo controverſias declamavit* (4). Philoſtratus tells us, that the Sophiſt Hadrian, who had gained the ſuperiority at Rome, had no ſooner given out, that he would harangue, but the Senators, Knights, and all the ranks of men, crowded to the Athenæum. Δρόμῳ ἐχώρουν ἐς τὸ Ἀθήναιον ὁμοῦ μέσοι (5). Let us add the following words of St. Jerom, *Quando omne Athenæum Scholaſticorum vocibus perſonabat* (6): i. e. "When the whole A-"thenæum reſounded with the voices of the Scho-"laſticks." And theſe of Sidonius Apollinaris; *Dignus omnino, quem plauſibilibus Roma foveret ulnis, quoque recitante crepitantis Athenæi ſubſellia cuneata quaterentur* (7): i. e. "He was worthy to be encou-"raged by the approbation of Rome, and that when "he recited his works, the crowded ſeats of the re-"ſounding Athenæum ſhould be ſhaken with the ap-"plauſe." The Etymology, which Dion Caſſius gives us, is a new reaſon againſt thoſe, who ſuppoſe the Athenæum to have a Temple of Minerva. He tells us, that this place was called ſo on account of the exerciſes of the Men of Letters there ἀπὸ τῆς ἐν αὐτῷ τῶν πεπαιδευμένων ἀσκήσεως (8). He informs us likewiſe, that the Conſul aſſembled the Senate in the Athenæum, when he heard that the Pretorian Cohorts had ſeized the murderers of Pertinax. The objection which may be drawn from this, that the Senate met only in places conſecrated by the Augurs, is not of equal force with the reaſons, which prove that the Athenæum was not a Temple of Minerva. Thoſe Writers who aſſert, that the firſt place which was called *Athenæum*, was in Athens (9), would find it very difficult to prove it. The Abbé des Marolles underſtood this word in a ſenſe ſtill more falſe; for he tells us in his Tranſlation of Aurelius Victor, that Hadrian *ſent for the Men of Learning from all parts, as if he would have transferred Athens to Rome.*

(2) *In Horat.* Sat. 10. lib. 1.

(3) Julius Capitolin. *in Pertinace.*

(4) Capitol. *in Gordiano.*

(5) Philoſt. *in Adriano.*

(6) *De Obitu Paulinæ ad Pammach.*

(7) Epiſt. 14. lib. 9. *See likewiſe* Epiſt. 9. *ejuſdem Libri*; and Ep. 8. lib. 4.

(8) Xiphil. *in Didio Juliano, ſub finem*, where Xylander tranſlates Ἀθήναιον by *Templum Minervæ.*

(9) *See* Faber's *Theſaurus*, edit. 1692.

I ſhall obſerve by the by, that in the city of Alexandria the Poets, Rhetoricians, and Grammarians aſſembled themſelves in the Temple of the Muſes, in order to diſplay their genius. Ἀπάγει παρὰ τὸ τέμενος τῶν Μουσῶν· ἔνθα ποιηταὶ καὶ ῥήτορες καὶ τῶν γραμματικῶν οἱ παῖδες φοιτῶντες, ποιοῦνται τὰς ἐπιδείξεις. Thus ſpeaks an Author of the ſixth Century of the Cuſtom of his time; I mean Zacharias of Mitylene in his Book *de Mundi Opificio*. See page 339 of the eleventh volume of the *Bibliotheca Patrum*, printed at Paris in 1644.

[*B*] *It was built by the Emperor Hadrian.*] I have proved this by the paſſage of Aurelius Victor, ſo that Caſaubon is extremely miſtaken in ridiculing Theodorus Marſilius, whom he treats with great ſeverity without naming him (10). The latter makes uſe of a great deal of impertinent pains in his Commentary upon Perſius, to prove, that the Athenæum and the Temple of Apollo Palatinus were the ſame place. Voſſius has taken notice of this error of his, and cenſures Father Raderus for the ſame in his Commentary upon the LXXth Epigram of the Xth Book of Martial (11). He might likewiſe have cenſured Savaro on the ſame account, who by theſe words of Horace,

(10) Caſaub. *Comment. in Capitol. Vit. Pertinac.*

(11) Voſſ. *de Imitat.* pag. 36.

——— *Hæc ego ludo,*
Quæ nec in æde ſonent certantia judice Tarpa (12),

(12) Sat. *ult.* lib. 1.

"I divert my time
"In writing verſes, which are not deſign'd
"To be recited in Apollo's temple,
"Where Tarpa ſits as judge.

underſtands that Horace was not willing, that his Verſes ſhould be read in the Athenæum (13). He gives this explication as the very words of an old Scholiaſt. Lipſius makes uſe of the ſame authority, tho' he owns, that another old Scholiaſt underſtands in that place by *ædem* the Temple of Apollo Palatinus (14). If this learned man had thought of the paſſage of Aurelius Victor, he would not have preferred the explication of the former of theſe Scholiaſts to that of the latter (15). See the article of TARPA.

(13) Savaro *in Sidon. Apollin.* Epiſt. 14. lib. 9.

(14) Lipſius, Ep. 48. Cent. 2. *ad Belgas.*

(15) Voſſius, *de Imitat.* pag. 61.

[*C*] *Often left them conſiderable expences to defray.*] The Author of the Dialogue *de Cauſis corruptæ Eloquentiæ* is my authority for this, when he tells us, *Domum mutuatur, & auditorium exſtruit, & ſubſellia conducit, ut beatiſſimus recitationem ejus eventus conſequatur:* i. e. "He borrows the uſe of an houſe, "he builds a hall to hear in, and hires ſeats, in or-"der that he may gain ſucceſs by reciting his works." Juvenal will ſerve me for a ſecond authority; for he threatens the Poets with the mortification of not meeting with any Nobleman, who will allow them a ſufficient ſum, to reimburſe them for the expences, which they have been at:

Nemo dabit regum quanti ſubſellia conſtent,
Et quæ conducto pendent anabathra tigillo,
Quæque reportandis poſita eſt orcheſtra cathedris (16).

(16) Juvenal. Sat. 7. ver. 45.

"With no kind patron now the Poet meets,
"To pay the hire of pulpit and of ſeats."

I would not poſitively affirm, that they never recited in a houſe, which they hired; but I cannot help ſaying, that Voſſius affirms it without any ground, ſince the teſtimonies, which he quotes, ſignify nothing leſs than what he pretends. The firſt paſſage, which he cites, is that from the Dialogue *de Cauſis corruptæ Eloquentiæ*, in which we have ſeen above the words *domum mutuatur*, which ſignifies an Houſe, the uſe of which is borrowed, and not an hired Houſe. The ſecond is that from Juvenal, which is as follows:

AN enquiry whether the Poets recited their works in an hired houſe. Voſſius's errors.

——— *Cum jam celebres notique Poetæ*
Balneolum Gabiis, Romæ conducere furnos
Tentarent (17).

(17) Sat. 7. ver. 3.

"When now the celebrated Wits for need,
"Hire bagnio's, to the Cryer's trade ſucceed,
"Or get their own by baking others bread."

CHARLES DRYDEN.

Which only repreſents the dreadful barrenneſs of the profeſſion of Poetry, which obliged the Poets to turn bankrupts to the Muſes, and to maintain themſelves by ſome mechanical employment, as that of a Keeper of Baths, a Baker, or a Crier. The third proof is from this paſſage of the ſame Satyriſt:

Ipſe facit verſus, atque uni cedit Homero
Propter mille annos; & ſi dulcedine famæ
Succenſus recites, Maculonis commodet ædes (18).

(18) Idem, ibid. ver. 38.

"Himſelf

taſte for the Sciences, propoſed among other views which he had in building the *Athenæum*, to prevent Authors from being ſubject any longer to theſe inconveniences. There is no doubt but this place ſerved likewiſe for others to read Lectures there. I find likewiſe that the Senate aſſembled there ſometimes (*d*). The name of this place has been applied to all kinds of Colleges deſigned for the teaching of the Sciences and Languages; for they are called in Latin *Athenæa*. Some Writers have likewiſe thought that Libraries have been called *Athenica* (*e*).

(*e*) Salmaſ. *in Trebell. Pollion. de triginta Tyrannis.*

(*d*) See note [*A*] towards the end.

" Himſelf writes Verſe, which he to yours prefers,
" And only yields to Homer's for their years:
" But to your ſhare to try what Fame will fall,
" Any great Man will lend an empty hall."

It is very evident, that in this paſſage as well as in the preceding there is no mention at all of the Poets hiring of a room in order to recite their Poems, that one cannot conceive how ſuch miſtakes could eſcape the obſervation of Voſſius, in a book printed during the Author's life (19), and entitled *de Imitatione cum oratoriâ tum præcipuè poeticâ, deque Recitatione Veterum:* Of Imitation with regard to Oratory and eſpecially Poetry; and of the Manner of Authors reciting their works among the ancients." This laſt ſubject has been treated fully by Creſollius in his *Theatre of the ancient Sophiſts*.

(19) At Amſterdam 1647, with his *Inſtitutiones Poeticæ*.

☞ATHENÆUS a Phyſician, was born at Attalia, a city of Cilicia. He was contemporary with Pliny [*A*], and was the founder of the Pneumatic Sect. His doctrine was (*a*), that the *Fire*, *Air*, *Water* and *Earth* are not the true elements, as is generally ſuppoſed, but that their qualities are ſo, namely *Heat*, *Cold*, *Moiſture* and *Dryneſs*. To theſe he added a fifth element, which he called *Spirit* (πνεῦμα), whence his Sect had its name. He thought that this Spirit penetrated all bodies, and kept them in their natural ſtate; this he borrowed from the Stoicks, whence Galen calls Chryſippus one of the moſt famous of thoſe Philoſophers, *the father of the Pneumatic Sect*. We find a hint of this doctrine alſo in Virgil [*B*]. But Athenæus was the firſt who applied it to Phyſick. He thought that in the greateſt part of diſeaſes, this *Spirit* was the firſt that ſuffered; and that the pulſe (*b*) was only a motion cauſed by the natural and involuntary dilatation of the heat in the arteries and heart. We have but very little of this famous Author remaining, ſo that we muſt look for a farther account of the doctrines of this Sect in the writings of Aretæus (*c*).

(*a*) Galen. *Introduct.*

(*b*) Idem, *de Differentiis Pulſ.* lib. 4. cap. 4.

(*c*) *See* Wigan, *de Aretæi Sectâ*; *and* Le Clerc, *Hiſt. de la Medicine*, Part 2. liv. 4. Sect. 2. ch. 2.

[*A*] *He was contemporary with Pliny.*] We may conjecture that he lived after Themiſon, by a paſſage of Galen, wherein he tells us that Magnus, who was a follower of Athenæus, had compoſed a Diſcourſe on the diſcoveries made after Themiſon. It is very probable that Magnus wrote this book with a view to relate the innovations his maſter had made in Phyſick. That he was not before Celſus is probable, becauſe this Author makes no mention of him. The ſame may be ſaid with regard to Pliny. We may farther obſerve, that Archigenes, who did not write after the time of Adrian, was the diſciple of Agathinus, and he of Athenæus. Now if we allow Athenæus to be but fifty years older than Archigenes, which is about the ſpace between the beginning of the reign of Veſpaſian and that of Adrian, he cannot be later than Pliny; and this Author's ſilence concerning him ſeems to ſhew that he is not more ancient.

[*B*] *We find a hint of this doctrine in Virgil.*] It is in the 6th Æneid,

Principio cœlum, ac terras, campoſque liquentes,
Lucentemque globum Lunæ, Titaniaque aſtra
Spiritus intus alit, totamque infuſa per artus
Mens agitat molem, & magno ſe corpore miſcet.

" Know firſt, that heav'n and earth's compacted frame,
" And flowing waters, and the ſtarry flame,
" And both the radiant lights, one common ſoul
" Inſpires, and feeds, and animates the whole.
" This active mind infus'd through all the ſpace,
" Unites and mingles with the mighty maſs."

DRYDEN.

ATHENÆUS, a Greek Grammarian, born at Naucratis in Egypt, flouriſhed in the third Century [*A*]. He was one of the moſt learned men of his time. He had read ſo much, and remembered ſuch a variety of things, that he might be juſtly ſtiled the Varro

[*A*] *Athenæus . . . . flouriſhed in the third Century.*] Tanaquil Faber has cenſured Helvicus, who quoting Suidas, has placed Athenæus under the Emperor Antoninus Pius (1). Here are two errors; for Suidas makes him flouriſh under Marcus Aurelius, and does not deſerve to be copied in this point, ſince Oppian, who dedicated a Poem to the Emperor Caracalla (2), died before Athenæus. Helvicus therefore ought to have placed Oppian fifty years after our Author. This is one error, which Faber objects to him; and he aſſerts that Athenæus lived at the ſame time as Herodian, who concluded his Hiſtory in the year 238. It is certain that Athenæus places himſelf later than Oppian: Καὶ τὸν ὀλίγῳ πρὸ ἡμῶν γενόμενον Ὀππιανὸν τὸν Κίλικα (3): i. e. " And Oppian the Cilician, who " liv'd a little before us." He ſays this, when he ſpeaks of ſeveral Authors, who had written upon fiſhing. It will undoubtedly be objected, that he ſays in another place (4), that he knew the Poet Pancrates, who received ſome preſent from the Emperor Hadrian. But this will not prove any conſiderable difficulty. It is ſufficient to ſuppoſe, that this Pancrates was very young at that time, that he lived eighty years, and that he died before Athenæus was twenty years of age. We ſhall find, that nothing hinders the latter from having lived till the time of the Emperor Gordian. If Mr. Tillemont had recollected the Greek paſſage of Athenæus, which I have quoted, the old age, which he ſuppoſes our Author muſt have reached to, would have appeared ſtill more ſurprizing to him; for he imagines him to have been *very old*, only from the ſuppoſition that his work was written after the death of Commodus; and the reaſon which he gives is, that Athenæus *knew the Poet Pancrates, who was famous in the time of Hadrian* (5). He does not object againſt Suidas, who has placed him under Marcus Aurelius; tho' that Author deſerves to be cenſured in conſequence of the Greek paſſage, which we have ſeen above. It cannot juſtly be urged, that it is not Athenæus, who affirms that he knew the Poet Pancrates; but that theſe words are Callixenus the Rhodian's, whom he had quoted juſt before. This ſuppoſition cannot be admitted. Caſaubon has very well ſhewn that Callixenus's words are wanting in Athenæus's Book (6); but he has omitted one very ſtrong reaſon for this conjecture; which is, that the paſſage in queſtion begins thus: *Since I have mentioned the city of Alexandria*, Callixenus would not have expreſſed

(1) Tan. Fab. Epiſt. 43. lib. 1. pag. 211, 212.

(2) This was in the year 217.

(3) Athen. lib. 1. pag. 13.

(4) Idem, lib. 15. pag. 677.

(5) Tillem. *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 2. pag. 309.

(6) Caſaub. *in Athen.* pag. 958.

(a) *See* Caſaubon's Preface to Athenæus.

Varro of the Greeks (*a*). Of all the works which he wrote [*B*] we have none extant but that which is entitled *The Deipnoſophiſts*, that is to ſay, *The Sophiſts at Table* (*b*), in which he introduces a certain number of learned men of all profeſſions, who diſcourſe upon a great many ſubjects at the table of a citizen of Rome, whoſe name was Larenſius. There is an infinite variety of facts and quotations in this work of Athenæus, which render the reading of it very agreeable to thoſe who are capable of admiring antiquity from a real knowledge of it. But there is no doubt, but that the learned men who were contemporary with the Author, had not ſo favourable an opinion of his work as we have at preſent. Thoſe learned men were able to conſult the originals, and had ſeen moſt of the things which Athenæus propoſed to them, ſo that they conſidered his performances only in the worſt light as a mere compilation and collection of quotations. But with regard to us, who can conſult but a very ſmall part of the Authors cited by him, and can only find in his book an hundred curious particulars which he mentions, we conſider his compilation as a very valuable treaſure; we conſider it only in the moſt favourable light, and we transfer to the Author the eſteem which we have for the rare particulars which he mentions, and which are become rare, only becauſe the books, from which he took them, are not now extant. By this means a compiler, who is abſolutely deſpiſed in the preſent age, will be admired a thouſand years hence, if there ſhall happen in the Republick of Letters the ſame revolutions, which occaſioned the loſs of the greateſt part of the antient Greek and Roman Authors. We cannot be certain, that ſuch a revolution will never happen. We ought not to cenſure thoſe, who compile; they labour perhaps more for the advantage of future ages, than thoſe Authors who borrow nothing from their fellow-writers. We find in the *Deipnoſophiſts* of our Author ſeveral ſatyrical ſtrokes, and a great many pieces of ſcandalous hiſtory, with a variety of obſcene ſtories. There is no book extant, which has been worſe handled by the Tranſcribers than Athenæus [*C*]. All the editions which we have of it, are very defective [*D*]. Some perſon has made an abridgment of this work [*E*]. Moreri has attempted to ſay ſomething of this, and has

(b) Δειπνοσοφιστῶν Βίβλια πεντεκαὶ δέκα. *Deipnoſophiſticorum Libri quindecim.* Voſſius would have done better not to have made uſe twice in the ſame page (it is the 232 *de Hiſtor. Græcis*) of the word Δειπνοσοφιστικῶν.

(7) Ἐν τοῖς περὶ Ἀλεξανδρείας. i. e. "In his "books concern-"ing Alexan-"dria." Athen. lib. 15. pag. 676.
(8) Athen. lib. 5. pag. 211.
(9) Voſſ. *de Hiſt. Græc.* pag. 232.
(10) Athen. lib. 4. cap. 13. *in fine.*

ſed himſelf in this manner in a work concerning that city (7). It was Athenæus therefore, who made uſe of that phraſe, after he had concluded what he had quoted out of Callixenus.

[*B*] *The works which he wrote.*] He wrote one concerning the *Kings of Syria*, as he informs us himſelf (8). Voſſius aſcribes to him another *concerning the illuſtrious Men and Generals of Armies, who had fought duels* (9). He founded this upon the words of the fourth Book: Ὅτι δὲ καὶ οἱ ἔνδοξοι καὶ οἱ ἀγχιμάχοι ἐμονομάχησαν καὶ ἐκ προκλήσεως τοῦτ' ἐποίουν, ἐν ἄλλοις εἰρήκαμεν (10). i. e. "We have obſerved in another place, "that illuſtrious Men and Generals of Armies being "challenged did not refuſe to engage in ſingle com-"bat." This ſubject would be very proper for a particular treatiſe; but it might have been likewiſe inſerted as an Epiſode in another work, and eſpecially by an Author who travels ſo far in a ſhort time, and loves a Rhapſody ſo much as Athenæus. Upon this account Voſſius's opinion is not very certain.

[*C*] *There is no Book extant, which has been worſe handled by the Tranſcribers than Athenæus.*] It is impoſſible to reckon the omiſſions, tranſpoſitions, and falſe readings in it, the number of them is ſo great. Theſe faults may be imputed to the Tranſcribers; but with regard to the loſs of part of the work, we muſt not blame them ſo much for it. The two firſt Books are wanting, with the beginning of the third, and the greateſt part of the laſt. To ſupply this loſs in the beſt manner poſſible, the abridgment of what is loſt has been publiſhed with what remains intire; for, as I ſhall ſhew immediately, we have an abridgment of the whole work ſtill extant.

[*D*] *All the Editions, which we have of it, are very defective.*] The firſt is that which Aldus Manucius publiſhed in 1514. Marcus Muſurus, a Greek by nation, aſſiſted him in the publication of this Edition. However as they had no good manuſcripts, and were not ſo accurate as was neceſſary in correcting it, there remained an infinite number of faults in it. The Baſil Edition, which followed this in 1535 *apud Joannem Valderum* in folio, publiſhed by James Bedrot and Chriſtian Herlinus, is equally bad. Natalis Comes ventured to tranſlate Athenæus into Latin. Every one knows that he was a Man of Learning. We find by his Mythology that he had read and ſtudied a great deal; but as he was not at all converſant in critical Learning, it is certain that his tranſlation is the moſt wretched performance imaginable. This is the firſt verſion which was publiſhed of it. *Ante omnes (nam de Sanga Romano vereor ut credendum ſit Paulo Jovio,) Latinum fecit Athenæum* (11). i. e. "He was the firſt who tranſlated Athenæus into Latin; "for with regard to Sanga the Roman, I am afraid "we cannot truſt Paulus Jovius." *Quamvis rumor ſpargeretur Sangam Patritium Romanum, virum, ut aiunt, eximiæ doctrinæ, id præſtitiſſe* (12). i. e. "Tho' "there is a report, that Sanga a Roman Patrician, "and a man, as it is ſaid, of excellent learning, per-"formed that taſk." Caſaubon does not tell us where Paulus Jovius ſays this. It is in his Book *de Piſcibus Romanis*. His words are as follow: *Sanga Romanus, Poeta lepidus, cujus beneficio Athenæum Latinum legimus* (13). i. e. "Sanga a Roman, and a Poet of "great wit, by whoſe means we read Athenæus in "Latin." But theſe five laſt words are not to be found in the Edition of Baſil in 1561 *per Henricum & Petrum Pernam*; which ſhews, that Paulus Jovius had acknowledged that he was miſtaken. Dalechamp, a celebrated Phyſician, publiſhed a ſecond tranſlation, which is preferable to that of Natalis Comes, and would have been much better than it is, if the Author had had leſs practice. But as he applied himſelf to his profeſſion, and only allowed to Athenæus the leiſure, which he had remaining from the attendance upon his patients, he did not perform all that might have been expected from him, tho' for almoſt thirty years together he had devoted to this work all the time, that his employment would allow him (14). This is the utmoſt which has been done for our Author. Dalechamp's Edition, with the Greek on one ſide and the Latin on the other, with the volume of Notes by Caſaubon, is the beſt that can be procured. The Abbé des Marolles has tranſlated this Author into French. I do not at all doubt but that he followed the Latin tranſlation as his only model, and has committed a great number of faults. I know nothing of this performance but from the *Journal des Savans* (15). It is in 4to, and was printed at Paris in 1680. It is the firſt French verſion of the original, and the laſt compoſition of the Tranſlator. I have been informed, that it ſold ſo well, that it is ſcarce to be met with among the Bookſellers, and bears an exceſſive price. With regard to Sanga's verſion, ſee above the quotations (11), (12), and (13).

(11) Caſaub. *Præfat. Animadv. in Athen.*

(12) Dalechamp. *Epiſt. Dedic. Athen.*

(13) Cap. 31. pag. 164. edit. 1531. *ex officinâ Frobenianâ.*

(14) *Ex præfatione Caſauloni in Athen.*

(15) Of the 20th of May 1680.

[*E*] *Some perſon has made an abridgment of this work.*] Caſaubon frankly acknowledges, that the Author of this Abridgment is abſolutely unknown to him, and that he could not tell either his name, or country, or age, in which he lived (16). However he places him above five hundred years above himſelf, and he is well aſſured, that he ought to be placed

(16) Caſaub. *Animadv. in Athen. init.*

has been greatly miſtaken [F]. All that he tells us of Athenæus, and two other perſons of that name, is defective [G]. We ſhall ſee in what this defect conſiſts in the laſt note of this Article.

placed higher than Euſtathius (17), becauſe Euſtathius has more than once made uſe of the Abridgment of Athenæus preferable to the original, which has occaſioned him to fall into ſome miſtakes (18). Caſaubon aſſerts that this Abridger was ſome Grammarian or other, who undertook the ſame taſk with regard to Athenæus, as Hermolaus had done with regard to Stephanus Byzantinus, and that he deſerves in ſome reſpects to be commended for his learning, and in others to be cenſured for want of exactneſs (19). The manuſcripts of Athenæus were already very much corrupted, when this Abridgment was made. This may be proved by two reaſons. We find in the Abridgment ſeveral corruptions like thoſe of thoſe manuſcripts; and the Author of the Abridgment himſelf confeſſes, that he has omitted ſome things, becauſe they had been falſified (20). Caſaubon had the manuſcript of the Abridgment (21). David Hoeſchelius ſent it to him. The firſt Book and part of the ſecond was wanting in it; ſo that there was retrenched from the beginning of it almoſt all that had been inſerted in the Editions of Athenæus to ſupply what was loſt in the Deipnoſophiſts.

(17) Idem, *in Præfat. & in Animadv.* p. 3.

(18) Idem, *in Animadv.* p. 1 and 2.

(19) Idem, ibid. pag. 3.

(20) Idem, *in Præfat.*

(21) Idem, *Animadv. initio.*

[F] *Moreri has attempted to ſay ſomething of this; and has been greatly miſtaken.*] His words are as follow: *Athenæus wrote a work of the Deipnoſophiſts in fifteen Books, which Hermolaus of Byzantium abridged, according to Suidas.* I ſhall ſay nothing of his omiſſion. It is evident that he ſhould have told us, whether what we have is the work itſelf, or only the abridgment of it, which he ſpeaks of. But let us confine ourſelves to his faults of commiſſion. I. It is falſe, that Hermolaus of Bizantium abridged Athenæus. II. It is falſe, that Suidas ſays it. III. It is falſe, that Suidas has mentioned any one, who abridged the Deipnoſophiſts. Caſaubon ſeemed to me at firſt to have been the occaſion of theſe miſtakes; I mean, the innocent occaſion of them; for who could have imagined, that any perſon could have ſtumbled in theſe word? *Putem confectum Conſtantinopoli ante annos quingentos & amplius hanc Epitomen ab aliquo Grammatico, qualis fuit Hermolaus Byzantius Auctor eorum Excerptorum, quæ hodie pro Ἐθνικῶν Stephani libris in doctorum manibus verſantur* (22). i. e. "I ſhould "think, that this Abridgment was made at Conſtan"tinople above five hundred years ago by ſome Gram"marian; ſuch an one as Hermolaus of Byzantium, "the Author of thoſe *Excerpta*, which are at preſent "in the hands of learned men inſtead of Stephanus's "*Ethnica*." But I found afterwards, that it was Charles Stephens, who miſled Moreri. I am of opinion, that Volaterranus was the firſt, who falſely aſſerted, that Suidas ſays, that Hermolaus of Byzantium had abridged Athenæus. This error of Volaterranus was taken in the Edition of Athenæus in 1535, as we may be informed without conſulting that Edition by Geſner's *Bibliotheca*. How eaſy ſoever it was to avoid the falling into the ſame miſtake, ſince Geſner took notice of it, yet it is certain, that Charles Stephens, Lloyd, and Hoſman have run into it, and have likewiſe aſſerted what is ſtill worſe, that we have nothing of Athenæus remaining but the Abridgment of Hermolaus of Byzantium. *Opus, quod ad nos ſane haudquaquam integrum pervenit; ejus Epitome ab Hermolao Byzantio* TANTUM *relicta, Authore Suidâ.* i. e. "A work, which has not come "down to us entire, the Abridgment of it by Her"molaus of Byzantium ONLY remaining, according "to Suidas."

(22) Idem, *Animadv.* pag. 3.

[G] *All that he tells us . . . . of two other perſons of that name is very defective.*] Theſe two are Athenæus the Hiſtorian and Athenæus the Philoſopher. Moreri tells us, that the former wrote *the Hiſtory of Semiramis*, and that this Hiſtory is to be found in the ſecond Book of Diodorus Siculus, and that Muretus has copied it without quoting the Author. A reader muſt be very inattentive not to perceive, that thoſe words contain ſomething of a contradiction. Is it uſual for an Hiſtorian to place in a little corner of his work all that another Hiſtorian wrote concerning a long reign and one very fruitful in events? Could a critic of Muretus's character include in one of his ſhort chapters (23) the whole Life of Semiramis? This is abſurd. He ſhould therefore have expreſſed himſelf in ſome ſuch manner as this: *Diodorus Siculus relates an action of Semiramis, and quotes an Author, whoſe name was Athenæus. Muretus relates the ſame action without citing any Author.* To conclude from thence, that this Athenæus had written the Hiſtory of Semiramis, and conſequently that he ought to be placed among the Hiſtorians, is too haſty a way of proceeding. For upon ſuch a view Seneca muſt have written the Hiſtory of almoſt all the great Men; for there is ſcarce any one, of whom he has not mentioned ſome action or other, or ſome remarkable ſentence. This is urged in oppoſition to Voſſius, who at all adventures has placed the Author mentioned by Diodorus Siculus among the Hiſtorians. But he has taken care not to aſſert poſitively, that this Athenæus wrote the Hiſtory of Semiramis.

(23) It is the 17th of the 6th book of his *Variæ Lectiones.* Moreri has quoted it; but the quotation is placed under the article of ATHENÆUS the Phyſician.

With regard to Athenæus the Philoſopher, it is a miſtake, that Strabo quoted by Moreri affirms that he taught at Rome the Philoſophy of Ariſtotle; that upon his return home, he was accuſed of having a deſign of forming a Republick, and that he was ſeized. What Strabo tells us is as follows (24): "Athenæus, "a Peripatetic Philoſopher, born at Seleucia in Cili"cia, had a ſhare in the Government, and was a De"magogue (25) in his own country for ſome time. "Afterwards he became an intimate friend of Murena, "and fled away with him, when it was diſcovered, "that Murena conſpired againſt Auguſtus. He was "ſeized in his flight, but the Emperor not finding "him guilty, ſet him at liberty. Athenæus returned "to Rome, and repeated to thoſe, whom he met, theſe "words of Euripides,

(24) Lib. 14. pag. 461.

(25) I hope I may be allowed to make uſe of this word after the manner of the Greeks to ſignify thoſe, who by their ſpeeches gained a great aſcendant over the people, and engaged them to take ſuch reſolutions as they thought proper.

Ἥκω τιχρῶν κευθμῶνα καὶ σκότου πύλας
Λιπών.

"*I am juſt come from the cave of the dead and the* "*gates of darkneſs.*" It is impoſſible to conceive whence theſe errors of Moreri ſprung; for it ſeems to be more difficult to give ſuch a falſe repreſentation of things, than to relate them as they are to be found.

☞ATHENODORUS ſurnamed Cordylio, a very eminent Stoic Philoſopher, was probably of Pergamus (*a*), where he lived till he was very much advanced in years. He conſtantly refuſed to accept the favours which Kings and Generals would have beſtowed upon him. Cato the younger being in Aſia at the head of an army, and knowing the merit of this great man, was very deſirous of having him with him; but thinking that a letter would not prevail upon him to leave his retirement, he reſolved to go himſelf to Pergamus, and by his entreaties and prayers, he prevailed upon Athenodorus to follow him to the camp, whither he returned in a triumphant manner, being more remarkable for his new acquiſition, than Lucullus or Pompey could be for the conqueſts they had made (*b*). Athenodorus continued till his death with Cato, in whoſe houſe he died (*c*). He is perhaps the ſame who is mentioned by Diogenes Laertius [*A*], in the *Life of Zeno Citticus.*

(*a*) A city of Aſia Minor, formerly the Capital of the Kingdom of Attalus.

(*b*) Plutarch. *in Vita Catonis Minoris, Oper.* tom. 1. pag. 665. ed. Pariſ. 1624.

(*c*) Strabo, lib. 14. pag. 674.

ATHENODORUS

(1) Lib. 7. *in Zenone Citticeo,* pag. 250 edit. Steph. Gr. 8vo, 1570.

[H] *He is perhaps the ſame, who is mentioned by Diogenes Laertius.*] That Author tells us (1), from Iſidorus the Rhetorician, that *Apollodorus the Stoic, who had the care of the Library at Pergamus, expunged out*

☞ ATHENODORUS the ſon of Sandon was a famous Stoic Philoſopher. He was born at Tarſus (*a*), or perhaps in a village near it, whence he was ſurnamed *Cananita*. He went to the court of the Emperor Auguſtus, but we cannot tell at what age. The Emperor beſtowed the greateſt honours upon him (*b*), and made him Tutor to Tiberius (*c*). It appears that Auguſtus had a very great eſteem for him, and found by experience that Athenodorus was a man of virtue and probity (*d*). This Philoſopher uſed to ſpeak very freely to the Emperor, and to give him advice even in a very extraordinary manner, of which we ſhall relate an inſtance in the note [*A*]. Having continued at court till he was very old, he deſired leave to return into his own country, which the Emperor granted him. Before he went away, he warned the Emperor not to give himſelf up to anger, but, whenever he ſhould be in a paſſion, to rehearſe the four and twenty letters of the alphabet, before he reſolved to ſay or do any thing; whereupon Auguſtus taking him by the hand, *I want*, ſaid he, *your aſſiſtance ſtill longer*, and kept him for a year more (*e*). Plutarch, who tells us this, relates in another place an action of Athenodorus, which ſhews, that this Philoſopher had very good principles even in his youth [*B*]. When he was returned to Tarſus, he there laboured to reſtore the liberty of his country, where one Boetius, as bad a Poet as a Citizen, having gained the favour of the mob, acted the Tyrant. Athenodorus finding the city in a very ill ſituation, endeavoured at firſt by good words to reclaim Boetius and his followers; but finding that his mildneſs only encreaſed their pride and inſolence, he at laſt reſolved to exert the power which the Emperor had given him, and baniſhed Boetius, with his chief partizans (*f*). We are not told when he died, but ſince he was very old when he left the court of Auguſtus, it is very probable that he did not live to ſee how unſucceſsful he had been in the education of Tiberius. He wrote ſeveral works [*C*], mentioned by the Ancients, but none of them are extant.

(*a*) *In Cilicia.*

(*b*) Strabo, lib. 14. pag. 674.

(*c*) Suetonius, *in ejus Vita*, cap. 4.

(*d*) Dion Caſſius, lib. 52. p. m. 562.

(*e*) Plutarch. *in Apophthegm. Oper.* tom. 2. pag. 207.

(*f*) Strabo, *ubi ſupra.*

of the Books there, all what had been ſaid amiſs by the Stoics: but this being diſcovered, brought Athenodorus into ſome danger, ſo that he reſtored again the paſſages, which he had eraſed. Now ſince Athenodorus Cordylio lived a long time at Pergamus, where Cato met him, and ſince he was a great Stoic, it is probable that he was zealous enough for the glory of his ſect, to expunge out of their Books, whatever might be a diſhonour to them. We may obſerve, that we do not find, that the Athenodorus, of whom we ſhall give an account in the next article, ever was at Pergamus, tho' his native place not being very far from that city, we dare not be poſitive. If Diogenes Laertius had been more careful to diſtinguiſh the perſons, of whom he ſpeaks, when they have the ſame name, he would have ſaved the critics a great deal of trouble. He mentions in the ſame place (2), another Athenodorus, who was the diſciple of Zeno Citticus, and conſequently much more ancient than Athenodorus Cordylio.

(2) Ibid. p. 251.

P.

[*A*] *An inſtance of his free advice to the Emperor.*] It is well known that Auguſtus extremely loved the company of women, and that even the Roman Senators often ſent him their wives, who were generally in a covered chair or litter, that they might not be ſeen. It happened one day, that Athenodorus met a Senator, who was extremely concerned, becauſe the Emperor had ſent for his wife, who was very beautiful. The Philoſopher took hold of this opportunity, to make the Emperor ſenſible of the danger to which he expoſed himſelf by theſe practices. He put himſelf into the chair inſtead of the Senator's wife, and taking a naked ſword in his hand, he ordered the chairmen to carry him to Auguſtus. As ſoon as he was come into his preſence, he ruſhed out of the chair ſword in hand, as tho' he had intended to murther the Emperor, who was at firſt exceedingly terrified; but when Athenodorus had acquainted him with his intention, Auguſtus was very well pleaſed with the contrivance, and promiſed upon oath never to expoſe himſelf thus any more (1). Cedrenus, who gives us a very particular account of this, is miſtaken, where he calls Athenodorus an Alexandrian. Strabo, who was this Philoſopher's contemporary, was no doubt better acquainted with the place of his birth; and he tells us (2) expreſly that Tarſus was his native country, πατρὶς.

(1) Dion Caſſius, lib. 56. pag. 686. *and* Cedrenus, *Hiſtor. Comp.* pag. 172.

(2) Lib. 14. pag. 674.

[*B*] *This Philoſopher had very good principles even in his youth.*] He had an elder brother called Xeno, who was left guardian to him, and had ſquandered away the beſt part of his eſtate. At laſt he was condemned for a rape, and all his goods confiſcated. Athenodorus was at that time very young, and part of his brother's confiſcated eſtate being delivered to him, he would not forſake him, but gave him half of the eſtate; and tho' his brother acted in a very ungrateful manner to him, even at the time when he ſhared his eſtate with him, yet he did not ſhew him the leaſt reſentment, but ſupported with the utmoſt patience, and greatneſs of mind his brother's ill-nature (3).

(3) Plutarch. *de Fraterno Amore, Oper.* tom. 2. p. m. 484.

[*C*] *He wrote ſeveral works.*] Athenæus mentions one (4), intitled, περὶ σπουδῆς καὶ παιδιᾶς, i. e. "Of "things ſerious and jocoſe." Laertius quotes (5) the eighth Book of a work, intitled, περιπάτων, *Diſſertations*, in which Athenodorus ſaid, that one Diogenes of Tarſus uſed to anoint himſelf, which made him always look neat and bright. Strabo ſays (6), that he wrote concerning the ocean, and its tide. Laſtly, we find in Stephanus (7), that Athenodorus wrote the hiſtory of his own country. Stephanus's words are, Ἐπὶ ὁ Ἀγχιάλη κλίσμα τ' Ἀγχιάλης τῆς Ἰαπέτου θυγατρὸς, ὡς Ἀθηνόδωρος περὶ τῆς αὐτῆ πατρίδης γράφων, &c. i. e. "Anchiale was founded by Anchiale the daughter of "Japetus, as Athenodorus writes in his Book concern-"ing his own country." However, we cannot be poſitive that all theſe works were written by the ſame Athenodorus, tho' nothing appears to the contrary, as Voſſius (8) juſtly obſerves.

(4) *Apud* Voſſium, *de Hiſt. Græc.* lib. 2. cap. 5.

(5) *In Diogene, verſus finem.* p. m. 727. edit. Steph. Gr. 8vo, 1570.

(6) Lib. 1. p. 6.

(7) *In voce* Ἀγχιάλη.

P.

(8) *Ubi ſupra.*

☞ ATKYNS (RICHARD), was deſcended from a good family [*A*], and born at Tuffleigh in Gloceſterſhire in the year 1615, and having been educated in Grammar Learning, was ſent to Baliol College in Oxford in 1629, and continued there two years as a Gentleman Commoner. He removed from thence to Lincoln's-Inn, and ſoon after travelled into France with the ſon of Thomas Lord Arundel of Wardour by a ſecond

[*A*] *Was deſcended from a good family.*] His father was ſon and heir of Richard Atkyns of Tuffleigh in Gloceſterſhire, Eſq; who was Chief Juſtice of Weſt-Wales, and one of Queen Elizabeth's Council of the Marches in Wales, and brother to Sir Edward Atkyns of Lincoln's Inn, one of the Barons of the Exchequer. His mother was ſecond daughter of Sir Edwin Sandys of Latimer in Bucks, Baronet, by his wife the Lady Elizabeth Sandys of the Vine near Baſingſtoke in Hampſhire, deſcended from Margaret Bray, the only child of John Bray, next brother and heir to Sir Reginald Bray, Knight-Banneret, and Knight of the Garter, who died without iſſue (1).

(1) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. Col. 595.

cond Venter; but the young Gentleman dying there, he returned home, and improved himſelf in the accompliſhments of a Courtier, and then married, which laſt circumſtance proved very unfortunate to him in the latter part of his life. Upon the breaking out of the civil wars he raiſed a troop of horſe for the King at his own charge, and ſerved him in a very particular manner; for which he afterwards ſuffered extremely in his eſtate. At the Reſtoration, being then a Colonel, he was made one of the Deputy-Lieutenants of Gloceſterſhire, and diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his attachment to the Government and to the Church of England. He wrote ſeveral Tracts [*B*]. At laſt being committed

[*B*] *He wrote ſeveral tracts.*] I. *The Original and Growth of Printing*, London 1664 in four ſheets in 4to. II. His *Vindication*. London 1669 in 4to. III. *A Relation of ſeveral paſſages in the Weſtern War of England*, wherein he was concerned. IV. *Sighs and Ejaculations*. Theſe two laſt pieces were printed with his *Vindication*. We ſhall give the reader ſome account of his *Original and Growth of Printing*, from Mr. Palmer's *General Hiſtory of Printing*, publiſhed at London in 1732, in 4to. *Book III. Chap. I.* All our Engliſh writers, who have mentioned the Introduction of that art into England before Mr. Atkyns, and particularly Stowe, Baker, and Howel, have proceeded only upon conjecture or common and fallacious reports; or perhaps the firſt of the abovementioned writers led the reſt into theſe miſtakes, that printing was not invented till the year 1459, nor brought into England till 1471; that the firſt preſſes were ſet up at the Abby of Weſtminſter; that Dr. Iſlip, Abbot of Weſtminſter, firſt introduced the art into England; and that London had it at leaſt ten years before any other city of Europe, except Mentz and Harlem. The falſity of ſeveral of theſe particulars appears from the firſt Book of the *General Hiſtory of Printing* abovementioned; and the reſt are manifeſtly diſproved by a Book in the Library of the late Lord Pembroke, which was printed at Oxford in 1468. But in 1664, Mr. Atkyns publiſhed his account of this Book, and of an old Manuſcript Chronicle, preſerved at Lambeth in the Archbiſhop's Palace, in his *Original and Growth of Printing*, which he publiſhed by order of Sir Will. Morrice then Secretary of State. The deſign of this Book, which is little more than an invective againſt the company of Stationers, is to prove that Printing is a branch of *the Royal Prerogative*, and a *Flower* of the *Engliſh Crown*. But the Chronicle, which a friend of his ſent him a copy of, is far from being of undoubted authority, ſince it is liable to theſe exceptions; 1. That neither Mr. Atkyns nor his anonymous friend pretend to have ſeen the original, much leſs to have compared the copy with it. 2. They give no account when and by whom this Chronicle was written, and how it was bequeathed to the Library at Lambeth. 3. No Author beſides Mr. Atkyns mentions this Chronicle in that Library, except thoſe, who wrote it from him; tho' that Author expreſſed his hopes, that his Book would occaſion the diſcovery and publication of it for the ſatisfaction of the public. 4. It is not to be found there now, the late Earl of Pembroke having employed a perſon to ſearch for it, but in vain. 5. It gives an account of ſome particulars, abſolutely inconſiſtent with the more authentic accounts which we are now maſters of, with reſpect to the circumſtances of the firſt diſcovery of the art; ſo that we may ſuppoſe, that whoever the Author was, he has taken ſome part of his account from common report and from the Dutch, who have claimed the invention. We may add to this, that Mr. Atkyns has interſperſed his own obſervations, in the account of the author of the Chronicle in ſuch a manner, that it is very difficult to diſtinguiſh them exactly. However, as it gives the moſt probable and clear account of this affair, we ſhall preſent the reader with the Cronicle, which is as follows. *Thomas Bourcher, Archbiſhop of Canterbury moved the then King* (Henry VI) *to uſe all poſſible means for procuring a mold (for ſo 'twas then called) to be brought into this Kingdom. The King (a good man and much given to works of this nature) readily hearkened to the motion, and taking private advice how to effect this deſign, concluded it could not be brought about without great ſecrecy, and a conſiderable ſum of money given to ſuch perſon or perſons, as would draw off ſome of the workmen from Harlem in Holland, where John Guthenberg had newly invented it, and was himſelf perſonally at work. 'Twas reſolved that leſs than one thouſand marks would not produce the deſired effect; towards which ſum the Archbiſhop preſented the King with three hundred marks. The money being now prepared, the management of the deſign was committed to Mr.* Robert Tournour, *who then was of the robes to the King, and a perſon moſt in favour with him, of any of his condition. Mr.* Tournour *took to his aſſiſtance Mr.* Caxton, *a citizen of good abilities, who trading much into Holland might be a creditable pretence, as well for his going as ſtaying in the Low-countries. Mr.* Tournour *was in diſguiſe (his beard and hair quite ſhaven off;) but Mr.* Caxton *appeared known and publick. They having received the ſaid ſum of one thouſand marks, went firſt to Amſterdam, then to Leyden, not daring to enter Harlem itſelf; for the town was very jealous, having impriſoned and apprehended divers perſons, who came from other parts for the ſame purpoſe. They ſtayed till they had ſpent the whole one thouſand marks in gifts and expences, ſo that the King was fain to ſend five hundred marks more; Mr.* Tournour *having written to the King, that he had almoſt done his work, a bargain (as he ſaid) being ſtruck between him and two Hollanders for bringing off one of the workmen, who ſhould ſufficiently diſcover and teach this new art. At laſt with much ado they got off one of the under workmen, whoſe name was,* Frederick Corſells *(or rather* Corſellius,*) who late one night ſtole from his fellows in diſguiſe into a veſſel prepared before for that purpoſe, and ſo the wind (favouring the deſign) brought him ſafe to London. 'Twas not thought ſo prudent to ſet him on work at London, but by the Archbiſhop's means, who had been Vice-Chancellor and afterwards Chancellor of the Univerſity of Oxon, Corſellis was carried with a ſtrong guard to Oxon; which guard conſtantly watched to prevent* Corſellis *from any poſſible eſcape, till he had made good his promiſe, in teaching how to print; ſo that at Oxford printing was firſt ſet up in England; which was before there was any printing-preſs or Printer in France, Spain, Italy, or Germany, except the city of Mentz, which claims ſeniority as to printing, even of Harlem itſelf, calling herſelf* Urbem Moguntinam artis Typocraphicæ inventricem primam; *tho' 'tis known to be otherwiſe, that city gaining that art by the brother of one of the workmen of Harlem, who had learned it at home of his brother, and after ſet up for himſelf at Mentz. This preſs at Oxon was at leaſt ten years before there was any printing in Europe (except at Harlem and Mentz,) where alſo it was but new born. This preſs at Oxford was afterwards found inconvenient to be the ſole printing place of England, as being too far from London, and the ſea; whereupon the King ſet up a preſs at St. Albans, and another at the Abby of Weſtminſter, where they printed ſeveral books of Divinity and Phyſick; for the King, for reaſons beſt known to himſelf and council, permitted then no law-books to be printed, nor did any Printer exerciſe that art, but only ſuch as were the King's ſworn ſervants, the King himſelf paying the price and emolument for printing books.* Thus far the Chronicle, or Mr. Atkyns's extract from it. But the author of it, as Mr. Palmer obſerves (2), is miſtaken in ſeveral points. 1. In ſuppoſing Harlem to be the place, from whence *Corſellis* came. It is not probable, that the art was invented there, eſpecially by Guttenberg, or in the year 1459, ſince it appears, that the Pſalter was printed at Mentz by Fauſt two years before that, beſides the ſeveral books printed with wooden blocks. 2. If the book mentioned by Mr. Atkyns to have been printed at Oxford, in 1468, be the firſt book printed there, it is plain, that this city had not the art ten years before any other; becauſe there is extant a book printed at Straſburg, by John Guttenberg in 1458. It was likewiſe at Venice, in the monaſtery of Sublaco, Augſburg, Rome and France before 1468. If it be urged, that there might be other books printed before that at Oxford,

(2) Pag. 125.

committed priſoner to the Marſhalſea in Southwark for debt, he died there the 14th of September 1677. He had the character of a very ingenious and intelligent perſon (*a*).

(*a*) Wood, *Ath. Oxonienſ.* vol. 2. Col. 595, 596. 2d edit. London, 1721.

or that it required ſome time to provide all the neceſſary materials of a printing-houſe, the ſame plea will equally ſerve for thoſe other places abovemention'd. 3. If we admit Guttenberg to have carried the art to Holland, which is extremely probable, it will ſtill be falſe, that Mentz received it from the brother of one of his workmen. Theſe are the inconſiſtencies and contradictions to plain facts, now certainly known, which derogate from the authority of this Chronicle, and of thoſe, who follow it. We have already hinted, that he rather followed the reports ſpread about from Holland, than made any ſtrict enquiry into this ſubject. This will appear more evident from the following conſiderations. 1. That during the infancy of the art (3), Fauſt and Schoeffer, and together with them Guttenberg, carried on the buſineſs with all poſſible ſecrecy, till the former being obliged to diſcover it at Paris for his own ſafety, being accuſed of magic, and the latter having broken the partnerſhip, and gone to ſet up the art elſewhere, it was thought of no further uſe to conceal his invention. 2. That Mr. Mattaire ſuppoſes, that Guttenberg being caſt at law, and ſentenced to reimburſe his moiety, and pay the charges of the ſuit, went away to Straſburg to evade the ſentence; where not thinking himſelf ſafe from further proſecution, he might really come down to Harlem, and there inſtruct Coſter or ſome others in this art. This ſeems to be more than probable, not only from the author of the Chronicle's mentioning Guttenberg, and not Coſter, as inventor of the art, but likewiſe from his dating the invention nine years later than it was diſcovered; which muſt be aſcribed to its not having been known at Harlem till the year 1459, tho' it had been practiſed at Mentz from the year 1450, or ſoon after. 2. If we conſider that Holland and the Low-Countries were the only places of Germany, into which we traded, whereas the city of Mentz, which lies very far in the Continent, was then little known to us; we ſhall not wonder, that our firſt accounts of the original of printing ſhould be taken from the Dutch, agreeably to their violent claims to the invention of it, and their ſtories invented to deprive Fauſt of the honour of his diſcovery; for the Chronicle acquaints us, that the city of Oxford received it from a fugitive ſervant of Guttenberg, who had learned it from his brother then working with him, and went to ſet it up there. There remains one ſingle difficulty ſtill; why the Chronicle aſcribes the invention to Guttenberg, when all the Dutch writers make no mention of him, but attribute it entirely to their countryman Coſter. To ſolve this, if we ſuppoſe this account given to the author by Frederick Corſellis, or even by Mr. Caxton or Turnour, which is very probable, we may juſtly preſume, that they ſpoke as they were informed upon the place, agreeably to the account which Guttenberg gave of himſelf and of his invention, which the Dutch did not venture to contradict till after his death or departure from Holland, when they aſſumed the whole diſcovery to themſelves, and repreſented Coſter as the ſole inventor, excluſive of every other pretenſion. We have inſiſted the longer upon theſe circumſtances, becauſe they notoriouſly demonſtrate, that thoſe contradictions to plain facts, univerſally known and aſſented to by all but the Dutch writers, confirm the authority of the reſt of the Chronicle; ſince they are exactly drawn from the legends of that nation, which were then generally believed over all the Low-Countries, and were the only accounts that our merchants, and particularly the two gentlemen employed by King Henry VI, could procure concerning the original of printing. And it is not improbable, that what the Chronicle of Mr. Atkyns mentions of the impriſonment of ſeveral perſons at Harlem on ſuſpicion of a deſign to ſteal the art, might be done rather out of fear, leſt any of thoſe ſtrangers ſhould deprive them of their honour by expoſing the vanity of their pretenſions, ſince themſelves could not be ignorant of what was done at Mentz long before that time. But before we diſmiſs this Chronicle, which, as we obſerved above, was unknown till Mr. Atkyns publiſhed it, we ſhall give an account, which Mr. Palmer found in a manuſcript in his poſſeſſion, and which ſeems to be older than the year 1664, when Mr. Atkyns printed his Chronicle. This account entirely agrees, except in a few circumſtances, with that of the Chronicle abovementioned; and is as follows.

(3) *See* Mr. Palmer's *General Hiſtory of Printing*, Book 1. and B. 3. pag. 125, 126.

The riſe and progreſs of printing in England.

The art of printing was firſt brought into England in the time of Henry VI. at the charges of the Archbiſhop of Canterbury (Bourchier,) *who employed one* Turnour *Maſter of the Robes to the King, and one Mr.* Caxton *a Mercer of London, but uſing the trade of a Merchant, to go to Harlem to endeavour to bring over ſome of the workmen, that had then newly practiſed the art there, who prevailed upon ſome of the under-workmen to come over with them into England, and to teach them their trade. As ſoon as they were landed, they were conveyed under a guard to the Univerſity of Oxford, for fear they ſhould run back again; and there they ſet up a preſs about the year* 1467, *as appears by ſeveral books, that were printed there about that time. The names of thoſe workmen were* Rood *an* Almayn (*or* German) *and* Winken de Worde; *and the charges of the journey coſt the Archbiſhop* 1500 *marks, as appears by ſeveral papers and memorials relating to this matter, that are ſtill extant in the Library at Lambeth. Shortly after there was a preſs ſet up at the Abbey of St. Albans, which continued to the diſſolution, &c.*

T.

☞ ATKINS or ETKINS (JAMES), Biſhop of Galloway in Scotland in the 17th Century, was the ſon of Mr. Henry Atkins, Sheriff and Commiſſary of Orkney, and born at Kirkwall in the Stewartry of Orkney. He was educated in the College at Edinburgh, where he commenced Maſter of Arts, and afterwards went to Oxford in order to compleat his ſtudies, eſpecially in Divinity, under Dr. Prideaux, the Regius Profeſſor there, in 1637. He was afterwards appoin ed Chaplain to James Marquis of Hamilton, the King's High Commiſſioner for Scotland; in which ſtation he acquitted himſelf ſo well, that his Patron upon his return to England procured a preſentation for him from the King to the Church of Birſa in the Stewartry of Orkney; where he continued ſome years, and was appointed Moderator of the Preſbytery. His loyalty expoſed him to great inconveniences and dangers till the Reſtoration [*A*]; when he attended Dr. Thomas

[*A*] *His loyalty expoſed him to great inconveniences and dangers till the reſtoration.*] In the beginning of the year 1650, when James Marquis of Montroſs landed in Orkney, Dr. Atkins was nominated by the unanimous votes of the Preſbytery to draw up a Declaration in their names and his own; which with their conſent and approbation was publiſhed, and contained very ſtrong expreſſions of loyalty and firm reſolution to adhere to their allegiance to the King. Upon this account the whole Preſbytery was depoſed by the General Aſſembly of the Kirk, which was ſitting at that time at Edinburgh, and the Dr. was likewiſe excommunicated for correſponding with the Marquis, who had fallen under the ſame cenſure. The Council of Scotland immediately paſt an Act for ſeizing of our Divine, in order that he might be tried for his life; but upon private notice from his Kinſman Sir Archibald Primeroſe, who was then Clerk of the Council, he eſcaped to Holland, where he concealed himſelf till the year 1653, when he returned to Scotland, and removed his family to Edinburgh, and lived there privately till 1660 (1).

(1) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 1171.

mas Sydſerf Biſhop of Galloway, who was the only Scots Biſhop living at the return of King Charles II; and came with him to London, where the Biſhop of Wincheſter preſented him to the Rectory of Winfrith in Dorſetſhire. He continued there till the year 1677, when he was conſecrated Biſhop of Murray in Scotland. In 1680 he was tranſlated to the See of Galloway, and had a diſpenſation granted him to reſide at Edinburgh, that he might not be expoſed to the violent zeal of the oppoſite party. His exemplary virtue and firm attachment to the Proteſtant religion, made his death extremely regretted [B], which happened by an apoplexy at Edinburgh the 28th of October 1687. He was then ſeventy four years of age, and his funeral ſermon was preached by John Biſhop of Dunkeld (a).

(a) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 1170, 1171. 2d edit. London, 1721.

[B] *His exemplary and firm attachment to the Proteſtant Religion made his death extremely regretted.*] Tho' he did not reſide upon his Dioceſe, yet he took all poſſible care of the government of it by Paſtoral Letters, which he frequently wrote to the Synods, Preſbyteries, and Miniſters, and even undertook a very long journey to viſit it, notwithſtanding the infirmities of old age, which he laboured under. He was remarkable for his ſincere piety and ſingular learning; and very zealous in oppoſing the taking off of the penal laws againſt Popery in Scotland; and notwithſtanding he was incapable of walking thro' age and ſickneſs, yet he was daily carried to the Parliament, where he declared publickly againſt aboliſhing of theſe laws, and uſed all his efforts to perſuade the Nobility and Gentry to a conſtant adherence to the Proteſtant Religion, and to oppoſe all the deſigns, which might be prejudicial to it (2). T. (2) Idem, Ibid.

ATRAX or ATRACIA (a), a city in Theſſaly (b) upon the Peneus, received its name from Atrax, the ſon of Peneus and Bura, who built it (c). It muſt have been very conſiderable, ſince the Poets ſometimes make uſe of the Epithet *Atracian* to ſignify Theſſalian [A]. Pliny places the Atracians among the people of Ætolia (d); but we muſt not infer from thence, that he meant a different people from thoſe who inhabited the city of Atrax, which he fixes in Theſſalia (e). The confines of the people and the diviſions of the provinces were frequently changed, and by that means the ſame province or diſtrict, which belonged at one time to Ætolia, was conſidered as belonging to Theſſalia at another time. The river ATRAX, which emptied itſelf in the Ionian Sea (f), paſſed thro' the country of the Atracians.

(a) Steph. Byzant. *verbo* Ἄτραξ.
(b) Strabo, lib. 9. pag. 303.
(c) Steph. Byz. *ubi ſupra.*
(d) Plin. *Hiſt. Natur.* lib. 4. cap. 2.
(e) Ibid. cap. 8.
(f) Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 2.

ATTALUS

[A] *The Poets ſometimes make uſe of the Epithet* Atracian *to ſignify* Theſſalian.] Ceneus, who was killed in the fight between the Centaurs and Lapithæ at the marriage of Perithous is called *Atracides* by Ovid (1); not to ſignify that he was the ſon of Atrax, for a little before he ſtiles him *the ſon of Elatus* (2); but to ſignify in general that he was of Theſſalia. I am not ignorant, that according to other Authors (3) he was the ſon of Atrax. The ſame Poet calls the wife of Perithous ſimply *Atracis*.

(1) *Metamorph.* lib. 12. verſ. 209.
(2) *Proles Elateia.* ibid. ver. 89.
(3) Antonini Liberal. *Metamorph.* cap. 17.

Deſine mirari poſito quod candida vino
Atracis ambiguos traxit in arma viros (4).

" Admire no more,
" That bold Perithous' beauteous wife ſhould warm
" The rugged Centaurs 'midſt the flowing banquet
" To dreadful conteſts."

(4) *Amorum*, lib. 1. Eleg. 4.

He gives her in another place the proper name of *Hippodamia*; but he adds the Epithet of *Atracis*:

An fera Centauris indicere bella coegit
Atracis Hæmonios Hippodamia Viros (5)?

" Did not fair Hippodamia rouſe the men
" In furious battle to engage the Centaurs?

(5) Ovid. Epiſt. Helenæ *circa finem.*

Valerius Flaccus diſtinguiſhes her by theſe words, *Atracia Virgo* (6).

(6) Argonaut. lib. 1. ver. 141.

We cannot ſuppoſe, that Ovid meant, that ſhe was the daughter of Atrax. This would prove too much. For then Ceneus muſt have had the ſame father; but he has made him the ſon of Elatus, and he has not told us, that Ceneus was brother to the Lady who was married; which would have been an unpardonable omiſſion, if he had thought that he was brother-in-law to Perithous.

I believe that Apuleius imagined, that the proper name of Perithous's wife was Atracis; for as he wrote in proſe, he would not have called her ſo, if he had known that this word was only a poetical figure. *Sic inſtar Atracis* (ſays he (7), *vel* (read &) *Peritheoi diſpectæ diſturbatæque nuptiæ.* Beroaldus has very juſtly diſcovered, that the Author is treating here of Hippodame (or Hippodamia) the wife of Perithous; but when he adds, that ſhe was called Atracis, becauſe ſhe was the daughter of Atrax, who was the firſt Author of Magic among the Theſſalians (8), he advances a thing, which he ought to have brought ſome proofs of; for we do not find that Atrax inſtituted Magic. It is true, that it was ſtiled *Ars Atracia* (9); but it was only in the ſame ſenſe as *Ars Theſſalica*, which ſignifies in general Magic, becauſe Theſſaly was famous for it (10). It is in the ſame ſenſe that we ought to underſtand theſe verſes of Valerius Flaccus:

(7) *Metamorph.* lib. 4. pag. 357. edit. *ann.* 1615.
(8) *See the notes of* Philip Beroaldus upon this paſſage of Apuleius.
(9) Statii *Thebaid.* lib. 1. ver. 106.
(10) Plin. *Hiſt. Nat.* lib. 30. c. 1.

Quamvis Atracio lunam ſpumare veneno
Sciret, & Hæmoniis agitari cantibus umbras (11).

" Altho' he knew the pallid moon would foam
" With dire Atracian poiſons; and the ſhades
" Would riſe from hell at his harmonious ſtrains."

(11) Argon. lib. 6. ver. 447.

The Scholiaſt upon Statius is the only Writer, if I am not miſtaken, who has aſſerted, that Atrax was the father of Hippodamia; for it is in this manner I would correct the word *Hippocatiæ*, and not, as Barthius has done, by Hippocrateæ (12). The Scholiaſt upon Homer's Odyſſey B. XXI, Euſtathius upon the ſame paſſage, and Hyginus C. XXXIII, tell us, that Perithous's wife was named Hippodamia, and that ſhe was the daughter of Adraſtus. I cannot tell whether the genitive caſe Ἄδρηκος has not been changed into Ἀδράστου. If this be the caſe, the true name of the father of Hippodamia muſt have been removed to make way for that of Adraſtus. The tranſcribers have introduced ſome alterations as difficult to be made as this. I ſhall produce an inſtance taken from this very ſubject. All the manuſcripts of Lycophron read at preſent ἅρπαγες λύκοι (13), i. e. " ravenous wolves." This ſignifies the Argonauts. But the copy, which Stephanus Byzantinus made uſe of, reads this paſſage, ἄτρακες λύκοι (14), i. e. " Atracian wolves," or wolves of Theſſalia. It is thus Euſtathius has cited this paſſage of Lycophron (15).

(12) *See* Barthius's *Commentary upon Statius*, tom. 2. pag. 30, 31.
(13) Lycophron. *Alexandra*, ver. 1309.
(14) Steph. Byzant. *in verbo* Ἄτραξ.
(15) *See* Canter upon theſe words of Lycophron.

As for what Barthius aſſerts, that *Atraciæ Oræ* in Propertius (16) ſignifies a diſtant place, and that Catullus has made uſe of the word *Atracis* in the ſame ſenſe (17), is not very well imagined. Some Criticks read in Catullus *Atacis*, a river in Gaul, and not *Atracis*, a river of Greece. However that be, we ought not to underſtand what Catullus and Propertius ſay in a literal ſenſe (18). With regard to what Barthius ſuppoſes, that they intended ſome alluſion to the magic Arts, it is a mere ridiculous imagination.

(16) Propert. Eleg. 8. lib. 1.
(17) Catull. Epigram. 96.
(18) *See* Scaliger upon the paſſage of Propertius.

ATTALUS the name of ſeveral Kings of Pergamus. See PERGAMUS.

☞ATTERBURY (LEWIS) leſs known by the Sermons which he publiſhed [*A*], than as the father of Dr. *Francis Atterbury* Biſhop of Rocheſter, was born about the year 1631 in Northamptonſhire, in which county his father, whoſe name was Francis, was Rector of Middleton or Milton, and ſubſcribed among other Miniſters to the lawfulneſs of the covenant in the year 1648. Our Author was entered a Student in Chriſt-Church Oxon in the beginning of 1647, when he was about ſixteen years of age. He ſubmitted afterwards to the authority of the Viſitors appointed by the Parliament (*a*), and took the degree of Bachelor of Arts on February the 23d 1649 (*b*). He was admitted or created Maſter of Arts in Convocation by virtue of a diſpenſation from the Chancellor on March the 1ſt 1651 (*c*). He became a Preacher during the times of the Uſurpation. But after the Reſtoration he was made Chaplain to Henry Duke of Gloceſter, and took the degree of Doctor of Divinity December the 1ſt 1660; and obtained afterwards the Rectory of Middleton's Keyns, or Milton near Newport-Pagnell in Buckinghamſhire (*d*). He was frequently involved in Law-ſuits, which required his attendance at London; upon his return from whence in the beginning of December 1693, he had the misfortune to be drowned near his own houſe (*e*). His eldeſt ſon, who was of the ſame name with himſelf, was likewiſe a Student in Chriſt Church, and took the degrees of Doctor of Laws in 1687, and publiſhed ſeveral volumes of Sermons. He died the 24th of October 1732.

His other ſon *Francis* will afford us ſufficient materials for a very curious Article.

(a) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 910. edit. 2. London 1721.

(b) Idem, *Faſti Oxon.* col. 70.

(c) Idem, ibid. col. 98.

(d) Idem, *Athen. Oxon.* col. 910. and *Faſti*, col. 728.

(e) Idem, *Athen. Oxon.* col. 911.

[*A*] *The ſermons, which he publiſhed.*] I. *The good Subject, or the right Teſt of Religion and Loyalty*, preached the 17th of July at the aſſizes at Buckingham, on *Prov.* xxiv. 21, 22. London 1684 in 4to. II. *The Ground of Chriſtian Feaſts, with the right way of keeping them*, preached at a meeting of ſeveral natives and inhabitants of the county of Bucks in the pariſh Church of St. Mary le Bow, on the 30th of November 1685. London 1686 in 4to. III. *Babylon's Downfall; or England's happy Deliverance from Popery and Slavery.* London 1691 in 4to (1). This is the ſubſtance of a ſermon preached at Guild-Hall Chapel, before the Lord Mayor and Aldermen the 28th of June 1691, and at Milton the 17th of Feb. 1688. Thus Mr. Wood writes in his *Athenæ Oxonienſes*; but in his *Faſti* (2), he ſays, that this ſermon was preached at Guild-Hall Chapel the 9th of January 1691. He ſuppoſes likewiſe (3), that our author publiſhed ſome other ſermons, which he had not ſeen. T.

(1) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 911. and *Faſti*, col. 128.

(2) Col. 128.

(3) *Athen. Oxon. ubi ſupra.*

☞ATTERBURY (FRANCIS), ſon of Dr. Lewis Atterbury, mentioned in the preceding article, was born at Milton near Newport-Pagnel in Buckinghamſhire, March the 6th 1662 (*a*). He was educated at Weſtminſter-School, and from thence elected, with the faireſt promiſes of the Great Man he afterwards proved, to Chriſt-Church-College in Oxford in the year 1680, when he was ſeventeen years of age (*b*). He ſoon diſtinguiſhed himſelf there by his fine genius, and admirable ſkill in polite Literature, and gave the public two years after a remarkable inſtance of his poetical talent in his Latin tranſlation of Mr. Dryden's *Abſalom* and *Achitophel* [*A*]. We have likewiſe among his Engliſh juvenile performances in verſe a beautiful Epigram upon a Lady's Fan [*B*]. June 13th 1684 he took the degree of Bachelor

(a) *Survey of the Cathedrals* by Brown Willis, Eſq; vol. 1. pag. 304. edit. London 1727.

(b) *Athenæ Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 1063. 2d edit. London 1721.

[*A*] *His Latin Tranſlation of Mr. Dryden's* Abſalom *and* Achitophel.] Mr. Wood in his *Athenæ Oxonienſes* (1) tells us, that in this Tranſlation he had the aſſiſtance of Mr. Francis Hickman, Student of Chriſt-Church; and that this Tranſlation was publiſhed in 4to 1682, under the following title: *Abſalon & Achitophel Poema Latino carmine donatum.* Oxon. 1682. There was alſo another Latin Verſion of the ſame Poem publiſhed the ſame year at Oxford by Mr. William Coward of Merton College (2), afterwards an eminent Phyſician. The original begins thus;

(1) Vol. 2. col. 1063 and 1064. 2d edit. 1721. See alſo the *Faſti Oxon.* col. 230.

(2) Wood, *Faſti Oxon. ubi ſupra.* and *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 947, 948.

" In pious times, e'er Prieſt-craft did begin,
" Before Polygamy was made a ſin;
" When man on many multiplied his kind,
" E'er one to one was curſedly confin'd:
" When nature prompted, and no laws deny'd
" Promiſcuous uſe of concubine and bride;
" Then Iſrael's Monarch, after Heav'n's own heart,
" His vigorous warmth did variouſly impart
" To wives and ſlaves; and wide as his command,
" Scatter'd his Maker's Image thro' the land." &c.

Mr. Atterbury's Tranſlation is as follows:

Cognovere pias nondum pia ſecula fraudes
Arte ſacerdotum, nondum vetuere maritos
Multiplici celebrare jugo connubia leges;
Cum vir ſponſarum numeraverat agmen, & uni
Non ſervare toro, fato adverſante, coactus
Plurima fertilibus produxit ſtemmata lumbis;
Cum ſtimulos natura daret, nec legibus ullis
Et ſponſæ & lenæ vetitum eſt commune cubile;
Tunc Iſraelis, cælo cedente, Monarcha
Concubitu vario vernas nuptaſque fovebat;
Quaque erat Imperii limes, ibi meſſe feraci
Tranſcripta Archetypi ſparſim generatur imago.

The other Latin Verſion mentioned by Mr. Wood, was publiſhed in 4to. We ſhall give a ſpecimen of the beginning of it, which the learned reader may compare with that of Mr. Atterbury, which ſeems much ſuperior to the other both in elegance and perſpicuity; and Mr. Wood obſerves *, that it was *more extolled than that of* Coward.

* *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 948.

Nondum myſtarum pia fraus eluſerat orbem,
Nondum uni conjux porrexerat ora capiſtro,
Sed ſimilem amplexa eſt, natura urgente, maritum
Sponſaque, & innocuo reſidens in fornice pellex.
Tunc, qui Judaicas rerum flectebat habenas
Jeſſides, cælo charum caput, integer ævi
Igne pari Nuptas arſit ſervaſque, Tonantis
Ectypa ſyderei brevibus tranſcripta tabellis
Diffundens lati vaga per confinia Regni.

[*B*] *We have likewiſe among his Engliſh juvenile performances in verſe a beautiful Epigram upon a Lady's Fan.*] It is ſaid, that the Lady, to whom he addreſſed theſe verſes, was afterwards his wife.

Flavia, the leaſt and ſlighteſt toy
Can with reſiſtleſs art employ.
This Fan in meaner hands would prove
An engine of ſmall force in love;
Yet ſhe with graceful air and mein,
Not to be told, or ſafely ſeen,
Directs its wanton motions ſo,
That it wounds more than Cupid's bow;
Gives coolneſs to the matchleſs Dame;
To ev'ry other breaſt a flame.

And

Bachelor of Arts (*b*); and April the 20th 1687, that of Master of Arts (*c*). The same year he exerted himself in the controversy with the Papists by publishing *An Answer to some Considerations on the Spirit of Martin Luther, and the Original of the Reformation* [C], wherein he vindicated that great Reformer in the strongest manner imaginable, and shewed

(*b*) Idem, *Fasti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 225.

(*c*) Idem, ibid. col. 230.

And here it may not be improper to present the reader with his Translation of two Odes of *Horace*, which he made when he was young. The former is that of *Ode* 3. *Book IV.*

He, on whose birth the lyric Queen
Of numbers smil'd, shall never grace
The Isthmian Gauntlet, nor be seen
First in the fam'd Olympick race.
He shall not after toils of war
And taming haughty Monarch's pride,
With lawrell'd brows conspicuous far,
To Jove's Tarpeian Temple ride.
But him the streams, that warbling flow
Rich Tyber's flow'ry meads along,
And shady groves, (his haunts) shall know
The Master of th' Æolian Song.
The sons of Rome, majestic Rome!
Have fix'd me in the Poet's Choir,
And envy now, or dead, or dumb,
Forbear to blame what they admire.
Goddess of the sweet-sounding lute,
Which thy harmonious touch obeys,
Who canst the sinny race, tho' mute,
To Cygnet's dying accents raise;
Thy gift it is, that all with ease
My new unrival'd honours own;
That I still live, and living please,
O Goddess! is thy gift alone.

The other is that of Ode 9. Book III.

H. Whilst I was fond, and you were kind,
Nor any dearer youth, reclin'd
On your soft bosom, sought to rest,
Phraates was not half so blest.
L. Whilst you ador'd no other face,
Nor lov'd me in the second place,
My happy celebrated fame
Outshone ev'n Ilia's envy'd flame.
H. Me Chloe now possesses whole,
Her voice and lyre command my soul;
Nor would I death itself decline,
Could her life ransom'd be with mine.
L. For me young lovely Calais burns,
And warmth for warmth my heart returns.
Twice would I life with ease resign,
Could his be ransom'd, once with mine.
H. What if sweet love, whose bands we broke,
Again should tame us to the yoke;
Should banish'd Chloe cease to reign,
And Lydia her lost pow'r regain?
L. Tho' Hesperus be less fair than he,
Thou wilder than the raging Sea,
Lighter than down, yet gladly I
With thee would live, with thee would die.

[C] *Exerted himself in the controversy with the Papists by publishing* An Answer to some considerations on the Spirit of Martin Luther and the Original of the Reformation.] The *Considerations*, which Mr. Atterbury answered, were written by Mr. Obadiah Walker, Master of University-College; and Mr. Atterbury's Answer was published the 10th of August 1687; to which a Reply was made by Mr. Thomas Deane M. A. and Fellow of University-College (3). Mr. Atterbury observes in the Preface to his Answer, that *the Doctrines have for near two Centuries kept the field against all encounterers. And does the Author think*, says he, *they may be foiled at last by two or three little remarks upon the Life and Actions of a single Reformer? But it looks like a jest, when the irregularities committed by Luther in Germany are turned upon us here in England. As if any thing that he said or did could affect a Church established upon its own bottom, and as independent on any foreign authorities, as the crown her Defender wears. Luther's voice is indeed to us, what our Author* (*a*) *terms it*, The Voice of a Stranger; *and though we are always ready to wipe off the unjust aspersions cast upon him by his enemies, yet this is what we are obliged to, not as sons, but as friends. Whenever injured virtue is set upon, every honest man is concerned in the quarrel. But these last attacks have been so very feeble, that had we for once trusted the cause to its own strength, 'twould have suffered but little damage.* He tells us afterwards, that his attempt is confined within the bounds of an answer; and pretends to nothing more than a bare pursuit of the Author step by step; and the laying open his blunders for the reader's ease, just in the same order they lie. *There was nothing frightful in this task, but the toil of being forced to think so long upon so very thoughtless a Writer. In all other respects 'twas as easy as one would wish. The History-Part lay within a little room; and the reasonings upon it were so thin, that they needed only setting in the light to be look'd through. In both my greatest helps have been drawn from one single Author the* Considerer *himself; who in every Book of his has made it appear, that he can write contradictions as well as believe them.* In his *Answer* he considers the objections urged against Luther's doctrines from the pretended defects in his morals, particularly with regard to *incontinence*, and *contention*, and *disobedience*. With respect to the first, he observes (4), that there is no one action thro' the whole course of Luther's Life, that can possibly come under that character, but only his marriage with Bora; which happened not till 1525, whereas he began his Reformation in 1517. *Fleshly Lusts* therefore could have given no just prejudice against his doctrine, when it first appeared, since his very adversaries do not till long after that charge them upon him. It is likewise certain, that he did not preach against the Vow of Continence till several years after. As for the other charge of *contention* and *disobedience* (5); the question is not *whether* Luther disobeyed, for that is confessed; but *when* and *in what manner* he did it. For if upon enquiry it be found, that for near three years together he treated his adversaries with all mildness, and paid a just deference to his superiors; if he threw not off their authority, while there was any hope left of doing things in a regular way, and mingled no gall in his expressions till after all the venomous mouths in Europe had been opened upon him, how can he with any colour of reason be termed contentious or disobedient? And that this was his case any impartial man, that reads the joint accounts of Sleidan, Soave, Melancthon, and Melchior Adamus, must needs acknowledge. Mr. Atterbury afterwards remarks (6), that Luther's doctrine with regard to Justification does not coincide with the *Solifidian* and *Fidiciary* opinion; since an hundred instances might be brought from his writings, where the necessity of good works in order to salvation is displayed; which is acknowledged by Cardinal Bellarmin, who allows that Luther taught that good works were in some measure necessary, because he affirms that to be no true faith, which does not produce good works. *Lutherus docet aliquo modo necessaria esse bona opera, cum affirmet veram fidem non esse, quæ non parit bona opera* (7). . . *I will not say*, continues our Author (8), *that in the prosecution of this he never went awry; he did so in reviving that doubt which was some time in the primitive Church of St. James's Epistle being canonical, because he thought it ran counter to St. Paul; but he withdrew this plea of his, when he was better informed; if quoting from it afterwards, as from Scripture, be owning its authority. . . . Indeed in the first Edition of his German Bible he calls it* Straminea, *not absolutely, but in comparison with those of St. Paul. But in all the Editions after* 1526 *it is left out; and the* arida, *the pamphlet talks of, is in none of them all.* He then considers the objections urged against Luther for depretiating religious vows, penance, &c. With respect to the novelty of his opinions, and his marching alone against the doctrine of the primitive ages, it deserves no other answer than that true jest of Scaliger's, *Nos non sumus Novatores, sed vos estis Veteratores* (9). He never denied the validity of the former Clergy's ordination, but proceeded in the work of his Ministry, without expecting any new mission (10).

(3) Idem, *Ath. Oxon.* col. 616, and 1064.

(*a*) Pag. 2. of *Consider.*

(4) See his *Answer to some Considerations, &c.* edit. London in 8vo, 1723. pag. 9, 10.

(5) Ibid. p. 10, 11.

(6) Ibid. pag. 17.

(7) Bellarm. *de Justificat.* lib. 4. cap. 1.

(8) *Answer, &c.* pag. 19.

(9) Ibid. pag. 47.

(d) Pag. 238, 239, edit. London 1732.

(10) Ibid.

(11) Pag. 49

(12) Pag. 53

(13) Pag. 5 & seq.

(14) Pag. 7 72.

(15) Pag. &c.

(16) Pag.

(17) Pag. 112, 113.

(18) Vari

ſhewed an uncommon fund of learning, enlivened with that agreeable ſpirit and vivacity peculiar to his writings. While he continued at the Univerſity he was tutor to Mr. Charles Boyle, afterwards Lord Orrery; but he ſoon began to be weary of a College life, as appears by a letter of his to his father [*D*] dated October the 24th 1690, and publiſhed in Mr. Budgell's *Memoirs of the Life and Character of the late Earl of Orrery* (*d*). In the year 1692, while he was only Student of Chriſt Church, he preached before Queen Mary at Whitehall on the 29th of May, a Sermon upon *The Duty of Praiſe and Thankſgiving*, which was publiſhed at London in 4to the ſame year (*e*). A diſappointment

(*d*) Pag. 238, 239, edit. London 1732.

(*e*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon. ubi ſupra.*

miſſion (10). But, it will be ſaid, he rejected the authority of Councils. Yes, *ſi quando contraria Scripturæ ſtatuunt*, whenever they determine any thing contrary to Scripture; and ſo do all the Reformed as well as he (11). Luther is next arraigned for ſpeaking contemptuouſly of the Fathers; but this is a rank calumny. Let his lateſt writings ſpeak for him in this point (12). *I ſay not this*, ſays he in his Commentary upon the ſecond chapter of Geneſis, to lay a blot upon *the holy Fathers, whoſe labours we ought with veneration to receive. They were great men; but men ſtill.* Mr. Atterbury then vindicates him from the imputation of deſpiſing Church-Guides, and yet arrogating to himſelf all the authority of them (13); and he obſerves (14), that *as for the heat, with which Luther treated his adverſaries, 'twas ſometimes ſtrained a little too far, but in the general was extremely well fitted by the Providence of God to rouſe up a people the moſt phlegmatic of any in Chriſtendom. Europe lay then under a deep lethargy, and was no otherwiſe to be reſcued from it, but by one, that* would cry mightily, and lift up his voice with *ſtrength. Beſides, Printing and Letters had juſt peeped abroad in the world, and the Reſtorers of Learning in Italy, taking the advantage of the preſs, wrote very eagerly againſt one another; ſo that invectives were in theſe days the faſhionable way of writing. If Luther therefore mingled a little gall with his ink in his Books of Controverſy, he followed but the humour of the age; and conſidering the ſtupidity, the malice, and the obſtinacy of his readers, cannot but be thought excuſable. I have ſeen at the end of Theodoret's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory a Catalogue of Cæſars, Biſhops, Heretics, &c. where Chryſoſtom is ſet down as guilty of too great ſharpneſs and liberty of ſpeech; but it is added,* profecto illorum temporum vitia ſecari atque uri, non levibus medelis curari voluere. *And this is the plea we would make for Luther.* Our Author then examines the reproach caſt upon that great Reformer for having *frequent intercourſes and dialogues with the Devil* (15), and particularly for the diſputes between them concerning *private Maſſes*, againſt which the Devil is ſaid to have urged many reaſons. Mr. Walker having attempted to anſwer theſe reaſons, Mr. Atterbury remarks with a great deal of humour, that *the tables are turned, and whereas the ſcene before lay betwixt Luther and Satan, 'tis now betwixt the Devil and the* Conſiderer. *And for my part,* ſays he (16), *to give every one his due, I think the Devil has much the better on't.* He afterwards obſerves (17), that the Church of England was not concerned in what Luther ſaid or did. Whilſt he was pulling down the Papacy in Germany, ſhe was carrying on the ſame deſign here at home. She had ſtruggled for a Reformation ever ſince Wickliff's days for about a hundred and fifty years together. Her Lollards (as they were called) had all along ſpoken, written, and died for it. She could not however bring it to the birth till about this time, when the eyes of all Europe began to be opened. Then it was ſhe puſh'd it forward, and threw off the Pope's yoke in concert with other churches. *Her proceedings,* continues he, *were regular, and by the joint authorities of the State civil and eccleſiaſtical. If irregularities were done elſewhere, let them anſwer for them, that did them. Whatever Luther's actions at that time might be, they concern us no more than the Hiſtorian's* (18) *flouriſh about Sultan Selim's conqueſt, does his Hiſtory of Hereſies. They were cotemporary indeed, and that's all; for there's no other dependance between them. But neither is the Reformation in general blaſted by this method. For let Luther be as bad as he will, yet the doctrine of the Apoſtles, and the primitive Church is, we hope, never the worſe for his preaching it. He pretended to no new Revelation; had he done ſo, 'twould have been requiſite perhaps, that he ſhould have lived up to it. He only pointed out ſome old truths, that had lain hid a great while, and detected ſome errors, which in the courſe of time had, like ruſt, overſpread Chriſtianity. Here have we nothing to do but to put ourſelves upon the ſearch, whether thoſe pretences of his to antiquity be true or falſe; for if they be true, 'tis a confeſt point, that they muſt be liſtened to, whoever he be that makes them.* Mr. Atterbury therefore concludes (19), that the method of Mr. *Walker*'s pamphlet is every way inſufficient; and let *the ſpirit of Martin Luther* be as *evil* as it is ſuppoſed to be, yet the proof of this would not blaſt any ſingle truth of that Religion he profeſſed; tho' upon a faithful enquiry it will be found, that *his life was led up to thoſe doctrines he preached, and his death was the death of the Righteous.* This piece of our author was the occaſion of Biſhop Burnet's ranking him in the firſt volume of *the Hiſtory of his own Time* (20) among thoſe eminent Divines, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their admirable defences of the Proteſtant Religion. And Biſhop Atterbury appeals to this himſelf in that part of his ſpeech upon his tryal, where he vindicates himſelf from the ſuſpicion of Popery. *Was I,* ſays he, *influenced by any diſlike of the eſtabliſhed Religion, and ſecretly inclined towards a Church of greater pomp and power? I have, my Lords, ever ſince I knew what Popery was, oppoſed it, and the better I knew it, the more I diſliked it. I begun my ſtudy in Divinity, when the Popiſh controverſy grew hot about that immortal book of Tillotſon's, when he undertook the Proteſtant cauſe in general, and as ſuch I eſteemed him above all. You will pardon me, my Lords, if I mention one thing. Thirty years ago I writ in defence of* Martin Luther, *and have preached and writ to that purpoſe from my infancy; and whatever happens to me, I will ſuffer any thing; and will, by God's Grace, burn at the ſtake, rather than depart from any material point of the Proteſtant Religion, as profeſſed in the Church of England.* Mr. *Wynne* likewiſe, who was his Council, in his defence of the Biſhop obſerves, "how grievous it was for one of his Lord-"ſhip's character and function, to be taxed with "breaches of his duty to God and man, of ſcandal "to Religion, of deſigns of overthrowing Church and "State in favour of Popery, who happens to be the "only Clergyman in England, that ever thought it "worth his while *to draw his pen in defence of Mar-*"*tin Luther*, the great inſtrument of our Reformation "from Popery, and who has upon all occaſions ap-"peared the moſt ſtrenuous aſſerter of it."

(10) Ibid.

(11) Pag. 49.

(12) Pag. 53.

(13) Pag. 56, & *ſeq.*

(14) Pag. 71, 72.

(15) Pag. 76, &c.

(16) Pag. 87.

(17) Pag. 111, 112, 113.

(18) *Varillas.*

(19) Pag. 118.

(20) Book pag. 674. edit. London 1722.

[*D*] *He ſoon began to be weary of a College-life, as appears by a letter of his to his father.*] Mr. Budgell who publiſhed this letter, obſerves, that it will not only *ſhew what opinion that* great genius *had of Mr. Boyle, but is likewiſe an evidence, what the conſciouſneſs of his own abilities forced him to think of* himſelf, *while he was yet a young man.* We ſhall quote ſome paſſages from that letter. *My pupil I never had a thought of parting with, till I left Oxford. I wiſh I could part with him to morrow on that ſcore; for I am perfectly wearied with the nauſeous circle of* ſmall affairs, *that can now neither divert nor inſtruct me. I was made, I am ſure, for* another ſcene, *and* another ſort *of converſation; though it has been my hard luck to be pinned down to this. I have thought and thought again,* Sir, *and for ſome years; now, I have never been able to think otherwiſe, than that I am loſing time every minute I ſtay here. The only benefit I ever propoſe to myſelf by the place, is ſtudying; and that I am not able to compaſs. Mr. Boyle takes up half my time; and I grudge it him not; for he's a fine gentleman. And while I am with him, I'll do what I can to make him a man. College and Univerſity buſineſs take up a great deal more; and I am forced to be uſeful to the Dean in a thouſand particulars, ſo that I have very little time.*

ment which he met with in an application to the late Earl of Nottingham, is ſaid to have been the reaſon of his coming up to London (*f*). For we are told, that ſome time before his father's death having ſollicited that Nobleman in order to ſucceed his father in the Rectory of Milton, the preference was given to Dr. Wotton, ſo that he loſt his expectation of that preferment, which he then called the height of his ambition, and matter of his option, eſpecially as it was the place of his birth. But this diſappointment proved the occaſion of his advancement, for in a ſhort time he diſtinguiſhed himſelf in ſuch a manner, that two years afterwards we find him made Chaplain to King William and Queen Mary, and choſen Lecturer of St. Bride's, and Preacher at Bridewell; before the Preſident and Governors of which Hoſpital, and thoſe of Bethlehem, he preached on the 16th of Auguſt 1694, being Election-Day, a remarkable Sermon in Bridewell Chapel on *The Power of Charity to cover Sin* [*E*]. October the 21ſt the ſame year he preached before the Queen at Whitehall a Sermon on *The Miraculous Propagation of the Goſpel*, and

(*f*) *See* Mr. Tho. Stackhouſe's *Memoirs of the Life and Conduct of Dr. Francis Atterbury late Biſhop of Rocheſter from his birth to his baniſhment*, pag. 18, 19. London 1723, in 8vo.

[*E*] *A remarkable Sermon . . . . on* the power of Charity to cover Sin.] His text was, 1 St. Peter iv. 8. *Charity ſhall cover a multitude of Sins:* from whence he inferred this general propoſition, "that the virtue "of Charity is of ſo great price in the ſight of God, "that thoſe perſons, who poſſeſs and exerciſe it in "any eminent manner are peculiarly entitled to the "divine favour and pardon, with regard to number-"leſs ſlips and failings in their duty, which they "may be otherwiſe guilty of. This great Chriſtian "perfection, of which they are maſters, ſhall make "many little imperfections to be overlooked and un-"obſerved; it ſhall *cover the multitude of Sins*." This occaſioned ſome obſervations upon that Sermon, by Mr. Hoadly, in the *Poſtſcript* to his *ſecond Letter to Dr. Atterbury*, publiſhed in the year 1708, and reprinted in his collection of Tracts (21) in 1715, where he obſerves, that he ſhould have left the main doctrine, tho' contrary to the deſign of the text, without any cenſure, conſidering that it might be underſtood only of ſuch unavoidable *ſlips* and *failings*, and *little imperfections*, as have not the wrath of God in another world expreſly revealed againſt them in the Goſpel; but that the particulars, which follow, and the manner, in which this general propoſition is explained, cannot ſo readily be paſſed over. Mr. Hoadly remarks then, that the Charity, which our author ſuppoſes to be of ſuch great efficacy, is ſometimes declared to be the love both of God and man, as comprehending all or almoſt all the moral duties, which is of greater extent than that of St. Peter, and leaves a man uncapable of very *groſs Sins*. And therefore the man actuated by this divine and comprehenſive virtue may properly, after this, be ſaid to have *no ſins to be covered*; becauſe Charity in this ſenſe is inconſiſtent with any, and cannot be ſaid to take away the guilt of them, but by taking away their exiſtence. Whereas the Charity meant by St. Peter is *Charity among ſt one another*, and a mutual forgiveneſs among mankind. But the moſt exceptionable part of Mr. Atterbury's Sermon is, that we are told, that *as for thoſe ſins, which a man had fallen into, before the attainment of this gift, they were certainly remitted alſo, and covered before the attainment of it; elſe doubtleſs he had never attained it*. On the contrary, we are aſſured in the Goſpel, that *unleſs we forgive men their treſpaſſes, our heavenly Father will not forgive us our treſpaſſes*, which we have at any time committed againſt him, and that our former ſins ſhall not be covered, till we have attained that *Charity*, to which the promiſe of forgiveneſs is annexed. Beſides, Mr. Atterbury's doctrine repreſents Charity to be of no force nor account with God with reſpect to our paſt ſins; which, it ſeems, he pardons without any regard to our attainment of Charity, nay, whilſt we are void of it, and before we have attained it; notwithſtanding he has expreſly declared the contrary. Mr. Hoadly then examines the following paſſage of the Sermon, wherein we are told, that *the charitable man is peculiarly entitled to the pardon of many ſins, becauſe he is in a peculiar manner liable to incur the guilt of many*; whereas juſt before the author had ſaid, that *the reſt of the virtues conſtantly attend upon Charity*; that *no great guilt of any kind can well be thought to harbour in that breaſt, where true Charity dwells*; and *the charitable man* was declared *uncapable of committing any heinous ſins*. But now he is the moſt liable of all others to incur the *guilt of many ſins*; and thoſe not of the lighteſt ſort, which proceed, according to Mr. Atterbury, from *that frame of mind, on which Charity is grafted; and from the very exerciſe of the virtue itſelf*. For *Charity*, ſays he, *is grafted always on good nature and a ſweetneſs of diſpoſition*. But this cannot be true, ſince the Goſpel requires the exerciſe of Charity from men of all ſorts of natural diſpoſitions. Beſides the temper, on which alone our author will permit Charity to be founded, is very far from the true good nature; ſince he declares it to be ſuch a temper, *as hinders us from arming ourſelves with that ſtubborn, incomplying virtue, which is requiſite to preſerve a man undefiled and blameleſs. It makes us eaſy and yielding, . . . ready to comply with a thouſand things, (of which we are not exactly well ſatisfied) upon the pure ſcore of good nature*, &c. This is undoubtedly a ſtrange account of the moſt excellent of Chriſtian virtues, which makes it the daughter of weakneſs, and the companion of a ſhipwreck'd conſcience. Again, the *exerciſe of Charity, eſpecially where the principle of it is ſtrong*, is declared by our author, *to lay us open to ſeveral failings*. For inſtance, 1. *It makes us omit oftentimes the duties incumbent on us from our profeſſions and callings*. 2. It makes us *perhaps neglect to take care of thoſe, whom it is the firſt point of Charity to take care of, our children and families*. 3. *It warms us with ſuch a zeal for doing good, as breaks out ſometimes into acts not reconcileable with the rules of right reaſon*; and Saint Francis's preaching the Goſpel to beaſts and birds is given as an inſtance of this: 4. *The charitable man, who loves every thing, doth not fail ſometimes to love his own virtue too; to be ſo ſtruck with the excellency of Charity, as to be too little concerned for faith*. Mr. Hoadly examines theſe aſſertions; and then proceeds to the third reaſon, which our author aſſigns for the pardon of the charitable man's ſins, which is, becauſe his Charity has engaged the *united prayers* of multitudes; *and no wonder if they prevail*. But if his ſins be ſuch as the Goſpel condemns, and he has not forſaken them, the united prayers of the whole creation will avail nothing towards his pardon. If they be ſuch, as Mr. Atterbury improperly ſtiles *ſins*, ſuch imperfections as are conſiſtent with *a ſtate of ſafety*, upon the terms declared in the Goſpel, they do not ſtand in need of ſuch united prayers. But what is this to the power of his own Charity to cover his ſins; when this is here aſcribed to the force of the *united prayers* of others, not to the virtue of his Charity? In the inferences, which our author draws from what he had before laid down, he obſerves, that *God hath a right to all the higheſt inſtances and degrees of virtue, that it is poſſible for us to abound in, that we are ſtrictly obliged to practiſe them to the utmoſt; and yet ſo far is he pleaſed to abate of this right, as to accept the performance of one great duty in lieu of the omiſſion* (he ſhould have ſaid, the *performance*) *of many others*. This *Act of Grace* he magnifies by obſerving, that *reaſon never did or could make this known to the Heathen world*; and adds, that the *Goſpel hath now revealed it unto us*. But Mr. Hoadly aſks, where this Revelation is to be found in the Goſpel, ſince it ſeems directly contrary to the whole tenour of it? This relaxes the obligations, which men are under to the diſcharge of their ſeveral duties; and upon this ſcheme, as Mr. Atterbury himſelf obſerves, we have no reaſon *to complain of the ſtrictneſs of our rule, or the hardſhips of our Chriſtian warfare. The rule is ſtrict indeed; but then as there are great helps and aſſiſtances, enabling us to live up to it, ſo great* abatements *and* allowances, *we ſee, are made to us at laſt, if we do*

(21) Pag. 213, & *ſeq.*

and October the 28th another, which was publiſhed and intitled, *The Scorner incapable of true Wiſdom* (*g*). This Sermon was immediately attacked in a piece in 8vo intitled, *A Twofold Vindication of the late Archbiſhop of Canterbury, and of the Author of the* Hiſtory of Religion, *the firſt part defending the ſaid Author againſt the defamations of Mr. Fr. Atterbury's Sermon, and both thoſe eminent perſons againſt a traiterous Libel, intitled,* The Charge of Socinianiſm againſt Dr. Tillotſon conſidered. *In two Letters to the Honourable Sir R. H. The ſecond containing Remarks on the ſaid Sermon, and a Reply to the ſame Libel. Wherein ſome right is done to that great and good man Dr. Tillotſon in the points of the* Original of Sacrifices, *the* Sacrifices of Chriſt, Future Puniſhments, &c. *And a Word in defence of the eminent Biſhop of Saliſbury. By another Hand.* London printed in the year 1696. We ſhall give ſome account of this piece in the note [*F*]. In December 1698 he reſigned his Lectureſhip at St. Bride's, as appears by his Farewel-Sermon [*G*]; in which he tells his audience, that during the ſeven years which he had held that Lectureſhip, he had preached the Goſpel of Chriſt in ſimplicity and godly ſincerity among them, directing his diſcourſes againſt thoſe vicious principles and practices, which ſeemed

(*g*) Mr. Wool, *ubi ſupra*, is miſtaken in the title of this Sermon, when he ſays it was *The Scorner incapable of true* Religion.

not. In ſhort, if our author's account of the Goſpel terms be juſt, St. Paul ought not to have ſaid, that *the Grace of God bringing ſalvation, hath appeared in the Goſpel, teaching us to deny ungodlineſs and worldly luſts, and to live ſoberly, righteouſly and godlily*; but that there is no neceſſity for theſe virtues, but that God will accept *of one duty in lieu of many others*; and that our performance of that ſhall be our juſtification, notwithſtanding our omiſſion of many others. *But this is a ſort of ſalvation, in my judgment*, ſays Mr. Hoadly, *unworthy of the nature of man to receive, and unworthy of the nature of God to offer.*

[*F*] *We ſhall give ſome account of this piece in the note.*] Mr. Atterbury having ſaid in his ſermon, that *ſome men, who write pretended Hiſtories of Religion, are beholden to the real Religion of others, that their Hiſtories are not written*; Sir Robert Howard, the author of *the Hiſtory of Religion*, who ſuppoſed himſelf to be intended by that paſſage, obſerves, in a letter prefixed to this piece, that as for Mr. Atterbury, he knew him not; *but he has made himſelf known*, ſays he, *by chooſing a very improper place (the pulpit) to vent a paſſion unſuitable to Chriſtianity or common morality; for ſuch muſt an injurious violence be eſteemed, that has no reaſon pretended to excuſe, or at leaſt to extenuate his paſſion. From that place we expect to be taught by perſuaſion, not by railing; yet he ſeems to have a Chriſtian conſideration, that hinders him from writing ſome body's life. If he means mine, I will free him from his tender Chriſtianity, and own that I writ* The Hiſtory of Religion; *and if he pleaſes to uſe the freedom I give him, I aſſure him, I ſhall not be diſpleaſed at any truth, that he can write; but if his uſual paſſion guides him otherways, I ſhall attend him with ſuch anſwers, and make him ſuch ſuitable returns, as will be proper for the occaſion, and conſider his calling with as little reſpect as he did the ſacred place, where he choſe to rail.* The author of the *firſt Letter* (22) tells us, that Mr. Atterbury's reſentment againſt Sir Robert Howard was particularly occaſioned by a paſſage againſt perſecution; wherein he adviſes the contending parties of Chriſtians, that "ſetting aſide their wranglings about obſcure and undecidable queſtions and myſteries, they would conſider the Goſpel as a doctrine chiefly of love, mercy, and charity, and behave themſelves accordingly towards one another." He remarks likewiſe, that one of the reaſons, which Mr. Atterbury alledges why *the ſcorner ſeeketh wiſdom, and findeth it not*, is a very ſtrange one; *becauſe*, ſays our Divine, *the Scorner is a man of quick and lively parts; and ſuch men are apt to give themſelves a looſe, beyond plain reaſon and common ſenſe.* The author of the Letter remarks upon this (23), that the whole deſign of that part of his ſermon is to ſhew, "that *quick and lively parts* are marvellous hindrances in the queſt of "wiſdom and truth. According to him, the only "hopeful candidate of wiſdom is Sancho Pancha." *He ſaith*, continues that author (24), *that the thing, which the Scorner ſeeketh for is wiſdom; and yet he adds, he finds it not, becauſe he has* quick and lively parts. *That is, according to this* Student (25), *the Scorner ſeeks for what he has, and he miſſes it, becauſe he poſſeſſes it. It is well that the* Student's *ſermons are ſo ſhort, as they always, I obſerve, are; for theſe are ſuch flat and direct contradictions, that if there were many of them, they would too much expoſe the preacher to the contempt of his very meaneſt hearers. I have done with Father* Francis *for the preſent; only this, Sir, I ſhall promiſe you, that when he is diſpoſed to try his hand in writing lives, he ſhall have the ſatisfaction to ſee his own picture drawn in ſuch lively colours, as time ſhall not eaſily deface.* The ſame author, in his ſecond *Letter, in anſwer to the charge of Socinianiſm againſt Dr. Tillotſon conſidered, and to the appendix concerning* The Hiſtory of Religion, having treated his antagoniſt Dr. Monroe with great ſeverity, ſtiles Mr. Atterbury *a man of learning and wit* (26), and very *unlike* to that Doctor, and obſerves that Sir Robert Howard was *ſomewhat concerned*, that ſuch a perſon as the former *ſhould firſt miſtake the deſign of his book, and then make ſuch haſte to ſcandalize him for it in the Royal preſence*, whereas he could not but ſmile at the efforts of the latter. The writer of another little piece in that collection, intitled, *The Author of the* Hiſtory of Religion *vindicated from the ſcandalous and unchriſtian invectives of Mr.* F. A. &c. concludes with theſe words (27). *A little thinking and reaſoning will perhaps ſatisfy the curious why the author of the* Hiſtory of Religion *has not been dreſſed up in the* San Benito. *For reaſon we thus: would Mr.* Atterbury *be content that his character ſhould be opened, and The Hiſtory of his life drawn forth? He muſt needs have more tenderneſs for his own reputation than ſo. He knows it is not prudence (or ſhould know ſo) to break his neighbour's windows, when his own houſe is made of glaſs. Again, we may conſider, that tho' a dog may bark, and no body mind him, yet if he bite, he may chance to have his teeth knock'd out.*

(22) Pag. 19.

(23) Ibid. pag. 22, 23.

(24) Pag. 25.

(25) Mr. Atterbury had ſtiled himſelf in the title page of his Sermon, *a Student of Chriſt-Church.*

(26) Pag. 59.

(27) Pag. 87, 88.

[G] *In December* 1698 *he reſigned his Lectureſhip of St. Bride's, as appears from his Farewel-Sermon.*] It was preached on Decemb. 11th 1698, and is the laſt of the ſecond volume of his poſthumous Sermons publiſhed by Dr. Moore. The text is *Rom.* xii. 18. *If it be poſſible, as much as lyeth in you, live peaceably with all men.* He obſerves, that he choſe that ſubject, becauſe as it was the laſt opportunity, that he ſhould have of beſpeaking his audience under that character, which he had till then born towards them; and becauſe it was likely therefore, that the conteſt then on foot about the choice of a new Lecturer, might end in the ſame little animoſities and miſunderſtandings, which are uſual on ſuch occaſions. *I thought*, ſays he (28), *I could not do better than to diſcourſe to you upon a ſubject, that might be of ſome uſe to temper and allay them, and to diſpoſe you towards ſuch a* peaceable *ſtate of mind, as becomes thoſe, who are about to chooſe a Miniſter of the* Goſpel of Peace. He obſerves (29), that *they* live peaceably *in* religious matters, *who on the one ſide are contented to enjoy their own opinions, without arraigning their Superiors in Church and State for being otherwiſe minded; and without diſturbing the publick peace, in order to propagate their tenets, and make proſelytes; and who on the other ſide do not by unjuſtifiable methods of ſeverity force men into the profeſſion of what they diſbelieve; whoſe zeal for their faith never makes them forget their temper, nor out-run the bounds of Chriſtian goodneſs and prudence; who make great allowances for the weakneſs of mens reaſon and the ſtrength of their prejudices, and condemn not all as inſincere, who are not ſo enlightened as they are; but leave them to ſtand or fall to their own maſter;*

(28) Sermons by Biſhop Atterbury publiſhed by Dr. Tho. Moore, vol. 2. p. 320.

(29) Pag. 324.

ſeemed to him moſt to prevail, and ſparing nothing, which he obſerved to be amiſs among them, out of regard to men's *perſons* or *opinions*, or to any worldly conſideration whatever. He obſerved that the infidelity of the age had forced him to dwell often on the great articles and myſteries of our faith, and to explain them largely; but he called God to witneſs, that he never propoſed any explication of thoſe points, or recommended any thing of this kind to their belief, but what he firmly and from the bottom of his heart believed himſelf. "The faith, *ſays he* (*b*), I have delivered to you, the faith of the "Church of England, into which we were all baptized, is, I am entirely ſatisfied, the "ſame that *was once delivered to the Saints*. I hope none of you will be ever invited by "the ſpecious arts and inſinuations of hereſy to depart from it. I am ſure the profeſſion "of it in all its branches and members, is what by the grace of God I intend to live and "die in." He is thought by ſome perſons to have born no inconſiderable part in the famous controverſy between Mr. Boyle and Dr. Bentley about the genuineneſs of Phalaris's Epiſtles [*H*], which were publiſhed by the former in the year 1695, and attacked by the Doctor in his *Diſſertation upon Phalaris's Epiſtles*; an examination of which was ſoon after publiſhed by Mr. Boyle. But a greater ſcene of controverſy afterwards opened itſelf for him with regard to the Convocation, which it will be proper to trace from the firſt occaſion of it. In the year 1697 there was publiſhed a pamphlet in 4to, ſuppoſed to be written by Sir Bartholomew Shower, and intitled, *A Letter to a Convocation Man, concerning the Rights, Powers, and Privileges of that Body* [*I*]. An anſwer to this letter appeared ſoon after in 8vo, written by Dr. William Wake, the preſent Archbiſhop of Canterbury, intitled, *The Authority of Chriſtian Princes over their Eccleſiaſtical Synods aſſerted, with particular reſpect to the Convocations of the Clergy of the Realm and Church of England; occaſioned by a late pamphlet, intitled*, A Letter to a Convocation-Man &c.

(*b*) Sermons by Biſhop Atterbury, publiſhed by Dr. Tho. Moore, vol. 2. pag. 343, 344.

maſter; praying for them in the mean time, that they may come to the knowledge of the truth, and endeavouring by all gentle perſuaſive methods to reclaim them. He lays down afterwards (32) this excellent rule for our conduct in religious diſputes, that "we muſt con-"tend for the truth of the Goſpel itſelf, ſo as not to "forget the plain precepts of it; and for the glory "of God with ſuch a well regulated zeal, as does "not trample upon any of his commands; that is, "the warmth of our concern for the beſt doctrines, "perſons, or things, muſt never ſo far tranſport us, "as to make us ſay any thing of any man, but "what our cauſe and his character will juſtify; nor "endeavour to inſpire people with worſe opinions "concerning him, than we in our conſciences believe "he deſerves." He remarks likewiſe (33), that it is a man's duty *to keep himſelf always from embarking in parties and factions, and falling in with vehemence into all the intereſts and deſigns of them. This will neceſſarily in time imbitter his ſpirit, and ſour his humour, make him like and diſlike men implicitly, and lead him into many reſentments, which he has nothing to do with.*

(32) Pag. 330.

(33) Pag. 335.

[*H*] *He is thought by ſome perſons to have born no inconſiderable part in the famous controverſy about the genuineneſs of Phalaris's Epiſtles.*] Mr. Stackhouſe in his *Memoirs of the Life and Conduct of our Author* (34), publiſhed in the year 1723, aſſerts this; *tho' it was proper*, ſays he, *at that time, to have the honour of it devolved upon another.* And he afterwards obſerves (35), that there was ſuch an Anſwer publiſhed to Dr. Bentley's Diſſertation, *as perhaps never appeared in any language before. It may be juſtly called the Pride and Glory of the Moderns, and a Confutation of all that can be ſaid in preference of the Ancients. There is ſuch an eloquence of ſtyle, and juſtneſs of expreſſion, exact method, terſe wit, fine raillery, and genteel ſatyr thro' the whole, that whoever is minded to be curiouſly entertained for a while, let him read it; whoever deſires to overcome in the philological way, let him make it his pattern, and learn to imitate it. He will ſoon perceive therein ſuch a ſtrength of genius and warmth of invention guided by art, and kept in by the laws of correct writing, ſuch an eaſy diſplay of learning, happy declenſions of his adverſary's force, and foiling him frequently at his own weapon, as will induce him to be of my opinion, viz. that Dr. Bentley was certainly cut down by ſome eminent Maſter, however decent it might be thought at that time for a young Gentleman to give him the* Coup de Grace, *and ſharpen it with this Sarcaſm:*

(34) Pag. 7, 8.

(35) Pag. 10.

——— Pallas te hoc vulnere, Pallas
Immolat.

What may convince the world of the truth of this common conjecture is the figure that he makes in another famed controverſy, wherein he avowedly ſtands alone, and treats his adverſary, (no leſs an adverſary, than the Reverend Doctor Wake, the preſent Archbiſhop of Canterbury,) in the ſame keen manner. Mr. Rymer in his *Eſſay concerning curious and critical learning* (36), tells us, that if he may be permitted to ſuggeſt his own opinion, he fancies that this Book againſt Dr. Bentley *was written (as moſt publick compoſitions in Chriſt-Church are) by a* Select Club. And Mr. Budgell takes notice of the ſame conjecture in his *Life of the Earl of Orrery* (37), and obſerves, that the Author of the *Tale of a Tub* hints at this, when in his battle between the ancients and the moderns, he ranges Sir William Temple and that Nobleman on the ſide of the ancients, and ſpeaking of the latter, ſays, *Boyle clad in a ſuit of armour, which had been given him by all the Gods, &c.* However Mr. Budgell concludes, that Mr. Boyle *was at leaſt the Author of the greateſt part of that Book; ſince the ſame ſtyle and ſpirit runs thro' the whole piece; ſo that it muſt have been formed and put together by one hand; and I never yet heard*, ſays he, *any reaſon to doubt but that hand was the late Earl of Orrery.*

(36) Printed at London 1698, in 8vo, pag. 62.

(37) Pag. 194.

[*I*] *A Letter to a Convocation-Man concerning the Rights, Powers, and Privileges of that Body.*] The Author of that Pamphlet begins with *plain Engliſh*, as he calls it, *that if there ever was need of a Convocation, ſince Chriſtianity was eſtabliſhed in theſe Kingdoms, there was need of one at that time.* He endeavours then to prove "their aſſembling, con-"ferring, or reſolving, does not depend on the ab-"ſolute free pleaſure of the Prince; but tho' the "King be intruſted with the formal part of ſum-"moning and convening, yet by the very eſſence "and conſtitution of our Church, a Convocation "ought to ſit, meet, and act, and by law and cu-"ſtom muſt aſſemble and confer in time of Parlia-"ment." He concludes, that *Canons framed by the King and Convocation have a full force and validity, and need no confirmation by the Parliament, provided they do not impugn common law, ſtatutes, cuſtoms, or prerogative.* He defines an Engliſh Convocation to be "an Eccleſiaſtical Court or Aſſembly eſſential to "our conſtitution, and eſtabliſhed by the law of it, "by the ſame law, as the Gentleman receives his "rent, and the Member enjoys his privilege;" and in another place (38), that it is *the higheſt Eccleſiaſtical Court or Aſſembly call'd and convened in Parliament-time.* He acknowledges the King as *ſupreme Head over all perſons and in all cauſes, in contradiction to all foreign Powers and Juriſdictions only* (39); and inſinuates (40), that the King by reſtraining the ſeſſions and actings of Convocation had broke in upon the *eſſence and conſtitution of our Church and the fundamentals of our Government.*

(38) Pag. 29.

(39) Ibid.

(40) Pag. 35.

(41) Par 21, 22. London

&c. [*K*]. Dr. Wake was ſeconded by a Gentleman of the Law, whoſe name was Mr. W. Wright, and who publiſhed an anonymous piece under the title of *A Letter to a Member of Parliament; occaſioned by* A Letter to a Convocation-Man concerning the Rights, Powers, and Privileges of that Body, &c. London, 1697, in 4to. This Gentleman maintains the right of the Crown to diſſolve eccleſiaſtical aſſemblies, and that the Convocation cannot meet without the King's permiſſion. But Dr. Wake was not long after attacked by Mr. Samuel Hill, Rector of Kilmington, who publiſhed, without his name, *Municipium Eccleſiaſticum*, or *The Rights, Liberties, and Authorities of the Chriſtian Church aſſerted, againſt all oppreſſive Doctrines and Conſtitutions; occaſioned by Dr. Wake's Book, &c.* 1697, in 8vo. The Doctor therefore found himſelf obliged to vindicate himſelf in his *Appeal to all the true Members of the Church of England in behalf of the King's Eccleſiaſtical Supremacy as by Law eſtabliſhed; by our Convocations approved; and by our moſt eminent Biſhops and Clergymen ſtated and defended, againſt both the Popiſh and Fanatical Oppoſers of it.* London in 1698, in 8vo. On the ſame ſide likewiſe appeared an anonymous advocate for the civil powers, in a ſmall Tract intitled, *A brief Enquiry into the Ground, Authority, and Rights of Eccleſiaſtical Synods, upon the Principles of Scripture and Right Reaſon; occaſioned by a late book, intitled,* Municipium Eccleſiaſticum. London 1699, in 8vo. Mr. Hill wrote a defence of himſelf under the title of *The Rights of the Chriſtian Church further defended, in anſwer to the* Appeal *of Dr. Wake. By Samuel Hill, Rector of Kilmington*, 1698, in 8vo. There appeared on the oppoſite ſide a pamphlet, ſuppoſed to have been written by Dr. Richard Weſt, and intitled, *Some Thoughts on a Convocation, and the Notion of a Divine Right, &c.* 4to, 1699. The year following Mr. Atterbury entered into this diſpute with great vigour and reſolution, and publiſhed his *Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an Engliſh Convocation ſtated and vindicated; in anſwer to a late book of Dr. Wake's, intitled,* The Authority of Chriſtian Princes over their Eccleſiaſtical Synods &c. *and ſeveral other pieces.* London 1700, in 8vo [*L*]. This book appeared at firſt without his name, though, as Dr. White

[*K*] *Dr. Wake's Book intitled,* The Authority of Chriſtian Princes &c.] In this Book he endeavours to prove that under the Government of a Chriſtian Prince the Church has no other right to aſſemble in Synods, but what it receives from the grant or expreſs permiſſion of ſuch a Prince. And conſequently, that no perſon can be deputed to a Synod without his particular leave: and when the Synod is aſſembled, they have no right to ſit, debate, diſpute, or determine upon any point of doctrine or diſcipline, any further than is allowed by the Prince; who may ratify, annul, or alter all their acts and proceedings, as he thinks proper; and ſuſpend the execution of all or any of their Conſtitutions and Decrees. In ſhort that the authority of their Acts depends entirely and ſolely upon him, and that no Synod can diſſolve themſelves without his permiſſion. Dr. Kennet in his *Eccleſiaſtical Synods &c.* (41) obſerves, that Dr. Wake's attempt upon this ſubject was the more difficult, *becauſe no Writer before him had profeſſly treated of theſe matters. And truely,* continues that Author, *ſince our Church was reformed, no occaſion had been given. No diſputing with the King's Supremacy among Church-men, as by law eſtabliſhed, from* 25 *H.* VIII. *to* 9 *W.* III. *For this reaſon the Doctor had a better title to civil uſage, becauſe he was a firſt adventurer, and made diſcoveries of a world, as it were, before unknown. He had a further right to ſome allowances, in that he owned himſelf in haſte, and ſpoke modeſtly of what he had done. He offers it as* a rude and haſty performance (*Ep. Ded.*), at moſt but an imperfect Eſſay, and the firſt lines of a draught; ſhews rather what he deſigned, than what he was able in any tolerable manner to finiſh; Preface p. 111. *with many other acknowledgments ingenuous and free; not inſulting his adverſary, nor catching at a word for triumph, but with a good eaſy air, approving himſelf a Writer of ſome breeding and ſome conſcience, for an example to his anſwerers or accuſers.*

(41) Part 1. p. 21, 22. edit. London 1701.

[*L*] *Publiſhed his* Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an Engliſh Convocation &c.] He tells us, that Convocations or Provincial Synods have been held frequently from the very beginning of Chriſtianity. The authoritative part of theſe meetings was compoſed of the Biſhops and Preſbyters. They met twice a year, and needed no leave. In theſe Aſſemblies the *Gravamina Cleri*, or *Articuli Reformationis* were conſtantly expected from the lower Houſe. A Convocation of the Province of Canterbury is an attendant upon a Parliament of England. The Clergy were brought to Parliament by the *præmunientes* clauſe. But in proceſs of time, by a miſtake in their politics, they were ſeparated from the Parliament, and yet continued to attend it in two provincial Aſſemblies or Convocations; which as they met for the ſame purpoſe, and had the ſame reaſons of State inſerted into their Writs of Summons as the Parliament had, ſo they kept cloſely to the forms and rules and manner of ſitting and acting practiſed in Parliament; and they had parliamentary ways, and parliamentary privileges, and attended the Parliament as one of the three States of the Realm. But he declares, that he is not for ſetting a plea for any old privileges and preeminences of the Clergy, which are long ſince dead and buried, and which he thinks ought never to be revived, even for the ſake of the Clergy themſelves, who have thriven beſt always under *a competency of power and moderate pretences.* Theſe Parliamentary Convocations, he ſays, came into the room of Provincial Synods. But he aſſerts, that the Clergy have not only a right to meet and ſit in Convocation, as often as a new Parliament ſits, but a right alſo, when met, of treating and deliberating about ſuch affairs as lie within their proper ſphere, and of coming to ſit reſolutions upon them, without being neceſſitated antecedently to qualify themſelves for ſuch acts and debates by a licence under the Broad Seal of England. He takes a great deal of pains about the Statute of 25 *Henry VIII. c.* 19. which was the *Act of Submiſſion*, and puts ſuch a ſenſe upon it as at length to conclude, that with regard to all convocational Acts previous to the paſſing or decreeing a Canon, the Clergy have juſt the ſame right to them ſince this Statute, as they had before. Tho' they cannot make and attempt a Canon, yet they may ſpeak the ſenſe of the whole Clergy of the Kingdom in matters proper for them to interpoſe in. They may petition, adviſe, addreſs, repreſent, give their judgment, where it may be deſired, or their cenſures either of men or books, where it may be needful; and ſuggeſt the fitteſt methods of ſecuring the Chriſtian Faith, and of preventing the revival of old hereſies and errors, and the growth of new ones. He attacks Dr. Wake in a great many points; and aſſerts that the *præmunientes* in the Biſhop's Writ is not an idle uſeleſs clauſe, inſerted only on a particular occaſion, and continued by accident, but a real and effectual Summons of the Clergy to Parliament; ſuch as they formerly made formal returns to, as often as it went out, and expreſly obeyed. He gives ſome inſtances of this till the time of Henry VIII; and then attempts to ſhew, that the Writ to the two Archbiſhops to convene the Clergy of their Provinces,

(b) *Eccleſiaſtical Synods, &c.* Part 1. pag. 31. edit. London 1701, in 8vo.

White Kennet informs us (*b*), it was freely owned in converſation. He endeavours to confute his Antagoniſts as well by reaſon as authorities drawn from authentic Acts and Conſtitutions of England. But having occaſionally made ſome critical remarks upon Dr. Burnet Biſhop of Saliſbury, that Prelate wrote a piece againſt him, intitled, *Reflections on a book intitled*, The Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an Engliſh Convocation, &c. London 1700, in 4to [*M*]. Mr. Atterbury publiſhed the year following a ſecond edition of his *Rights, &c.* [*N*], with his name prefixed to it, and very conſiderable additions, which he printed ſeparately for the ſake of thoſe who had the firſt edition. But this work of his did not

Provinces, tho' it does not expreſly mention a Parliament, yet has an immediate reference to it; the original deſign of its iſſuing out together with the Biſhop's Writ being only to ſecure an obedience to the premunitory clauſe of it, and to make the Clergy's parliamentary attendance the more full and certain. After having diſcourſed largely of the Right of the Clergy to meet and act in Convocation, he touches on the neceſſity of ſuch meetings, that they may preſerve their right; and promiſes to inſiſt diſtinctly upon it hereafter. Dr. Kennet tells us (42), that *the bulk of this Book, the ſpecious preface to it, the number of citations, and above all the ſpirit of aſſurance, made people think this would determine the whole matter. And then the artificial giving a great and juſt character of the King, the many inſinuating addreſſes to the Commons, the pretty ways of ingratiating with the inferior Clergy, the high zeal for our Church, and pleading fundamental rights and liberties of it, with the briſkneſs of running down an adverſary into the utmoſt contempt and odium; all this was apt to create in many a kind reception of the Book; which when ſet off with the induſtrious applauſe of conſiderable people, who admire every thing of themſelves and their own, gave all poſſible advantage to the cauſe and this defence of it.* But we ſhall give the reader ſome further account of this performance in the note [*N*], where we ſhall ſpeak of the ſecond edition of it.

(42) Ibid. pag. 31.

[*M*] *That Prelate anſwered him in a piece intitled*, Reflections on a Book intitled, The Rights &c.] Mr. Atterbury had not only criticiſed upon ſeveral paſſages in the Biſhop's *Hiſtory of the Reformation*, but likewiſe cenſured him for his forwardneſs upon all occaſions to be ſevere upon the Clergy. "My Lord of "Sarum, (*ſays he in the Preface to his* Rights &c.) "indeed may freely have taxed the vices of the Cler"gy even in Books where he was defending the or"ders of the Church of England, or the truth of "the Chriſtian Religion. His high ſtation is his "warrant for whatever he has done of this kind late"ly, and a bar to all manner of reply. And his "former reprehenſions, ſhould they have been ſome"what too free, are capable of this excuſe, that be"ing a *Stranger*, he might not then have throughly "acquainted himſelf with the ſtate of our Church, "or the character of its Members. And if he ſaw "faults in them, it was not to be expected that he ſhould "conceal them with the ſame tenderneſs, as if he "had his birth and breeding among them." Biſhop Burnet in his *Reflections* obſerves, that tho' the Author of the *Rights &c. pretended to plead the cauſe of the Church, which is indeed the cauſe of Chriſt himſelf, yet he had ſo entirely laid aſide the ſpirit of Chriſt, and the characters of a Chriſtian, that without large allowances of charity one can hardly think, that he did once reflect on the obligations he lay under to follow the humility, the meekneſs, and the gentleneſs of Chriſt. So far from that, he ſeems to have forgot the common decencies of a man or of a Scholar.* He ſays likewiſe, that *a Book writ with that roughneſs and acrimony of ſpirit, if well received, would be a much ſtronger argument againſt the expediency of a Convocation, than any he brings or can bring for it.* He declares, that a Convocation cannot be called a true Repreſentative of the Church, tho' it be now a legal one. In that for Canterbury there are twenty Deans or more, who pretend to ſit there; as many Proctors from the Chapters, and ſixty Archdeacons, and but thirty eight Clerks choſen by the Clergy. So that the Deans and Chapters, who had their authority at firſt by Papal Bulls, and have now exemptions and juriſdictions continued to them only by a proviſo in the Statute of 25 *H. VIII.* have more intereſt in the Convocation, than the whole body of the Clergy. He affirms that for above a hundred and forty years the Crown had been in poſſeſſion of a right of making uſe of a Convocation, or of ſettling matters of Religion without it, at diſcretion; and that this has been underſtood at leaſt by Divines and Lawyers in favour of the Prince. And that therefore it argued the fruitfulneſs of a man's imagination, who could make ſo great a Book, and ſuch heavy complaints for no other cauſe but this.

(47) Pag. 10 11.

Mr. Atterbury takes notice of theſe *Reflections* of the Biſhop in the Preface (43) to the ſecond edition of his *Rights &c.* where having acquainted the reader what *Alterations* and *Enlargements* were made in that edition, he obſerves, that the number of theſe is not increaſed by any change made in thoſe few paſſages, which the Biſhop had ſingled out, as moſt liable to exception. *For in thoſe*, ſays he, *I have not, upon a re-examination, found myſelf obliged to alter any thing; but have left them juſt as they ſtood before his Lordſhip's Reflections came forth; for which I ſhall e'er long give his Lordſhip and the Reader my reaſons.... One change only his Lordſhip's Reflections have produced, that whereas before I ſent theſe papers abroad without a name, I have now yielded to his Lordſhip's Reproofs ſo far as to act more freely and openly; the rather, becauſe his Lordſhip has been pleaſed to impute that part of my management to a principle of* not engaging paſt retreat (*), *and to a proſpect of being* taken off, *as his Lordſhip is pleaſed to expreſs himſelf. Had any perſon of lower rank than his Lordſhip ſaid this, I ſhould have taken the liberty to reply, that ſuch motives could not have occurred ſo readily, but where they had been of familiar uſe and application. But I know my diſtance too well to make his Lordſhip ſuch a return, whatever occaſion he ſhall give me for it. However ſince it was ſo eaſy to ſet this matter right by adding a word or two in the title-page, I have upon his Lordſhip's exhortation done it; being indeed perſuaded that this was ſuch a cauſe, as no man ought to be either aſhamed or afraid to appear in.*

(43) Pag. 43.

(*) *Reflections on the Rights of an Engliſh Convocation*, p. 2, 3.

[*N*] *A ſecond Edition of his* Rights.] He dedicated it to *the Archbiſhops of the Provinces and the Preſidents of the Convocations of Canterbury and York*, and tells them, that he doubted not but they would find, that *he had aſſerted the Rights of the Clergy within that circle only, which the law has mark'd out for them,.... and upon principles, which every good Engliſhman muſt approve, and with ſuch a moderation and deference to the civil power, as can diſguſt none of the temporalty, but the profeſſed enemies of Religion and the Order.* He obſerves in his *Preface* (45), that *the Letter to a Convocation-man*, with the Replies to it, had led him to conſider the point in debate with a particular care and attention. That *he came to Dr. Wake's Book with expectations of finding there whatever was neceſſary to ſet this matter in a clear light. The bulk of the work, the appearance of learning it carried, and the great authority by which it endeavoured to recommend itſelf, all ſeemed to promiſe exactneſs. But that upon peruſing it to his ſurprize he found that it was a ſhallow, empty performance, written without any knowledge of our conſtitution, any ſkill in the particular ſubject of debate, upon ſuch principles as are deſtructive of all our civil as well as eccleſiaſtical liberties, and with ſuch aſperſions on the Clergy both dead and living, as were no leſs injurious to the body, than his doctrine.* He aſſures us afterwards (46), that he had undertaken that work, "not led ſo much by inclina"tion to ſtudies of this kind, *ſays he*, as puſhed on by "an hearty concern for the intereſts of Religion and "of my Order (as far as the latter of theſe is ſub"ſervient to the former) and by an eager deſire of "doing ſomewhat towards ſupporting the good old "conſtitution I live under; which Dr. W. has both "in Church and State done his beſt to undermine." *His blow indeed is directly levelled at the rights and liberties of the Church only; but it glances often on*

(45) Pag. 1.

(46) Pag. 4.

(48) Pag.

(49) Pag 23.

not continue long without a reply; for Dr. White Kennet, afterwards Biſhop of Peterborough, under the countenance of Archbiſhop Teniſon (*i*), undertook a particular reply to it in his *Eccleſiaſtical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations in the Church of England hiſtorically ſtated and juſtly vindicated from the Miſrepreſentations of Mr. Atterbury. Part I.* London 1701 in 8vo. He vindicates Dr. Burnet Biſhop of Saliſbury, Dr. Wake, and other Writers

(*i*) See the *Life of Biſhop Kennet*, pag. 19. edit. London 1730, in 8vo.

thoſe of the State, and wounds them ſore, as far as his arm was capable of putting ſtrength into it. The argument of his Book throughout turns upon ſuch maxims and grounds as equally affect both of them. Dr. Atterbury endeavours to fix theſe imputations upon Dr. Wake by alledging ſome paſſages from his Book; and proceeds (47) with an uncommon ſeverity of expreſſion to ſhew, that *the Clergy are not the only perſons concerned in this diſpute; the Laity too have their ſhare in it. For beſides that, if ſlavery be once eſtabliſhed in the Church, it will quickly ſpread itſelf into the State. Dr. Wake's principles, we ſee, are ſuch as have an immediate tendency toward ſubverting liberty in general; and would, if purſued thro' their juſt conſequences, give the Prerogative as high an aſcendant over Parliaments as Convocations. And when ſuch things are ſaid therefore, not the men of the Church only, but every free-born ſubject of England ought to take the alarm; for their birth-right is endangered.* "The very "beſt conſtruction, that has been put upon Dr. W.'s "attempt even by candid readers, is, that it was an en- "deavour to advance the Prerogative of the Prince in "Church-matters as high, and to depreſs the intereſt of "the ſubject as low as ever he could with colour of "truth. But ſurely this itſelf is no very creditable ac- "count of it. Thoſe Caſuiſts, that have taken pains to "inſtruct men, how near they may poſſibly come to a ſin "without actually ſinning, have not been reckoned "the honeſteſt part of their profeſſion. And thoſe "Divines, who read leſſons to Princes how to ſtrain "their eccleſiaſtical power to the utmoſt without ex- "ceeding it, and oppreſs their Clergy legally, are not "ſurely the beſt men of their Order. They are "Church *Empſons* and *Dudleys*, and uſually find the fate "of ſuch wretched inſtruments to be deteſted by the one "ſide, and at laſt abandoned by the other." He vindicates himſelf from the ſuſpicion of being diſaffected to the government (48). *Diſaffection*, ſays he, *to the government, as the charge is commonly managed, is a word only made uſe of by thoſe, that are in favour, to keep others out. It is a reproach taken up on purpoſe to juſtify premeditated deſigns of oppreſſing men; for ſo the ſoldier ſaid, that the countryman* whiſtled *treaſon, when he had reſolved to plunder him. For my part, I am not ſhy of owning to Dr.* Wake *my naked thoughts on this head; and he may make what uſe he thinks fit of them. If then to be a true* Lover of England, its Monarchy and Epiſcopacy; *if to have the utmoſt eſteem for the* Heroic Qualities *and* matchleſs Merits *of our Prince, and to think that no inſtance of* Reſpect *and* Duty *that ſubjects can pay him too great, while they take care to preſerve their own rights and privileges; if to prefer the true intereſts of the Proteſtant Religion and the preſervation of our civil Liberties to all other conſiderations, and for theſe (among other) ends to pray heartily for the continuance of our preſent government both in Church and State; if theſe be inſtances and marks of diſaffection, then the author of theſe papers muſt own himſelf diſaffected, and not otherwiſe.* His apology for the ſeverity of his ſtyle is as follows (49). "If un- "der a ſenſe of theſe injuries, I have not ſo tem- "pered my pen every where, but that an hard word "may now and then have eſcaped me, I need no "excuſe for it. Dr. *Wake*'s way of dealing, would, "I am ſure, have juſtified much rougher returns than "any I have made him. But whatever of this kind "the Reader meets with, he may aſſure himſelf, that "it ſprang not from any the leaſt mixture of *private* "prejudice or reſentment; for I have no quarrel with "Dr. *Wake*, but upon a public account." *On the contrary the good ſervices he did againſt Popery, enclined me always to wiſh well to him, and to eſteem him. Or had I wiſhed him ill, yet I would never have taken this way of expreſſing it; for* Petavius (†) *has taught me long ago, that to write againſt ſome men, is the way only to have their penſions doubled. And the experience of later times than his has ſhewed, that it is poſſible to write a man out of reputation into preferment. Much leſs can I be ſuſpected to have engaged in this deſign out of intereſt. The way to that is not by appearing in behalf of councils; which (as* Johannes Major (†) *well obſerved) meet but ſeldom, and have no dignities to diſpoſe of.* Dr. Atterbury immediately after aſſerts that the author of *the Letter to a Member of Parliament*, has in a page or two *ſaid more for the cauſe, than Dr. Wake has done throughout his mighty performance, which is really nothing more than a ſeries of long, flat, impertinent accounts, attended with ſuitable reflections; but without one wiſe word ſpoken, or true ſtroke ſtruck in behalf of his point from the beginning of the book to the end of it. And were it not therefore on ſome other accounts beſides the mere merit of the work, it would have deſerved no anſwer but what the Fryar in one of our hiſtories gave in a certain conteſt with his* Prior; & frater Salamon de Ripple ad monitiones dicti Prioris reſpondit, ſic dicendo (*) *Trufeles! Trufeles! Trufeles* (†)! He tells us (54), that he had enlarged the *ſecond Edition* of his book in ſeveral reſpects, and in ſome that are very material; and he obſerves (55), that he was not ignorant what menaces had been given out, nor what meaſures had been actually taken towards cruſhing him and that work; "but I do not find, *ſays he*, my reſolutions in "the leaſt ſhaken on that account. I have only taken "occaſion from thence to aſk myſelf a few queſtions, "which, I thank God, I have been able to anſwer "to my own ſatisfaction; and am, I hope, prepared "for any event, that ſhall befall me." In his fourth Chapter he gives us *ſome general reflections on Dr.* Wake's *way of managing the controverſy*, and endeavours to ſet aſide a conſiderable part of his book as foreign to the point in debate. Upon this occaſion he indulges his uſual talent of raillery; and obſerves, that *the Doctor had kindly prepared us in his preface to expect* digreſſions; *but withal promiſed us in his nice manner, that they ſhould be rather not directly to the purpoſe, than altogether diſtant from it.... The Doctor muſt forgive me, if I tell him, that theſe hiſtorical unedifying accounts of his put me in mind of the honeſt confeſſion of* William Caxton *the Chronicler; the words of which will become Dr.* Wake's *mouth as well every whit as they did his; and I cannot help thinking that I hear him in the cloſe of his firſt Chapter thus addreſſing himſelf to his Reader*; If I cowde, *ſays he*, have founde moo ſtoryes, I wolde have ſette in it moo; but the ſubſtaunce that I can fynde and know I have ſhortly ſette theim in this boke; prayeinge all theym that ſee this ſymple worke of myne to pardon me of my ſimple writinge. *And indeed I for my part ſhould have been very ready ſo to do, had it been as* harmleſs *as it is* ſimple; *and were it not likely, as* ſimple *as it is, to be produced hereafter for a teſtimony againſt the Church's rights, if it be not now oppoſed and diſowned.* Theſe extracts will give the Reader an idea of the particular genius and manner of writing of our author in his polemical treatiſes. He was attacked the ſame year by Dr. Kennet in his *Eccleſiaſtical Synods* &c. who tells us in his *Preface*, that upon a review of Mr. *Atterbury*'s book, compared with ſome collections of his own, and with the beſt of his underſtanding, he grew ſenſible, that the hiſtorical part of the argument was very falſely repreſented, and that the zeal for our Church was indeed without any knowledge in the conſtitution of it. That upon hearing Mr. Atterbury deſigned a more correct edition of his *State of Convocations*, he laboured to ſupply him with ſome amendments and additions, that he might have uſed or rejected at his own diſcretion. That he concluded Mr. Atterbury's *ſecond Edition* would render it a more accurate and uſeful work; ſince he *knew the author to be a man of great parts, and a ſharp pen, and a wonderful ſagacity in faults and imperfections.* But when he came to run over his *additions to the Preface*, to the body of the book, to the *Appendix*, and after all the *Addenda*, to ſupply and complete the new edition, he found, that it was not only one of the moſt *disjointed pieces*, which he ever yet

(47) Pag. 10, 11.

(48) Pag. 20.

(49) Pag. 22, 23.

(†) Cap. 18. *Comment. in Evangel. Matth. verſus finem.*

(*) An old Engliſh word for *Trifles.*

(†) Thorn. cap. 2064.

(54) Pag. 27.

(55) Pag. 44.

(†) *Petavius Croio reſponſurum ſe negat, ideo quod novit Annua augeri ſemper Miniſtris contra quos ſcribitur.* Grot. Ep. 1742. p. 746.

Writers from the attacks of our Author. Soon after this came out a pamphlet in 4to, ſuppoſed to be written by Dr. Richard Weſt, and intitled, *The Principles of Mr. Atterbury's book conſidered, and his Arguments againſt Dr. Wake and others ſtated and examined* [O]; and another in 4to with the title of *Mr. Atterbury's Arguments for the Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an Engliſh Convocation conſidered.* Dr. Hody, Chaplain to the Archbiſhop of Canterbury, publiſhed likewiſe the ſame year his *Hiſtory of Engliſh Councils and Convocations, &c.* in 8vo, and an anonymous Writer appeared on the ſame ſide in a pamphlet in 8vo intitled, *The Regal Supremacy in Eccleſiaſtical Affairs, &c.* Mr. Hill abovementioned defended himſelf from the objections of his Antagoniſts, and particularly from thoſe of Dr. Wake, in his *Rights, Liberties, and Authorities of the Chriſtian Church aſſerted againſt all oppreſſive Doctrines and Conſtitutions, &c.* London 1701 in 8vo. The ſame year alſo appeared *Some Remarks upon the Temper of the late Writers about the Convocations, particularly Dr. Wake, Dr. Kennet, and the Author of* Mr. Atterbury's Principles, &c. *by a Gentleman in the Country* [P]. London 1701, in 4to.

This

yet ſaw, but ſtill the moſt *imperfect*. For he obſerved with ſurprize, that he had made very few corrections of his moſt material errors; and thoſe, which he dared not repeat, he had corrected in ſuch a clandeſtine manner, that the very amendment was more deceit upon the Reader, than the fault itſelf. *For tho' he had profeſſed to the world,* ſays Dr. *Kennet, that* all the alterations of moment were printed together in ſeparate ſheets, *I found them not ſo. I found very conſiderable alterations, not* in a few words only, *as he would excuſe it, but in ſenſe of Hiſtory and Law ſo notorious, that I could not but bring ſome of them together to confront the author, or at leaſt themſelves. I found alſo, that he was ſo far from repenting of the liberty and rudeneſs with which he had treated his Brethren and his Fathers, that he confirmed his perſonal reflections, and improved them, and perfectly inſulted more and more. Nay, and when he perceived his former ſtrictures to be downright ſlanders; yet there he turned them, with ſuch an air of illuſion, that I profeſs, I never ſaw ſuch artifices in writing. He has done ſo in ſeveral inſtances by my Lord Biſhop of* Sarum, *by* Dr. Wake, *by Mr. Archdeacon* Nicholſon, *by the author of* Occaſional Thoughts on a Convocation, &c. *I perceived farther, that he had made his whole ſubject in effect* new, *under the pretence of enlarging his former volume.* Dr. Kennet gives ſome inſtances of this; and then tells us, that when he ſaw theſe and many other inſtances of diſingenuity and dangerous errors, he thought really it would be a reproach to the Engliſh Church and Nation, if ſuch a book were judged to be the ſenſe of the Clergy, or of any other ſerious men of letters. He afterwards mentions the motives of his own writing, the firſt of which was "to re-"prove that deriding and inſulting way of raillery "and wrath, that wounds religion, and does but wea-"ken that Church, whoſe Prieſts ſhall ſo attempt to "vindicate her rights and powers." He concludes with aſſuring us, that his view was likewiſe *to promote the peace of our Mother Church, by the King and Parliament's conſtant protection of her; and to requeſt his Brethren, not to ſet up for independence and another fatal ſeparation; which none but our enemies can project or wiſh.* "My deſigns, ſays he, are no worſe, "and therefore I fear no ill treatment for them. As "to Mr. Atterbury, he and I may reſt content, that "our ſuperiors will not eſpouſe a cauſe without full "ſatisfaction in it; and much leſs will they bear "down us little men, or ſhew any indignation at us, "if we write contrary to their firſt ſenſe of things; "and therefore I dare not ſubſcribe to his murmurs "and complaints, *I am not ignorant, what menaces "have been given out,* &c." We have mentioned in the Note [L] a paſſage from Dr. Kennet concerning the reaſons why our author's book was ſo highly applauded; after which Dr. Kennet proceeds to examine the performance more particularly, and obſerves, that Mr. Atterbury ſhews himſelf in it *an aſſuming writer* (56); that he denies himſelf to have written in haſte, when the very form and compoſition of his book are the ſtrongeſt proof of it; that he appeals to manuſcripts and records, while he is a ſtranger to them; that he is intolerably ſevere in his perſonal reflections, and abuſes Dr. Wake, tho' he owns that he has *no quarrel with him, but on a publick account*; and that he is trifling and childiſh in correcting ſmall miſtakes, and inſults other perſons for errors, which are merely his own. He ſhews (57) our Author's miſtake with regard to the ſtory of Solomon de Ripple quoted above, ſince Solomon was no Fryar but a regular Canon, nor had he any conteſt with *his Prior*, but with *the Prior* of another houſe in defence of his own Abbot. Nor did he cry out *Trufeles*, but *Truthleſs, Truthleſs, Truthleſs*; to deny the *Truth* of the Prior's allegation of a pretended Bull; not a *Triſle*, but of very great importance; only not a true and authentic Bull, but all forgery and falſhood. In his *Appendix* he obſerves again, that Mr. Atterbury *in his ſecond Edition* had altered ſeveral paſſages notoriouſly falſe in the former, without the leaſt notice in the *Addenda*, that in theſe inſtances he had been miſtaken before. *Theſe hints*, ſays he, *together with the temper of the Author, as it has diſcovered itſelf in the management of this controverſy gave me reaſon to ſuſpect the ſame kind of* ſecret Retractation *in other parts of the Book. And upon the comparing the two Editions, I found my ſuſpicion very well grounded; as the reader alſo will underſtand by and by from a number of material alterations in points of Hiſtory and Law, not one of which he has mentioned in the* Addenda.

(57) Pag. 153, 154.

[O] Soon after this came out a Pamphlet in 4to intitled, *The Principles of Mr. Atterbury's Book conſidered, and his arguments againſt Dr. Wake and others ſtated and examined.*] The Author of it tells us, that it was Mr. Atterbury's main deſign to abuſe and miſrepreſent his antagoniſt, to ſtate his arguments unfairly, and anſwer what he never ſaid. He aſſerts, that whatever cuſtom there may be for the Clergy's being called to Convocation when the Parliament ſits, there is not the ſame right for their ſitting and acting. Not one inſtance is brought to prove that the King ſince the Reformation was ever denied the power of proroguing the Convocation, while the Parliament continued ſitting, or that when he exerciſed his authority in denying them to ſit and act, the legality of it was ever diſputed. He charges Mr. Atterbury with a groſs miſtake about the *Præmunire* in the caſe of the Clergy in the time of King Henry VIII; and he confronts him with Mr. Smalridge's *Animadverſions on Church Government*. He ſays, that ſuch faults as Mr. Atterbury's were, are (God be thanked) to be found in few other Writers; and that he diſcovered none ſuch in any of thoſe Authors, whom with all the ſtock of ſpite and ingenuity he was maſter of, he ſets himſelf to defame. He charges him likewiſe with falſely interpreting the Act of Submiſſion; and obſerves, that Mr. Atterbury has this very particular way of managing controverſy, that he is well aware what authorities oppoſe his notions. If they are downright enemies, he denies them to be legal evidence. If by fraud or perverting their plain ſenſe, he can reduce them to his opinion, he takes that method for impoſing upon his readers credulity. And if confidence of being in the right can have any influence, his readers are ſure never to want a biaſs. He enlarges upon the petition of the Convocation in Edward VI's time to that King for a licence; and expreſſes his reſentment that ſuch a ſtorm ſhould be raiſed againſt the Royal Supremacy in the days of King William, to whom the nation had been ſo much obliged.

(56) *Eccleſ. Synods, &c.* pag. 32, *& ſeq.*

[P] *The ſame year were publiſhed* Some Remarks upon the Temper &c.] The Author of this Pamphlet complains, that the Writers on the oppoſite ſide to Mr. Atterbury,

This was followed by *An occaſional Letter on the Subject of Engliſh Convocations; by the Author of* Eccleſiaſtical Synods and Parliamentary Convocations in the Church of England, &c. London 1701, in 8vo. In this letter Dr. Kennet obſerves, that he ſhall not condeſcend to take notice of the *Remarks upon the Temper, &c.* abovementioned, but leave it to the world to judge on which ſide the temper lay. He vindicates his reflections on Dr. Atterbury, and ſays, that he had not exhauſted his ſubject, and mentions many other errors, which he might have pointed out in the chapters, which he had conſidered. The ſame year there was publiſhed a pamphlet in 4to, ſuppoſed to be written by Dr. Edmund Gibſon, the preſent Biſhop of London, intitled, *A Letter to a Friend in the Country, concerning the Proceedings of the preſent Convocation*; in which the Author argues from inſtances for the Archbiſhop's right to prorogue the Lower Houſe of Convocation as well as the Upper, and anſwers the inſtances alledged againſt it. This was ſoon replied to by a pamphlet, ſaid to be written by Dr. Atterbury, and intitled, *The Power of the Lower Houſe of Convocation to adjourn itſelf, vindicated from the Miſrepreſentations of a late paper, intitled,* A Letter to a Friend in the Country, &c. 4to, 1701. This was followed with a pamphlet, ſuppoſed to be written by Dr. George Hooper, afterwards Biſhop of Bath and Wells, and intitled, *A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Lower Houſe of Convocation relating to Prorogations and Adjournments, from Monday Feb.* 10, 1700 (*Engliſh Account*) *to Wedneſday June* 25, 1701. *Drawn up by the Order of the Houſe. London* 1701 in 4to. The Author reflects with great freedom upon the *Letter to a Friend in the Country*, which he charges with falſe aſſertions, and inconcluſive arguments, as well as prevarications. Soon after this appeared a pamphlet written by the ſame hand as the *Letter to a Friend in the Country*, and intitled, *The Right of the Archbiſhop to continue or prorogue the whole Convocation, aſſerted in a ſecond Letter, by way of reply to a pamphlet, intitled,* The Power of the Lower Houſe, &c. *and alſo a late book, intitled,* A Narrative of the Proceedings of the Lower Houſe, &c. *with the Publiſher's preface, as far as they relate to the point of Continuation.* London 1701, in 4to. The Author charges thoſe whom he writes againſt with being inconſiſtent in their principles; and obſerves (*k*), that *it will be more eaſily believed for the future, that the meeting of the Clergy is not an equal bleſſing to the Church at all ſeaſons and under all diſpoſitions.* A letter ſoon after was publiſhed to the Author of the *Narrative*, containing *A Vindication of the Proceedings of ſome Members of the Lower Houſe with relation to the Archbiſhop's prorogation of it, May the 8th* 1701, 4to. This was followed by a piece, ſaid to be written by Dr. Atterbury, and intitled, *A Letter to a Clergyman in the Country, concerning the choice of Members, and the execution of the Parliament-Writ for the enſuing Convocation*, 4to, dated Nov. the 17th 1701 [*Q*]. This was followed by a *ſecond Letter* upon the ſame ſubject, 4to, Decemb. the 10th 1701, in which the Author endeavours to clear and confirm the entry of the Archbiſhop's Parliament-Writ in the Convocation-Acts of both Provinces. In anſwer to theſe two *Letters* appeared *The Caſe of the* Præmunientes *conſidered*, 4to, 1701 [*R*]. The Author anſwers the motion about ſtrictly executing the *Præmunientes* clauſe, which was Dr. Atterbury's, out of Dr. Kennet's Reply to him; and in anſwer to his

(*k*) Pag. 132.

Atterbury, notwithſtanding their pretences to moderation, have failed in that point in their writings; and particularly Dr. Wake, and Dr. Kennet; tho' he owns, that his deſign is not to defend Mr. Atterbury, but only to deſire his readers *to paſs righteous judgment every where alike, and afford every Writer a due degree of reſentment, according as he is found to tranſgreſs the rules of temper and moderation* (58).

(58) Pag. 62.

[*Q*] *A Letter to a Clergyman in the country concerning the choice of Members &c.*] The Author recommends a particular care in the election of new Members of the Convocation, in conſideration of the diſputes on foot between the two Houſes; and intimates, that when they are determined to the prejudice of the lower Clergy, there will be an end of the rights and liberties of their Houſe, and that they will be from that moment an uſeleſs and inſignificant part of the conſtitution (59). He obſerves, that the late pleas for the authority of Metropolitans had not been advanced with any view of perpetuating the preſent Church eſtabliſhment; and that a temporal Government founded in liberty, as the Engliſh is, can never incorporate kindly with a ſpiritual Society, which is ſupported by ſlavery, but will either reduce it to ſome kind of conformity with itſelf, or quickly deſtroy it. He intimates, that it had been reſolved, that *the not executing of the clauſe* Præmunientes *in the Biſhop's Writ, but ſuppreſſing the ſame, after that the right of the Clergy to meet in their Parliamentary Convocations hath been publickly diſputed and denied, and the encouraging books and papers written againſt the rights and authority of Convocations, is a grievance.* He inſiſts upon the Clergy's demanding the execution of that clauſe, which he obſerves would fix their meeting ſo cloſe to thoſe of the Parliament, that neither the malice of their enemies, nor treachery of their falſe friends, would ever be able to diſſolve the union. He concludes with this text of Scripture; *Be of good courage, and let us play the men for our people and for the cities of our God; and the Lord do that which ſeemeth him good.*

(59) Pag. 1. Col. 1.

[*R*] *The caſe of the* Præmunientes *conſidered.*] The Author obſerves (60) that thoſe, who oppoſed the Biſhops, had begun the diſpute, and carried it on with a manifeſt violation of charity and good manners; for which he appeals to *the Letter to a Convocation-man*, and *Dr. Atterbury's Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an Engliſh Convocation*, and to every one of their later Pamphlets; *in which*, ſays he (61), *there are ſo many inſinuations, colours and ſtories, as even Martin Mar-Prelate did not more effectually affront the Biſhops of the Church of England.* He remarks then, that they had been inconſiſtent with each other; that the Author of *the Rights, Powers, and Privileges &c.* came in for a ſecond to the Writer of *the Letter to a Convocation-man*, and yet recedes from him in one of his three *principal* points, and in many other matters of opinion and fact. That this *ſecond* came in ſoon after to relieve himſelf in a new Edition of his *Rights, Power, &c.* owning his name and titles; and then he differs from himſelf more than he had differed from his friend. He builds the Hiſtory of our Reformation upon another model, and raiſes pretenſions abſolutely new. Then comes *The power of the Lower Houſe to adjourn itſelf*, &c. which, tho' juſtly ſuppoſed to come from the ſame hand, is clearly another ſcheme; for it was all before calculated to reſtrain the King's Supremacy; and 'tis now all to advance it beyond the Act of Submiſſion, and above all appearance of authority in the Archbiſhop and Biſhops.

(60) Pag. 1. Col. 2.

(61) Pag. 2. Col. 1.

his *ſecond Letter* [*S*] tells him, that the ſight of that had confirmed him in the opinion, that his cauſe was now capable of nothing but hardy countenance, and ſlight of hand (*l*), and that it would have been given up for loſt with all honeſt men, when it could be no longer ſupported with ſincerity and plainneſs, and *when the laſt reſort was to great untruths, ambiguous reſerves, and the artifices of deceiving* (*m*). Another paper likewiſe appeared againſt the *Letter to a Clergyman*, &c. intitled, *The late pretence of a conſtant practice to enter the Parliament as well as Provincial Writ, in the front of the Acts of every Synod, conſidered in a Letter to the Author of that Aſſertion, &c.* 4to, December the 11th 1701 [*T*]. This was followed with a Reply to Dr. Atterbury's *Second Letter to a Clergy-Man*, intitled, *The late Pretence, &c. further conſidered and diſproved in a ſecond Letter, &c.* 4to, December the 16th 1701 [*U*]. This occaſioned another pamphlet of Dr. Atterbury, intitled, *A third Letter to a Clergyman in the Country, &c. in defence of the two former*, 4to, January the 8th 1701 [*X*]; which was replied to in *An Anſwer to a* third

(*l*) Pag. 18. Col. 1.

(*m*) Pag. 20. Col. 2.

ſhops. *Then follows*, continues the Author, *the* Narrative of the Proceedings of the Lower Houſe, *and perfectly contradicts the former principles; in denying the Lower Houſe an* inherent power *of adjourning at diſcretion, and confining them not to go beyond the Biſhop's day; in denying the Members to abſent themſelves without leave of the Preſident; in making other conceſſions, and laying down poſitions wholly repugnant to them, that had gone before. Which uncertainty in their principles ſhews clearly enough, that they begun theſe new claims before they had fixt either upon the grounds or extent of them.* He tells us afterwards, that the managers of the cauſe againſt the Biſhops had not been ingenuous and fair in their relation of things. *They have told*, ſays he (62), *matters of fact directly wrong; they have charged falſhood on their adverſaries, that has turned purely upon their own heads. They have over and over repeated ſome ſlanders, when the world knew them to be ſuch. They have been ſo groſs in thoſe ways of inſincerity, that ſolemn proof has been made of it under the atteſtation of a Publick Notary. And 'tis ſaid, there will be other convictions of the like kind, when they pleaſe to call for any further ſatisfaction.*

(62) Pag. 2. Col. 2.

(63) Pag. 18. Col. 1.

[*S*] *His ſecond Letter.*] He obſerves (63), that the Author of *the Letter to a Clergyman in the country* having been ſufficiently told by his friends, that *he had run into very foul miſtakes in that firſt Letter, reſolved in ſome ſecond paper to bring himſelf off as well as he could.* He tells us then, that he had *aſſerted* in the firſt place *a direct falſhood*, and points out three other egregious miſtakes in his *ſecond Letter*; under the laſt of which he remarks *a way of reflecting, that directs us*, ſays he, *to the Author of both Letters; for none but Dr. A. could have taken ſuch a liberty. You could not cloſe*, continues he, *your laſt Letter, without* telling a piece of news, *as you call it; that notwithſtanding* a late ſolemn Atteſtation under the hand of a Public Notary concerning the want of a certain clauſe in ſeventy Archiepiſcopal Mandates, yet in the very Regiſters of the Archbiſhop, to which this Atteſtation refers, there is more than one Mandate with this very clauſe in it. *I muſt tell you, this news of yours is falſe and ſcandalous..... You don't believe yourſelf, when you make your friend believe ſo; for you immediately throw it upon a proverbial Lyar, Fame.* Yet Fame ſays that ſuch Mandates there are in thoſe very Regiſters.

[*T*] *The late pretence of a conſtant practice to enter the Parliament as well as Provincial Writ &c.*] The Author of *the Letter to a Clergyman in the country* had ſaid, that it was the conſtant practice ever ſince the Act of Submiſſion, in the front of the Acts of every Synod to enter the King's Parliament-Writ with the clauſe *Præmunientes*, as well as that to the Archbiſhop for calling the Clergy of his Province. And in proof of this he appealed to the original Acts of the Convocations of the Province of York, and the authentic Extracts of the Province of Canterbury. The Writer of the *late Pretence &c.* proves the contrary by a certificate from York, and by evidence from thoſe Extracts of Canterbury; and then ſignifies his concern at ſo bold a ſtroke to ſerve a turn, before the falſity of it could be detected; and at that Author's ſo ſhamefully impoſing on his brethren, and his profaneneſs in applying a text of Scripture in the cloſe of his Letter to the ſupport of what was contrary to religion and truth. And that Author having in this caſe offered in ſo many words, that if he deceived his readers herein, he was content to forfeit all his credit with any good man for ever; this animadverter tells him, that he could not ſee how he could avoid in that reſpect falling under his own ſentence. He adds, that he could not help being in pain for the Church, when they, who made moſt noiſe about maintaining it, put its defence upon ſuch an iſſue as this. And here, upon occaſion of Dr. Atterbury's declaring, that *if he deceived his readers, he was contented to forfeit all his credit with any good man for ever*, we ſhall tranſcribe a paſſage from a Pamphlet, intitled, *The preſent State of Convocation in a Letter, giving the full relation of Proceedings in ſeveral of the late Seſſions &c. correcting the miſtakes and ſlanders of the pretended* Faithful Accounts, *Numb.* 1, 2. London 1702 in 4to. "After the Form of Prorogation had been this day, "February 12th, read and ſigned in the Upper-Houſe, "as the Clergy were departing out of the Jeruſalem "Chamber, Dr. A. toward the door was earneſtly "puſhing on ſome Members, and crying, *Away to "the Lower-Houſe, to the Lower-Houſe.* The Ch. of "L. turning back to him, aſked, *If he were not a-"ſhamed to be always promoting contention and diviſion?* Dr. A. anſwered to this effect, *That he was "not* aſhamed *to be for the rights of the Clergy; that "there never was an inſtance before the laſt year, where "the Clergy were diſmiſſed by a Prorogation in the Up-"per-Houſe.* The Ch. replied, *I am afraid, Sir, you "are not to be believed; for I think by your own con-"feſſion* you have forfeited your credit with all good "men for ever (64)."

(64) Pag. 27.

[*U*] *The late Pretence &c. further conſider'd and diſproved in a ſecond Letter.*] The Author here freely tells the Writer of *the Letter to a Clergyman in the Country*, that a complication of falſhoods put together with ſo much management could not be the effect of ignorance, tho' even that would not be pardoned at the end of ſo ſolemn an appeal. But that an intended deceit (as this has all the appearance of being) was of a blacker complexion, and required a ſolemn *recanting*. That explaining would not be ſufficient; and that he had taken ſuch lengths in his aſſertion, that if he could keep up his credit under ſuch a cloud of witneſſes, that ſo fully impeach it, he muſt conclude there is not encouragement enough for ſincerity in this world. But that he could not ſuppoſe his brethren would ſet aſide their regard to publick Records, rather than queſtion the integrity of one, who kept his concluſion, even when he was forced to take notice himſelf that his premiſes failed. That he hoped he himſelf would repent of that, which upon the ſtricteſt enquiry appeared to him to be the greateſt prevarication he ever met with, except his Poſtſcript; which refers to a clauſe in the Archiepiſcopal Mandate.

[*X*] *A third Letter to a Clergyman in the Country &c.*] He complains of his anſwerers, that their chief talent and merit lay in darkening diſputes, and wearying readers by an endleſs repetition of the ſame baffled arguments, without any new turn of art or improvement. He obſerves, that the art of ſpreading ſcandal is in our time grown to an high pitch of perfection; and that ſome of the Order are extremely improved of late in their ſkill this way. That for his part he is eaſier under the reproaches of his antagoniſt, than he ſhould be under his panegyrics. He aſſerts his own innocence; and declares that he had repreſented facts truly, and that the Author or

third Letter to a Clergyman in the Country in defence of the Entry of the Parliament-Writ, &c. *wherein the great diſingenuity of the Author of it is plainly ſhewn, and the raſhneſs and falſhood of his former aſſertion is fully proved upon him*, 4to, March the 6th 1701 [*Y*]. In 1702 was publiſhed *Dr. Atterbury's Caſe of the Schedule ſtated, wherein an account is given of the riſe and deſign of that Inſtrument, and of the influence it hath on the adjournments of the Lower-Houſe of Convocation; and all the authorities urged in behalf of the Archbiſhop's ſole power to prorogue the whole Convocation, are occaſionally examined. By a Member of the Lower-Houſe of Convocation.* London 1702, in 4to. To this was oppoſed *The Schedule reviewed, or the right of the Archbiſhop to continue or prorogue the whole Convocation, cleared from the exceptions of a late* Vindication of the Narrative of the Lower Houſe; *and of a book, intitled,* The Caſe of the Schedule ſtated. London, in 4to, 1702. This piece is ſuppoſed to be written by Dr. Edmund Gibſon, who complains in it, that the manager of the cauſe of the Lower-Houſe had betrayed ſuch an unſteadineſs in his opinions, and had recourſe ſucceſſively to ſuch a variety of ſhifts, as would tempt one to think, that he firſt reſolved upon his point, and then ſet himſelf to find out ways to maintain it; and that the foundations of the defence were ſo often changed, that it was a ſign the cauſe had not been well conſidered by the firſt undertaker. This was followed with *The Parliamentary Original and Rights of the Lower-Houſe of Convocation cleared, and the evidences of its ſeparation from the Upper-Houſe produced on ſeveral heads, particularly in the point of making ſeparate applications (as a diſtinct body of men) to other bodies or perſons, in purſuance of an argument for the* Power of the Lower-Houſe to adjourn itſelf; in 4to 1702. The year following Dr. Gibſon publiſhed *A ſhort ſtate of ſome preſent queſtions in Convocation, particularly of the Right to continue or prorogue; by way of Commentary upon the Schedule of Continuation.* London 1703, in 4to, to which Dr. Geo. Hooper replied in his *Summary Defence of the Lower-Houſe of Convocation, particularly concerning Adjournments, in anſwer to a pamphlet, intitled,* A ſhort State, &c. in 4to 1703. This was anſwered by Dr. Gibſon in his *Marks of a defenceleſs cauſe in the proceedings and writings of the Lower-Houſe of Convocation, particularly in their third and laſt ſyſtem of principles invented by the* Vindicator *of their* Narrative, *and repeated in a pamphlet, intitled,* A ſummary defence of the Lower-Houſe; in 4to, 1703. The ſame Author likewiſe publiſhed, *The pretended independence of the Lower-Houſe upon the Upper, a groundleſs Notion, &c. being a Vindication of* Synodus Anglicana, *and the* Schedule Reviewed; *together with the integrity of their Author from the cenſures and reflections of a late pamphlet, intitled,* The Parliamentary Original and Rights of the Lower-Houſe, &c. in 4to, 1703. But the moſt conſiderable work againſt Dr. Atterbury was Dr. Wake's *State of the Church and Clergy of England in their Councils, Synods, Convocations, Conventions, and other public Aſſemblies, hiſtorically deduced from the converſion of the Saxons to the preſent time; occaſioned by a book intitled,* The Rights, Powers and Privileges

Authors, whom he was engaged with, had denied it upon mere frivolous conjectures and reaſonings. He produces a certificate of five Parliament-Writs to the Archbiſhop inſerted in the Extracts of five Convocations for Canterbury, and another certificate in oppoſition to the aſſertions of his antagoniſts. He ſays, that the wiſhes of thoſe who wrote againſt him, to find the facts he alledged falſe, were exceeding ſtrong, and that they miſtook thoſe wiſhes for arguments. That his antagoniſt uſed his words more like an executioner than a fair anſwerer, and put what he ſaid upon the rack to make it confeſs a meaning, which he could not but know in his conſcience it was never intended to imply. He gives alſo a further account of the affair of the Archbiſhop's *Mandate*, and charges his antagoniſt with a very groſs and wilful prevarication about it, and calls upon him either as publickly to diſprove the charge, or to own it. He confeſſes in the cloſe, that his taſk had been tedious, but that it was abſolutely neceſſary in order to clear his own integrity, and detect the Artifice of thoſe men, who, he ſays, *make lies their refuge, and in falſhood hide themſelves.*

[*Y*] *An Anſwer to a third Letter to a Clergyman &c.*] The Writer complains that the Author of that *Letter* had confounded him with two other Authors in ſeveral of his Reflections (65); and obſerves (66), that tho' he might with more decency reſent the treatment, which other better Writers had found from him, than that abundance of ſcorn, *with which*, ſays he, *you honour myſelf; yet I ſhall make no returns of that kind, either upon my own or their account. To be ſure not on my own, who have deſerved the uſage I have met with, if I have done you any injuſtice; and I ſhall think myſelf ſufficiently revenged, if I have ſhewn, that I offered you none. This, I think, I have done; but I muſt leave the reader to determine between us, when I have ſummed up the cauſe.* He then recapitulates what he had urged againſt his antagoniſt's aſſertion, "that it was the conſtant practice, in the front of "the Acts of every Synod, to enter the King's Par-"liament-Writ with the *premoniſhing* clauſe, as well "as that to the Archbiſhop for calling the Clergy of "his Province, undoubtedly to ſhew, that the Clergy "then aſſembled in Synod met no leſs in virtue "of the one than of the other." And he calls upon him to try again if *five* ſuch inſtances as he had brought from the Province of Canterbury from 1614 to 1625, and two from that of York, with the circumſtances that attend them all, will ſupport his aſſertion, and juſtly preſerve that credit, which he had *pawn'd with any good and conſidering man. I do not pretend,* continues he, *to equal abilities in thoſe matters with you; but hope the goodneſs of my cauſe may ſo far make up the diſproportion between us, as to keep me from being thought to go out of my depth. . . . . If you ſhall think fit to make trifling exceptions only to things incidentally mentioned, and that with ſo much ſcorn and contempt as you have ſhewn in this Letter, I ſhall think myſelf at liberty to ſit ſtill, as I am ſure ſuch uſage will not provoke me to write. However I wiſh for your own ſake, as well as for the intereſt of the Church, that* your expreſſions had leſs virulency in them, and your arguments more of ſincerity, plainneſs, and ſtrength. *Were they no otherwiſe pointed, they would go farther in the minds of good men a great deal, and the Church might receive great advantage from your miniſtry in it. But as your abilities have been employed, I doubt the ſearch you may have made and occaſioned, will not compenſate for the breach of the order and peace of the Church, and the ſcandal given both to the enemies and friends of Religion by our unhappy diviſions.*

(65) Pag. 1. Col. 1, 2.
(66) Pag. 16. Col. 1.

vileges of an Engliſh Convocation. Fol. 1703 [Z]. We find little after this of any importance upon the Convocation-diſpute till the year 1708, in which Dr. Atterbury publiſhed, without his name, *Some proceedings in the Convocation, A. D. 1705, faithfully repreſented. To which is prefixed an Account of the ſeveral ineffectual attempts at divers times made by the lower Clergy towards quieting all Diſputes, and proceeding upon Synodical Buſineſs.* London in 4to. This was anſwered in a pamphlet intitled, *Partiality detected, or a Reply to a late pamphlet, intitled,* Some Proceedings in the Convocation, &c. *diſcovering the many partial repreſentations and unjuſt reflections contained in the ſaid pamphlet,*

[Z] *Dr. Wake's* State of the Church and Clergy of England &c.] He begins his Preface by obſerving, that there is ſomething in the nature of controverſial writing ſo corruptive of morality, ſo apt to deſtroy ſome of the nobleſt graces of a Chriſtian life, that he looks upon the caſe to be much the ſame in that, as it is in other wars, and that nothing leſs than an abſolute neceſſity ought to engage a good man in either. *What temptations,* continues he, *it miniſters to pride and paſſion, to malice and uncharitableneſs, to falſeneſs and inſincerity; and what occaſions it too often affords to thoſe, who do not come with a large portion of calmneſs and integrity to the management of it, for the moſt indecent miſcarriages in ſome or all of thoſe particulars, I ſhall not need to ſay. I would to God our own times had not given us too many inſtances of it, to the ſcandal of Religion, as well as to the juſt cenſure of thoſe, who have allowed themſelves ſuch liberties as nothing can excuſe; and it is to be hoped, when they ſhall ſeriouſly reflect upon what they have done, they will be themſelves the moſt forward of any to condemn.* He afterwards profeſſes his *zealous concern* for the *rights, powers,* and *privileges* of the Biſhops and Clergy, and tells us, that *he is verily perſuaded, that he has done more to aſſert and ſecure them, than Dr. A. after all his loud pretences, has endeavoured, or, without forſaking the principles which he has laid down, will ever be able to do.* He obſerves, that he had begun and finiſhed his Anſwer to *the Letter to a Convocation-man* in about three months time; that after three years labour and application an anſwer to it came out under the ſpecious title of *The Rights, Powers, and Privileges, &c.* "The diſtance of the time, *ſays he,* the bulk of the "book itſelf, and the number of its quotations, the "familiar references which it every where made to "our manuſcript records, as well as to our printed "Hiſtorians, raiſed in me at firſt view a more than "ordinary expectation from it, and prompted me to "conclude, that in it I ſhould certainly meet with "ſomewhat to inſtruct as well as much to correct me, "and have my own wiſh thus far accompliſhed as to "ſee the ſubject fully exhauſted by another hand, "which I had freely acknowledged, as I had good "reaſon to do, I wanted both leiſure and materi-"als to finiſh." *In this opinion I was the more confirmed upon my firſt peruſal of the Preface to it. I ſaw a ſpirit of wrath and uncharitableneſs accompanied with ſuch an aſſurance of the then unknown Author's abilities for ſuch an undertaking, as I had hardly ever met with in the like degree before. I perceived that he deſired in the direct reverſe of what I had profeſſed, to be look'd upon to have written with care and deliberation, to have fully ſearched into his ſubject, and to have been no leſs plentifully ſtored with materials of all kinds for the perfect clearing of it. And tho' I do not think a man of pride and arrogance, full of himſelf, and a deſpiſer of all others, to be generally the beſt qualified to know either himſelf or the truth, yet I hoped I ſhould here find ſomewhat to clear the one, and thereby to atone for, if not to juſtify, the other.* . . . "What the reſult of my examination of this "Book was, the following treatiſe will abundantly ſhew. "I found in it enough to commend the wit, tho' "not the ſpirit of him, who wrote it. Life and vi-"gour, quick thoughts expreſſed in a briſk turn of "words, ran thro' the moſt part of it. One thing "indeed I deſired, (and even that too, for ought I "knew, was not the leaſt evidence of the artifice "of its Author,) that a general darkneſs and obſcu-"rity was ſpread over the whole performance; ſo "that it was not eaſy, even upon a careful reading, "to determine either what his principles were, or by "what arguments or authorities he ſupported thoſe "principles." He obſerves then that he was reſolved upon a confutation of it, *with this perſuaſion,* ſays he, *which neither prejudice nor indignation at the rudeneſs or confidence of my adverſary, but the mere juſtice I owe to truth, obliges me to declare, that in all my life I never met with ſo many or ſuch groſs miſtakes (for I am unwilling to call them by any harder name) of matters of fact, as well as errors in all kind of principles, as I found in this Book; ſcarce a leaf of which will bear a rigorous ſcrutiny, and but a few that will ſtand the moſt favourable examination. But ſo it muſt needs be,* where an Author writes in the dark out of other mens Collections; *and appeals to* Regiſters *and* Records, *not only without ever ſeeing of them, but from ſuch ſhort hints, which tho' the firſt tranſcriber may poſſibly have underſtood, yet a raw compiler, who knows nothing at all of the matter, can hardly be ſuppoſed capable of making any wiſe or pertinent uſe of them. This is an excuſe which Dr. A. I confeſs has no right to, becauſe he pretends to have been himſelf the gatherer, as well as digeſter, of the materials of his Book. But I am well aſſured that this was truly the caſe; and 'tis the moſt favourable apology I know how to make for a great many of his errors.* Dr. Wake however tells us (66), that "to pay what is due to "an adverſary, it muſt be allowed, that Dr. A. has "done all that a man of forward parts and a hearty "zeal could do to defend the cauſe which he had "eſpouſed. He has choſen the moſt plauſible topics "of argumentation; and he has given them all the "advantage, that either a ſprightly wit, or a good "aſſurance could afford them. But he wanted one "thing; he had not truth on his ſide; and error, "tho' it may be palliated, and by an artificial ma-"nager, ſuch as Dr. A. without controverſy is, be "diſguiſed ſo as to deceive ſometimes even a wary "reader, yet it will not bear a ſtrict examination. And "accordingly I have here ſhewn him, notwithſtanding "all his other endowments, (in which, if he pleaſes, "he ſhall have my free conſent to ſtand above me,) "to have deluded the world with a mere romance; "and from the one end of his diſcourſe to the other "to have delivered a Hiſtory, not of what was really "done, but of what it was his intereſt to make it "believed had been done." He vindicates himſelf afterwards from the imputations caſt upon him by Dr. Atterbury, that *he had written againſt his conſcience;* and that in order to ſet up *an unreaſonable authority* in the Prince, he had eſpouſed ſuch *notions* as naturally tend to the *overthrow* of our *conſtitution* both in *Church* and *State. Were I now minded,* ſays he, *to recriminate, and ſhew in how many inſtances this pretended* Church-Advocate *has ſet up ſuch notions, as, being fairly purſued, muſt tend to the deſtruction not only of our* Synodical Rights and Liberties, *but of our very* Epiſcopal Conſtitution *itſelf, I ſhould not need to look far for them. The doctrine of* Attendance, *which he is ſo* fond of, and builds the greateſt part *of his Book upon, is itſelf a principle of ſlavery, recommended under the name of Right and Liberty, and equally injurious to the Clergy on either ſide, both as it obliges them to a conſtant attendance whenever the Parliament meets, and as long as it ſhall continue to ſit, and deprives them of all power to aſſemble or act at any other times, when that great Council is not held. And how far that Preſbyterian notion maintained by him, that mere Preſbyters have by primitive practice and inſtitution an equal right of place and voice with Biſhops in the Councils of the Church, may be improved to confound the powers and authorities of both, I ſhall leave it to every real friend of our Eccleſiaſtical Polity to conſider. Many other principles there are ſcattered up and down in his Book, which I might here bring together, were I diſpoſed to take the like method with him, which he has done to prejudice his reader againſt me.*

(66) Preface, pag. 7.

phlet, particularly as to what concerns the proceedings of the Convocation in Ireland. London 1708, in 4to [*AA*]. Biſhop Burnet in the ſecond volume of his *Hiſtory of his own Times* (*n*), and other writers take notice of our Author's conduct in theſe diſputes in very ſevere terms [*BB*], which we ſhall give the reader, who will conſider us in this as well as in all other articles as mere Hiſtorians, who endeavour only to give a candid repreſentation of perſons and things, and therefore not accountable for the prejudices or partiality of others. However the vigour with which he appeared in defence of the *Lower-Houſe of Convocation*, diſtinguiſhed him in ſuch a manner, that he received the thanks of that houſe. For we are informed in the *Hiſtory of the Convocation, which met Feb. the 6th* 1700, publiſhed in 4to, 1702, that on April the 8th, when Dr. Finch returned from the Upper-Houſe to the Lower, with an account that no meſſage would be received from them for want of the Prolocutor's preſence, the Dean of Gloceſter took occaſion to ſay, that ſince the Upper-Houſe denied this correſpondence with them, it was now time for the Houſe to return their thanks to Mr. Atterbury for his learned pains in aſſerting and vindicating the rights of Convocation. Upon which it was warmly debated, and the form of thanks being propoſed to be changed from *learned pains in aſſerting and vindicating*, into his *endeavours to aſſert and vindicate*, upon a diviſion of the houſe, it was carried as deſigned in the affirmative. And then the Prolocutor ſaid, *Mr. Archdeacon of Totneſs, I and this Houſe*, (which the Author of the *Hiſtory* obſerves to be no parliamentary phraſe) *return you our thanks, &c.* Upon this vote a letter was afterwards ſent to the Univerſity of Oxford, *that whereas Mr. Francis Atterbury, late of Chriſt Church, had ſo happily*

(*n*) Book 6. pag. 249. edit. London 1734.

[*AA*] *Partiality detected, or a Reply to a late Pamphlet entitled,* Some Proceedings, &c.] The Author obſerves in his Preface, that he has taken things in order as they lay both in his antagoniſt's Preface and Book, and endeavoured to ſhew that *the facts referred to in both are in many particulars very greatly miſrepreſented*, and that the things attempted by the majority of the Lower-Houſe have not been for peace. That the repreſentation which that Writer has given us of them, after above two years chewing upon them, is, he confeſſes, *ſo extremely artificial, and wrought up with ſo many guarding expreſſions*, where there was any room for them, in preparation for a defence, if he ſhould be called to account, that it had taken up a good deal of time ſo to detect the partiality of it, as to make it evident to thoſe, who are ſtrangers to the proceedings of the two Houſes of Convocation. *But I verily believe*, continues he, *that even ſuch will ſee thro' all his diſguiſes; that he has not followed truth in the accounts he has given, and that neither he nor his friends have laboured for peace. That the Archbiſhop and Biſhops, and many Members of the Lower-Houſe acting with them, who are charged as the diſturbers and hinderers of it, have made real approaches towards it, and managed the diſputes that remained with a decent regard to thoſe that oppoſed them. And that on the other hand the patrons of the Lower-Houſe's claims have fallen very ſhort of that reſpect they owed to their fathers and brethren in the manner of treating this controverſy, and advanced every new Convocation in their pretenſions and practices upon them; and to ſupport their pretences have brought in at laſt an evidence from Ireland, which has as little relation to* Right, *as it has tendency to* Peace. *I am not aware that I have expreſſed myſelf ſo as to miſlead my reader in any particular; and tho' I will not for all this pretend to ſay there is no one miſtake in my paper, as much care as I have taken to avoid making any, yet I do promiſe, that if this Writer, or any for him, does ſhew me any ſuch error, I will readily retract it; as I deſire nothing but that the truth ſhould be known. But if this Writer or any of his friends ſhould treat this Anſwer with ſcorn and diſdain, without making any fair reply to the arguments and facts it contains, as has been formerly done, I ſhall not think myſelf obliged to take any notice of ſo unſincere and haughty a Writer.* Having remarked likewiſe upon what his antagoniſt had ſaid with relation to a Pamphlet intitled, *Proceedings in the preſent Convocation* (67) *relating to the danger of the Church &c.* which had been voted by the Lower-Houſe to be *diſingenuous, partial, falſe*, and *ſcandalous* (68); and obſerved (69), that "he cannot tell whether the world will "be contented with this, and allow that Houſe ſo "aſſembled to be ſuch competent Judges in a caſe, "that ſo nearly related to them, as to ſubmit to their "ſentence, which appears without any evidence to "ſupport it, only becauſe it was pronounced in a "place that ought to have had greater influence on "the minds of thoſe that met in it, than we have "hitherto found;" he proceeds thus: *I ſhall not enter much into the perſonal reflections, which this Writer makes on the perſon he ſuppoſes to have been the Author of the fore-mentioned account, and which I think a man that makes ſuch profeſſions of regard to truth and peace ſhould have wholly forborn. And the rather becauſe it has put people upon gueſſing at this Writer alſo, and ſaying that the perſon ſuppoſed has the leaſt reaſon of all men to reproach others with* Fabulous Hiſtory, *had there been any occaſion given him here, where no inſtance of falſhood being produced, there is no reaſon to think it is the truth of this Hiſtorian, that has drawn ſo much diſpleaſure upon him. But it has been the practice of this Writer and his friends from the very beginning to call the accounts of thoſe that oppoſed them, falſe and ſcandalous, without ever ſhewing any particular, wherein they were ſo, as they were told in the Preface to the Account of the Convocation in* 1702.

(67) That which began Oct. the 25th, 1705.
(68) See *Some Proceedings, &c.* pag. 3.
(69) *Partiality detected, &c.* pag. 31.

[*BB*] *Biſhop Burnet . . . and other Writers take notice of our Author's conduct in this diſpute in very ſevere terms.*] The Biſhop obſerves, that thoſe, who began then to be called the *High-Church* Party, being diſappointed of their views of preferment, *ſet up a complaint over England of the want of Convocations, that they were not allowed to ſit nor act with a free liberty to conſider of the grievances of the Clergy, and of the danger the Church was in.* "This, ſays he, was a new "pretenſion, never thought of ſince the Reformation. "Some Books were writ to juſtify it with great a-"crimony of ſtyle, and a ſtrain of inſolence, that "was peculiar to one *Atterbury*, who had indeed "very good parts, great learning, and was an ex-"cellent Preacher, and had many extraordinary things "in him; but was both ambitious and virulent out "of meaſure; and had a ſingular talent of aſſerting "paradoxes with a great aſſurance, ſhewing no "ſhame, when he was detected in them, tho' this "was done in many inſtances. But he let all theſe "paſs without either confeſſing his errors, or pre-"tending to juſtify himſelf. He went on ſtill vent-"ing new falſhoods in ſo barefaced a manner, that "he ſeemed to have outdone the Jeſuits themſelves. "He thought the Government had ſo little ſtrength, "or credit, that any claim againſt it would be well "received. He attacked the ſupremacy of the Crown "with relation to eccleſiaſtical matters, which had "been hitherto maintained by all our Divines with "great zeal. But now the hot Men of the Clergy "did ſo readily entertain his notions, that in them "it appeared, that thoſe, who are the moſt earneſt "in the defence of certain points, when theſe ſeem "to be for them, can very nimbly change their "minds upon a change of circumſtances." And here it may not be improper to quote a paſſage from a Pamphlet in 4to, intitled *A Reconciling Letter upon the late differences about* Convocational *Rights and Proceedings, as managed by thoſe, who have maintained the Liberties of the* lower Clergy; which paſſage, if

happily asserted the rights and privileges of an English Convocation, as to merit the solemn thanks of the Lower-House of it for his learned pains upon that subject; it might be hoped that the University would be not less forward in taking some publick notice of so great a piece of service to the Church. And that the most proper and seasonable mark of respect to him would be to confer on him the degree of Doctor of Divinity by diploma, without doing exercise, or paying fees; which was accordingly done. We find him likewise engaged in a warm contest with Mr. Nicholson, then Archdeacon, and afterwards Bishop of Carlisle, on account of a passage in his *English Historical Library* relating to Convocations [*CC*]. But to view our Author apart from these disputes, in the year 1698 he preached a Sermon of *the Usefulness of Church Musick* on St. Cecilia's day; and December the 4th the same year another upon *the wretchedness of living in a wavering state of mind*, at the Rolls Chapel, of which he was appointed Preacher by Sir John Trevor Master of the Rolls. In 1700 he was made Archdeacon of Totness by Sir Jonathan Trelawny then Bishop of Exeter, and was installed January the 29th (*o*); and the same Bishop likewise appointed him Canon-Residentiary of Exeter. In 1701 he preached a Sermon before the House of Commons on the 29th of May concerning *the wisdom of Providence manifested in the Revolution*

(*o*) Le Neve, *Fasti Eccles. Anglican.* pag. 97. edit. London 1716, in fol.

the allegations in it be well-grounded, reflects very severely upon the sincerity of Dr. Atterbury as a Writer in this controversy. The Author of it having observed that a certain number of Members in the Lower-House of Convocation, who were represented by their friends as wise and good men, espoused the Episcopal cause, and all along opposed the majority of their brethren, proceeds thus: *These few men, and some others of the like opinion, have objected hard things against the Writers on our side. They say, Dr. Atterbury and Mr. Hill, who join in the same cause or defence of Convocations, are as wide in their principles as East and West, never to be reconciled. They say, that Dr. Atterbury made two editions of the same Book, directly contradicting one another in many material points. That in both Editions he kept to the one design of lessening the King's Prerogative in convocational affairs. And yet that he is since engaged in a mere opposite argument of advancing the Royal Prerogative much beyond the Act of the Clergy's Submission, and much beyond the claims of any former reign, by making the Synod purely* subsist *by the King's Writ; by rendering the Archbishop an* instrument *only of the King, and wholly* ministerial *to him. For they presume Dr. A. to be the Author of the three sheets, intitled,* The Power of the Lower-House of Convocation to adjourn itself &c. *wherein they pretend he has brought the Church to a kind of absolute subjection to the State; has released the Presbyters from all canonical obedience to the Archbishop and Bishops; has set up for a power in the Lower-House, which was never before imagined, and cannot be now exercised without destroying the constitution of an Episcopal Church. That he has attempted to prove this by reasons, which they call mere fallacies, and by facts, which they assert to be perfect falsehoods. That he has set off the action with such turns and reflections as they complain of, to be anger and bitterness of spirit. And especially that he has took occasion to be unjust to Dr. K. in charging him with the want of sincerity about omitting a clause in the Archiepiscopal Mandates, when yet another, who has replied in* The Right of the Archbishop to continue and prorogue the whole Convocation, &c. *does justify the care and integrity of Dr. K. and throws back the charge of falsehood upon him that made it; and this under the attestation of a Public Notary, to make the fact more apparent, and the conviction more undeniable.* The Author then mentions the inconsistences, which he had observed between three of the principal Tracts in defence of the Lower-House of Convocation, the two former of which were either known or supposed to have been written by Dr. Atterbury, viz. *The Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation*, 2d Edit. *The Power of the Lower-House to adjourn itself*; and *The Narrative of the Proceedings of the Lower-House of Convocation*, with *Notes* in the margin, and the *Preface* of the Publisher. "I must confess, says he, upon collating of them, I "do find some matters of *opinion* and some of *fact* "so variously stated, that I must beg the benefit of "your judgment how to extricate myself out of some "doubts and difficulties; which to reject, and which "to believe."

[*CC*] *Engaged in a contest with Mr. Nicholson, on account of a passage in his* English Historical Library *relating to Convocations.*] Mr. Nicholson (71) had defined from Bishop Stillingfleet (72) Convocations to be *only occasional assemblies of the Bishops and inferior Clergy for such purposes as the King shall direct, when they meet*; which drew upon him the censures of Dr. Atterbury in the Preface (73) to his *Rights, Powers, and Privileges &c.* who tells us in another place of his Preface (74), that Mr. Nicholson in a little Book of his had taken upon him to be Umpire in that controversy. *By what secret motive,* says he, *he was invited to undertake this office, he best knows. Sure I am, that it was not out of any peculiar skill and ability he had to discharge it. Since he has gone out of his way to mix in a dispute that did not belong to him, he must excuse me, if I have not gone out of mine, to avoid seeing his mistakes; which I have taken notice of no otherwise than as the course of my reflections and the particular matter I was upon, led me to observe them. And even at this rate the crop was plentiful.* In the Book itself he treats Mr. Nicholson with great severity; and particularly where says (75); *Whether all this evidence put together may be allowed to outweigh our Librarian's new guess, must be left to the reader. If it does, it will be apt to raise in him no very advantageous opinion, either of Mr. Nicholson's skill in these particular matters, or of his modesty in any.* He tells us afterwards (76), that *the only thing that can keep Dr. W. in countenance, is that a certain Brother-Author of his, a Member of Convocation, knows as little of these things as he does. . . . .* "I remember, continues he, his (*Mr. Nicholson's*) words of Bale, (such another rash and rude "Writer) who has misjudged of a certain piece; "*The character might be true, for any thing perhaps that he knew; but 'tis that Writer's way to give "accounts of men and their labours at random* ‖: "Words, which had Mr. Nicholson carried in his "eye throughout the course of his work, it would "have been much shorter, and much better than it "is at present. The three parts of his *Historical "Library* would have shrunk into the compass of "one, had he confined himself to say nothing of "Books, but what he *knew* of them. And this I "assure him is a character not given at random." But Dr. Kennet in a passage quoted * above from his *Preface* to his *Ecclesiastical Synods* has asserted, that our Author had dealt very unfairly with Mr. Nicholson, as well as with several other eminent Writers. And Mr. Nicholson himself published *A Letter to Dr. White Kennet in defence of the Historical Library against Mr. Francis Atterbury's Objections*; 1702, in 4to. He vindicated himself likewise in the *Preface* to his *Scottish Historical Library* (77), in the conclusion of which Preface (78) he observes, that the man who should dare to publish such a new and false exposition of a Statute-Law, as Mr. Atterbury has ventured to give us of the 25th of Henry VIII, would immediately be adjudged guilty of *leasing-making*; *and I need not*, says he, *inform so knowing a person, as he pretends to be, what would follow upon such a sentence. The Laws of England are perhaps a little better humoured; but neither will they long endure such a load of Jest and Poetry as this Explainer seems to be bringing upon them.*]

(71) *Hist. Libr.* vol. 3. pag. 200. edit. London 1699.
(72) *Rights of the Parochial Clergy*, pag. 364, 365.
(73) Pag. 3.
(74) Pag. 24.
(75) Pag. 460.
(76) Pag. 476, 477.
‖ *Hist. Libr.* vol. 1. p. 177.
* See note [*N*].
(77) Edit. London 1702, in 8vo.
(78) Pag. 36.

volution of Government, in which he gives a noble deſcription of the conſtitution of England, and King William's character [*DD*]. The ſame year he was engaged with Dr. Jane Dean of Gloceſter, Dr. Aldrich Dean of Chriſt-Church, Dr. Sherlock Dean of St. Paul's, Dr. Cave, Dr. Alſton, Dr. Lancaſter, and Mr. Duke, in reviſing an edition of the Greek Teſtament in folio, with Greek *Scholia* upon the whole, collected from the Fathers, &c. by Mr. Archdeacon Gregory, which was deſigned to be publiſhed at Oxford (*o*). Queen Anne upon her acceſſion to the throne appointed him her Chaplain. In the year 1703 May the 30th he preached a Sermon upon *the terrors of Conſcience* before the Lord Mayor at St. Paul's, which is a ſtrong repreſentation of the horrors attending guilt [*EE*]. In 170$\frac{4}{5}$ March the 8th he preached before the Houſe of Commons on *the duty of publick interceſſion and thankſgiving for Princes*, and gave a beautiful Panegyric upon the Queen [*FF*]. In Auguſt or September following he was preſented to the Deanery of Carliſle (*p*) [*GG*], and inſtalled October the ſecond (*q*). His funeral Sermon on

(*o*) See an Advertiſement at the end of the preface to the *Narrative of the Proceedings of the Lower-Houſe of Convocation*, London 1701, in 4to.

(*p*) Le Neve, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 337.

(*q*) Willis's *Survey of the Cathedrals*, vol. 1. pag. 304.

[*DD*] *In which he gives an admirable deſcription of the Conſtitution of England, and King William's Character.*] He tells us (79), that we of this Iſland enjoy a conſtitution, wiſely moulded out of all the different forms and kinds of Civil Government, into ſuch an excellent and happy frame, as contains in it all the advantages of thoſe ſeveral forms, without ſharing deeply in any of their great inconveniences. *A conſtitution*, ſays he, *nicely poized between the extremes of too much liberty and too much power, the ſeveral parts of it having a proper check upon each other by the means of which they are all reſtrained or ſoon reduced within their due bounds; and yet the peculiar powers, with which each is ſeparately inveſted, are ſure always in dangerous conjunctures to give way to the common good of the whole. A conſtitution, where the Prince is cloathed with a prerogative that enables him to do all the good he hath a mind to, and wants no degree of authority, but what a good Prince would not and an ill one ought not to have. Where he governs tho' not abſolutely, yet glorioufly, becauſe he governs men and not ſlaves; and is obeyed by them chearfully, becauſe they know, that in obeying him they obey thoſe laws only, which they themſelves had a ſhare in contriving. A conſtitution, where the external Government of the Church is ſo cloſely interwoven with that of the State, and ſo exactly adapted to it in all its parts, as that it can flouriſh only, when that flouriſhes, and muſt, as it hath always hitherto done, decline, die, and revive with it. In a word, where the intereſt of Prince and Subject, Prieſt and People are perpetually the ſame; and the only fatal miſtake, that ever happens in our politics, is, when they are thought to be divided.* He afterwards proceeds to the character of King William in this manner: *To the influence of this day* (that of the Reſtoration) *it is owing, that we have now at the head of our troops and our councils a Prince, who hath happily joined together the extremes of martial and political virtues, and knows as well how to govern a free people by their own laws and cuſtoms, as to command legions; who, whether in the cabinet, or in the field, is equally in his ſphere; and is always indifferent either to war or peace, any further than the one or the other ſhall conduce to the good of his people and the general intereſt of mankind* (80).

(79) Serm. 7. pag. 263, edit. London 1723.

(80) Ibid. pag. 267.

[*EE*] *A ſtrong repreſentation of the horrors attending guilt.*] He has given us in that Sermon a character of Mr. Hobbs, with an idea of the perpetual fears and apprehenſions, which he was ſubject to, and which our Author accounts for from the conſciouſneſs of his attempts to deſtroy the very firſt principles of all Religion, notwithſtanding his own inward conviction of it. And he illuſtrates his ſubject by Tiberius's Letter to the Senate from his infamous retreatment at Capreæ, with Tacitus's Reflections upon that Letter. *Believe it*, ſays Dr. Atterbury (81), *the tales of ghoſts and ſpectres were not (as is commonly ſaid) the mere inventions of deſigning men to keep weak minds in awe; nor the productions only of a religious fear, degenerated into melancholy and ſuperſtition; but wicked men, haunted with a ſenſe of their own guilt (as the cruel Tetrarch here in the text with the Baptiſt's murther) were uſed to affright themſelves with ſuch phantoms as theſe, and often miſtook ſtrong and terrible imaginations for real apparitions.* He afterwards obſerves (82), that "the diſorders and reprehenſions of *conſci-* "*ence* are not a *continued* but an *intermitting* diſeaſe, re- "turning upon the mind by fits, and at particular "ſeaſons only; in the intervals of which the patient "ſhall have ſeeming health and real eaſe. The e- "ruptions of burning mountains are not *perpetual*, "nor doth the ſmoak itſelf aſcend always from the "tops of them; but tho' the ſeeds of fire lodged in "the caverns may be ſtifled and ſuppreſſed for a "time, yet anon they gather ſtrength, and break "out again with a rage great in proportion to its diſ- "continuance. 'Tis by accidents and occaſions chiefly "that the power of this principle is called forth into "act; by a ſudden ill turn of fortune, or a fit of "ſickneſs, or our obſervation of ſome remarkable in- "ſtance of divine vengeance, which hath overtaken "men in like caſes."

(81) *Sermons by Dr. Fr. Atterbury, publiſhed from the Originals by Thomas Moore*, D. D. vol. 2. p. 116, 117. edit. London 1734.

(82) Pag. 120, 121.

[*FF*] *A beautiful Panegyric upon the Queen.*] *A Queen*, ſays he (83), *who wears the crown of her forefathers, to which ſhe is entitled by blood, and which was placed on her Royal Head, not only with the free conſent, but with the univerſal joy and acclamations of her ſubjects. Who rules a willing people, not by the terrors of rods and axes, but with the indulgent tenderneſs of a common parent. Who deſires rather to be beloved than feared by them, and takes the trueſt way toward ſecuring their utmoſt love, by ſhewing in every ſtep of her gracious conduct, that ſhe entirely loves them. Who hath no intereſt, can have no intereſt ſeparate from theirs; and upon whom malice itſelf could never faſten a ſuſpicion of her purſuing any meaſures, which aimed rather at her own glory or advantage, than the common good of England. The Law is as much a rule to her, as to the leaſt of thoſe who obey her; the fixt meaſure, not only of her governing power, but even of her will to govern; and ſhe makes no other uſe of that power, with which the Laws have inveſted her, than to give life and force to them. The bleſſings of her mild and merciful Government deſcend from the Throne upon her people*, as the ſmall rain cometh down into a fleece of wool, *without vehemence or noiſe*, like the drops of rain, that water the earth gently and inſenſibly. *She draws up the free offerings of our love and duty only to return them back again in ſhowers of Royal Bounty; which make glad the land, and produce a mighty increaſe.* He tells us afterwards, that "ſhe "deſerved the Throne, *as well by her virtue as by* "*her birth*; who in that publick and exalted ſtation "preſerves all the innocence and ſanctity of a *private* "*life*; who is ſuperior to all the temptations, which "a great power ſuggeſts, and which nothing but as "great goodneſs ever overcomes; and to whom there- "fore her ſubjects ſeem to be almoſt as much oblig- "ed for the ſhining pattern of unaffected piety which "ſhe ſets them, as for all the other bleſſings of her "proſperous reign."

(83) *Sermons*, vol. 1. Serm. 8. pag. 299, 300, &c. edit. 1723.

[*GG*] *Preſented to the Deanery of Carliſle.*] Upon this occaſion we are obliged by the impartiality, which is neceſſary to ſuch a work as ours, to take notice of a very extraordinary piece of conduct in our Divine, mentioned in a little piece, intitled, *A Letter from the South by way of Anſwer to a Letter from a Northern Divine*, &c. Upon the nomination of Dr. Grahme from the Deanery of Carliſle to that of Bath and Wells, Dr. Atterbury was appointed to ſucceed him; who took out the inſtruments for his inſtallation before his predeceſſor had reſigned. Dr. Nicholſon Biſhop of that See told him therefore, when he came to wait upon him, that he could not admit him for Dean without a formal Reſignation from Dr. Grahme; ſo that Dr. Atterbury was detained a whole

on Mr. Thomas Bennet the bookſeller engaged him in a diſpute with Mr. Hoadly the preſent Biſhop of Saliſbury, concerning the advantages of virtue with regard to the preſent life. Dr. Atterbury had inferred from this paſſage of St. Paul, 1 Cor. xv. 19. *If in this life only we have hope in Chriſt, we are of all men moſt miſerable*, that if there were no life after this, men would be more miſerable than beaſts, and that the beſt of men would often be moſt miſerable, ſince their principles do not give them leave to taſte ſo freely of the pleaſures of life, as other men's do, and expoſe them more to the troubles and dangers of it. Mr. Hoadly examined theſe concluſions in a *Letter to Dr. Francis Atterbury, concerning Virtue and Vice* [*HH*], publiſhed in the year 1706. This was anſwered by Dr. Atterbury in the Preface to his volume of Sermons, in which he endeavours to ſupport his opinion, and by a long induction of great authorities to ſhew the world, that the general current of Divines, eſpecially thoſe of our own country, agreed with

whole month at Carliſle unadmitted and ſlightly regarded, till the Reſignation inſiſted upon was produced. This Reſignation however upon examination was found to have a flaw in it; which upon his return he endeavoured to rectify in a very unuſual manner. He ſaw that the date of it was almoſt a month ſubſequent to that of his Collation, which rendered the latter null and invalid; and therefore took the following method to amend it. On the 10th of January 1704-5 by the intereſt of Mr. S—d he met his predeceſſor and deſired him to antedate his Reſignation; and inſtead of the 5th of Auguſt to date it on the 8th of July, that ſo it might be reconciled to his Letters-Patents of Collation. The Dean of Wells required a day's time to conſider of the affair, and conſulted an able civilian and other friends, who told him, that as Dr. Atterbury's Letters-Patents were regiſtered, and his own Reſignation inrolled in Chancery, to offer at any alteration of them, when they ſtood upon record, would be a very ill and ſcandalous, as well as dangerous practice. The Dean of Wells therefore ſent the next morning a Letter to Dr. Atterbury, and excuſed himſelf from meeting on that occaſion that day, becauſe he could not poſſibly comply with his requeſt of altering the date of his Reſignation. When the Doctor ſaw that this deſign failed, another ſtep was taken; for a friend of his on the Saturday following made a motion to a conſiderable Officer in the Chancery, that the date of the Reſignation might be altered in the Roll itſelf. But this propoſal was likewiſe rejected; and ſo the publick inſtruments continued irregular.

[*HH*] *Mr. Hoadly examined theſe concluſions in a Letter . . . concerning Virtue and Vice.*] He endeavours to ſhew, that Dr. Atterbury has extremely miſtaken the ſenſe of his text, and advanced ſeveral poſitions of dangerous conſequence to Religion. He obſerves (84), that the Apoſtle ſpoke only with reſpect to the ſevere ſufferings, to which the profeſſion of Chriſtianity then expoſed its profeſſors. "The Apoſtle, "*ſays he to Dr. Atterbury* (85), ſpeaks of Chriſtians "profeſſing faith in Chriſt; you ſpeak of perſons "practiſing the moral precepts of Religion. The "Apoſtle ſpeaks of the condition of ſuch Chriſtians "in a ſtate of the moſt bitter perſecution; you ſpeak "of the condition of virtuous perſons in the ordinary "courſe of God's Providence. The Apoſtle deſigns "nothing by his aſſertion and ſuppoſition, but to "ſhame thoſe ignorant unwary profeſſors of Chriſtia-"nity out of the denial of a general Reſurrection; "you on the contrary draw from your ſuppoſition and "aſſertions an abſolute argument for the Certainty of "a future State. So that upon the review it ſeems "evident, that you have miſtaken the aſſertion it-"ſelf, which the Apoſtle layeth down in the text, "the perſons concerning whom he intends it, the "times, to which he manifeſtly limits it, and the con-"cluſion which he deſigned ſhould be drawn from "it." He then examines the following aſſertion of our Author: "Were there no life after this . . . . "the beſt of men would be often the moſt miſerable; "I mean, as far as happineſs or miſery are to be "meaſured from pleaſing or painful ſenſations. And ſup-"poſing the preſent to be the only life we are to lead, "I ſee not but that this might be eſteemed the true "meaſure of them." Mr. Hoadly tells us, that theſe words expreſly aſſert, that ſuppoſing there were no future State, the practice of virtue would not be the happineſs of man, but the purſuit of bodily pleaſures, which the beaſts are capable of enjoying; and that the beſt of the Heathen Philoſophers would have deteſted ſuch an opinion, nay and even the worſt too, ſince Epicurus was far from ſpeaking in that manner concerning virtue, tho' he abſolutely denied a future State and a Providence. Whereas Dr. Atterbury had maintained that poſition, without once ſuppoſing ſuch a ſtate of perſecution, as the Apoſtle pointed at. Mr. Hoadly obſerves, that it is very ſtrange, that he ſhould take ſuch a notion for granted without attempting any proof of it, tho' it was the main point in the diſpute. That in making the compariſon firſt between men and beaſts, and then between the beſt and worſt of men, he ſhould not once mention any ſingle inſtance of the excellence of the former above the latter. *One would have thought*, ſays he, *that even ſuppoſing no ſtate after this, it were ſome advantage to be made capable of knowing God; of imitating him; of ſeeing him in his works; of ſtudying and finding out truth. One would have thought, that the pleaſures of friendſhip and honeſt ſociety; of interchanging mutual good offices; of contributing to the eaſe and happineſs of our fellow-creatures; and of the practice of many virtues, which are happineſs itſelf, might have been worth the mentioning; not to ſay, might have been accounted by you far beyond the pleaſures of ſenſe, even in this ſtate.* "It is again wonderful, that you "ſhould not think it worth your while to mention "any ſingle diſadvantage either of beaſts in their "being made wholly uncapable of theſe God-like ſa-"tisfactions; or of wicked men in the proſecution "of their luſts and paſſions." *What? Is it of no account, that wicked men follow their inclinations, even upon your own ſuppoſition, in contradiction to their reaſon? Or is this an happier ſtate than to follow reaſon, and imitate God, in contradiction to inclination? Doth not the latter neceſſarily leave the man in a more happy ſtate than the former? Or are thoſe laſhes of conſcience, under which you ſuppoſe the wicked, of no manner of conſideration? Is it of no account, that the intemperate purſuit of the pleaſures the wicked chooſe, deſtroys even their own deſign, and leads them into a thouſand ſickneſſes, diſturbances, perplexities, deaths; which the virtuous keep off by their temperance, and chaſtity, and command over their appetites? Is it of no account, that envy, malice, revenge, inſatiable deſire of riches or honours, are preſent unhappineſs in themſelves; and that the virtues contrary to them are inward peace and harmony and quiet? Is it of no account, that many vices impair the health, deſtroy the vigour of the mind, haſten death, ruin eſtates, diſturb families, render men the ſcorn and contempt of the good part of the world? And are not theſe certain inconveniences and unhappineſſes in this preſent eſtate, and ſuch as were fit to be mentioned? Is it of no account, that wicked men are as liable to ſickneſs and afflictions, as the good; and want thoſe ſupports in them, which the good and upright, upon your own ſuppoſition, enjoy? Nay that their very ſucceſſes in this world are frequently the occaſions and inſtruments even of their preſent ruin and unhappineſs? And why, I pray, ſhould all this be overlooked for the ſake of thoſe brutiſh pleaſures, in which they indulge themſelves even beyond the example of beaſts?* Mr. Hoadly urges ſeveral other objections againſt our Author's doctrine, with the ill tendency of it. *Your poſitions*, ſays he (86), *deprive the cauſe of virtue of a very good and proper argument to recommend it to the trial of any perſons, who are ſtrangers to it, viz. that it will contribute even to their preſent happineſs much more than vice; that it will more conſult the eaſe of their minds, the health of their bodies, the preſervation and increaſe of their eſtates, the eſtabliſhment of their good name; all which doctrine,*

(84) Mr. Hoadly's *Several Tracts*, pag. 106. edit. London 1715.
(85) Pag. 111, 112.
(86) Pag. 117, 118.
(87) Pag. 1 2. *Sermons*, 2. edit. Lon 1726.
(88) Ibid. 74.

with him in the point conteſted. This vindication of himſelf was written in ſo ſevere and ſatyrical a manner [*II*], that Mr. Hoadly publiſhed in 1708 *A ſecond Letter* to him in anſwer to the Doctor's Preface [*KK*]; and he tells us in the Preface to his Collection of Tracts printed in 1715, that theſe *two Letters* againſt Dr. Atterbury were deſigned to vindicate and eſtabliſh the tendency of virtue and morality to the preſent happineſs of ſuch a creature as man is, which he eſteems a point of the utmoſt importance to the Goſpel itſelf. In 1707 April the 9th he preached a Faſt-Sermon before the Lord Mayor at St. Paul's. His obligations to Sir Jonathan Trelawney, now promoted to the Biſhoprick of Wincheſter, induced him to dedicate to that Prelate the firſt volume of his Sermons [*LL*]. His Latin Sermon to the Clergy of London at Sion-College, upon *Rom.* xiii. 1. preached May the 17th 1709, with a paſſage in a pamphlet publiſhed by him in 1708, engaged him in a diſpute with Mr. Hoadly about Paſſive Obedience [*MM*]. In 1710 he was ſuppoſed to have

are in their ſeveral degrees preſent happineſs. Your doctrine robs even Chriſtianity itſelf of an argument, viz. that the moral virtues it recommends, are in themſelves infinitely preferable to the vices contrary to them; and much more conducive to the preſent happineſs of man, as well as to his future. It ſeems to contradict ſeveral texts of Scripture, which declare at leaſt thus much, that in the ordinary courſe of God's Providence, the virtuous man doth more truly enjoy happineſs even in this life than the wicked. And it gives a wide encouragement to men, who have no faith, or a very weak one, concerning future rewards, to diſturb human ſociety by their inordinate purſuit of the beſtial pleaſures.

[*II*] *This vindication of himſelf was written in ſo ſevere and ſatyrical a manner, &c.*] He tells us in that Preface (87), that he might well have ſpared himſelf the trouble of reviewing and defending, what appeared not to him to have been blamed by any *wiſe* or *good* men. "For whether, *ſays he*, the Writer of the "*Letter* be ſuch, till I know who he is, I may "have leave to doubt. All he ſays of himſelf is, "that he is an *obſcure perſon*; one, I ſuppoſe, he "means, that is in the dark; and thinks it proper "to continue ſo, that he may take advantage from "thence to attack the reputation of others without "hazarding his own. There may be ſomewhat of "*wiſdom* perhaps, but ſure there is little of *goodneſs* "or fairneſs in this conduct. Several ſuch *obſcure perſons* "as theſe we have had of late, who have inſulted "men of great abilities and worth, and taken plea-"ſure to pelt them from their coverts with little "objections. The ill ſucceſs of their attempts hath "juſtified their prudence in concealing themſelves." He concludes his anſwer to the Letter with theſe words (88): "Theſe are ſuch manifeſt indications of "*inſincerity* and *malice*, as all his grave pretences of "*concern for the cauſe of virtue* will not cover or "elude. If after all he pleads *ignorance* for his ex-"cuſe; ſince I have ſhewn him his foul miſtakes "and injurious miſrepreſentations, it will become "him publickly to own and retract them; and I "now call upon him in my turn to do it. If he "doth not, they will be heavy upon him in another "world, to whomſoever he may have recommended "himſelf in this by the means of them."

(87) Pag. 1 and 2. *Sermons*, vol. 2. edit. London 1726.

(88) Ibid. pag. 74.

[*KK*] *A* ſecond Letter *to him in anſwer to the Doctor's Preface.*] Mr. Hoadly obſerves with regard to the ſuſpicions which Dr. Atterbury would have raiſed concerning his being a Chriſtian, that if his own profeſſions can do any thing towards the removal of thoſe ſuſpicions, which the Doctor would willingly appear to entertain himſelf, and laboured to infuſe into his readers, that he might be aſſured that he is one who firmly believes the truth of the Chriſtian Religion, and that plain revelation in it of a future ſtate, in which good men ſhall be rewarded, and the wicked puniſhed. "But I cannot, *ſays he*, think it "of much importance to any argument, whether the "world knew the Writer or not, unleſs it be, as it "often proves, to lay prejudices in the way of the read-"ers, who, I think, can better judge of the force of any "reaſoning, when it is removed as much as poſſible "from every thing perſonal. If precedents can be "of any force to prove that *nameleſs* Writers may "be wholly free from all evil deſigns, I could appeal "to your own example, who began that controverſy, "in which you have ſince gained ſo great a reputa-"tion with a book deſtitute of the name of its Au-"thor. You were at that time in the dark. But "would you have thought it kind or juſt and reaſon-"able, if it had then been inferred, that you *took* "*advantage from thence to attack the reputation of* "*others without hazarding your own; that there was* "*little of goodneſs or fairneſs in that conduct; that* "*nameleſs Authors have no right to be conſidered, &c.?*" "As for the uncharitable uſage, *ſays he in another* "*paſſage*, I have met with from you without the "leaſt ground, unleſs for being of a different opini-"on; and repreſenting this difference to you ſeriouſly "and gravely, I pray God not to lay it to your "charge. My civility you have returned, by ſup-"poſing the worſt that can be ſuppoſed of me; by "charging me not with involuntary miſtakes, but "wicked and impious deſigns. The cauſe I main-"tain is the cauſe of *Infidelity. Deiſt, Egyptian,* "*raſh, inſincere, malicious, baſe, diſhoneſt, ignorant,* "and the like, are the Chriſtian compliments, which, "with an happy variety of expreſſion, you paſs up-"on one, who acted a very different part towards "you; and who now forgives you, well knowing, "that all the provocations you can offer, cannot "juſtify what they well deſerve, the return of the "like from a Chriſtian.

[*LL*] *To whom . . . he dedicated the firſt volume of his Sermons.*] This dedication is greatly admired for the exquiſite addreſs and elegance of it. He deſires the Biſhop to accept of that publick teſtimony of gratitude from a man, *who ſtands*, ſays he, *indebted to your Lordſhip for many favours, great in themſelves, but made much greater by your generous manner of conferring them. For they were not the effects of importunity, on the juſt rewards of domeſtick ſervice; they ſprung not from dependance or acquaintance, being beſtowed on one, who was (at the firſt) little known to your Lordſhip otherwiſe than by his honeſt endeavours to retrieve thoſe ſynodical rights of the Clergy, whereof you, my Lord, have been all along, to your great honour, the avowed patron and defender.*

[*NN*] *Engaged him in a new diſpute with Mr. Hoadly about Paſſive Obedience.*] Our Author in a Pamphlet of his abovementioned, intitled *Some Proceedings in Convocation, A. D.* 1705, *faithfully repreſented, &c.* in which, Mr. Hoadly tells us (90), he had been careful to impreſs every character peculiar to himſelf, has the following paſſage *p.* 25. *Even the modeſt and moderate Mr. Hoadly . . . . hath ventured to treat the body of the eſtabliſhed Clergy with language more diſdainful and reviling, than it would have become him to have uſed towards his* Preſbyterian *antagoniſt upon any provocation, charging them with rebellion in the Church, whilſt he himſelf is preaching it up in the State.* Mr. Hoadly therefore was induced to examine very particularly Dr. Atterbury's Sermon at Sion-College, which, ſays he to the Doctor (91), *I take for the utmoſt ſtretch of your judgment and wit united, in order to prove your charge, and compaſs your ends againſt one, who hath neither given ground for ſuch a charge, nor deſerved ſo much of your zeal.* At the cloſe of his Examination he gives a *Review* of Dr. Atterbury's *Management* of his cauſe; and obſerves, that it is very ſtrange, that he ſhould uſe ſo much art in his Sermon, as not to declare in poſitive words his own judgment concerning the main queſtion in the whole debate; that, whilſt he is raiſing Trophies upon the performance of another, he ſhould run himſelf into ſuch a multitude of inconſiſtencies; and that he ſhould be ſo ſevere upon another, and repreſent him as *ſounding the trumpet of ſedition*, and yet ſhould himſelf in the

(90) See his *Large Anſwer to Dr. Fr. Atterbury's Charge of Rebellion, &c.* pag. 4. edit. London 1710.

(91) Ibid. pag. 12.

have been very assistant to Dr. Sacheverell, and to have had a great share in drawing up of his speech [*N N*]. The Convocation of the Clergy of the Province of Canterbury having met November the 15th the same year, chose our Author for their Prolocutor in the

the very same Sermon give the greatest commendation to other men, who had sounded the same trumpet. (92) Ibid. p. 181. "Upon the review of the whole, *continues he* (92), the "art of some men will plainly appear. Alas! every man of the lowest capacity can speak his mind "openly, and declare his true judgment. But to "manage a controversy after such a manner as to "deceive many, to make that appear a darling "doctrine, which one believes to be false; to seem "to differ much where one hardly differs one hair's "breadth; to speak so as to be esteemed an Advocate for one cause; and yet to drop what really pleads "for the contrary; *hæ tibi erunt artes:* this is a management worthy of a great genius, and above the "attainment of every vulgar head." Mr. Hoadly likewise tells us in his Preface to his *Original and Institution of Civil Government discussed*, that he had added a large Answer to Dr. Atterbury's charge of rebellion, in which he had examined his Latin Sermon, because *after he had been contending against the hearty opposition of those, who truly and really differed from him, he thought proper fully to consider the attacks of one, who would only seem to do so.* "In this part, "*says he*, it was impossible to avoid several per- "sonal observations; because my business was to de- "fend against a particular method of controversy, so "peculiar to one person, as that I know not that it "hath ever been practised or attempted by any other "Writer. . . . If I have in the least matter mistaken "or misrepresented this Author, I am ready upon the "first notice to set it right again. All I pretend to, "in what I produce out of his *Sermon*, is to let the "reader into his true meaning and design; not to "come up to the beauty of his expression; which I "think in many places to be almost inimitable." At the end of his *Answer* he has subjoined an *Appendix*, in which, that *the reader might the better judge of* Dr. Atterbury's *conduct in that controversy, and of the treatment*, which himself *in particular had received from him, he transcribes some remarkable passages out of his Rights, Powers, and Privileges of an English Convocation*, which he confronts with others from his Latin Sermon; and he observes, that he should not have done this, if the Doctor had "given the world the "least reason to think, that upon mature consideration his judgment was really altered; since every "man hath a right to declare upon all good oc- "casions against it, when he is convinced of any "error." (93) *Appendix*, pag. 203, 204. *But when a Writer*, says he (93), *is carrying on two different causes upon two sets of contradictory principles, and is gaining himself applause amongst the same persons at the same time, by standing up for and against liberty; by depressing the Prerogative and exalting it; by lessening the executive power, and magnifying it; by loading some with all infamy for pleading for submission to it in one particular, which he supposeth an encroachment, and by loading others with the same infamy for pleading against submission to it in cases, that touch the happiness of the whole community; when a Writer, I say, is carrying on two causes after so unparallel'd a manner; nothing can be more proper than the method which I have here taken, to open the eyes both of himself and his readers.* This Sermon of his was likewise taken notice of in Dr. Sacheverell's Tryal, by Lieutenant General Stanhope, afterwards Lord Stanhope, who having observed, that it is allowed by the most strenuous Advocates for passive Obedience, that there is a latitude left to subjects in extreme cases, when their rights and liberties are invaded, proceeds thus: *I shall on this occasion quote to your Lordships the Sermon of a Reverend Divine, who, I am sure, is not thought to be a favourer of anti-monarchical principles, nor to deserve any of those pretty Epithets, which the Doctor so liberally bestows on those, who differ from him in opinion. 'Tis the Latin Sermon of Dr. Atterbury preached to the Convocation* *. *The scope and drift of that Discourse, my Lords, was to preach up absolute Obedience; yet such is the invincible force of truth, and such the nature of this argument, that the Doctor, not to betray his conscience, after having well thought upon it, is obliged to express himself in the following words, which your Lordships will give me leave to read to you out of his Sermon, which I have here in my hand.* "Quando autem quibusque de cau- "sis *Magistratuum* imperia detrectare, nosmetipsos "in libertatem vindicare liceat, ne verbulo quidem "indicant; nisi cum aliquid ab hominibus forte im- "peratum fuerit, latis à Deo legibus contrarium; "id ubi acciderit, quid agendum sit, Petri vox illa "declarat: *Obedire oportet Deo magis quam homini- "bus.*" *The sense of this passage, my Lords, if I mistake not, is this:* But when, and upon what causes it may be lawful to oppose the power of the Prince, and assert our liberties, the Scriptures do not declare; unless in cases, when men shall command things contrary to the laws of God. When that shall happen, St. Peter tells us what we must do, "We must obey God "before men." The General then applies this to the case of the Revolution, and appeals to the memory of their Lordships, whether King James did not command things contrary to the Laws of God; and whether the whole course of his reign was not a series of illegal commands, calculated to destroy our holy Religion, and to violate all our religious and civil rights. "But "to return, *says he*, to Dr. Atterbury's Sermon, he "goes on thus: *Petenda sunt ista . . . a jurisconsultis, à "thesium politicarum tractatoribus; è legibus, è rerum "publicarum formis suæ cuique genti propriis, tanquam "è fonte suo, sunt haurienda.* In English thus: "But in such cases you must advise with the Lawyers, "and those learned in Politics, and have recourse to "the laws and constitutions peculiar to each several "country, as to the springs and fountains of this "knowledge." And here it may not be improper to quote a passage from a Pamphlet printed at London in 8vo, 1710, 5th Edit. entitled, *The Managers* Pro *and* Con, *or an Account of what is said at Child's and Tom's Coffee-houses for and against Dr. Sacheverell.* The Author tells us (94), that "Mr. Hoadly, who to his (94) Pag. 21. "honour had incurred the malice of the whole par- "ty, and been recommended by their Satyr to the "Parliament, and by the Parliament in a very ho- "nourable manner to the Queen, had admirably ex- "posed the self-contradictions of one of them in the "*Appendix* to his last Book." *There he brings in the Dean*, continues the Author, *desiring*, that the Clergy may be put in heart and be at hand always to stand up with them, (*viz. the Laity*,) and to resist a growing tyranny either in Church or State ‡. *Mr. Hoadly is not able to reconcile this doctrine with that contained in the Latin Sermon. But tho' such inconsistent principles are irreconcileable, yet if we consider the circumstances of time, we may account for them; because it seems to be much the same design, that made him print that doctrine then, that has made him preach this doctrine now. That Book was printed in* 1700, *when King William was upon the throne, and the Hanover Succession upon the anvil. Then Mr. Dean was* ready to resist the growing tyranny in Church and State. *The Latin Sermon I hear was first preached in English about* 1708; *then it was a damnable sin* to resist their hereditary right, who was about that time on board the *Mars*.

‡ *Rights and Powers &c. of an English Convocation*, edit. 1. pag. 105.

* The General is mistaken in this point; for it was preached only before the *Clergy of London.*

[*N N*] *Had a great share in drawing up of his Speech.*] Bishop Burnet in the second volume of *the History of his own Time* (95) tells us, that *it was very plain the* (95) Pag. 542. *Speech was made for Dr. Sacheverell by others; for the style was correct, and far different from his own.* And we find a passage in a Pamphlet published in the year 1712 in 8vo, entitled, *The Nation vindicated from the Aspersions cast on it in a late Pamphlet, entitled,* A Representation of the present State of Religion, &c. Part. II. which passage insinuates in very gross terms, that our Author had a hand in that Speech; and is as follows (96): "If one sees a vile wretch striking (96) Pag. 40. "at the foundation of the Government, and arraign- "ing the administration; and the better to do this, "manifestly perverting the sacred Writ, and before "the most august Assembly in the world solemnly in- "voking God's Name to a most notorious falshood; "how can one believe that this man has a grain of "Religion; or that his abettors had much more? "I mean those reverend Divines, who if they did

preference to Dr. Kennet Dean of Peterborough, whoſe intereſt was ſupported by the Archbiſhop and ſeveral of the Biſhops, who had voted againſt Dr. Sacheverell; and on December the 6th he was preſented to the Archbiſhop, upon which occaſion Dr. Smalridge, afterwards Biſhop of Briſtol, and Dr. Atterbury made each of them an elegant ſpeech in Latin [*OO*], which the Metropolitan anſwered in the ſame language. But Mr. Harley, afterwards Earl of Oxford, being apprehenſive leſt the former diſpute between the Archbiſhop and the Lower-Houſe of Convocation might be revived, uſed his utmoſt efforts to eſtabliſh a good correſpondence between them; for which purpoſe he invited Dr. Atterbury to dine with him, and procured a letter from the Queen to the Archbiſhop (*q*); and her Majeſty ſent a licence to the Convocation, empowering them to enter upon ſuch conſultations, as the preſent ſtate of the Church required; but the management of affairs in the Lower-Houſe was principally directed by our Author [*P P*]. May the 11th 1711, he was appointed among other members of the Upper and Lower-Houſes of Convocation to compare Mr. Whiſton's doctrines with thoſe of the Church of England; and in June following he drew up the *Repreſentation of the preſent ſtate of Religion*; which

(*q*) *See* Boyer's *Political State*, vol. 1. for Jan. 1710-11, p. 43. 2d edit. 1718.

" not MAKE his Speech, could not but be ſenſible of all his abominable prevarications; yet " with lifted up eyes, and all other actions and geſtures, ſeemed to be as much affected with all he " ſaid, as any of thoſe fooliſh women, whom this holy Farce had ſet a crying. Such a conduct as this " is apt to make people ſuſpect there are in the world " (to borrow an expreſſion from this repreſentation) " determined enemies of all religion and goodneſs, " and that none but ſuch, tho' to get the D---y of C--- " C--- * or C--e †, would have acted ſo ſcandalous a " part." The Author of *the Memoirs of Queen Anne* (97) having obſerved, that Dr. Sacheverell's Council did all that was in their power both in the Anſwers to the articles of impeachment, and in their pleadings, to clear his intentions from the imputation of diſloyalty to the Queen, and diſreſpect to the Government, tells us, that " the like care was taken of his " Speech, which made ſo great noiſe; in compoſing " of which, beſides his Council, ſome Clergymen " were thought to be concerned, viz. Dr. ATTERBURY, " Dr. *Moſs*, and Dr. *Smalridge*, becauſe they were " frequently with him in Weſtminſter-Hall, and at " his apartments in the Temple. Atterbury was a " proud obſtinate man, and a hot ſtickler againſt men " of moderate principles, which cauſed him to be " much cried up by ſome ſort of people, tho' he " was no friend to the preſent happy eſtabliſhment, " as has ſince been made manifeſt." And Mr. Boyer in his *Hiſtory of the Life and reign of Queen Anne* (98), informs us, that *it was generally believed, that Dr. Sacheverell's Speech was not of his own compoſing, but the joint Work of Dr.* ATTERBURY, *Dr. Smalridge, and Dr. Freind, ſupervis'd and corrected by Sir Simon Harcourt and Mr. Phips.*

*Chriſt-Church.
† Carliſle.
(97) Pag. 69. edit. London 1729.
(98) Pag. 427. edit. London 1722.

[*OO*] *Dr. Smalridge afterwards Biſhop of Briſtol . . . made . . . an elegant Speech in Latin.*] He ſtiles his friend Dr. Atterbury a man, who was a ſtranger to no branch of Literature, and had been long and ſucceſsfully exerciſed in moſt arts and ſciences, and was moſt accompliſhed and perfect in the moſt perfect kinds of learning: *Vir in nullo literarum genere hoſpes, in pleriſque artibus & ſtudiis diu & feliciter exercitatus, in maxime perfectis literarum diſciplinis perfectiſſimus.* With regard to his conduct in points of controverſy, he allows him to have been too ſevere in his treatment of his antagoniſts; but alledges that this was not to be aſcribed to any determined ill-nature, or envy, or pride in him, but to a temper of itſelf too warm, or perhaps to a degree of paſſion eaſily pardonable in a ſoldier, who fought for every thing dear to him, in a ſon endeavouring to reſcue his mother from injury and violence. But if there be a greater number of excellencies in his writings; if he has treated of things in themſelves difficult, uſeful and agreeable; if he has confirmed them with the ſtrongeſt arguments; if he has impreſſed them upon the minds of his readers by a pure and perſpicuous ſtyle; it is reaſonable that he ſhould receive the applauſe due to learning from men of letters; from the eloquent the honour due to eloquence. *Si quid forte aſperius, ſi quid ardentius, ſi quid liberius effuderit; lector paulo humanior id non odio, non livori, nec arrogantiæ tribuit, ſed aut ingenio ſuapte natura aliquantum præfervido, aut fortaſſe iracundiæ, in milite pro aris ſociſque acriter dimicante, in filio ab injuria & vi matrem ſuam eripiente, facile ignoſcendæ. Quod ſi plures in illius ſcriptis effulgent virtutes; ſi res tractaverit cognitu difficiles, utiles, jucundas; ſi eas validiſſimis argumentis firmaverit; ſi puro ac dilucido ſermone in ipſis legentium animis inſcripſerit, eruditioni apud eruditos, eloquentiæ apud diſertos ſuus conſtet honos.*

[*P P*] *The management of affairs in the Lower-Houſe was principally directed by our Author.*] Biſhop Burnet tells us (99), that ſoon after the meeting of the Convocation the Queen ſent a Licence to the Convocation, empowering them to enter upon ſuch conſultations, as the ſtate of the Church then required, and particularly to conſider of ſuch matters as ſhe ſhould lay before them; limiting them to a *Quorum*; and that the Archbiſhop of Canterbury, the Biſhop of London, or the Biſhop of Bath and Wells ſhould be preſent, and agree to their reſolutions. With this Licence there was a Letter directed to the Archbiſhop, in which the Convocation was ordered to lay before the Queen an account of the late exceſſive growth of infidelity and hereſy in the nation; and to conſider how to redreſs abuſes in excommunications; how rural Deans might be made more effectual; how Terriers might be made and preſerved more exactly; and how abuſes in Licences for marriages might be corrected. In this whole matter, continues the Hiſtorian, neither the Archbiſhop nor any of the Biſhops were ſo much as conſulted with; and ſome things in the Licence were new. The Archbiſhop was not named the Preſident of the Convocation, as was uſual in former Licences; and in theſe the Archbiſhop's preſence and conſent alone was made neceſſary, except in caſe of ſickneſs, and then the Archbiſhop had named ſome Biſhops to preſide as his Commiſſaries. And in that caſe the Convocation was limited to his Commiſſaries, which ſtill lodged the Preſidentſhip and the Negative with the Archbiſhop. This was according to the primitive pattern to limit the Clergy of a Province to do nothing without the conſent of the Metropolitan. But it was a thing new and unheard of to limit the Convocation to any of their own body, who had no deputation from the Archbiſhop. A report of this being therefore made by the Committee, that was appointed to ſearch the Records, it was laid before the Queen; and ſhe ſent the Convocation a meſſage to let them know, that ſhe did not intend, that thoſe whom ſhe had named to be of the *Quorum*, ſhould either preſide or have a negative upon their deliberations, tho' the contrary was plainly inſinuated in the Licence. The Archbiſhop was ſo ill of the gout, that after the firſt meetings he could not come any more, and the Biſhop of London was in the ſame circumſtance; upon which the Biſhop of Bath and Wells ſeeing how invidiouſly he was diſtinguiſhed from his brethren, in which he had not been conſulted, pretended ill health; ſo that the reſt of the Biſhops were at a ſtand, till a new Licence was ſent them, in which the Biſhops of Wincheſter, Briſtol, and St. David's, were added to be of the *Quorum*. The two laſt were newly conſecrated, and had been in no functions of the Church before. And thus the Queen not only paſſed over all the Biſhops made in King William's reign, but a great many of thoſe named by herſelf, and ſet the two laſt in a diſtinction above all their brethren. *All this*, ſays Biſhop Burnet, *was directed*

(99) *Hiſtory of his own Time*, vol. 2. p. 569, 570.

which was extremely excepted againſt [22]. Aug. the 27th the year following he was made Dean of Chriſt-Church in Oxford (r), which preferment had been vacant ever ſince the deceaſe of Dr. Aldrich, who died December the 14th 1710. He maintained the moſt exact diſcipline in that College, according to ſome perſons; though others affirm that his haughty and deſpotic humour raiſed a prodigious confuſion there, as it had done before at Carliſle, while he was Dean of that Cathedral; ſo that Dr. Smalridge his ſucceſſor in Chriſt-Church uſed to complain of his own hard fate, in being obliged to carry water

(r) Le Neve, *ubi ſupra*, p. 232.

(s) Ibid. pag. 528.

rected by Atterbury, *who had the confidence of the chief Miniſter; and becauſe the other Biſhops had maintained a good correſpondence with the former Miniſtry, it was thought fit to put marks of the Queen's diſtruſt upon them, that it might appear with whom her Royal favour and truſt was lodged.*

[22] *He drew up* the Repreſentation of the preſent ſtate of Religion, *which was extremely excepted againſt.*] The Committee named to draw up this Repreſentation were the Biſhops of Peterborough, Bangor, Landaff, St. Aſaph, and St. David's, and Dr. Stanhope, Mr. Blomer, Dr. Godolphin, Dr. Altham, Dr. Brideoak, Dr. Smalridge, Dr. Aſheton, Dr. Gaſtrel, Dr. Willis, and Dean Atterbury; but Dr. Sydal was afterwards put in the room of Mr. Blomer. After many ſittings they reduced it to the form in which it was publiſhed. But we are told (100), that this Repreſentation was not unanimouſly approved by all the Members of the Joint-Committee, for ſome of them diſſented to ſome parts of it; and ſome things were inſerted in it by the Lower-Houſe, not agreed to in the Committee. The draught being laid before the Upper-Houſe for their approbation, ſeveral exceptions were made to it. For beſides the ſtile, which was thought by ſome too florid and rhetorical, as well as ſome expreſſions too warm for ſo grave and venerable an Aſſembly, the majority were of opinion, that ſome facts aſſerted in it, and reflecting on the laſt Miniſtry, were not ſufficiently and clearly proved; and that other matters were mentioned in it, which were not cognizable by the *Convocation*, but only by the *Civil Power*. Upon which the Biſhops thought fit to model the Repreſentation in another form. The Biſhops having tranſmitted it to the Lower-Houſe for their approbation, the inferior Clergy adhered to the Draught made by the Joint-Committee, after they had added other matters to it, and particularly the paſſage which acknowledged the Queen's *care to tranſmit the ſucceſſion of the Crown in the Proteſtant line, as eſtabliſhed by Law*; which important clauſe was omitted by the perſon who made that Draught. Thus neither of the Repreſentations was preſented to the Queen, and the Convocation roſe with the diſreputation of doing nothing in a point of ſuch conſequence, and which had been recommended ſo earneſtly by the Queen. The fault of this was laid upon the Biſhops by the Author of the *Examiner* (101), who in another paper (102) paid a very great compliment to Dr. Atterbury upon his being choſen Prolocutor. *If we may gueſs*, ſays he, *the temper of a Convocation from the choice of a Prolocutor, as it is uſual to do that of a Houſe of Commons by the Speaker, we may expect great things from that Reverend Body, who have done themſelves much reputation, by pitching upon a Gentleman of ſo much piety, wit, and learning for that office; and one who is ſo throughly verſed in thoſe parts of knowledge, which are proper for it.* However it appears, that the former Miniſtry had entertained different thoughts of his qualifications for that poſt, as is evident from the Earl of Sunderland's letter to Dr. Chetwood Dean of Gloceſter, dated Nov. 11, 1708, wherein he obſerves, that there were two competitors for the chair, Dr. Atterbury and Dr. Willis, afterwards Biſhop of Wincheſter. *As for the firſt*, ſays the Earl, *his character is too well known for me to ſay any thing to it. The latter, I will venture to ſay, is qualified with all the abilities neceſſary for ſuch a poſt, as well as of known zeal for her Majeſty's Government, and the eſtabliſhed Church, and of ſuch a temper and prudence as would tend towards healing the diviſions in the Church, rather than widening of them.* But let us hear Biſhop Burnet's account of this affair of the *Repreſentation*. He tells us (103), that the Convocation entered on the conſideration of the matters referred to them by the Queen. And a Committee was appointed to draw up a Repreſentation of the preſent ſtate of the Church and of Religion in the Nation; "but after ſome heads were agreed on, Atterbury procured, that the drawing up of this might be left "to him. And he drew up a moſt virulent declama- "tion, defaming all the Adminiſtration from the "time of the Revolution. Into this he brought "many impious principles and practices, that had "been little heard of or known, but were now to be "publiſhed, if this ſhould be laid before the Queen. "The Lower-Houſe agreed to his Draught, but the "Biſhops laid it aſide, and ordered another Repreſen- "tation to be drawn in more general and more mo- "deſt terms. It was not ſettled which of theſe "Draughts ſhould be made uſe of, or whether any "Repreſentation at all ſhould be made to the Queen. "For it was known, that the deſign in aſking one "was only to have an aſperſion caſt both on the "former Miniſtry and on the former reign. Several "proviſions were prepared with relation to the other "particulars in the Queen's Letter; but none of theſe "were agreed to by both Houſes." There is a paſſage to the ſame purpoſe in *The Memoirs of Queen Anne* (104), wherein the Author having obſerved, that the Lower-Houſe of Convocation had appointed a Committee, who, with the concurrence of ſome of the Biſhops, might draw up a Repreſentation of the State of Religion, tells us, that "the leading men "among the Clergy, eſpecially thoſe who ſought "after honour and preferment, were zealous to go "hand in hand with the new Miniſtry, and to "ſtrengthen the Houſe of Commons in all their hot "proceedings. Among others Dr. Atterbury had a "deep ſhare in this buſineſs, and led moſt of the "Clergy by his pretended zeal for their intereſts. "This Repreſentation was very long, and contained "a great deal concerning the Atheiſm and Irreligion "of the times, which they aſcribed chiefly to the late "growth of hereſy and ſchiſm, and to the printing "of wicked and atheiſtical Books, which tended to "promote many dangerous opinions, the fault being "laid chiefly on thoſe, who had been lately in pow- "er." But this Repreſentation of the Lower Clergy was never preſented. For ſeveral of the Members of the ſame Houſe, and even ſome, who were of the Committee, found great fault with it, while it was under deliberation; and when it was brought up to the Biſhops for their concurrence, none of them objected againſt ſuch a Repreſentation, had it been done purely with an honeſt zeal, that Judges and Magiſtrates might have the Royal Injunction to put a ſtop to irreligion and profaneneſs ſo far as they came within their cognizance. But they obſerved there was too much of deſign to be ſeen in this Repreſentation, and ſome of the Biſhops complained both of the matter and manner of it; the ſtyle being too florid for a ſubject of ſuch ſerious conſideration. *And as to the matter*, continues that Author, *they took notice, that it contained ſeveral things, which came only within the cognizance of the Civil Power; and that there were alſo ſeveral expreſſions of too much zeal and warmth, which ſeemed to be applied to the late Miniſtry, whereunto they could not agree, ſeeing it did by no means become Miniſters of the Goſpel, while they complained of vice and immorality to apply any thing directly or indirectly to particular perſons, before there was ſome proof brought againſt them, as that might be the means only to influence theſe jealouſies, which were already too much rivetted in the minds of the common people, and which in the end might be found to be ill-grounded.* He tells us likewiſe, that the Biſhops obſerved, that the Lower-Houſe had omitted the mention of the Houſe of Hanover. They reduced the *Repreſentation* therefore to a much ſhorter compaſs, and returned it to the Lower-Houſe. *But thoſe who bore a ſway among the inferior Clergy, were very refractory upon this occaſion, as they had been at other times in oppoſing the Biſhops. For theſe drew up a new Repreſentation, but altogether upon their firſt model, wherein they indeed ſupplied their own defect in mentioning the Proteſtant Succeſſion in this, which they had*

(100) Boyer, *Political State for June* 1711, p. 345, *& ſeq.* 2d edit. 1718.

(101) For June 21, N° 47.
(102) N° 22. Col. 4.

(103) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 570, 571.

(104) Pag. 107, 108. edit. London 1729, 8vo.

(105) Pa

(104) Part pag. 4.

ter after him to extinguiſh the flames which he had raiſed. In 1712 he diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the diſpute between the two Houſes of Convocation [*RR*]. In the beginning of June 1713, upon the deceaſe of Dr. Thomas Spratt, he was promoted to the See of Rocheſter and Deanery of Weſtminſter, and was conſecrated at Lambeth the 4th of July following (*s*). He had a very conſiderable intereſt in the Miniſtry at that time, and would probably have been raiſed to the Archbiſhopric of Canterbury, if the Queen's death had not prevented it. It is ſaid that Dr. John Sharp Archbiſhop of York apprehending that Dr. Atterbury might entertain hopes of ſucceeding him, uſed his endeavours to procure his Archbiſhopric for Sir William Dawes, and to exclude the other. However our Biſhop had ſo powerful an intereſt, that it was reported he would be made Lord Privy-Seal. He officiated at the coronation of King George I. as Dean of Weſtminſter; and it is ſaid, that when the ceremony was over, he offered to preſent the King with the Chair of State and Royal Canopy, which were his perquiſites as Dean; but that the offer was rejected with ſome marks of diſlike towards him. During the rebellion in Scotland, when the Pretender's declaration was diſperſed, the Archbiſhop of Canterbury, and the Biſhops in and near London had publiſhed a *Declaration of their abhorrence of the preſent rebellion; and an exhortation to the Clergy and People under their care to be zealous in the diſcharge of their duties to his Majeſty King George.* But the Biſhop of Rocheſter refuſed to ſign this declaration [*SS*], and engaged Biſhop Smalridge in the ſame refuſal. In ſome of his Sermons which he preached a few years before his commitment, we find ſeveral excellent paſſages

(*s*) Ibid. pag. 528.

had omitted in the other, and changed ſome words and phraſes for others that were more decent; but they could not abate any thing of their zeal againſt the late Miniſtry; and therefore the Biſhops refuſed to join with them; ſo that the Convocation broke up without doing any buſineſs. The Repreſentation of the Lower-Houſe was ſoon after attacked in a Pamphlet, intitled *The Nation vindicated from the aſperſions caſt on it in a late Pamphlet, intitled* A Repreſentation of the preſent State of Religion, &c. The firſt part of *The Nation vindicated* was publiſhed in 1711, and the ſecond part *with ſome Remarks on the Repreſentation of the Iriſh Convocation* was printed in 1712. The Author tells us (104), that "a paper which labours to make the "Nation appear black and odious ought not in cha- "rity to be ſuppoſed to have paſſed the Lower-Houſe "of Convocation, ſince 'tis publiſhed without any au- "thority or any name beſides that of *John Morphew*, "for whom 'tis ſaid to be printed. They ſurely "could not be guilty of ſo inconſiſtent a thing, as to "frame a Repreſentation againſt Printing without au- "thority, and yet publiſh their own without any. "Nor can I well ſuppoſe, after what has been uſually "ſaid by Eccleſiaſtics againſt appealing to the mob, "that they would chooſe to make them judges of the "diſagreement between the two Houſes concerning "*the preſent State of Religion.* And therefore one "ſhould rather conclude, that the publiſhing this un- "authorized paper as theirs was owing to ſome of "their mortal enemies, who took this opportunity of "playing them the moſt ſpiteful trick imaginable." *Had this Repreſentation,* adds he (105), *ſuitable to the nature of the ſubject, and agreeable to that ſtate of grief the Repreſenters pretend to lie under, been writ after a grave and ſerious manner, and aſſerted inconteſtable facts only, and concluded with deſiring the Magiſtrate to proceed with the utmoſt ſeverity againſt immorality, or any opinions, which conſiſtently with the laws of Chriſtianity he has a right to puniſh, none ſhould more heartily applaud their deſign, or more readily come into it than I.* The Author therefore undertakes to prove, 1. That the publiſhers of that paper, inſtead of charging the Church and Kingdom with a prodigious increaſe of impiety and licentiouſneſs, had reaſon to bleſs God, that they were ſince the Revolution much amended even in thoſe things, which are on purpoſe mentioned, to ſhew how much worſe they are ſince that time, than they were in the preceding reigns. 2. That with regard to the account they give of the various ſteps, which they ſay have been *taken to infect the minds of the people with Atheiſm, Deiſm, Hereſy, and every monſtrous and deſtructive error*, there never was ſo diſingenuous, unfair, and partial a paper offered to the publick; and that there is ſcarce a paragraph relating to that matter, but what is falſe either in whole or in part; and that whilſt it complains of the increaſe of Popery, it advances ſuch notions, as, were they true, would oblige the Nation to return to the Church of Rome; and while it condemns other writings for expoſing the creeds, is ſo unfortunate, as to fall under the ſame fault itſelf. *And in proving all this,* ſays he, *I ſhall do juſtice to the Lower-Houſe of Convocation; for then ſure every one will be convinced they could not be the compilers of ſuch a Repreſentation.* 3. That they have omitted the chief cauſe of Atheiſm, Deiſm, Hereſy, and every pernicious and deſtructive Error; and that it is next to a miracle, that the Laity, conſidering the conduct of too many of their guides, are ſo good and virtuous as they are at preſent.

(104) Part 1. pag. 4.

(105) Pag. 6.

[*RR*] *Diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the diſpute between the two Houſes of Convocation.*] We are obliged to have recourſe again to Biſhop Burnet, who tells us (106), that in this Convocation there was a doubt ſuggeſted, whether the Queen's Licence ſtill ſubſiſted after a prorogation by a Royal Writ. The Attorney General gave his opinion, that it was ſtill in force; upon which the Biſhops went on with the reſolution, in which the former Seſſions had ended, and ſent back to the Lower-Houſe a paper, which had been ſent to them from that Houſe in the former Seſſion, with ſuch amendments as they thought proper. But then Dr. Atterbury ſtated a new notion, that as in a Seſſion of Parliament a prorogation put an end to all matters not finiſhed, ſo that they were to begin all a-new; the ſame rule was to be applied to Convocations, in purſuance of his favourite notion, that the proceedings in Parliament were likewiſe to be obſerved among them. The Biſhops did not agree to this; for upon ſearching their Books they found a courſe of precedents to the contrary. And the Schedule, by which the Archbiſhop prorogued them, when the Royal Writ was ſent him, did in expreſs words continue all things in the ſtate, in which they were then, to their next meeting. "Yet this, *continues the Biſhop*, did not "ſatisfy Atterbury and his party; ſo the Lower- "Houſe ordered him to lay the matter before the "Attorney-General for his opinion. He did that "very partially, for he did not ſhew him the paper "ſent down by the Biſhops; he only gave him a "very defective abſtract of it; whereupon the At- "torney-General gave him ſuch an anſwer as he de- "ſired; by which it was very plain that he was not "rightly informed about it. The Biſhops reſolved "to adhere to the method of former Convocations, "and not to begin matters afreſh, that had been for- "merly near finiſhed. By this means they were at "a full ſtop, ſo that they could not determine theſe "points, which had been recommended to them by "the Queen.

(106) Vol. 2. pag. 602, 603.

[*SS*] *The Biſhop of Rocheſter refuſed to ſign this declaration.*] The reaſon, which he alledged for his refuſal, was on account of ſome reflections caſt upon a party, which he ſaid were not inferior to any in point of loyalty. The paſſage was this: "We are "the more concerned, that both the Clergy and "People of our Communion ſhould ſhew themſelves "hearty friends to the Government upon this occa- "ſion, to vindicate the honour of the Church of "England; becauſe the chief hopes of our enemies

"ſeem

paſſages againſt the Popiſh religion [*TT*], as well as upon other ſubjects. He appeared generally among the proteſtors againſt the meaſures of the Miniſtry under the late King, and drew up the reaſons for ſome of the proteſts with his own hand. On Friday Auguſt the 24th 1722 about two a-clock in the afternoon he was apprehended [*UU*] at his houſe in Weſtminſter by two Officers, the under Secretary and a Meſſenger, who carried him before a Committee of the Lords of the Privy-Council, who having examined him [*XX*], committed him priſoner to the Tower of London for High-Treaſon, where he complained of having met with very ſevere treatment [*YY*]. His commitment having occaſioned a great deal of noiſe, in order to prevent the effects of it among the Clergy, there was publiſhed a pamphlet in 4to, intitled, *A Letter to the Clergy of the Church of England on occaſion of the commitment of the Right Reverend the Lord Biſhop of Rocheſter*

" ſeem to ariſe from diſcontents artificially raiſed a-
" mongſt us, and becauſe *ſome who have valued them-*
" *ſelves, and been too much valued by others for a*
" *pretended zeal for the Church, have joined with Pa-*
" *piſts in theſe wicked attempts*, which as they muſt
" ruin the Church if they ſucceed, ſo they cannot
" well end without great reproach to it, if the reſt of
" us do not clearly and heartily declare our deteſta-
" tion of ſuch practices.

[*TT*] *Several excellent paſſages againſt the Popiſh Religion.*] In his Sermon at Weſtminſter-Abbey, November 5th 1718, upon Acts xxvi. 26, (107), he explodes, in a very elegant manner, the pretences which are made to miracles in the Romiſh Communion. *But as confidently and publickly*, ſays he, *as they make theſe boaſts of miracles, we may obſerve, that the miracles themſelves are ſaid to have been done very privately in religious houſes and places of ſecrecy and retirement; in remote regions of the world, whither no body will go to diſprove them; in ſuperſtitious countries, where no man hath a mind or leave to examine them. And theſe are circumſtances which ſmell ſtrongly of impoſture and contrivance; for why ſhould things deſigned for publick uſe and influence be thus tranſacted in the dark without witneſſes? A miracle is in the nature of it, ſomewhat done for the converſion of Infidels; it is* a ſign, not to them that believe, but to them that believe not. *And yet it ſo happens, that Popiſh miracles are generally done at home before believers, where there is little or no need of them, or doubt concerning them; or if abroad, yet they are placed at ſuch a convenient diſtance, as not to lie within reach of confutation.* " In
" China and Japan theſe wonder-workers may pre-
" tend to have done as many miracles as they pleaſe,
" without the fear of a diſcovery; in Spain and Italy
" they may venture now and then to ſet up for
" them, where there are ſo many always ready to
" favour their pretences, and to run into any pious
" fraud, that can be contrived for them. But in he-
" retical countries, (as they term ours) they are very
" ſhy, and ſparing of their talent this way; and
" ſtill the more hereſy there is in a country, the
" fewer miracles are heard of there." He afterwards obſerves, that the moſt abſurd pretence of this kind, is that famous miracle of the corporal preſence in the Euchariſt, which is done ſo much in the dark, that no body ever *did* or *can* ſee it, either *before* or *after* it was done, or even *while* it is doing; no, not the doer himſelf, as loudly as he may boaſt of it. " The miracles of the Goſpel are ſo many appeals
" to the ſenſes of men; but this is a ſtrange new kind
" of miracle, which is perfectly inviſible. To ſay,
" that it muſt be received by faith, that we muſt
" believe it to be a miracle, is to deſtroy the very
" end and deſign of miracles; which are works done
" in order to procure the belief of ſomewhat elſe,
" and are not therefore themſelves to be believed and
" taken for granted. In a word, it is a miracle,
" the doing of which is ſo utterly a ſecret, that it
" wants another miracle to prove it to be one. And
" yet of all things in the world, it is the moſt inca-
" pable of being proved this way; for miracles be-
" ing, as I ſaid, appeals to the ſenſes, and Tranſub-
" ſtantiation a plain contradiction to them, the cal-
" ling in of a miracle to evince the truth of this doc-
" trine would be (as one very juſtly reaſons) to prove
" to a man by what he ſees, that he doth not ſee
" what he ſees. Either therefore the pretended cor-
" poral preſence is no miracle; or, if it be one, we
" are ſtill excuſeable in not admitting it, ſince it
" comes to us in a way ſo very ſingular, and demands
" our aſſent againſt the teſtimony of ſenſe, upon the
" reports of which all other miracles are founded."
And in his Sermon preached at Weſtminſter-Abbey on Whitſunday 1716 to ſhew that *miracles are the moſt proper way of proving the divine authority of any Religion*, he calls the Church of Rome *the moſt groſs and impoſing Church in the world* (108).

(107) *Sermons publiſhed by Dr. Moore*, vol. 1. Serm. 1. pag. 17, 18.

1 Cor. xiv. 22.

(108) Ibid. vol. 1. Serm. 8. pag. 224.

[*UU*] *He was apprehended.*] Two Officers, with the Under-Secretary and a Meſſenger went to his houſe at Weſtminſter with orders to bring him and his papers before the Council. We are told (109), that he happened to be in his night-gown when they came in, and being informed of their buſineſs deſired time to dreſs himſelf. In the mean while his Secretary came in, and the Officers went to ſearch his papers; in the ſealing of which the Meſſenger brought a paper, which he pretended to have found in his cloſe-ſtool, and deſired that it might be ſealed up with the reſt. The Biſhop obſerving it, and believing it to be a forged one of his own, deſired the Officers not to do it, and to bear witneſs that the paper was not found with him. However they did it; and tho' they behaved themſelves with ſome reſpect towards him, yet the Meſſengers treated him in a very rough manner, and threatened him, if he did not make haſte to dreſs himſelf, to carry him away naked as he was. Upon which he deſired his Secretary to ſee his papers all ſealed up, and went himſelf directly to the Cock-pit, where the Council waited for him. But theſe circumſtances are very contrary to the account, which we find in the *Letter to the Clergy of the Church of England, &c. I take the liberty*, ſays the Author of that Letter, *to affirm, becauſe I may do it with truth, that the diſtinction of a private and a publick character was well obſerved upon this occaſion, and that he met with all the civility, I may ſay, tenderneſs, which could poſſibly be ſhewn to any one under circumſtances reſembling his. For the perſons directed by order of King and Council to ſeize his Lordſhip and his papers, received a ſtrict command to treat him with great reſpect and reverence.*

(109) Stackhouſe, *Memoirs of the Life and Conduct of Dr. F. Atterbury*, pag. 86.

[*XX*] *Having examined him.*] The Author of the *Letter* quoted in the preceding note tells us, that when he was examined by the Committee he was permitted to ſit down, and was heard with patience and reſpectful attention in all that he had to offer on his behalf. And what was more unuſual, he was allowed, after he had withdrawn himſelf, to enter twice into the Council-room, and there either alledge or requeſt ſomething in his favour. And that when he was committed, no marks of triumph on the ſide of the Government attended him to the Tower; but as the heart of an unhappy man would wiſh, he paſſed privately and without any guards to that, which is the moſt honourable place of confinement. We are likewiſe informed by another Writer (110), that it was reported, that while he was under examination, he chanced to make uſe of our Saviour's anſwer to the Jewiſh Council, while he ſtood before them; *If I tell you, you will not believe me, and if I alſo aſk you, you will not anſwer me, nor let me go* (111); and after three quarter's of an hour's ſtay at the Cock-pit, he was ſent to the Tower privately in his own coach, and without any manner of noiſe or obſervation.

(110) Stackhouſe, p. 87, 88.

(111) Luke xxii. 67, 68.

[*YY*] *Where he complained of having met with very ſevere treatment.*] *I have been*, ſays he in his Speech to the Houſe of Lords, *under a long and cloſe confinement; and have been treated with ſuch ſeverity and ſo great indignity, as I believe, no priſoner in the Tower of my age and function and rank ever was; by which means what ſtrength and uſe of my limbs I had, when I was firſt committed in Auguſt laſt, is now ſo far declined*

Rocheſter to the Tower of London [ZZ]. What ſhare he was charged to have had in the conſpiracy appears from the *Report of the Secret Committee of the Houſe of Commons* [*AAA*]; which occaſioned a reſolution in that Houſe on March the 11th 1723, that *Francis Lord Biſhop of Rocheſter was principally concerned in forming, directing, and carrying on a wicked and deteſtable conſpiracy, for invading theſe Kingdoms with a foreign force, and for raiſing inſurrections and a rebellion at home, in order to ſubvert our preſent happy eſtabliſhment in Church and State, by placing a Popiſh Pretender upon the Throne.* In conſequence of this a Bill was brought in *to inflict certain pains and penalties* upon him, which was read for the firſt time on the 23d of March, and ordered to be ſent to the Biſhop. His trial being appointed for the fourth of April, he ſent a letter to the Speaker of the Houſe of Commons, acquainting him with the reaſons which had determined him not to give that Houſe any trouble concerning the Bill depending againſt him, but that he ſhould be ready to make his defence and plea againſt it, when it came to be argued *in another Houſe, whereof he had the honour to be a Member.* One of the Members of the Houſe of Commons (*t*) oppoſed the Bill againſt him, by alledging, that it was plain the Pretender had none but a company of ſilly fellows about him; and it was to be feared, that if the Biſhop, who was allowed to be a man of great parts, ſhould be baniſhed, he might be ſollicited and tempted to go to Rome, and there be in a capacity to do more miſchief by his advice, than if he was ſuffered to ſtay in England, under the watchful eye

(*t*) Mr. Oglethorpe, who has lately exerted the public ſpirit of an old Roman by his indefatigable endeavours in founding the new Colony of *Georgia* in America.

clined that I am very unfit to make my defence againſt a Bill of ſuch an extraordinary nature. The great weakneſs of body and mind, under which I labour, ſuch uſage, ſuch hardſhips, ſuch inſults, as I have undergone, might have broken a more reſolute ſpirit and much ſtronger conſtitution, than falls to my ſhare.

[ZZ] *There was publiſhed a pamphlet in 4to, intitled,* A Letter to the Clergy of the Church of England &c.] The Author of it obſerves, that *it is a thing both reaſonable in itſelf, and highly for the intereſt of the publick, that the welfare of the Church of England, and the ſafety of all its Teachers in particular, ſhould be the conſtant aim and endeavour of our Government.* "This, *ſays he,* our Civil Governours are, I am perſuaded, firmly ſatisfied in..... As it is therefore "their intereſt and duty, ſo I verily believe it is "their inclination and endeavour carefully to ſupport "it, and it would be highly unreaſonable in us to "think, that whenever their cenſures fall upon any "of our order, they act, notwithſtanding theſe two "powerful motives, to the contrary, upon either paſſion and prejudice, or miſrepreſentation." He ſhews then the regard which the King had for the Order of Biſhops, and the great influence which they had at Court; and remarks, that the other conſideration, which inclines him to believe that only juſtice and the neceſſity of the State moved the Civil Government in that important affair of the Biſhop of Rocheſter, is, that *till the time of this diſcovery his Lordſhip had a full weight of regard and reſpect paid to his merit at Court, and in the great Council of the nation. Whatever applications he has made to his preſent Majeſty, (and ſome he has made) have been always received and anſwered favourably. Whenever in the honourable aſſembly of the Peers he delivered his opinion about the publick affairs of the Nation, even when he oppoſed all the meaſures and endeavours of the Miniſters of State, they were always obſerved to anſwer his arguments with candour and good manners; and tho' he uſually expreſſed himſelf with all the elegance of language, with all the juſtneſs of delivery, and in the moſt decent geſture of an Orator, yet was it the civility of his audience more than the weight of his eloquence, which gained him attention. For eloquence is a blunt tool with men's reaſon, when it comes from a ſuſpected perſon. It is indeed a ſharp arrow and a poiſoned one too, when it is in the hands of him, whoſe deſigns are evil and not known to be ſo; and therefore as it is what ſcarcely one in a thouſand can ever arrive at, ſo ſcarcely one in ten thouſand can ſafely be truſted with it.* He then adds another conſideration, which ſhould diſpoſe even the moſt diſaffected ſubject to think, that this commitment had a juſt and even neceſſary foundation, which was *the unpopular view, in which ſuch an action uſes to appear among us*; and he remarks, that the commitment of the Biſhop of Rocheſter was very different in the nature of the charge from that of the ſeven Biſhops and of Dr. Sacheverell; and therefore if he had been diſcovered to have contributed any way to deſigns of ſubverting the conſtitution, and placing upon the throne one grown under the very wing of the Papal See, there is no good ſubject but muſt ſee clearly not only the juſtifiableneſs, but even the neceſſity of his commitment. *I preſume,* continues he, *that there is no Proteſtant among us, who believes that a Biſhop, as a Biſhop, is or ought to be exempt from civil enquiries. That erroneous notion was baniſhed from our Iſle with Popery long ago; and the King's Supremacy over all his ſubjects is not doubted by any Member of our Church. Indeed while a Prelate acts within his proper ſphere, a larger portion of reſpect is his due. The Government, as well as private men, ought not raſhly to ſuſpect or take up an accuſation againſt him; for the integrity of his character is the beſt ſupport of that authority, which he ought to have in order to govern all thoſe, who are in his Dioceſe and under his Epiſcopal Juriſdiction. This he has a right to from Scripture and by the reaſons of State. But whenever any one of that high ſtation acts contrary to his religious character, and foments civil wars, and ſtrikes at the eſtabliſhment of his country, it is his intereſt that his ſacred office be not regarded in the queſtion, leſt it ſerve only to aggravate the crimes proved upon him, or (to ſpeak the language of the great St. Paul) to make* his ſin exceeding ſinful. The Author afterwards addreſſes himſelf to the friends of the Eſtabliſhment among the Clergy, and repreſents to them, that with too many they lie under the ſcandal of being a reſtleſs and ungovernable body. He reminds them of their having ſolemnly dedicated themſelves to the miniſtry of holy things, and therefore that it is improper for them to interpoſe in publick affairs; that their function obliges them to promote peace; that they are in ſome ſort penſioners of the ſtate, in which they live, and obliged by the moſt ſacred oaths to allegiance to the Government. He concludes his diſcourſe with an expoſtulation addreſſed to thoſe, who wiſh for a change, and not only deſire, but attempt a rebellion; and ſhews them the fatal conſequences, which would inevitably attend the ſucceſs of their deſigns.

[*AAA*] *What ſhare he was charged with having had in the conſpiracy, appears from the report of the ſecret Committee of the Houſe of Commons.*] The Committee obſerve, that they find themſelves obliged to mention the Lord Biſhop of Rocheſter as principally aiding, directing, and employing George Kelly, Clerk, in the proſecution of his deſigns. As Mr. Kelly's correſpondencies ſeem'd to derive their weight and ſignificancy chiefly from his being employed by the Biſhop of Rocheſter, the Committee mention the ſeveral reaſons that induced them to believe, that he was ſo employed. What the Biſhop is chiefly charged with is, carrying on a traiterous correſpondence abroad, in order to raiſe an inſurrection in the Kingdom, and to procure foreign forces to invade it. To ſupport this accuſation three Letters were produced, which were thought to be written to General Dillon, a Roman Catholic Officer at Paris, to the late Lord Mar, and the Pretender himſelf under the feigned names of *Chivers, Muſgrave,* and *Jackſon.* We ſhall refer the reader to the Report itſelf for the circumſtances and evidence of this charge.

eye of thoſe in power. He was brought to trial before the Houſe of Lords on Monday the 6th of May, and on Saturday following he made his defence [*BBB*]. This was replied to by the King's Council, Mr. Reeve, and Mr. Wearg. His own Council were Sir Conſtantine Phipps, and William Wynne, Eſq; The Bill was read for the third time upon Wedneſday the 15th of May, and a motion being made that it ſhould paſs, it occaſioned a very warm and long debate. The Earl Poulet, who opened the debate, ſpoke to the nature of the Bill, ſhewed the danger of ſuch an extraordinary proceeding, and

[*BBB*] *He made his defence.*] He complains at firſt of the ſeverities which he had ſuffered in the tower, and tells the Lords the reaſon why he did not defend himſelf before the Commons, becauſe both by the reſolution of that Houſe, and the preamble of the Bill, he found himſelf prejudged. He enumerates ſome particular hardſhips under which he had laboured, and ſome reaſonable requeſts which had been denied him during his trial. He proceeds then to confute the charge againſt him from the want of evidence to ſupport it, and from its improbability. He obſerves that the charge in general is a wicked deſign to ſubvert the Government by depoſing the King, and placing the Pretender on the Throne, and in order to this traiterouſly conſulting with perſons at home to raiſe a rebellion, and traiterouſly correſponding with perſons abroad to procure an invaſion. With regard to the traiterous conſultation at home, it muſt be between him and the perſons ſuſpected and named in the Report. But with them he declares that he was very far from having had any great familiarity, or they any traiterous conſultations with him, having ſeen ſome of them not in one, others not in two years before; and having never dined with one at all, and but once with another. As for the traiterous correſpondence abroad, it conſiſted in three Letters ſent to General Dillon, the Lord Mar, and the Pretender, which the Biſhop dictated to Mr. Kelly; and two intercepted Letters from Mar and Dillon in anſwer to theſe, and in a foreign correſpondence carried on by Kelly with the Biſhop's knowledge and approbation. With regard to the three Letters, ſuppoſed to be dictated on April the 20th 1722, he aſſerts, that he could not be concerned in them, becauſe the concurrent teſtimonies of his ſervants, that *no ſtranger came near him about that time*, and the incompetent evidence of the Poſt-Office Clerks, who at ſuch a diſtance of time might not remember Mr. Kelly's hand-writing, ſeem to clear him. As for the two intercepted Letters from Mar and Dillon in anſwer to theſe, he inſiſts upon it, that they were ſent on purpoſe to be intercepted, and to fix the other upon him, becauſe they deſcribe him and his circumſtances in ſuch a plain and open manner, as, were they genuine, muſt have been inconſiſtent with the rules of reſerved writing. With regard to the foreign correſpondence, carried on by Mr. Kelly with the Biſhop's knowledge and approbation, he owns, that Mr. Kelly was no ſtranger to him; but denies, that he was in any degree intimate with him, or frequently ſaw him. He affirms, that he had no ſhare in his correſpondence, as Mr. Kelly himſelf had declared in the Houſe of Lords, and his ſervants teſtified upon oath, that they neither knew his name nor face, becauſe he came ſo ſeldom. And therefore it was hardly to be thought, that he would enter into ſecrets of ſo dangerous a nature with a perſon, with whom he had ſo ſlight an acquaintance. The only thing then that the charge reſts upon, is Neynoe's evidence; and an hear-ſay evidence, ſuch as his was, is (as he ſhewed from a paſſage in Sir John Fenwick's Bill of Attainder) of ſmall weight and conſideration in caſes of this nature. He then repreſents Neynoe as a pragmatical pretender to ſecrets which he knew nothing of, as a cowardly corrupt creature, who would ſwear backward or forward, ſay or unſay any thing for fear or pay; and as a profligate wretch, who had thrown away his life rather than venture to ſtand to the truth of what he had owned before his death. The Biſhop proceeds next to the improbability of the charge with regard to him. For if he had been concerned in any traiterous deſigns againſt the Government, 'tis reaſonable to think, that he would have made the late Duke of Ormond, whom he always highly regarded, his correſpondent, and not the Earl of Mar, whom he never converſed with, except when he was Secretary of State, and who had left the Pretender's intereſt ſeveral years, or Mr. Dillon, a military man, whom he never ſaw. That he would have ſent his Letters by ſome ſecret way, and not committed them to the common poſt; and that ſome traces at leaſt of ſuch a correſpondence would have appeared, either among his papers that were ſeized, or from the teſtimony of ſome credible witneſs. But for a man of his recluſe and retired manner of life, unacquainted with the arts of war, and active only in his proper ſphere, to engage in a conſpiracy, when his heart was full of grief for the loſs of a wife, and his head buſied in buildings and books, and engaged in a correſpondence with learned men about ſettling an important point of Divinity, *thoſe*, ſays he, *that entertain ſuch thoughts without reaſon, may condemn me without argument.* "Here is a plot, *continues he*, of a year or "two ſtanding to ſubvert the Government with "an armed force; an invaſion from abroad; an inſurrection at home; juſt when ripe for execution it "is diſcovered; and twelve months after the contri"vance of the ſcheme no conſultation appears, no "men correſponding together, no proviſion made, no "arms, no officers provided, not a man in arms; "and yet the poor Biſhop has done all this." *What could tempt me to ſtep thus out of my way? Was it ambition, and a deſire of climbing into an higher ſtation in the Church? There is not a man in my office further removed from this than I am. Was money my aim? I always deſpiſed it, too much perhaps, conſidering what occaſion I am now like to have for it. For out of a poor Biſhoprick of five hundred pounds* per annum, *I have laid out no leſs than a thouſand pounds towards repairs of the Church and Epiſcopal Palace; nor did I take one ſhilling for dilapidations. The reſt of my little income has been ſpent as is neceſſary, as I am a Biſhop. Was I influenced by any diſlike of the eſtabliſhed Religion, &c.* (112)? *Once more; can I be ſuppoſed to favour arbitrary power? The whole tenor of my life hath been otherwiſe. I was always a friend of the liberty of the ſubject, and to the beſt of my power conſtantly maintained it. I may have been thought miſtaken in the meaſures I took to ſupport it. It matters not by what party I was called, ſo my actions are uniform.* In the concluſion he ſets before the Lords the grievouſneſs of the penalties to be inflicted upon him; the inſufficiency of the evidence to prove him in the leaſt degree guilty; and the fatal conſequences of making precedents in ſuch extraordinary proceedings. *My ruin*, ſays he, *is not of that moment to any number of men to make it worth their while to violate, or even to ſeem to violate their conſtitution in any degree, which they ought to preſerve againſt any attempts whatſoever. But where once ſuch extraordinary ſteps as theſe are taken, and we depart from the fixed rules and forms of juſtice, and try untrodden paths, no man knows where this ſhall ſtop.* "Though I am worthy of no regard; though what"ſoever is done to me may for that reaſon be looked "upon to be juſt; yet your Lordſhips will have ſome "regard to your own laſting intereſt, and that of "poſterity. This is a proceeding, with which the "Conſtitution is unacquainted; which under the pre"tence of ſupporting it, will at laſt effectually de"ſtroy it. For God's ſake, lay aſide theſe extraor"dinary proceedings; ſet not up theſe new and dan"gerous precedents. I for my part will voluntarily "and chearfully go into perpetual baniſhment, and "pleaſe my ſelf that I am, in ſome meaſure, the occaſi"on of putting a ſtop to ſuch precedents, and doing ſome "good to my country, and will live, wherever I am, "praying for its proſperity; and do with the words "of Father Paul to the State of Venice, ſay, *Eſto "perpetuo.* It is not my departing from it I am con"cerned for. Let me depart, and let my country "be fixed upon the immoveable foundation of law "and juſtice, and ſtand for ever." *Some part of my charge hath been diſproved by direct and full evidence, particularly that of writing the letters of the 20th of April,*

(112) See above Note [*C*].

and urged, that the ſwerving from the fixed rules of evidence, and conſequently from juſtice, muſt inevitably be attended with the moſt fatal conſequences to our excellent Conſtitution. Dr. Willis, then Biſhop of Sarum, in anſwer to that alledged, that as extraordinary diſeaſes require extraordinary remedies, ſo in caſes of extreme danger and neceſſity, when the very being of the State lies at ſtake, if the common Law cannot reach great

April, or that I knew who wrote them; which I utterly deny that I ever did, or as yet do know. Other parts of the charge there are, which are not capable of ſuch diſproof, nor indeed require it. There I reſt. But, my Lords, there is a way allowed of vindicating my ſelf. It is generally negative; that is, by proteſting and declaring my innocence to your Lordſhips, in the moſt deliberate, ſerious, and ſolemn manner, and appealing to God, the ſearcher of hearts, as to the truth of what I ſay, as I do it in what follows. I am charged in the Report with directing a correſpondence to Mr. Kelly; but I ſolemnly deny that I ever directly or indirectly ſaw a ſingle line of any of their letters till I met with them in print. Nor were the contents of any of them ever communicated to me. I do in the next place deny that I was ever privy to any memorial to be drawn up to be delivered to the Regent. Nor was I ever acquainted with any attempt to be made on the King's going to Hanover, or at the time of the Elections. Nor did I hear the leaſt rumour of the plot to take place after the breaking up of the camp till ſome time after Mr. Layer's commitment. I do with the ſame ſolemnity declare, that I never collected, remitted, received, or asked any money of any man to facilitate thoſe deſigns; nor was I ever acquainted with, or had any remittances whatſoever from any of thoſe perſons. I never drew any declaration, minutes, or paper, in the name of the Pretender, as is expreſly charged upon me. And I never knew of any commiſſion iſſued, preparation of arms, officers, or ſoldiers, or methods taken to procure any in order to raiſe an inſurrection in theſe Kingdoms. All this I declare to be true, and will ſo declare to the laſt gaſp of my breath. And I am ſure, the further your Lordſhips examine into this affair, the more you will be convinced of my innocency. Theſe contain all the capital articles, of which I am accuſed in the Report of the Houſe of Commons. " Had the charge " been as fully proved as aſcertained, it had been " vain to make proteſtations of my innocency, tho' " never ſo ſolemn. But as the charge is only ſup- " ported by the ſlighteſt probabilities, and which can- " not be diſproved in any inſtance, without proving " a negative; allow the ſolemn aſſeverations of a " man in behalf of his own innocence to have their " due weight, and I aſk no more, than that they " may have as much influence with your Lordſhips, " as they have truth." *If on any account there ſhall ſtill be thought by your Lordſhips to be any ſeeming ſtrength in the proofs againſt me; if by your Lordſhips judgments ſpringing from unknown motives, I ſhall be thought to be guilty; if for any reaſons or neceſſity of State, in the wiſdom and juſtice of which I am no competent judge, your Lordſhips ſhall proceed to paſs this Bill againſt me, I ſhall diſpoſe my ſelf quietly and tacitly to ſubmit to what you do; God's will be done.* " Naked " came I out of my mother's womb, and naked " ſhall I return; and whether he gives or takes a- " way, bleſſed be the name of the Lord." Mr. Wearg, in his reply to the Biſhop's defence, pays a fine compliment to the admirable eloquence, which that Prelate had exerted in his ſpeech. *It muſt be allowed,* ſays Mr. Wearg, *that the Reverend Prelate at the bar has made his defence with the utmoſt force and beauty of eloquence. Was I capable of anſwering it in the like manner, which I own I am not, yet I ſhould not think my ſelf at liberty to do it under the preſent circumſtances. For though it may be excuſable in a perſon upon his defence to make uſe of that powerful inſtrument of error and deceit, which always impoſes upon the reaſon, and miſguides the judgment in proportion as it affects the paſſions; yet I can't think the ſame methods juſtifiable in a perſon employed to carry on the proſecution. I ſhall therefore examine the force of what has been offered on behalf of the Reverend Prelate, ſtripp'd of the ornaments and colours of Rhetoriek.* We have an account of the effect, which the Biſhop's eloquence had upon the Houſe of Lords, in the following paſſage of the ſame Speech of Mr. Wearg. *Theſe things,* ſays he, *will ſeem incredible to one, who ſhall read this catalogue of complaints in his Lordſhip's Speech; and yet theſe are ſome of thoſe complaints, which with the aſſiſtance of a warm and maſterly ſtyle drew tears from ſome of your Lordſhip's eyes. But when ſtripp'd of that falſe beauty, and examined by the ſure and unerring rules of reaſon, appear to be without foundation, and to have been made without that ſtrict regard to truth, which, I preſume by ſome parts of his Lordſhip's Speech he would be thought always to have.* Mr. Wearg replies very particularly to all the allegations in favour of the Biſhop, and in the concluſion of his Speech has this paſſage. " The laſt thing preſſed by the Reverend " Prelate, is a ſolemn proteſtation, I cannot ſay of " innocence, becauſe it ſeems to me to be conceived " in ſuch terms as not to contradict any part of the " charge inſiſted upon by the Council for the Bill. It " is chiefly calculated to anſwer ſome particular cir- " cumſtances of times, without any denial of the " general charge, or the leaſt declaration of affection " or loyalty towards his preſent Majeſty. But if his " proteſtations amounted to a direct and poſitive de- " nial of the charge, they ought not to have any weight " with your Lordſhips, ſince this is a defence equally " in the power of the moſt guilty as well as the in- " nocent. A little proof is better than many prote- " ſtations. And I can't help obſerving upon this " head, and I hope his Lordſhip won't impute this " obſervation to ill nature, but a ſenſe of my duty, " which obliges me to make all proper obſervations, " that it appears his Lordſhip has not always that " ſtrict regard to truth, which he ought to have, by " the papers taken upon his ſervant at the Tower." The Duke of Wharton in his Speech againſt the Bill, took notice of an obſervation made by ſome of the Lords, and likewiſe by Mr. Wearg, that the Biſhop had made no declaration of affection or loyalty towards the King. *It has been ſaid in the debate,* ſays the Duke, *that the Biſhop ought to have made proteſtations of his zeal for his Majeſty and his family. But I think he took the moſt ready way of performing his duty, when he ſhewed himſelf innocent of the crimes laid to his charge. If he had made uſe of any expreſſions, which thoſe Lords blame him for omitting, the ſame good nature would have called it hypocriſy; and thoſe who are diſpleaſed with his ſilence, would have accuſed him of inſincerity.* The ſevereſt anſwer to the Biſhop's defence was publiſhed in ſeveral Letters in the London Journal for September 1723; two of which Letters profeſſedly treated the argument about the inherent right of the ſupreme authority of the Nation to proceed againſt a perſon by Bill in Parliament, and the prudence of making uſe of that right upon juſt and proper occaſions, in oppoſition to that part of the Biſhop's defence of himſelf relating to the method of proceeding againſt him by Bill. The Author obſerves in his Letter of *Sept.* 28. *N°.* 218. that the right itſelf is conſtantly allowed upon *ſome* occaſions by all thoſe, who have oppoſed the making uſe of it upon that. And with regard to the perſon here particularly concerned, it is ſufficient to remark, that the only ground of his complaints upon that head muſt be, that he had vainly flattered himſelf with the imagination, that he was ſafe in the prodigious care he had made uſe of to guard himſelf againſt the reach of all evidence in the common courſe of juſtice in inferior Courts; and from thence inferred, how very hard it was that one, who had given himſelf ſo much trouble in order to contract the guilt of treaſon, and ſo much more to hide it, ſhould be at laſt taken in the wilineſs of his own cunning, and brought to that puniſhment in an extraordinary method, which in the ordinary courſe of things he hoped to avoid. He proceeds then to the laſt part of the Biſhop's Defence, his ſolemn aſſeverations and concluſion of the whole. He calls this the *melancholy part of his defence*; *and ſo,* ſays he, *muſt every man think it, who has any regard laſt to the ſimplicity of words, or the ſacredneſs of oaths. For in ſuch a caſe as this, it makes but a ſmall dif-*

great offenders, the Legiſlature ought to exert itſelf. He was replied to by Dr. Gaſtrell Biſhop of Cheſter, who urged, that this was very far from the preſent caſe, ſince the conſpiracy, in which the Biſhop of Rocheſter was charged to have had a ſhare, had been diſcovered and diſappointed long before. He was anſwered by Dr. Gibſon, Biſhop of London, to whom the Duke of Wharton replied in a long ſpeech, wherein he ſummed up, with a great deal of ſkill, judgment and oratory, the whole evidence that had been produced againſt the Biſhop of Rocheſter, and endeavoured to ſhew the inſufficiency of it to prove the charge. His Grace was ſtrongly ſupported by the Lord Bathurſt [*CCC*].

The

ference in my account, whether a perſon in direct poſitive words perjures himſelf, or whether he artfully chooſes ſuch a manner of expreſſion, and ſuch particular matters to ſpeak of, as plainly ſhew the ſole intention of the man to be the avoiding every honeſt declaration that could be to the purpoſe. The Author obſerves then, that when a perſon, accuſed of a particular crime, after having ſaid what he thought proper in his own vindication, or in anſwer to the evidence againſt him, changes his tone, and voluntarily offers his ſolemn aſſeverations in order to clear himſelf, he does in effect take an oath to ſpeak to the main point, to ſpeak to it plainly, explicitly, without artifice; and is in much the ſame condition with any one, who is formally ſworn to ſpeak the truth, and the whole truth, as well as nothing but the truth. For the only uſe of voluntary aſſeverations in criminal caſes muſt ariſe from their plainneſs, their openneſs, their comprehenſiveneſs, and their fitneſs to the ſingle purpoſe, at which they would appear to aim. Otherwiſe they can have no weight but againſt the perſon who has recourſe to them. And this effect they muſt neceſſarily have. For when a perſon ſtands forth, and declares to the Judges, that he is ready to purge himſelf of the charge brought againſt him by ſolemn appeals to God, the ſearcher of hearts; and after this moving declaration is obſerved to avoid the direct charge laid againſt him, to pitch upon ſome nice particular circumſtances of facts, which were not made any part of that charge at the Bar where he now ſtands; and to mix up his moſt ſolemn words with that cunning and art, which ought to be far diſtant from them; it cannot be, but that his own method and form of proteſtation muſt itſelf recoil upon him, and be itſelf an argument of that guilt, which it was officiouſly brought to hide. *This*, continues the Author, *is the caſe here. The late Biſhop, to whoſe profeſſion ſuch a procedure little agrees, is expreſly charged with dictating ſome particular letters to Mr. Kelly; with correſponding with the Pretender; with breach of his repeated oaths of fidelity to King George, &c. After other inſufficient anſwers he deſires to have recourſe to the method of clearing himſelf by the moſt ſolemn appeals to God, as the ſearcher of hearts. In this method, and throughout the courſe of all theſe appeals to heaven, he carefully avoids the mention of King George's name, or that of any belonging to his family. He never once declares himſelf to have any ſenſe of his oaths to King George and the Proteſtant Eſtabliſhment, upon his mind, or once acknowledges King George's right to theſe Kingdoms. He never once, ſo much as in words, diſowns the Pretender's right to this crown, or diſclaims all correſpondence with him; or declares even the coldeſt reſolution againſt him. Theſe particulars, conſidering the charge laid againſt him of breaking through the ſacred ties of repeated oaths, could not be forgot, could not be omitted through haſte, or inadvertence, or defect of memory, but muſt be deſignedly, wilfully, and deliberately paſſed over. And then, when he comes to the main particular, he runs off from that, as it was laid againſt him in the Bill, and inſtead of denying in the preſence of God that he ever communicated or dictated any letters to Mr. Kelly, or the like; he dextrouſly, by I know not what figure of oratory, or what rule of art, ſolemnly denies that he ever* ſaw *any ſuch letters of Kelly's, or that the* contents *were ever* communicated TO him BY Kelly. *Such an uſe of words as this, and ſuch a change of language, are bad every where, but are inſupportably bad in a ſentence, uſhered in with a ſolemn appeal to Heaven, and ſanctified with the awful name of God.* " After having thus " put a cheat, as he hoped, upon the ears of his au- " dience, and after having *ſeemed* to deny (what he " did not at all deny) his *dictating* letters to Kelly " in the correſpondence laid to his charge; after " this he concerns himſelf only with other particu- " lar circumſtances, which were not the ſubject of " the charge againſt him, but lay ſcattered in the " *Report* of the Houſe of Commons; and moſt of " them only there mentioned, as matters related by " perſons examined concerning what they had heard " about the conſpiracy. Some of theſe particulars, " with very peculiar circumſtances of time and " place, (though as I have obſerved, not made any " part of the charge againſt him,) he has taken up- " on him more expreſly to deny, whilſt he was con- " ſcious, he avoided the true points laid upon him, " and might ſafely deal about his proteſtations, where " there was nothing particular ſo much as alledged " in his trial to confront and invalidate them. This " is the method he thought fit to take in ſo ſerious " and ſolemn a matter as that of appealing to God, " the ſearcher of hearts. And if the careful omiſſion " of all that was truly proper for the declaration of " his innocence upon ſuch an occaſion; the artful " evaſion of what he would ſeem to ſpeak to by a " ſubtle change of the main charge, and the dextrous " running away from the real accuſation againſt him " in the Bill, to ſeveral wandering particulars in the " *Report* not alledged againſt him; if all this be not " ſufficient to ſatisfy any unprejudiced perſon, that " guilt was the real ground of ſuch a behaviour, as " guilt alone could make neceſſary, I know not " what to add. This I am ſure of, that ſuch hid- " ing and concealing of truth; ſuch avoiding of all " plain language; ſuch prevarication and mental re- " ſervation, after having made a ſolemn ſhew of ap- " peal to God, can be thought to differ very little " from the guilt of perjury, or the greateſt diſreſpect " to the ſacredneſs of an oath. Better a thouſand " times had it been for one of his character never to " have entered into a method of defence, which was " not forced upon him, than to have entered into it " with ſuch ſolemnity, and to have come out of it " with ſuch a blot of falſhood and ſuch a mark of " guilt added to all the reſt." *The concluſion of his whole defence*, adds the Author, *is of a piece with this part of it. It is a concluſion, not only very moving, but which would very well become the mouth of a good, upright, and innocent man, ſubmitting himſelf to injuſtice and wrong under a ſenſe of God's over-ruling Providence. But, conſidered in the mouth of one ſo conſcious to himſelf of his own inward guilt, as not to be able plainly to diſown the charge; of one, proved by a multitude of convincing circumſtances to have brought himſelf to this condition by breach of ſolemn vows and oaths; and of one, whom all his own art and cunning could not cover from the light of evidence; it then becomes rather an aggravation of his crime, than an argument of his innocence, and is found to move the indignation and zeal of mankind much more than their pity and compaſſion. It is at beſt no otherwiſe eſteemed than it would have been, had it come from a perſon, whoſe characteriſtic and diſtinguiſhing mark, through his whole life of controverſy, was well known to have been a peculiar knack and dexterity of calling in the holy Scripture into all his private quarrels, and of applying the ſacred words of it to all the purpoſes of his own perſonal paſſions and reſentments.*

[*CCC*] *His Grace was ſtrongly ſupported by the Lord Bathurſt.*] He took notice firſt of the ungracious diſtinctions, which were fixed upon the Members of that noble and illuſtrious Aſſembly, who differed in opinion from thoſe, who happened to have the majority. That for his part, as he had nothing in view but truth and juſtice, the good of his country, the honour of that Houſe, and the diſcharge of his own conſcience, he would freely ſpeak his thoughts, notwithſtanding all diſcouragements. That he would not complain of the ſiniſter arts that had been uſed of late to render ſome perſons obnoxious, and under

pretence

The Earl of Strafford ſpoke on the ſame ſide, and likewiſe the Lord Trevor, who declared, that he had all along, and would ſtill oppoſe theſe extraordinary proceedings, which tended to lodge an exorbitant power in their fellow-ſubjects. That if he were to loſe his liberty, he had rather give it up to one ſingle Tyrant, than to many; for a Tyrant, if a man of common underſtanding, would, for his own ſake, be tender of the lives of his ſubjects; whereas many Tyrants would endeavour to deſtroy one another, to get one another's preferments. He was replied to by the Earl of Finlater and Seafield. The Duke of Argyle run through and confuted the moſt eſſential parts of the Biſhop's defence, and aggravated his offence, by which he had debaſed his holy function and character, and acted contrary to the moſt ſolemn and repeated oaths which he had taken. The Lord Gower ſpoke afterwards againſt the Bill; but what ſurpriz'd moſt perſons, was that the Lord Lechmere, who on ſeveral occaſions had expreſſed his diſlike of theſe extraordinary proceedings, declared it as his opinion, that there was ſufficient evidence to ſupport the charge. He was anſwered by Earl Cowper in a very remarkable ſpeech [*DDD*]. The Earls of Peterborough and Cholmondley ſpoke in favour of the Bill, which at laſt paſſed

pretence of their being ſo, to open their letters about their minuteſt domeſtick affairs. For thoſe ſmall grievances he could eaſily bear; but when he ſaw things go ſo far, as to condemn a perſon of the higheſt dignity in the Church, in ſuch an unprecedented manner, and without any legal evidence, he thought it his duty to oppoſe a proceeding ſo unjuſt and unwarrantable in itſelf, and ſo dangerous and diſmal in its conſequences. To this purpoſe he begged leave to tell their Lordſhips a ſtory, which he had from ſeveral Officers of undoubted credit, who ſerved in Flanders in the late war. A Frenchman, it ſeems, had invented a machine, which would not only kill more men at once, than any yet in uſe, but alſo diſable for ever any man who ſhould be wounded by it. Big with hopes of a great reward he applied to one of the Miniſters, who laid his propoſal before the late French King; but that Monarch conſidering, that ſo deſtructive an engine might ſoon be turned againſt his own men, did not think proper to encourage it; whereupon the inventor came over into England, and offered his ſervice to ſome of our Generals, who likewiſe rejected the propoſal with indignation. The uſe and application of this ſtory, added his Lordſhip, is very obvious. For if this way of proceeding be admitted, it will certainly prove a very dangerous engine. No man's life, liberty, or property will be ſafe. And if thoſe, who were in the adminiſtration ſome years ago, and who had as great a ſhare in the affections of the people as any that came after them, had made uſe of ſuch a political machine, ſome of thoſe noble perſons, who now appear ſo zealous promoters of the Bill, would not be in a capacity to ſerve his Majeſty at this time. His Lordſhip added, that if ſuch extraordinary proceedings went on, he ſaw nothing remaining for him and others to do, but to retire to their country-houſes, and there, if poſſible, quietly enjoy their eſtates within their own families, ſince the leaſt correſpondence, the leaſt intercepted letter might be made criminal. To this purpoſe his Lordſhip quoted a paſſage out of Cardinal de Retz's *Memoirs*, relating to that wicked Politician Cardinal Mazarin, who boaſted, that if he had but two lines of any man's writing, with a few circumſtances atteſted by witneſſes, he could cut off his head when he pleaſed. His Lordſhip likewiſe animadverted with great ſeverity upon the majority of the Bench of Biſhops, turning towards whom he ſaid, that *he could hardly account for the inveterate hatred and malice, which ſome perſons bore the learned and ingenious Biſhop of Rocheſter, unleſs it was that they were intoxicated with the infatuation of ſome of the wild Indians, who fondly believe they inherit not only the* ſpoils, *but even the* abilities *of any great enemy they kill* (112).

(112) *Hiſtorical Regiſter*, N° 33. *for the year* 1724, pag. 88, 89.

[*DDD*] *He was anſwered by Earl Cowper in a very remarkable Speech.*] He obſerved, that the ſtrongeſt argument, which had been urged for the Bill, had been neceſſity; but that for his part he ſaw no neceſſity, that could juſtify ſo unprecedented and ſo dangerous a proceeding. That, as already had been ſuggeſted, the conſpiracy had above a twelve month before been happily diſcovered, and the effects of it conſequently prevented. That beſides the intrinſic weight and ſtrength of the Government by the numerous offices and employments civil and military, and the wealth and intereſt of the well-affected to his Majeſty's Perſon, and the preſent happy Eſtabliſhment, the hands of thoſe at the helm had been ſtill fortified by the ſuſpenſion of the *Habeas Corpus* Act and the additional Troops; ſo that, in his opinion, there could be no danger to the Government, if Plunket and Kelly were not priſoners for life, nor the Biſhop of Rocheſter ſent into baniſhment. That on the contrary, if that Prelate's talent and genius lay in contriving and carrying on State-intrigues, he thought him leſs dangerous at home than abroad. That the other reaſons alledged to ſupport this extraordinary proceeding, had no more weight in them than the firſt. That the known rules of evidence, as laid down at firſt, and eſtabliſhed by the law of the land, were the birth-right of every ſubject of this nation, and ought to be conſtantly obſerved, not only in the inferior Courts of Judicature, but alſo in both Houſes of Parliament, till altered by the Legiſlature. That much had been ſaid of the power of Parliaments, which he owned was very great; but that, in his opinion, their abſolute power conſiſted only in making and repealing laws; and till ſuch time as a law was repealed, every ſubject had a right to it. That the admitting the precarious and uncertain evidence of the Clerks of the Poſt-Office, was a very dangerous precedent. That in former times it was thought very grievous, that in capital caſes a man ſhould be affected by ſimilitude of hands; but here the caſe was much worſe, ſince it was allowed, that the Clerks of the Poſt-Office might carry the ſimilitude of hands four months in their minds. That thoſe men might be honeſt, and ſwear to the beſt of their knowledge; but he was ſure they were at leaſt very willing and forward evidence; for when he aſked one of them, how he knew ſuch a paper to be Mr. Kelly's hand? he readily anſwered, that he had ſeen the ſame four months before, and he was ſure it could be no other; whereas any man, who has been ever ſo little converſant in the world, knows that hands may be ſo well counterfeited as not to be diſtinguiſhed. His Lordſhip then commended the Biſhop's noble and brave behaviour in not anſwering before the Houſe of Commons, whoſe proceeding in this unprecedented manner againſt a Lord of Parliament was ſuch an incroachment on the prerogative of the Peerage, that if ſubmitted to by paſſing this Bill, they might well be ſaid to be the laſt of Lords. Ultimus Romanorum, *my Lords*, (ſaid his Lordſhip in the concluſion,) *was a character of honour and praiſe; but to be the laſt of Britiſh Peers, by giving up our ancient privileges, will never, I doubt, admit of ſuch a conſtruction; and therefore I am for rejecting this Bill* (113). Some months after the tryal there was publiſhed a paper (114), intitled, *A Speech made by a noble Peer*, (Earl C—r) *in the Houſe of Lords, upon the third reading of the Bill* for inflicting pains and penalties on Francis Lord Biſhop of Rocheſter. This Speech was aſcribed to Earl Cowper, tho' it appears to have been eſſentially different from that, of which we have given the ſubſtance above. But the true account of this pretended Speech is as follows: Mr. Jeremiah Griffith, a Gentleman of the Law, having written a Defence of the Biſhop of Rocheſter in order to be publiſhed in the *True Briton*, ſeveral months after the baniſhment of that

(113) Ibid. pag. 90, 91, 92.

(114) Ibid. pag. 36. p. 325, & *ſeq.*

paſſed by a majority of eighty three to forty three, and received the Royal Aſſent the 27th of May. It is ſaid, that the King ſigned this Bill with ſome regret, being much concerned, as he ſaid, that there ſhould be any juſt occaſion of dooming to perpetual baniſhment a Biſhop of the Church of England, and a man of ſuch eminent parts and learning, and one, who had been ſo nearly attendant on him at his Coronation. However to mitigate in ſome meaſure the ſeverity of this ſentence, his daughter was permitted to attend him in his travels, and through the hands of her huſband, Mr. Morrice, he was allowed a correſpondence and intercourſe with his native country. On Tueſday the 8th of June he embarked on board the Aldborough Man of War, and landed the Friday following at Calais, where being informed that the late Lord Viſcount Bolingbroke, who had obtained his pardon, was juſt arrived to embark for England, he ſaid very facetiouſly, *Then I am exchanged.* He went thence to Bruſſels, where it is ſaid that he intended to pay a viſit to the Earl of Ayleſbury, a Roman Catholick Nobleman, who refuſed it, intimating, that though his own religion might be an excuſe for his being in an oppoſite intereſt to the Government of England, yet, he could not countenance a Proteſtant Clergyman, who acted inconſiſtently with the obligations of his religion and his oaths. The Author of the *True Briton*, a paper, which was publiſhed ſoon after, and in which the late Duke of Wharton is ſuppoſed to have had a conſiderable ſhare, has reflected in many paſſages with great ſeverity upon the Adminiſtration on account of the Biſhop's baniſhment, and has drawn a character of him which is extremely advantageous [*EEE*]. He ſoftened the rigours of his exile by ſtudy and converſation with men of learning, and kept a conſtant correſpondence by letters with the moſt eminent ſcholars and perſons of genius. We ſhall preſent our readers with the extracts of ſeveral original letters [*FFF*] written by the Biſhop about the year 1727, to an ingenious French Gentleman,

that Prelate, changed his reſolution of printing it in that manner, and thought proper to excite the curioſity of the publick by caſting it into the form of a Speech, and giving it the ſanction of Earl Cowper's name; which procured it very great ſucceſs, and many thouſand copies of it were ſold upon that account. We ſhall tranſcribe but one paſſage from it, which appears very incompatible with that Earl's known ſentiments with regard to Church-affairs. The Author of that paper introduces him as obſerving, that he expected to have heard from the Bench of Biſhops many arguments of another kind againſt the Bill, which were properly within their Sphere, and which he was ſure they were perfect maſters of. That the old Champions of our Church uſed to argue very learnedly, "that to make or degrade Biſhops, was not the buſi- "neſs of the State; that there is a ſpiritual relation "between a Biſhop and his flock, derived from the "Church, with which the State has nothing to do." But that this Bill deprived the Biſhop of that ſpiritual relation without the concurrence of the Church. That the Parliament alone did it; and that it muſt be owned, that if the Parliament can do it, they can as well make a new one in his room; and a clauſe for that purpoſe added to the Bill would as effectually do the one as the other. *What the thoughts of our Reverend Prelates are upon theſe points does not yet fully appear. Something of their conduct intimates as if our old Divines were miſtaken. But be that as it will, as the judgment of our Prelates will carry great weight, and as the reaſons for ſuch their judgment muſt needs be convincing, I do not doubt but they will give your Lordſhips full ſatisfaction, before this debate comes to a period. In the mean time I ſpeak my concern, that if Acts of Parliament are made to interfere with Church-affairs; if Biſhops are to be put in or turned out at pleaſure; and all this be done without the concurrence of the Church, the world abroad may, tho' unjuſtly, look upon our Church as a creature only of the State, and treat our Biſhops as if they were no more than State-Officers. I hope however from the courage, zeal, and conduct of our preſent Reverend Prelates, whatſoever becomes of this Bill, that they will be able to wipe off any ſuch ſcandal. They certainly have the honour, the dignity and authority of our Church always at heart, and every thing tending to her intereſt, they will moſt zealouſly promote. But whether the paſſing of this Bill will promote her intereſt, or be of any ſervice to her, they beſt know. For my part, I cannot even gueſs at any advantage ſhe poſſibly can receive by it, unleſs it be this, that it will make the Biſhoprick of Rocheſter, and the Deanery of Weſtminſter to become vacant.*

[*EEE*] *Has drawn a character of him, which is extremely advantageous.*] The Author tells us (115), that he could wiſh to have that Prelate's ſtyle, in order to paint a true character of ſo great and learned a man, But that the qualifications that adorned him were ſo conſpicuous, that no flowers of Rhetorick are required to illuſtrate them. *The firſt inſtance*, continues he, *which diſtinguiſhed him and entitled him to the favours of the Court and eſteem of mankind, was, the early proof he gave of his juſt pretenſions to holy Orders by the excellent Book, which he publiſhed in defence of the Reformation. And he could ſay the firſt of June laſt, he was the only Biſhop of the Church of England, who had wrote in defence of Martin Luther, the great Patron of the Proteſtant intereſt. This behaviour was juſtly valued in former reigns; and, it is preſumed, cannot be judged a crime in this. In the reign of Queen Anne he was advanced to the Deanery of Chriſt-Church, and afterwards created Dean of Weſtminſter and elected Biſhop of Rocheſter. His behaviour, in every ſtation of his life, has ſhewn him to be a perſon of the greateſt wit, built upon the foundation of good ſenſe, and directed by the ſtricteſt rules of Religion and Morality. He was always for maintaining the Dignity and Privileges of the ſeveral offices he bore in the Church; and this juſt way of behaviour, inforced by that ſteadineſs, which was natural to him, created him many enemies among the Canons of Chriſt-Church and Prebends of Weſtminſter, who generally muſt by their own intereſt be obliged to oppoſe any Dean, who ſhould maintain the undoubted rights, which he ought to enjoy.* . . . "His "piety towards his children, and his ſincerity to his "friends, made him juſtly beloved and reſpected by "both. No other crime can be laid to his charge, "but that for which he now ſuffers, which over- "ballances all his virtues. The malice of his ene- "mies inſinuated, that he would change his Religion "when he came into foreign countries, and be delud- "ed into the errors of the Church of Rome. But "he declared in his defence before the Houſe of "Lords with the ſtrongeſt aſſeverations, that he would "die at a ſtake, rather than abandon the principles "of the eſtabliſhed Church of England." The Author concludes with this paſſage: *The chearfulneſs with which he indured his fate ſhewed him to be ſuperior to all the calamities of life, and would induce every man to believe him innocent, had not ſo great, ſo independent, and ſo incorrupt a majority in both Houſes of Parliament declared him guilty.*

[*FFF*] *The extracts of ſeveral original letters.*] The Biſhop ſpeaking of the *Memoires & Reflexions ſur les principaux Evenemens du Regne de Louis XIV*, ſays, "That I now return, gave me pleaſure when I read "it. The turn is natural and familiar, and there is "an air of truth in all he ſays; but not, I think, "the hand of a maſter. He tells his tale, not like "a man who knows any thing of the rules of writing "well, but as an eaſy companion at a table. I ſay "of

(115) Vol. 1. N° 7. p. 58, 59. edit. London 1723.

(u) Mr. Thiriot, who has obliged the public with ſome pieces.

tleman (*u*), for whom he had a great eſteem. Theſe extracts are in his own words. Though we have tranſcribed the moſt material paſſages from them, and ſuch as were moſt proper

" of his ſtyle, what he ſays of his figure. *Ma* " *figure, qui n'étoit pas déplaiſante, quoique je ne fuſſe* " *pas du premier Ordre des Gens bien faits*. . . . i. e. " My figure, which did not diſpleaſe, tho' I could not " be ranked among handſome people of the firſt claſs." " Tho' not of the firſt (or even ſecond) order of good " writers, he is yet agreeable. . . . I cannot poſſibly " digeſt his taking notice, p. 145. of the Chevalier " de Rohan's fine legs. An obſervation, that I " ſhould have expected rather from the pen of a " fine Lady, and which ſhews that the Marquis was " in his nature a little too intent on ſuch trifles. He " is ſenſible of it, and excuſes himſelf in the words " that follows: but that excuſe ſerves only to ſhew " the ſtrength of the impreſſion he was under in " this reſpect, ſince he had judgment enough " to ſee the fault, and commits it notwithſtand- " ing. . . . . Though I ſee he is manifeſt- " ly piqu'd againſt Lewis XIV and his Miniſter " Louvois, yet I am apt to believe him in all he " ſays of both of them. His reſentment ſeems to " carry him no farther than to give him the privi- " lege of ſpeaking what he knew to be true; and, as " the world goes, he that allows himſelf to cenſure " the Great even thus far, muſt ſay a great deal of " ill of them. . . . . " Of ſeveral French Poets he ſpeaks thus. " Rouſſeau appears to me ſtill a " greater Poet, the more I conſider him. His ta- " lents are unconfined, and enable him in every ſort " of writing to which he turns himſelf equally to " excel. But the old hard words he makes uſe of " puzzle me often (who care not to conſult a Dicti- " onary) and chiefly in his allegories. . . . Chaulieu, " La Fare and Chapelle, have many graces of the " eaſy and natural ſtyle, but I do not think them ſo " perfect in their way as Rouſſeau is in his; nor (to " tell you the truth) do I take ſuch pleaſure in read- " ing them. The letters particularly of Chaulieu, " &c. are not maſter-pieces in their kind, and many " of his little copies of verſes have nothing extraor- " dinary in them. The copy which touched me " moſt is the Ode on Fontenay,

" *Muſes qui dans ce lieu champetre, &c.*

" I cannot but obſerve, that under all Chaulieu's " ſeeming gaiety, there is an air of melancholy, " which breaks out by fits, and ſhews he was not at " eaſe in his own mind. He endeavours to conceal " it, and acts the brave; but his readers, with a " little penetration, may ſee through the diſguiſe. " The fears of death haunt him perpetually, and ap- " pear even in thoſe places, where he ſays, he is not " afraid of it. I ſhould be glad to know how he " died, whether with the ſame courage he commends " in Lady Mazarine. I ſhould gueſs, not, by the " obſervations I have made of him." After peruſing a diſſertation of Mr. de Boze, the Biſhop makes the following remark. " This book, I find, was written " two and thirty years ago, and therefore it is no " wonder that it ſhould not be equal to the later per- " formances of the ſame Author. One may ſay of " it as Tully ſpeaks of his Collection of Paradoxes: " *Non tale eſt hoc opus, ut in arte poni poſſit, quaſi illa* " *Minerva Phidiæ; ſed tamen, ut ex eâdem officinâ* " *exiſſe appareat.* Though it be not of the ſame va- " lue with his other works, yet it is ſuch, as that one " may perceive the ſame workman's hand and ſkill in " it. He choſe a little contracted ſubject; and had " not room therefore to ſhew his talents at full length " in managing it. And yet, narrow and dry as his " ſubject is, he has, by making ſeveral little digreſſi- " ons, and by taking occaſion to ſay many things " which were not neceſſary to his point, rendred it, " not only inſtructive but entertaining.

" *In tenui labor, at tenuis non gloria, ſi quem* " *Numina læva ſinunt, auditque vocatus Apollo.*

" Whether his fourth Gordian be a reality or a phan- " tom; whether he owes his very being to this Gen- " tleman, or is only reſcued from oblivion, and " brought again to life by him, let the Antiquaries " determine: I am ſo eaſy and indolent as not to " think it of much moment, which way ſuch facts " are ſettled; nor ſhould I have thought what is writ- " ten on this point worth reading, if this Author " had not writ it. In all he writes, one ſees the " ſame candor and impartiality; the ſame learning, " good ſenſe and exactneſs. If the argument he " handles be not of importance, he makes it ſo by " his manner of handling it. So that I could wiſh, " inſtead of four books, he had written forty: as old " as I am, and as many other things as I have to " do, I ſhould read all of them." . . . " I have perus'd " *(ſays the Biſhop in another letter)* the book about " (116) Poverty and Painting with attention. It is " written in a very good Goût, and has excellent " things in it. I have been pleaſed with no book " ſo much that has fallen in my way, ſince I came " into France. However, I could wiſh thoſe philo- " ſophical reaſonings had been omitted; they belong " rather to a Member of the Academy of Sciences, " than to one of the Forty, and perhaps will neither " convince nor pleaſe in ſuch a performance. The " Author ſeems to have gone too deep in that ſort of " reflections, and ſometimes not to have gone deep " enough in others, which relate more immediately " and naturally to his ſubject. Forgive this freedom, " but it is my real ſenſe of the matter. Beſides, " there is, I think, a want of method in the (117) " whole; and the 19th ſection, which is ſo long, " is to me a little obſcure. The many learned cita- " tions there do not clear, but cloud the Author's " meaning. I am apt to imagine that in the muſi- " cal part of it, he ſpeaks of what he does not him- " ſelf thoroughly underſtand; for if he does, he " would probably have expreſſed himſelf ſo, that " his reader alſo would have underſtood it, which, " (as to me at leaſt) is not the caſe. In one " thing I differ from him eſſentially; my fixed opi- " nion is, that the reputation of all books which " is perfectly well writ, comes originally from the " few, and not from the many; and I think I " could ſay a good deal in defence of that opi- " nion. . . . I ſee him here, and every where, under " the image of

" . . . . *Urbani, parcentis viribus, atque* " *Extenuantis eas conſultò*. . . . . .

" He ſeldom ſpeaks out, where he is likely to of- " fend; but contents himſelf oftentimes rather to in- " ſinuate, than affirm; and makes uſe of other men's " words to expreſs his own ſenſe, where he is unwil- " ling too openly to own it, or too ſtrongly to preſs " it. *Ab arte ſuâ non receſſit*, as Tully ſays of Ariſ- " toxenus. Even in his judgment of the Belles Let- " tres he plays the Politician. . . . I could not but " obſerve how in the laſt ſection but one, he has fur- " niſhed Mr. de Voltaire with the hint of his Poem " on the Ligue. . . . . Upon the whole, I repeat my " thanks to you for the great ſatisfaction which the " reading of theſe (118) two volumes has given me. . . " As to Mr. Arnauld's piece, intitled, *Reflexions ſur* " *l'Eloquence*, though what he ſays there be ſenſible " and juſt; yet I do not ſee much of the great man " in it, and had no great pleaſure in peruſing it. . ." The following remarks are made upon Mr. Fonte- nelle's manner of writing, &c. " I return you (Sir) " the two Eloges, which I have peruſed with pleaſure. " I borrow that word from your language, becauſe we " have none in our own that exactly expreſſes it. By " the account I had of thoſe pieces, I imagined them " very different from what I find them. Mr. Fonte- " nelle's talents, as to the knowledge of Nature, Ma- " thematicks and the Belles Lettres, are ſufficiently " underſtood. But I take notice particularly of the " art and addreſs with which he conducts himſelf in " nice points, and the prudent and political views by " which his pen is guided; a quality, that does not " often belong to men who have ſpent ſo much of " their time in ſtudying the Arts and Sciences. He " has been miſinformed as to one little particular, in " the

(116) This is the work intitled, *Reflexions critiques ſur la Poeſie & la Peinture*, by Abbé du Bos, a new edition of it, with corrections and additions, has been publiſhed by the Author, ſince the writing of this letter.

(117) The Author has changed the order and diſpoſition of his work, in the laſt edition of it.

(118) The laſt edition is in three.

proper for our work, they yet muſt appear to as much diſadvantage, by being thus abridged, as a figure in a picture would do, which being heightened with a landſkip, ſhould

" the ſhort draught he has given us of Sir Iſaac New-
" ton's figure. The (119) *œil fort vif, & fort per-*
" *çant*, which he gives him, did not belong to
" him, at leaſt not for twenty years paſt, about which
" time I firſt came acquainted with him. Indeed, in
" the whole air of his face and make, there was no-
" thing of that penetrating ſagacity which appears in
" his compoſures. He had ſomething rather languid
" in his look and manner, which did not raiſe any
" great expectation in thoſe who did not know him.
" I ſee Mr. Fontenelle ſpeaks warily as to the MSS.
" relating to Antiquity, Hiſtory and Divinity, which
" Sir Iſaac left behind him: I wiſh, for the honour
" of our country, that they may be as excellent in
" their kind as thoſe he publiſhed. But I fear the
" caſe is otherwiſe, and that he will be found to have
" been a great maſter only in that one way to which
" he was by nature inclined. It is enough for us
" poor limited creatures, if we remarkably excel in
" any one branch of knowledge. We may have a ſmat-
" tering of more; but it is beyond the lot of our na-
" ture, to attain any perfection in them. Mr. Fonte-
" nelle's praiſe of Sir Iſaac's modeſty (and of modeſty
" in general) is to me the moſt pleaſing part of that
" deſcription he has given us of him. It is that modeſty
" which will teach us to ſpeak, and think of the Anti-
" ents with reverence, eſpecially if we happen not to be
" throughly acquainted with them. Sir Iſaac certainly
" was, and his great veneration for them was one diſtin-
" guiſhing part of his character, which I wonder, (or
" rather, I do not wonder) that Mr. Fontenelle has
" omitted. His opinion of them was, that they
" were men of great genius and ſuperior minds,
" who had carried their diſcoveries (particularly in
" Aſtronomy and other parts of Mathematicks) much
" farther than now appears from what remains of their
" writings. One may apply to them, what was ſaid
" by an old learned man, to one of leſs knowledge and
" fewer years, who inſulted him, *I have forgot more*
" *knowledge than ever you had.* More of the anci-
" ents is loſt, than is preſerved, and perhaps our new
" diſcoveries are not equal to thoſe old loſſes. --- But
" this was not what I had in my thoughts, when I
" ſat down to write: my intention was only to ex-
" preſs the ſatisfaction I had in the peruſal of what
" I return, of which I could ſay more, if the end
" of the page did not admoniſh me to tell you how
" much I am &c. . . . . The Book (entitled, *Diſſer-*
" *tation ſur la Muſique des Anciens* (120), ſays the Biſhop
" in his 13th Letter) I ſend you back, is written in
" a very ſenſible and agreeable manner, with a fine
" turn of thoughts and words, as far as I am able to
" judge. I could wiſh only that the Writer had
" been a greater maſter of his ſubject, ſo as to have
" given us diſtincter and fuller accounts of it, which
" would have left no doubts upon the minds of his
" readers. I am ſatisfied that a pen like his would
" have been able to expreſs the moſt nice and diffi-
" cult points of which he treats in a way equally in-
" ſtructive and pleaſing, and have opened to us in
" dialogue the myſteries of Muſic, as eaſily and fa-
" miliarly as Monſieur Fontenelle has done thoſe of
" Aſtronomy. The picture of Leontium, with which
" the reflections conclude, is exquiſitely drawn; not
" only *con Studio*, but *con Amore*, as the Italians
" ſpeak of the favourite pieces of their beſt maſters.
" One would think the Book was written on pur-
" poſe for the ſake of the character at the end of it:
" as the moſt material part of a letter is ſometimes
" carelеſly thrown into a poſtſcript. . . . . I dare ſay
" Mademoiſelle (121) Lenclos was of the Author's
" acquaintance. Hearſay could not have furniſhed
" him with ſo lively a deſcription of her. There is
" ſomething in the picture, that ſhews, it was paint-
" ed by the life, and not copied from another. . . .
" One thing he ſays of her p. 9. (pardon the remark)
" ſeems in ſome degree applicable to himſelf. His
" words are very good, and therefore I tranſcribe
" them. " *Son gout en le conduiſant de fleur en fleur,*
" *comme les Abeilles, lui fait courir indifferemment tous*
" *les pays, & tous les ſiecles. Mais ces ſortes d'ima-*
" *ginations, ſi legeres & ſi brillantes, a dedaignent*
" *pour l'ordinaire le travail d'attention. Un eſprit né*
" *pour les agremens, & qui n'a jamais ſacrifié qu'aux*
" *Graces, n'a garde de s'aſſujettir à la patience qui*
" *ſeroit neceſſaire pour comparer les beautés d'un tems*
" *avec celles d'une autre, pour étudier les rapports &*
" *les oppoſitions qui ſont entre elles, pour les tourner de tous*
" *les ſens, dont on peut les enviſager; enfin, pour y rappor-*
" *ter la triſte & penible exactitude que demande*
" *une parallele.*" i. e. ' *His taſte guiding him from*
' *flower to flower, like the bees, makes him rove indiſ-*
' *criminately through all countries and all ages. But*
' *theſe kind of very ſtrightly and ſhining imaginations,*
' *generally diſdain a labour that requires attention. A*
' *genius born for charms, and which has never ſacri-*
' *ficed but to the Graces, can never ſubject itſelf to*
' *the patience that would be neceſſary in order for com-*
' *paring the beauties of one age with thoſe of another;*
' *to ſtudy the relations and oppoſitions that are between*
' *them; to view them in all the lights in which*
' *they can be conſidered; in fine, to beſtow upon*
' *them the melancholy and painful exactneſs, which is*
' *requiſite for the forming of a parallel.*' " Let me aſk
" you, for my own information, whether *tourner de tous*
" *les ſens*, be a proper phraſe in that caſe. To me
" it ſeems to ſpoil the metaphor. . . . . He cites ſome
" authorities, which I am at a loſs to explain; par-
" ticularly p. 58, that of Varro *de Repub. Rom. L.* 1.
" *C.* 1. Sure he does not mean the ancient Varro,
" who writ nothing that I know of, under that title.
" . . . He is beholden, I find, to the long chapter of
" Abbé du Bos, where the ancient authorities, relat-
" ing to his ſubject, are collected; and he has made
" a free uſe of them. But my intention was, to tell
" you rather what pleaſed me in the Book, than
" what I diſliked. I thank you &c. . . . ." The
14th Letter goes on thus: " From what I have read
" (in theſe Books) and other pieces, ſince I came on
" this ſide of the water, I have conceived a much
" greater opinion of the Biſhop of Meaux, than I had
" while in England, and give him readily the pre-
" ference to all thoſe Writers of the Church of France
" which I am acquainted with. He is an univerſal
" genius, and manages every thing he takes in hand,
" like a maſter. Good ſenſe and ſound reflections
" attend all he ſays; which is expreſſed in the moſt
" agreeable and beautiful manner, without any of the
" pomp or paint of falſe oratory. He has particu-
" larly the ſecret of knowing, not only what to ſay,
" but what not to ſay; the hardeſt taſk even of the
" moſt exact and excellent Writers! . . But you know
" him, Sir, better than I; and I ſhould be to blame
" therefore in attempting any part of his character,
" did not gratitude forbid me to return your books,
" without giving you an account of the pleaſure I
" had in peruſing them. Even the Lady's Memoirs,
" relating to our Engliſh Princeſs, gave me a good deal;
" particularly that part of them, where the ſtory of
" her death is told, in as natural and affecting a
" manner, I think, as is poſſible. It has ſuch a
" melancholy air of truth in it, as, at the ſame
" time that it gives conviction, moves compaſſion;
" and one can no more read it, than one could have
" been preſent at the ſad ſcene of it, without tears.
" . . . I really prefer Monſieur de Meaux's funeral O-
" ration to thoſe of Flechier or Bourdaloüe; tho' I
" think he would have writ ſtill better, had he imi-
" tated them leſs; for, by that means, he now and
" then heightens his expreſſion a little too much,
" and becomes unnatural. I gave you one inſtance
" of that when I ſaw you laſt. . . ." Another Letter
ſays thus: " The more I read of the Biſhop of
" Meaux, the more I value him, as a great and
" able Writer, and particularly for that talent of
" taking as many advantages of an adverſary, and
" giving him as few as any man, I believe, that ever
" entered the liſts of controverſy. There is a ſerious
" warmth in all he ſays, and his manner of ſaying
" it is noble and moving; and yet I queſtion after
" all, whether he ſometimes is in good earneſt. Par-
" don that freedom, Sir, I have read him with at-
" tention, and watched him narrowly. . . . . I have
" read all the Biſhop [*de Meaux's pieces*] that have
" been

(119) The very lively and piercing eye.

(120) By the Abbé de Chatenеuf.

(121) A celebrated French Actreſs.

ſhould afterwards be copied ſingly, without any of the embelliſhments that accompanied it in the original. As moſt of theſe letters are critiques on ſeveral eminent French Writers, we do not doubt but they will prove agreeable to our readers. The ſentiments are as ſtrong and judicious, as the diction is polite and natural; and are ſo much the more worthy of the preſs, as they ſeem, by the great eaſe and unaffectedneſs with which they are written, not deſigned for it. Though ſome particulars may appear not very material, they yet ought to be conſidered as the cuttings of a diamond, the ſmalleſt of which are of value. The Biſhop ſeems to have been a greater maſter of the French tongue than one would have imagined (as he learnt it ſo late) by ſome very juſt remarks he makes on certain delicate idioms of it. It is ſaid that he tranſlated Virgil's *Georgics* into Engliſh [*GGG*], and wrote an *Harmonia Evangelica* in a new and more perſpicuous method than any yet publiſhed. Not long before his death he was obliged to vindicate himſelf againſt Mr. Oldmixon with relation to Lord Clarendon's *Hiſtory of the Rebellion*, which he, together with Dr. Aldrich and Dr. Smalridge, was charged with having altered and interpolated in a variety of places [*HHH*]. He died at Paris the 15th of February 1732, and his body

" been procured for me; and will wait for the reſt, " till I can have them from your hands. In the mean " time, I will read worſe Books, that I may reliſh " his the more, when I return to them; tho', to ſpeak " the truth, I know no Writer in your tongue, that " has leſs need to have his reader ſo prepared for " him. . . . . Do you hear nothing from your friend " Voltaire? Is England as well pleaſed with him, as " it was? and is he as well pleaſed with England? " Or, does the ſatisfaction on one ſide abate, in pro- " portion as it leſſens on the other? When will the " ſecond edition of his *Henriade* come out? Will it " afford us a better monument to the memory of that " Prince, and a nobler likeneſs, than the ſtatue on " Port-neuf? It will, if it be as well finiſhed as it " ſhould be. For

Non magis expreſſi vultus per ahenea ſigna,
Quàm per vatis opus mores animique virorum
Clarorum apparent.

" But the ſpirit of Pedantry is coming upon me, and " it is time therefore that I tell you, that I am &c."

" I find the very laſt works of that great man, [*the* " *Biſhop of Meaux*] (*ſays the Biſhop in his laſt Letter* " *but one*) are inferior to the reſt; but, nevertheleſs, " I would be maſter of all he certainly wrote. It is " uſeful to obſerve even the defects of firſt-rate " Writers, as well as their excellencies. There is an " ill-natured pleaſure in finding, that, as far exalted " above us as they are, they ſometimes ſink down " to our level. . . . . Mr. de Meaux ſtudied Critical " Knowledge late, with reſpect to the interpretation " of Scripture; and was never therefore ſo true a " maſter of it, as he was of the way of interpreting " it by the ſtream of tradition. But the older he " grew, the more admired he was; and that led " him to think himſelf equal to every man, in every " thing; and particularly to write books in Latin, and " Comments on Scripture, in both which ways I find " him unequal to himſelf; and I dare ſay, that is the " opinion of candid and judicious perſons in your " communion."

We find by the Biſhop's laſt and ſome other Letters, that he was acquainted with Father Courayer. " Our " friend, Pere Courayer, has been purſued with " mandements, cenſures and arrêts; nor have they, " I fear, yet done with him. I am concerned for " the fate of ſo valuable a Man, and ſo excellent a " Writer, whoſe views, I am perſuaded, were inno- " cent and good, however in the manner of execut- " ing them, he comes to have given ſo much offence. " The twenty Biſhops that have cenſured him, ſeem " to decline that part of the diſpute which relates " to the validity of our Engliſh ordinations. How- " ever, they have not ſpared the Church of England, " on other accounts, but have repreſented her in a " more diſadvantageous light than ſhe deſerves; " purely, I ſuppoſe, for want of knowing her. They " cite the Biſhop of Meaux, and cite thoſe works " of his, which were written expreſly againſt us; " which ſurely is a very odd way of repreſenting " our ſentiments; juſt as if I ſhould quote Monſr. " Claude's words, from any pieces of his written a- " gainſt the Church of France, to prove what ſhe " held in any doctrine of importance. I ſhould think " it became me rather to produce the Writers of that " Church, and the Acts and Monuments of it, for my " vouchers. The twenty Biſhops have taken this me- " thod, once, or twice; and if they had taken it " always, they would have been leſs liable to miſ- " takes in their repreſentations of us. What the Bi- " ſhop of Meaux ſays, with regard to our polity and " affairs, is not always to be relied on; for he was " not a maſter of that ſubject. He was a very great " man; nor would he have leſſened his character, " not to have aimed ſometimes at ſeeming to know, " what he really did not, in matters that lay a little " out of his compaſs. Excuſe the freedom I take " with the cenſurers, and the authority on which they " build, in relation to our matters; becauſe I have " good reaſon to think, that they have paid a defe- " rence to it, at the expence of truth. My know- " ledge is very limited; and yet it would be no pre- " ſumption in me to ſay, that I know better than " the Biſhop of Meaux did, what is the Conſtitution, " and what are the Principles and Tenets of the Church " of England. But enough of theſe reflections, into " which the mention of Pere Courayer has led me &c."

[*GGG*] *That he tranſlated Virgil's* Georgics *into Engliſh.*] He ſent this tranſlation to a friend, with the following lines prefixed;

——— *Hæc ego luſi*
Ad Sequanæ ripas, Thameſino à flumine longè,
Jam ſenior, fractuſque, ſed ipsâ morte, meorum,
Quos colui, patriæque memor, neque degener uſquam.

Theſe verſes have been tranſlated as follows:

" ——— Thus on the banks of Seine,
" Far from my native home, I paſs my hours,
" Broken with years and pain; yet my firm heart
" Regards my friends and country e'en in death."

We have likewiſe another verſion of them, which is a little more paraphraſtical:

" Thus where the Seine thro' realms of ſlavery ſtrays,
" With ſportive verſe I wing my tedious days;
" Far from Britannia's happy climate torn,
" Bow'd down with age, and with diſeaſes worn;
" Yet e'en in death I act a ſteddy part,
" And ſtill my friends and country ſhare my heart."

[*HHH*] *Not long before his death he was obliged to vindicate himſelf againſt Mr. Oldmixon with relation to Lord Clarendon's* Hiſtory of the rebellion, *which he together with Dr. Aldrich and Dr. Smallridge was charged with having altered in a variety of places.*] Mr. Oldmixon in the Preface to his *Hiſtory of the Stuarts* (122) has ſuggeſted, that *the Hiſtory of the Rebellion, as it was publiſhed at Oxford, was not entirely the work of the Lord Clarendon*, who did indeed write an Hiſtory of thoſe times, " and I doubt not, *ſays he*, a good one; " wherein, as I have been (I believe) well informed, " the characters of the Kings, whoſe reigns are writ- " ten, were different from what they appear in the " Oxford Hiſtory and its copy, Mr. Echard's. I " ſpeak this by hear-ſay, but hear-ſay from a perſon " ſuperior to all ſuſpicion, and too illuſtrious to be " named without leave." *I alſo humbly refer it to the* " *deciſion*

(122) Pag. 9.

body was brought to England, and interred on the 12th of May following in his vault in Weſtminſter-Abbey in a very private manner, attended only by William Morice, Eſq; who had married his daughter, and his two late Chaplains, Dr. Savage and Dr. Moore. Upon the urn, which contained his bowels, was inſcribed, *In hac urnâ depoſiti ſunt cineres Franciſci Atterburi Epiſcopi Roffenſis*; i. e. "In this urn are depoſited "the aſhes of Francis Atterbury Biſhop of Rocheſter." However the world may be divided about his moral and political character, it is univerſally agreed, that he was one of the greateſt men of the age for genius and ſkill in polite Literature, and that he wrote in the

deciſion of another very honourable perſon, whether there is not to his knowledge ſuch an Hiſtory in manuſcript ſtill extant; and to a Reverend Doctor now living, whether he did not ſee the Oxford copy, by which the book was printed, altered, and interpolated, while it was at the preſs. He has publiſhed likewiſe a Letter from *a Gentleman of diſtinction both for merit and quality* (123), as he ſtiles him, wherein he declares, that Mr. Edmund Smith, of Chriſt-Church Oxford, Author of the Tragedy of Phædra and Hippolytus, had frankly told him juſt before his death in the year 1710, *that there had been a fine Hiſtory written by Lord Clarendon, but what was publiſhed under his name was only patch-work, and might as properly be called* The Hiſtory of ALL-SMALL and ATTERBURY: "for to his "knowledge, 'twas altered; nay that he himſelf was "employed by them to interpolate and alter the ori-"ginal." That Mr. Smith turned to the character of Mr. Hampden, in the folio Edition of the Hiſtory, where is that expreſſion, *He had a head to contrive, a heart to conceive, and a hand to execute any villany* (124), and declared, that *it was foiſted in by thoſe Reverends. In ſhort*, ſays the Gentleman, *he not only underlined this paſſage as a forgery, but gave, during the ſhort time he lived with me, the ſame remark to ſome hundreds more.* Mr. Oldmixon likewiſe in his Hiſtory, *p.* 227, expreſſes himſelf thus: "In the character of this great "and excellent man, Mr. Hampden, which we could "wiſh had eſcaped his (Lord Clarendon's) drawings, "or the drawings of theſe clumſy Painters, into whoſe "hands his work fell, there is ſomething ſo very "falſe and baſe, that ſuch coin could only come from "a College-Mint. . . . . There are not words to ex-"preſs the infamy of this ſlander and impoſture, nor "the unparallel'd wickedneſs of thoſe Doctors, who "foiſted ſo horrid a reflection into that character." He obſerves then, that Mr. Smith confeſſed to the Gentleman in whoſe houſe he died, that among a great number of *Alterations* and *Additions*, which he himſelf made in *the Hiſtory of the Rebellion, by order of Dr.* ALDRICH, *Dr.* ATTERBURY, *and Dr.* SMALLRIDGE, *ſucceſſive Deans of Chriſt-Church, this very ſaying of Cinna, applied to Mr. Hampden, was one*; and that when he read it *to one of thoſe Doctors*, he clapp'd him on the back, and cried with an aſſeveration, *It will do. The Confeſſion Mr. Smith made, and the remorſe he expreſſed for being concerned in this impoſture, were his laſt words.* A great part of the paſſage from Mr. Oldmixon's Preface, including the Letter, was tranſlated *verbatim* into French, and publiſhed in the *Bibliotheque Raiſonnée des Ouvrages des Savans de l'Europe* for July, Auguſt, and September 1730, *Tom. V. part I. Art.* 5, *p.* 154, *&c.* and the Author of that Journal obſerved upon it, that if Dr. Atterbury was ſilent with regard to this accuſation, there could be no doubt but the falſification was proved; and ſhould he not be ſilent, what he ſhould ſay to clear up this matter muſt be very ſtrong to deſtroy the credit of ſuch a teſtimony. Dr. Atterbury therefore thought himſelf obliged to defend himſelf; and accordingly wrote a piece, dated from Paris October 26th 1731, and entitled, *Biſhop Atterbury's Vindication of Biſhop Smallridge, Dr. Aldrich, and himſelf from the ſcandalous Reflections of Oldmixon, relating to the publication of Lord Clarendon's Hiſtory.* He declares that the account publiſhed by Mr. Oldmixon, in all its parts, as far as he was any ways concerned, is entirely falſe and groundleſs; ſince he never ſaw Lord Clarendon's Hiſtory in manuſcript, either before or *ſince* the edition of it; nor ever read a line of it but in print. That it was impoſſible therefore, that he ſhould deal with Mr. Smith in the manner repreſented, with whom (as far as he could recollect) he never exchanged one word in all his life; and whom he knew not that he ever ſaw, till after the edition of that Hiſtory. That with regard to Biſhop Smallridge, no ſuſpicion of that kind can poſſibly reſt upon his memory, becauſe he was not any ways concerned in preparing that Hiſtory for the preſs, but as much a ſtranger to the contents of it as himſelf was, till it came forth in print. That the reviſing of the manuſcript, which is ſaid to have been written not very correctly, was committed to the care of Biſhop Spratt and Dean Aldrich by the late Earl of Rocheſter, who himſelf alſo aſſiſted in that reviſal from the beginning to the end of the work; ſo that any changes made in it muſt have had the conſent of thoſe three perſons; who were men of probity and truth, and incapable of conſpiring in a deſign to impoſe on the publick. That the Biſhop and Dean had occaſionally more than once aſſured him, that no additions whatſoever were made to the manuſcript Hiſtory; and that even the Earl himſelf in his Preface to the firſt volume had publickly proteſted his innocence in that reſpect, where he declares, that *they who put forth the Hiſtory*, (he means himſelf and his brother, as appears from what follows,) *durſt not take upon them to make any alterations in a work of this kind, ſolemnly left with them to be publiſhed, whenever it ſhould be publiſhed, as it was delivered to them.* That if the Earl and the other two perſons employed could be ſuppoſed to have made any additions, notwithſtanding ſuch aſſurances to the contrary, yet their good ſenſe (if not their integrity) would have prevented at leaſt their retouching thoſe characters, which are allowed to be the moſt diſtinguiſhed and beautiful part of the work, and to have ſomething of original in them, that is not to be imitated. The after-ſtrokes of any leſs able pencil intermixed with thoſe of the firſt maſterly hand, would ſoon be diſcovered. And yet the moſt diſcerning eye can find out no traces of ſuch a mixture; no, not in the character of Mr. Hampden, even in thoſe words, at the cloſe of it, againſt which Mr. Oldmixon ſo warmly declaims. They are perfectly in the ſtyle and manner of my Lord Clarendon; they contain nothing new in them, but only ſum up in ſhort what he had ſcattered thro' different parts of the two firſt volumes. Let the reflections there made be never ſo ſevere, they may naturally be ſuppoſed in the warmth of compoſure to have come from the pen of an Hiſtorian, who had himſelf with zeal oppoſed Mr. Hampden's meaſures, and both ſeen and felt the ſad conſequences of them. But that the editors of his Hiſtory no ways concerned in thoſe tranſactions ſhould ſixty years afterwards coolly and deliberately make ſuch a needleſs inſertion, is not to be imagined. The Biſhop urges, that this complaint ſhould have been brought againſt theſe editors, while it was capable of being thoroughly examined. That their very characters to thoſe who knew them, and the nature of the evidence to thoſe who did not, will be judged a ſufficient confutation of it. For what is this evidence? It conſiſts in an *hear-ſay from a perſon ſuperior to all ſuſpicion, but too illuſtrious to be named*; in an *appeal to another very honourable perſon, to a Reverend Doctor now living, and to a Gentleman of Diſtinction both for merit and quality*; none of whoſe names are thought fit to be owned. The only one produced in the caſe is that of Mr. Smith, *the Author of an excellent Tragedy.* "Of what uſe can his te-"ſtimony, *ſays the Biſhop*, be to this purpoſe (even "ſuppoſing the account of it exact,) when it is un-"doubtedly falſe, as to two of the three perſons it is "levelled at, Dr. Smallridge and myſelf; and may "therefore be juſtly preſumed alike falſe, as to the "third, Dr. Aldrich? Mr. Smith appears to have been "ſo little in the ſecret of the edition of that Book, "as not to have known even the hands thro' which "it paſſed; and is not therefore to be relied upon in "his accounts of any other circumſtances relating to it, "eſpecially with regard to Dr. Aldrich, his Governor at "Chriſt-

(123) The late Colonel Ducket, one of the Commiſſioners of the Exciſe.

(124) The words are much ſofter in the *Hiſtory*, where inſtead of *a Heart to conceive*, we find *a Tongue to perſuade*, and inſtead of the word *Villany* that of *Miſchief.*

the Latin tongue with a purity and elegance worthy of Cicero himſelf, and in his own language in a manner ſuperior to moſt of his Contemporaries. He was an excellent ſpeaker in the Houſe of Lords; and his character as a Preacher will appear to the greateſt advantage from the admirable repreſentation of it publiſhed in the *Tatler* [*III*]. Mr. Gordon, who cannot be ſuſpected of the leaſt partiality towards him, allows him to be a great maſter of the Engliſh Language; and having excepted againſt Biſhop Spratt's ſtyle, obſerves, that *with much greater juſtice has the ſtyle of*

" Chriſt-Church; for whom his perſonal averſion, " and the true reaſons of it, are too well underſtood " to need explaining. I forbear ſaying any thing " harſh of one, not able to anſwer for himſelf; but " many now alive who knew them both, know how " improbable and altogether incredible it is, that Mr. " Smith ſhould have had the leaſt ſhare in Dr. Al- " drich's confidence on ſo nice, or indeed on any oc- " caſion. The Gentleman, who ſeems to be *convinced* " *of the truth of Mr. Smith's aſſertions*, by his having " pointed out and *underlined* the paſſages in print, " which he ſaid he was employed (by the three ſuc- " ceſſive Deans) to *interpolate* and *alter* in manuſcript, " muſt ſurely have been very willing to be convinced; " otherwiſe he would not have taken a mere aſſerti- " on for a proof in ſuch a cauſe, and from ſuch a " perſon." This *Vindication* of the Biſhop was ſent by him with a Letter dated from Paris Nov. 19th 1731 to the Author of the *Bibliotheque Raiſonnée*, who has publiſhed them both in French in the *Journal* for the months of October, November and December 1731, *Tom. VII. Part. I. Art. IX. p.* 457 *& ſeq.* The Biſhop procured a copy of this *Vindication* to be ſent over to Mr. Pope, a Gentleman, with whom he had the firmeſt friendſhip, and whom he extremely admired among his other valuable qualifications for his excellent talent in Poetry. At the ſame time he wrote him the following Letter dated from Paris November 23d, 1731. " Dear Sir, You will wonder to ſee me " in print; but how could I avoid it? The dead " and the living, my friends and my foes, at home " and abroad, call upon me to ſay ſomething; and " the reputation of an Hiſtory, which I and all the " world value, muſt have ſuffered, had I continued " ſilent. I have printed here, in hopes that ſomebody " afterward may venture to reprint in England, notwith- " ſtanding the two frightning words at the cloſe of it. " Whether that happens or not, it is fit you ſhould have " a ſight of it, who I know will read it with ſome de- " gree of ſatisfaction, as it is mine, tho' it ſhould " have (as it really has) nothing elſe to recommend " it. Such as it is,

" *Extremum hoc munus morientis habeto.*

" For that may well be the caſe, conſidering that within " a few months I am entering into my ſeventieth year; " after which even the healthy and the happy can- " not much depend upon life, and will not, if they " are wiſe, much deſire it. Whenever I go, you " will loſe a friend, who loves and values you ex- " tremely, if in my circumſtances I can be ſaid to be " loſt to any one, when dead, more than I am alrea- " dy whilſt living. I expected to have heard from " you by Mr. M——, and wondered a little, that I " did not; but he owns himſelf in a fault for not " giving you due notice of his motions. It was not " amiſs that you forbore writing to me on an head, " wherein I promiſed more than I was able to per- " form. Diſgraced men fancy ſometimes, that they " preſerve an influence, where, when they endeavour " to exert it, they ſoon ſee their miſtake. I did " ſo, my good friend, and acknowledge it under my " hand. You ſounded the coaſt, and found out my " error, it ſeems, before I was aware of it. But " enough of this ſubject. What are you doing in " England to the honour of Letters? And particularly " what are you doing?

" *Ipſe quid audes?*
" *Quæ circumvolitas agilis Thyma?*

" Do you purſue the moral plan you marked out, " and ſeemed ſixteen months ago ſo intent upon? Am " I to ſee it perfected e'er I die? And are you to en- " joy the reputation of it whilſt you live? Or do you " rather chooſe to leave the marks of your friend- " ſhip, like the legacies of a will, to be read and en- " joyed only by thoſe, who ſurvive you? Were I as " near you as I have been, I ſhould hope to peep into " the manuſcript even before it was finiſhed. But alas! " there is and will ever probably be a great deal of " land and ſea between us. How many Books have " come out of late in your parts, which you think " I ſhould be glad to peruſe? Name them; the Ca- " talogue, I believe, will not coſt you much trouble. " They muſt be good ones indeed to challenge any " part of my time, now I have ſo little of it left. " I, who ſquandered away whole days heretofore, " now huſband hours, when the glaſs begins to run " low, and care not to miſpend them on trifles. At " the end of the lottery of life our laſt minutes, like " benefit-tickets in the wheel, riſe in their valuation. " They are not perhaps of ſo much worth in them- " ſelves, as thoſe, which preceded, but we are apt to " prize them more, and with reaſon. I do ſo, my " dear friend, and yet think the moſt precious mi- " nutes of my life are well employed in reading what " you write. But this is a ſatisfaction I cannot much " hope for; and therefore muſt betake myſelf to o- " thers, which are leſs entertaining. Adieu, dear " Sir, and forgive me engaging with one, whom you, " I think, have reckoned among the Heroes of the " Dunciad. It was neceſſary for me either to accept " of his dirty challenge, or to have ſuffered in the " eſteem of the world by declining it. My reſpects " to your mother; I ſend a paper for Dean Swift, if " you have an opportunity, and think it worth your " while to convey it. My country at this diſtance " ſeems to me a ſtrange ſight. I know not how it " appears to you, who are in the midſt of the Sun, " and your ſelf a part of it. I wiſh you would tell " me. You may write ſafely to Mr. M—— by the " honeſt hand, that conveys this, and will return to " theſe parts before Chriſtmas. Sketch out a rough " draught of it, that I may be able to judge whether " a return to it be really eligible, or whether I ſhould " not like the Chymiſt in the bottle upon hearing " Don Quevedo's account of Spain, deſire to be cork'd " up again. After all I do and muſt love my coun- " try with all its faults and blemiſhes; even that " part of the conſtitution, which wounded me unjuſtly " (and itſelf thro' my ſide) will ever be dear to me. " My laſt wiſh be like that of Father Paul, *Eſto per-* " *petua*; and when I die at a diſtance from it, it " will be in the ſame manner as Virgil deſcribes the " expiring Peloponneſian,

" *Sternitur, & dulces moriens reminiſcitur Argos.*

" Do I ſtill live in the memory of my friends, as they " certainly do in mine? I have read a good many of " your paper-ſquabbles about me, and am glad to ſee " ſuch free conceſſions on that head, tho' made with " no view of doing me a pleaſure, but of loading " another. Fr. Roffen".

[*III*] *His character as a Preacher will appear to the greateſt advantage from the admirable repreſentation of it publiſhed in the* Tatler.] The Author having obſerved (124), that the Clergy of Great Britain, whom he believed to be the moſt learned body of men now in the world, too much neglected the Art of Speaking, with the proper ornaments of voice and geſture, tells us, that he owned there are exceptions to this general obſervation, and that *the Dean, whom*, ſays he, *we heard the other day together, is an Orator*. That he has ſo much regard to his congregation, that he commits to his memory what he is to ſay to them; and has ſo ſoft and graceful a behaviour, that it muſt attract your attention. *His perſon*, continues he, *it is to be confeſſed, is no ſmall recommendation; but he is to be highly commended for not loſing that advantage, and adding to the propriety of ſpeech (which might paſs the criticiſm of Longinus) an action, which*

(124) Vol. 2. N° 66. See likewiſe the Preface to vol. 4.

of Dr. *Atterbury*, his ſucceſſor, been admired (x). Dr. Hickes in his *Diſſertatio Epiſtolaris de antiquæ Literaturæ Septentrionalis utilitate* (y), printed at Oxford in 1703, and publiſhed in the firſt volume of his *Linguarum Veterum Septentrionalium Theſaurus*, ſtiles him *a man of great Learning* (z), and the *very worthy Archdeacon of Taunton*. Dr. Fiddes, in the preface (*aa*) to the firſt volume of his *Body of Divinity*, acknowledges the aſſiſtance which he received from the Biſhop in the compoſition of that work, and ſtiles him a perſon who had *all the great talents, from which proper directions might be expected in any part, whether of theological, or of human and polite Learning*; and in his *Introduction* to his *Life of Cardinal Wolſey*, he acknowledges the Biſhop's offer of aſſiſtance in that work, which that Prelate had once deſigned to have written himſelf [*KKK*]. We ſhall conclude with the character of him by Mr. Dart, the Author of *The Hiſtory and Antiquities of the Abbey-Church of St. Peter's Weſtminſter*, which work the Biſhop had promoted. That Gentleman tells us (*bb*), that as he was among *the greateſt Judges*, ſo he was among *the greateſt Encouragers of Learning*; and in another place (*cc*) he ſtiles him a man, "whoſe controverſial and "other writings for accuracy, ſolidneſs, ſtrength of argument, and happineſs of "Language, have made him famous, as a church-man; and whoſe excellent taſte of "the fine Letters, familiarity with antient and modern Writers, ſublime fancy, nice "judgment, elegance of ſtyle, and manner of converſation, have and will diſtinguiſh "him throughout all the learned part of Europe."

(x) *Diſcourſes upon Tacitus*, prefixed to his tranſlation of that Hiſtorian, Sect. 14. p. 33. edit. London 1728. in fol.

(y) Pag. 82.

(z) *Per manus R. & doctiſſimi Viri F. Atterburi Archidiaconi Totnenſis digniſſimi, &c.*

(aa) Pag. 30, 31. edit. London in fol. 1718.

(bb) Preface to the 1ſt volume of the *Hiſtory and Antiquities of the Abbey-Church of St. Peter's Weſtminſter.*

(cc) *Lives of the Abbats of Weſtminſter*, pag. 44. in the 2d vol. of the *Hiſt. and Antiq. &c.*

which would have been approved by Demoſthenes. He has a peculiar force in his way, and has many of his audience, who could not be intelligent hearers of his diſcourſe, were there not explanation as well as grace in his action. This art of his is uſed with the moſt exact and honeſt skill. He never attempts your paſſions, till he has convinced your reaſon. All the objections which you can form are laid open and diſperſed, before he uſes the leaſt vehemence in his Sermon; but when he thinks he has your head, he very ſoon wins your heart, and never pretends to ſhew the beauty of holineſs, till he hath convinced you of the truth of it. The Author of a piece, intitled, *Some Rules for ſpeaking and action to be obſerved at the Bar, in the Pulpit, and the Senate, and by every one that ſpeaks in public, in a Letter to a Friend*, conſiders our Divine as an excellent model for that purpoſe. "In town, Sir, *ſays he* (125), you "have ſo many examples worthy imitation both in "the Senate, on the Bench, at the Bar, and in the "Pulpit, that if you well attend to them, you can "want little other direction; as *Cowper* and *Har-*"*court*, *Hanmer*, and *Stonehouſe*, and *Lechmere*, *Par-*"*ker* and *Price*, *Powis* and *Vernon*, *Canterbury* and "*York*, *Ely* and ROCHESTER, *Stanhope* and *Moſs*; "and therefore I ſhall laſtly refer you to thoſe *Liv-*"*ing Rules*, to make up the deficiency of *theſe*."

(125) Pag. 32. 3d edit. London 1716.

[*KKK*] *And in his* Introduction *to his* Life of Cardinal Wolſey, *he acknowledges the Biſhop's offer of aſſiſtance in that work, which that Prelate had once deſigned to have written himſelf.*] This *Life* was publiſhed at London in fol. 1724: and Dr. Fiddes in his *Introduction* (126) tells us, that he was ſenſible that this work would have been much more perfect, if he had embraced the opportunity which a very learned Prelate, now in exile, *ſays he*, "generouſly offered to me of compiling it in his "houſe. The world might then have expected a "compoſition, that I ſhould not have been ſuffered "to publiſh without thoſe advantages, which would "at leaſt have given a ſanction very favourable to "it. I ſhould under ſuch a direction not only have "had the benefit of many curious and deep reſearches "into Eccleſiaſtical Antiquity, but of the beſt and "moſt uſeful inſtructions both in reſpect to the mat-"ter and the conduct of my work. But as ſome "accidents rendered it impracticable for me to accept "an offer, that appeared equally advantageous and "honorary to me, I had not thoſe aſſiſtances, which "were expected from a perſon, able, as I had grounds "to believe, above any other to direct me in a work, "which he had ſometime thoughts of undertaking "himſelf. I ſhall not incur any cenſure for paying "a debt of gratitude to a learned Prelate under his "preſent circumſtances, or for celebrating thoſe great "talents, wherein as a perſon of capacity and let-"ters, his moſt inveterate enemies will allow him to "excel." T.

(126) Pag. 12, 13.

(9) Cornel. Nepos, cap. 5.

(10) Idem 17.

(11) See ginning of preceding tion.

(12) See Letter ad Quint trem, lib Fabricius Life of under th Rome 6

(13) Th of the ad Attic

ATTICUS (TITUS POMPONIUS) is conſidered as one of the moſt honourable men of antient Rome. He underſtood the art of managing himſelf with ſuch addreſs, that without leaving his ſtate of neutrality, he preſerved the eſteem and affection of both parties [*A*]. The ſtrict friendſhip which he had with Cicero, did not hinder him from having a great intimacy with Hortenſius; and he was the cauſe that theſe two rivals not only did not treat each other with any reproaches, but even lived together upon very good

[*A*] *He preſerved the eſteem and affection of both parties.*] He ſent money to Marius's ſon, who had been declared an enemy to the commonwealth, and he inſinuated himſelf in ſuch a manner into the favour of Sylla, that this Roman General would always have him with him, and was not at all offended, that Atticus deſired to be excuſed from attending him to Rome, by alledging that he was willing to continue neuter between both parties (1). *Noli, oro te, inquit Pomponius, adverſum eos me velle ducere, cum quibus ne contra te arma ferrem, Italiam reliqui* (2): i. e. "I deſire you "ſays Pomponius, not to urge me to attend you againſt "thoſe perſons, ſince I left Italy, that I might not bear "arms with them againſt you." He kept himſelf quiet at Rome during the war between Cæſar and Pompey; which did not in the leaſt offend Pompey (3), and prodigiouſly pleaſed Cæſar. After the death of the latter, he ſent money to Brutus, when the party of liberty began to decline, and he did a thouſand kind offices for Mark Anthony's wife and friends, while their party ſeemed to be loſt without any hopes of recovery. Mark Anthony was not ungrateful to him; for tho' he extended his furious reſentment to all Cicero's friends, he wrote with his own hand a very obliging *Letter* to Atticus (4). He uſed his intereſt afterwards to procure the marriage between Atticus's daughter and Agrippa the favourite of Auguſtus (5). At laſt notwithſtanding the cruel diviſions, which aroſe between Mark Anthony and Auguſtus, our Atticus preſerved the friendſhip of them both. One of them (6), when he was upon his journies, wrote him an exact account of all that he did, of what he read, and whither he was going; and when he was at Rome, he wrote to him almoſt every day to conſult him upon ſome queſtion or other. The (7) other gave him a full account of his affairs. It was undoubtedly a very difficult taſk to preſerve at the ſame time the friendſhip of theſe two antagoniſts. *Hoc quale ſit facilius exiſtimabit is qui judicare poteſt, quantæ ſit ſapientiæ eorum retinere uſum benevolentiamque, inter quos maximarum rerum non ſolum æmulatio, ſed obtrectatio tanta intercedebat, quantum fuit intercidere neceſſe inter Cæſarem atque Antonium, cum ſe uterque principem non ſolum urbis Romanæ, ſed orbis terrarum eſſe cuperet* (8).

(1) Cornel. Nepos *in Vit. Attici*, cap. 11.

(2) Idem, cap. 4.

(3) Idem, cap. 4. However, Cicero *Epiſt.* 6. lib. 11. *ad Attic.* obſerves, *that Pompey would have ill treated Atticus, if he had conquered.*

(4) Idem, cap. 10.

(5) Idem, cap. 12.

(6) That is, *Auguſtus.* Cornel. Nepos, cap. 20.

(7) That is, *Mark Anthony*, Cornel. Nepos, cap. 20.

(8) Idem, cap. 20.

good terms [*B*]. He never had any conteſt either with his mother or ſiſter [*C*]. He always ſhewed his generoſity to his friends, whenever they had any occaſion. His circumſtances enabled him to do this; for beſides the great eſtate which he ſucceeded to [*D*], he found out methods to employ his money, which produced him a very conſiderable profit. The conteſts which aroſe at Rome between Cinna's party and that of Marius, induced him when he was young to go to Athens, where he continued for a long time. He gained the affections of the Athenians in ſuch a manner, that the day on which he left their city was in ſome meaſure a day of mourning [*E*]. He was extremely fond of polite learning,

[*B*] *He was the cauſe, that theſe two rivals .... lived together upon very good terms.*] Thoſe, who knew how much the jealouſy of eloquence excites and agitates the other paſſions, will form a good notion of the addreſs and merit of a man, who underſtood how to preſerve peace between two of the moſt celebrated Orators among the ancients. It was not ſufficient for Pomponius Atticus to inſinuate himſelf agreeably into their affections; but it was likewiſe neceſſary that they ſhould obſerve in him ſuch qualities, as would inſpire them with eſteem and reſpect for him. The paſſage which I am going to quote, is very proper to ſhew the peculiar merit of him. *Utebatur intimè Q. Hortenſio, qui iis temporibus principatum eloquentiæ tenebat, ut intelligi non poſſe uter eum plus diligeret Cicero an Hortenſius, & id quod erat difficillimum, efficiebat ut inter quos tantæ laudis eſſet æmulatio, nulla intercederet obtrectatio, eſſetque talium virorum copula* (9). i. e. "He was very intimate "with Q. Hortenſius, who was the moſt eminent O"rator of that time; ſo that it could not be known "whether Cicero or Hortenſius loved him moſt; and "what was the moſt difficult point of all, he manag"ed it in ſuch a manner, that no reproaches paſt "between thoſe two men, who were rivals for the "ſupreme honour of eloquence, but they were unit"ed in a ſtrict friendſhip?

(9) Cornel. Nepos, cap. 5.

[*C*] *He never had any conteſt either with his mother or ſiſter.*] At the age of ſixty ſeven years he loſt his mother, who was then ninety; and he had then a ſiſter living, who was almoſt of the ſame age with himſelf. Upon the day, when the funeral of his mother was performed, he declared that he never had any occaſion to be reconciled to her, and that there never had been any quarrel between his ſiſter and him. "*Hoc ipſum verè gloriantem audierim in funere matris ſuæ, quam extulit annorum* 90, *cum eſſet ſeptem & 60, ſe nunquam cum matre in gratiam rediiſſe, nunquam cum ſorore fuiſſe in ſimultate, quam prope æqualem habebat; quod eſt ſignum aut nullam unquam inter eos querimoniam interceſſiſſe, aut hunc eâ fuiſſe in ſuos indulgentiâ, ut quos amare deberet, iraſci eis nefas duceret* (10). I do not mention this circumſtance of the time, in order to encreaſe the bulk of my book, and to fill up the page. Every one will ſee, that this is the eſſential part of this note; for if the good nature of Atticus appears here as a very remarkable circumſtance, it is chiefly on account of the great number of years, which he lived with his mother and ſiſter without any conteſt. It is a pity, that the Hiſtory did not likewiſe inform us how he acted with regard to his wife. He did not boaſt any thing upon that point (11); and this might lead one to ſuſpect that his addreſs or patience were not exerted ſo remarkably towards his wife as towards his mother and ſiſter, who perhaps on their part contributed very much to this harmony between them, and did not oblige him to make any conſiderable advances. The fact in this caſe would appear much leſs remarkable with regard to Atticus; but to take all the circumſtances together would not loſe any thing, but appear more extraordinary. We ſhall ſee in the following note, that Atticus always ſtood upon good terms with an uncle, whoſe temper was ſo extremely perverſe, that none of his relations could bear with it. But to return to Atticus's wife. It is ſtrange that Cornelius Nepos does not mention any thing either good or bad of her; and that we muſt have recourſe to other authors to learn, that her name was PILIA, and that Atticus married her in the year of Rome 697 (12). He was not young then; he was three and fifty years of age. He was in no haſte to liſt himſelf in the ſervice of matrimony. We may collect from a paſſage in one of Cicero's Letters (13), that Pilia was fond of her huſband; for with regard to the other paſſage (14), from which ſome Writers have imagined, that ſhe deſigned to procure a divorce from him, it is evident that it ought to be read in a different manner, and that it ſignifies, that ſhe was threatned with the Palſy. Mr. Sarrazin aſſures us in his tranſlation of the Life of Pomponius Atticus, that the city of Athens erected likewiſe ſtatues to Pilia the wife of Atticus; but it is plain, that he made uſe of a bad edition; for we muſt not read *Pilia* in Cornelius Nepos. Atticus's marriage was too long after his return from Athens, for the Athenians to think of erecting ſtatues to his wife. Would Cornelius Nepos have been ſo abſurd as to mention the ſtatues of Pilia, without acquainting us who ſhe was? The family of Pilia makes no manner of figure in the ancient Roman Hiſtory.

(10) Idem, cap. 17.

(11) See the beginning of the preceding quotation.

(12) See the 3d Letter of *Cicero ad Quintum Fratrem*, lib. 2. and Fabricius in his *Life of Cicero*, under the year of Rome 697.

(13) The 11th of the 5th book *ad Attic.*

(14) In the 7th Letter of the 16th book, *ad Attic.*

[*D*] *The great eſtate which he ſucceeded to.*] Quintus Cæcilius was his uncle by the mother's ſide. He was a perſon of an intolerable perverſe temper; but Atticus humoured it in ſuch a manner, that he continued in his favour without any interruption to the laſt. He found his account ſufficiently in this compliance of his; for Cæcilius made him his chief heir, and left him almoſt a million of money. Atticus's own patrimony was almoſt two hundred thouſand livres. *In ſeſtertio vicies quod à patre acceperat* (15). Cæcilius having adopted his nephew in his Will, Atticus was obliged to take upon him after that the name of *Q. Cæcilius Pomponius Atticus*. Let us ſee what Cornelius Nepos ſays of the four diſpoſition of this uncle. *Habebat avunculum Q. Cæcilium, equitem Romanum, familiarem L. Luculli* (16), *divitem, difficillimâ naturâ, cujus ſic aſperitatem veritus eſt, ut quem nemo ferre poſſet, hujus ſine offenſione ad ſummam ſenectutem retinuerit benevolentiam; quo facto tulit pietatis fructum. Cæcilius enim moriens teſtamento adoptavit eum, hæredemque fecit ex dodrante. Ex quâ hereditate accepit circiter centies LLS* (17). i. e. "He had an uncle "by the mother's ſide, whoſe name was Q. Cæci"lius, a Roman Knight, an intimate acquaintance "of L. Lucullus, rich, but of a very perverſe tem"per, which Atticus was ſo cautious of offending, "that tho' no perſon elſe could bear with him, yet "he maintained his good will without any offence "till he died extremely old. By this means he "reaped the advantage of his dutifulneſs, for Cæci"lius at his death adopted him in his Will, and "made him his heir to three parts in four of his "eſtate; ſo that he received from this inheritance "a hundred thouſand ſeſterces."

(15) Cornel. Nepos, cap. 14.

(16) Valer. Maximus, lib. 7. cap. 8. num. 5. tells us, *that Cæcilius had promiſed to make Lucullus his heir, and that having deceived him, his dead body was dragged thro' the ſtreets.*

(17) Cornel. Nepos, cap. 5.

[*E*] *He gained the affections of the Athenians in ſuch a manner, that the day on which he left their city was in ſome meaſure a day of mourning.*] He had tranſported great part of his effects thither, and either by lending or making preſents he had done great ſervices to the city of Athens (18). The inhabitants were not ingrateful, but ſhewed him all the publick honours imaginable. He refuſed the offer of the freedom of the city, and the raiſing of a ſtatue to him; but after he was gone ſeveral ſtatues were erected to him. His departure was extremely regretted. *Quo factum eſt, ut huic omnes honores, quos poſſent, publicè haberent, civemque facere ſtuderent, quo beneficio ille uti noluit; quod nonnulli interpretantur amitti civitatem Romanam aliâ adſcitâ. Quamdiu affuit, ne qua ſibi ſtatua poneretur, reſtitit, abſens prohibere non potuit..... Tranquillatis autem rebus Romanis remigravit Romam..... Quem diem ſic univerſa civitas Athenienſium proſecuta eſt, ut lacrymis deſiderii futuri dolorem indicaret* (19). i. e. "Upon which account "they paid him publickly all the honours poſſible, "and offer'd to make him free of the city; which pri"vilege he refuſed, becauſe, as ſome alledged, the free"dom

(18) Idem, cap. 2.

(19) Idem, cap. 3 and 4.

ing, and he kept at his houſe ſeveral Librarians (*a*) and excellent Readers. He always ordered ſome book to be read at his table, even when he treated his friends [*F*]. He never attempted to raiſe himſelf above the rank of life, in which he was born, which was that of a Knight. He might have obtained the moſt conſiderable poſts in the Republic; but he choſe rather to renounce all pretenſions to them [*G*], becauſe in the corruption which then prevailed, he could neither gain them nor diſcharge them according to the laws. He never had any law-ſuit, or appeared as an accuſer againſt any perſon, or ſeconded any one, who was an accuſer. The Emperor Auguſtus was related to him in this manner. Atticus had married his daughter to Agrippa; from which marriage came a daughter, whom Auguſtus betrothed to Tiberius almoſt as ſoon as ſhe was born (*b*). I am not of opinion, that Atticus's wife was deſcended from any conſiderable family (*c*). He ought to be ranked among the good Authors [*H*]. He reached the age of ſeventy ſeven years, almoſt without ever knowing what ſickneſs was. He had for thirty years together

(*a*) See below the quotation (38).

(*b*) *Nata eſt Attico Neptis ex Agrippa, cui virginem filiam collocavit. Hanc Cæſar vix anniculam Tiberio Claudio Neroni Druſilla nato privigno ſuo deſponsit.* Cornel. Nepos *in Vitâ Attici*, cap. 19.

(*c*) See note [C] at the end.

" dom of the city of Rome would have been loſt, if " he had accepted that of any other. While he contiued at Athens, he prevented any ſtatue from being " raiſed to him, but when he left that city, he " could not any longer hinder the citizens from paying him that compliment. . . . . The Roman affairs being reduced to a ſtate of tranquillity he returned to Rome. . . . Upon the day of his departure the whole city of Athens was thrown into the " deepeſt concern imaginable, and ſhewed by their " tears their ſenſe of the loſs they ſhould ſuſtain of " him." He ſpoke the Greek language with ſuch propriety, that he might have been taken for an Athenian (20). Some Writers were of opinion, that the ſurname of *Atticus* was given him on that account. Volaterranus aſſures us of this as of a thing mentioned by Cornelius Nepos (21); but he is miſtaken. The Abbé de Saint Real tells us, that Atticus was called ſo, *becauſe he underſtood Greek extremely well, and lived the greateſt part of his time at Athens* (22). It has been repreſented to him (23), that *he ſhould have ſaid only, that it was on account of having lived for a conſiderable time at Athens in his youth; ſince it is certain that he continued the greateſt part of his life in Italy or Epirus, where he had a large eſtate, as appears from his Life written by Cornelius Nepos and from divers paſſages in Cicero's Letters.*

(20) Idem, cap. 4.

(21) Volaterran. lib. 18. p. 666.

(22) *Remarques ſur les Lettres de Ciceron à Atticus* in the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*, tom. 20. pag. 78.

(23) By the Author of the *Bibliotb. Univerſelle*, ibid.

[*F*] *He always ordered ſome Book to be read at his table, even when he treated his friends.*] If he had kept an open table for all perſons promiſcuouſly, who would come to it, he would have done a very diſagreeable thing to a great many people by this cuſtom; but he only invited thoſe, who were of the ſame taſte with himſelf. *Nemo in convivio ejus aliud acroama audivit quam anagnoſten. . . . . Neque unquam ſine aliquâ lectione apud eum cœnatum eſt, ut non minus animo quam ventre convivæ delectarentur; namque eos vocabat, quorum mores à ſuis non abhorrerent* (24).

(24) Cornel. Nepos, cap. 14.

[*G*] *He might have obtained the moſt conſiderable poſts in the Republick; but he choſe rather to renounce all pretenſions to them.*] This is evidently the ſtrongeſt proof, which he gave of his virtue. There was no poſſibility at that time of being advanced to ſuch poſts but by diſhonourable methods; nor of executing them according to the laws of juſtice and for the advantage of one's country, without expoſing one's ſelf to the violence of a great number of ill men. Atticus choſe rather to continue in a private ſtation of life, than to gain the higheſt dignities at the expence of his conſcience. How excellent a conduct was this! But how uncommon at the ſame time! If all the world reſembled Atticus, there would be ſome reaſon to apprehend a ſtate of anarchy; but we may reſt ſatisfied in that reſpect; for there will always be a greater number of diſhoneſt perſons ready to take poſſeſſion of employments by all kinds of unlawful methods, than there will be places for them to receive. I have been told, that a man, who had ſpent his whole life in travelling, replied to thoſe, who reproached him with his ambulatory humour, that he ſhould have been glad to have ſettled in ſome city, but that he could never find any one, where the power and credit were in the hands of men of integrity. Another traveller declaring that he would put an end to his travels as ſoon as he ſhould find a city governed by thoſe perſons, who had the greateſt merit, was told thus, THEN YOU WILL DIE IN YOUR TRAVELS. *Honores non petiit, cum ei paterent propter vel gratiam vel dignitatem: quod neque peti more majorum, neque capi poſſent conſervatis legibus in tam effuſis ambitûs largitionibus, neque geri è republica ſine periculo, corruptis civitatis moribus* (25). i. e. " He " was not ſollicitous after publick offices, tho' they " lay open to him either on account of his intereſt " or dignity, becauſe they could neither be applied " for after the cuſtom of our anceſtors, nor obtained " conſiſtently with the laws amidſt ſo much bribery, " nor diſcharged without danger while the manners " of the city were ſo corrupt." Compare this with what has been ſaid above in the article of ALEXANDER ab ALEXANDRO, Note [*C*].

(25) Idem cap. 6.

[*H*] *He ought to be ranked among the good authors.*] He wrote *Annals*, in which he obſerved a very exact chronology, and cleared in the moſt perſpicuous manner imaginable, the genealogies of the Roman Magiſtrates. This work contains ſeven centuries; from whence we may eaſily conjecture, that it related principally to the Roman Hiſtory; I ſay *principally*, for we muſt not doubt, but that the author gave a ſhort hiſtory of ſeveral other ſtates in a chronological order. Cicero does not permit us to heſitate about this: *Cognoſcat etiam*, ſays he (26), *rerum geſtarum & memoriæ veteris ordinem maximè ſcilicet noſtræ civitatis; ſed & imperioſorum populorum & regum illuſtrium; quem laborem nobis Attici noſtri levavit labor, qui conſervatis notatiſque temporibus nihil cum illuſtre prætermitteret, annorum ſeptingentorum memoriam uno libro colligavit.* i. e. " Let him underſtand likewiſe the ſeries of the ancient hiſtory, eſpecially that of our city, and alſo " of other conſiderable nations and illuſtrious Kings. " This taſk has been made eaſy by the labour of " our friend Atticus, who has given us an account of " every thing important for ſeven hundred years, in " a chronological order in one book." Theſe Annals ſeem to have contained chronological tables. *Habuit iſte liber Attici & nova quidem multa, & eam utilitatem quam requirebam, ut explicatis ordinibus temporum uno in conſpectu omnia videbam* (27). i. e. " That " book of Atticus had among many other new things " this advantage, which I particularly wanted, " that by laying down a chronological ſeries of the " times, I ſaw all things at one view." I have remarked above that Atticus obſerved the genealogical order in a very clear manner; and I ſhall add here, that he wrote *Inſcriptions* of four or five verſes each, to be placed under portraits of illuſtrious men, and that his ſkill was greatly admired for being able to comprehend ſo many things in ſo few words. *Attigit quoque poeticen, credimus ne jus expers eſſet ſuavitatis. Namque verſibus, qui honore rerumque geſtarum amplitudine cæteros Romani populi præſtiterunt, expoſuit ita ut ſingulorum imaginibus facta magiſtratuſque eorum non amplius quaternis quiniſve verſibus deſcripſerit, quod vix credendum ſit tantas res tam breviter potuiſſe declarari* (28). . . . *Moris etiam majorum ſummus imitator fuit antiquitatiſque amator, quam adeo diligenter habuit cognitam, ut eam totam in eo volumine expoſuerit, quo magiſtratus ornavit. Nulla enim lex, neque pax, neque bellum, neque res illuſtris eſt populi Romani, quæ non in eo ſuo tempore ſit notata, & quod difficillimum fuit, ſic familiarum originem ſubtexuit, ut ex eo clarorum virorum propagines poſſimus cognoſcere. Fecit hoc idem ſeparatim in aliis libris, ut M. Bruti rogatu Juniam familiam à ſtirpe ad hanc ætatem ordine enumeravit, notans qui à quo ortus, quos honores, quibuſque temporibus cepiſſet. Pari modo Marcelli Claudii de Marcellorum, Scipionis,*

(26) *In Oratore.*

(27) Idem, *in Bruto.*

(28) Cornel. Nepos, cap. 18.

together had no occaſion to make uſe of any medicines. At laſt he fell ſick. His ſickneſs was very ſlight for three months, but after that the pains became extremely ſevere. He ſent for Agrippa his ſon-in-law, and two other perſons, and declared to them, that he was reſolved to put an end to his life by abſtaining from food. He deſired them to approve of his reſolution, and not to oppoſe it, ſince all their exhortations would be to no purpoſe. Agrippa however could not refrain from making uſe of tears and entreaties to induce him to ſubmit to live; but it was all in vain. After two days abſtinence the fever left him, and the diſeaſe abated. But notwithſtanding this Atticus perſiſted in his deſign, and died three days after (*d*). This happened in the year of Rome 721. He has fallen in our time into the hands of a very ſevere Cenſor [*I*]; but he has not been abandoned to the rigour of his cenſure [*K*]. There are ſome corrections to be made in Moreri's Dictionary [*L*]. I have omitted to obſerve, that Atticus was of the Sect of Epicurus (*e*), and we might challenge the moſt zealous aſſertors of the opinion, which maintains, that without the fear of a Providence, it is impoſſible to equal in the practice of morality thoſe who have acknowledged a Jupiter and a Neptune, &c. to ſhew a perſon of greater integrity than Atticus among the greateſt bigots among the Pagans.

(*d*) *Ex* Cornel. Nepote *in Vitâ Pomponii Attiti.*

(*e*) *See* Gaſſendus, *de Vitâ Epicuri*, lib. 2. cap. 6.

☞ATTICUS

Scipionis Cornelii & Fabii Maximi, de Corneliorum & Æmiliorum quoque, quibus libris nihil poteſt eſſe dulcius iis, qui aliquam cupiditatem habent notitiæ clarorum virorum (29). i. e. "He engaged alſo a little in poetry; I preſume, that he might not be entirely a "ſtranger to the charms of it. For he wrote an account of the actions and offices of the moſt eminent men among the Romans, in four or five verſes under their pictures, ſo that it was incredible, that "ſo many conſiderable facts could be related in ſo narrow a compaſs.... He was a great imitator of "the cuſtoms of our anceſtors, and very fond of antiquity, which he was ſo well ſkilled in, that he has given a full account of it, in that volume, which he wrote concerning Magiſtrates. For there "is no law, nor peace, nor war, nor any great action of the Roman people, which is not related there in its proper order, and what was the moſt difficult taſk, he has traced the original of families in ſuch a manner, that we may readily ſee from what ſtock our great men are deſcended. He performed this likewiſe ſeparately in other books, as particularly at the deſire of Marcus Brutus he gave an account of the Junian family from the firſt riſe of it to the preſent time, remarking from whom every one ſprung, and what offices he bore, and when. He did the ſame alſo for the family of the Marcelli at the requeſt of Marcellus Claudius, and for that of the Cornelii, and Fabii, and Æmilii at the deſire of Scipio Cornelius, and Fabius Maximus. Nothing can be more agreeable than theſe books to thoſe perſons, who have any taſte for the knowledge of the hiſtory of famous men." It is a pity, that theſe books are loſt. They would give us light into a multitude of particulars, which are now obſcure. I ſhall not ſay any thing concerning the *Hiſtory of the Conſulſhip of Cicero*, which Atticus wrote in Greek (30), and without any ornaments (31).

(29) Idem, ibid.

(30) Idem, ibid.

(31) Cicero, Epiſt. 1. lib. 2. *ad Atticum.*

[*I*] *He has fallen in our time into the hands of a very ſevere Cenſor.*] It is the Abbé de Saint Real. See his Book entitled, *Ceſarion ou Entretiens divers*. It was printed at the Hague from the copy at Paris in 1685. It is divided into four days, the third of which is a very ſevere criticiſm upon Pomponius Atticus and his panegyriſt Cornelius Nepos. I am informed, that the author of that piece has perſiſted in the ſame opinion, and that this appears from the remarks which he has added to his tranſlation of the firſt book of Cicero's letters to Atticus. This tranſlation is mentioned in a book, which is well known (32), and I am ſurprized that the Bookſellers of Amſterdam have not reprinted it; for I do not doubt but that a great deal might be learned from reading that book.

(32) In the 20th volume of the *Biblioth. Univerſelle*, pag. 73. See likewiſe the *Journal des Savans*, for Feb. 12, 1691.

[*K*] *But he has not been abandoned to the rigour of his cenſure.*] There was publiſhed a little piece in Holland in 1686 under the title of *Le Retour des peices choiſies, ou Bigarrures curieuſes*, in which among other things is inſerted an apology for Pomponius Atticus againſt the attacks of Ceſarion. The author of the apology has not put his name to it; but it is well known, that he was the late Mr. Reinſſant Keeper of the King of France's Cabinet of Medals. The *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres* (33), enlarged upon this piece of Mr. Reinſſant in ſuch a manner, as was by no means agreeable to the Abbé Saint Real.

(33) For Dec. 1686, Art. 4. pag. 1405.

[*L*] *There are corrections to be made in Moreri's Dictionary.*] I. It is falſe, that Cicero married Atticus's ſiſter. It was Cicero's brother, who married her. II. It was a miſtake to mention the intimate friendſhip between them, which was the reſult of this marriage; ſince Cornelius Nepos expreſly remarks, that Atticus's friendſhip was never ſo ſtrong for Quintus Cicero his brother-in-law, as it was for Cicero. *Erat nupta ſoror Attici Q. Tullio Ciceroni, eaſque nuptias M. Cicero conciliârat, cum quo à condiſcipulatu vivebat conjunctiſſimè, multo etiam familiarius, quam cum Quinto, ut judicari poſſit plus in amicitia valere ſimilitudinem morum quam affinitatem* (34). i. e. "Atticus's ſiſter was married "to Quintius Tullius Cicero, which marriage was procured by Marcus Cicero, with whom he had lived "in greateſt intimacy ever ſince they had been ſchool-fellows, even greater than he maintained with "Quintus, ſo that it was eaſy to judge from hence, "that a ſimilitude of diſpoſition has more influence "in friendſhip than affinity has." Pomponia, Atticus's ſiſter, was not always upon very good terms with her huſband (35); therefore ſhe was not a proper perſon at all to heighten the friendſhip between him and her brother. III. Cicero did not dedicate a volume of his letters to Atticus. Moreri ſhould have ſaid, that he kept a continual correſpondence with him by letters, and that we have a collection of the letters, which he wrote to him, divided into ſixteen books. Cornelius Nepos mentions this (36), and tells us, that we find in them the hiſtory of thoſe times, and in ſome meaſure a prophecy of what was to happen. *Ut nihil in iis non appareat, & facile exiſtimari poſſit prudentiam quodammodo eſſe divinationem. Non enim Cicero ea ſolum, quæ vivo ſe acciderunt, futura prædixit, ſed etiam quæ nunc uſu veniunt cecinit ut vates.* IV. It is extravagance to ſay, that Atticus *had no ſervants, but thoſe, who were capable of reading to him.* Moreri ſhould have only ſaid, that he had a great many ſervants, who were converſant in learning, able to read and write well, and bind books, and that all his footmen were capable of doing this (37). Cornelius Nepos ſays no more than this: how comes it then, that in the 17th Century any perſon ſhould preſume to affirm twenty times as much as he has done? Has not he expreſly obſerved, that beſides his ſervants, who were readers and librarians (38), Atticus had others all well inſtructed, and every one of them born and bred in his own houſe? *In eâ* (familiâ) erant *pueri literatiſſimi, anagnoſtæ optimi & plurimi librarii, ut ne pediſequus quidem quiſquam eſſet, qui non utrumque horum pulchrè facere poſſet. Pari modò* ARTIFICES CÆTERI, *quos cultus domeſticus deſiderat apprimè boni. Neque tamen horum quenquam niſi domi natum domique factum habuit* (39). i. e. "He had in his family very "learned youths, excellent Readers, and ſeveral Librarians, and there was not one of his Lacqueys, "who was not capable of performing both of "theſe offices. He had likewiſe OTHER ARTIFICERS, "neceſſary for the uſes of the family, who were very "ſkillful. And every one of theſe was born and edu-"cated in his houſe." The firſt and third of theſe four errors are not in the Dutch Edition of Moreri.

(34) Cornel. Nepos, cap. 5.

(35) *See* Cicero's *Letters to Atticus*, lib. 5. Epiſt. 1.

(36) Cap. 16.

(37) We find the name of ſome of Atticus's ſervants, in Cicero's Letters to him.

(38) We muſt underſtand this word of tranſcribers and bookbinders, according to the cuſtom of thoſe times.

(39) Cornel. Nepos, cap. 13.

ATTICUS Patriarch of Conſtantinople in the beginning of the fifth Century, was born at Sebaſtia, now Souſtia, a city of Armenia. He was firſt educated by the Macedonian Monks in the principles of their Sect; but being come to riper years, he embraced the faith of the Catholick Church (*a*). St. Chryſoſtom having been deprived of the See of Conſtantinople, Arſacius [*A*] was made Patriarch in his ſtead in the year 404; but he dying the next year (*b*), the See remained vacant for ſome months, becauſe there were a great many pretenders to it. At laſt Atticus, who was then a Prieſt, was choſen in the year 406, under the Conſulſhip of Arcadius for the ſixth time and Probus (*c*). The friends of St. Chryſoſtom at Conſtantinople, and all the Biſhops of the Eaſt refuſed to communicate with the new Patriarch, becauſe, as they thought, Chryſoſtom had been unjuſtly condemned. Atticus therefore procured an edict from the Emperor, to oblige them to communicate with him [*B*]. Palladius, who tells us this (*d*), adds, that Atticus had been one of the contrivers of the whole conſpiracy againſt Chryſoſtom; but as he does not alledge one inſtance of it, nor the leaſt proof of his aſſertion, we cannot much depend upon his teſtimony, eſpecially ſince he was ſo much an admirer of the deprived Biſhop, that he right or wrong condemns all thoſe who oppoſed him. However we muſt obſerve that Sozomen alſo tells us (*e*), that Atticus was one of the conſpirators againſt Chryſoſtom. But after the death of this Prelate, Atticus being uneaſy at the diviſions, which reigned in his church, a great many perſons refuſing to communicate with him, and holding private congregations, he ordered at laſt that Chryſoſtom's name ſhould be put in the Diptychs [*C*], and mentioned in Divine Service with thoſe of the other Biſhops, who were dead (*f*). He alſo wrote to St. Cyril Biſhop of Alexandria, earneſtly entreating him to do the ſame. But Cyril anſwer'd that this was not proper, becauſe by this means they ſhould ſeem to condemn thoſe who had depoſed Chryſoſtom, and alſo to diſgrace themſelves, if they ſhould admit among the Clergy and the Biſhops, one, who, by being depoſed, had been ranked amongſt the Laity. Both theſe letters are extant in Nicephorus Calixtus's *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* (*g*). The Ancients ſpeak very differently concerning Atticus's learning. Palladius ſays (*h*), that he was quite ignorant in the holy Scripture; and Sozomen tells us (*i*), he was more prudent and wiſe from the ſtrength of his natural parts, than from any learning he had acquired, and his Sermons were but indifferent, ſo that they were not thought worth tranſcribing, though they were not altogether deſtitute of learning. However, as he had ſome taſte for polite Literature, he uſed, when he was at leiſure, to ſtudy the beſt ancient Greek Authors; but not having begun ſoon enough to lay a good foundation, he appeared dark and obſcure even to the Learned, whenever he ventured to diſcourſe upon the ſubjects treated of by the Ancients. This is

(*a*) Sozomen. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 8. cap. 27. p. m. 362. edit. Reading, Cambr. 1720.

(*b*) Nov. the 11th.

(*c*) Socrates, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 6. cap. 20. pag. 339. Ead. edit.

(*d*) *In Vita Chryſoſtomi*, pag. 95.

(*e*) *Ubi ſupra.*

(*f*) Socrates, *ubi ſupra*, lib. 7. cap. 25. pag. 373.

(*g*) Lib. 14. cap. 26, 27.

(*h*) *Ubi ſupra.*

(*i*) *Ubi ſupra.*

[*A*] *ARSACIUS.*] He was the brother of Nectarius, St. Chryſoſtom's predeceſſor in the See of Conſtantinople. While he was yet but a Prieſt, he acquired by his behaviour the reputation of a pious and moderate man; but when he came to be a Biſhop, the great liberty, in which he indulged his Clergy, ſoon blemiſhed his character; for whatever they did amiſs was aſcribed to him; but what has been the greateſt blot in his reputation, was his hatred againſt Chryſoſtom and all his adherents, who were ſeverely treated at Conſtantinople, in all probability by Arſacius's means, at leaſt not without his knowledge and conſent (1). He procured, it ſeems, an Edict from the Emperor, to the following effect; *If any Biſhop refuſes to communicate with Theophilus, Arſacius, and Porphyrius, let him be depoſed, and if it appears that he has any eſtate either real or perſonal, let it be confiſcated.* There was another Edict to this purpoſe: *If any one hides a Biſhop or a Clerc, or only receives in his houſe any other perſon of thoſe, who communicate with John (Chryſoſtom), he ſhall forfeit his houſe* (2). It is certain that ſuch Edicts would not have been publiſhed, if the Primate of Conſtantinople, who had always a very great power, had not petitioned for, or at leaſt conſented to them. Palladius gives us a very ill character of this Prelate. *He was,* ſays he (3), *more mute than a fiſh, and leſs fit for buſineſs than a frog . . . . He broke the oath he had made upon the Goſpel; for when Nectarius, his brother, upbraided him for having refuſed the Biſhoprick of Tarſus, as tho' he waited for his death in order to ſucceed him (in the See of Conſtantinople), Arſacius ſwore to him, that he would never accept any Biſhoprick. The cauſe of his perjury was firſt his ambition, which made him covet the wife of his brother, if I may ſay ſo; and ſecondly the ſhame he was filled with at his brother's prophetical cenſures. He died fourteen months after his promotion to the See of Conſtantinople.* How far Palladius, the moſt partial of all Writers in favour of his Hero, is to be credited, when his account is not ſupported by any other Author, we leave our readers to judge.

(1) *See* Sozomen. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 8. cap. 23. pag. 355.

(2) Palladius, *de Vita Chryſoſtomi*, p. m. 26, 27.

(3) Ibid. pag. 94.

[*B*] *He procured an Edict from the Emperor to oblige them to communicate with him.*] That Edict was very ſevere againſt the Biſhops as well as againſt the Laity. With regard to the former the Emperor decreed, that *if any Biſhop refuſed to communicate with Theophilus, Porphyrius* (4), *and Atticus, he ſhould be ejected out of his Church, and all his eſtate confiſcated.* This Edict obliged ſome of the richeſt to comply, tho' much againſt their will; and ſome of the moſt indigent were by gifts and preſents prevailed upon to communicate with Chryſoſtom's enemies; but others, who were more conſcientious, and preferred their faith before worldly riches, left all their eſtates, and fled to ſome other country. The Laity was not treated with leſs ſeverity; the Edict declared, that "they, who were promoted to honours and dignities, ſhould be deprived "of them, the ſoldiers be caſhiered, and the reſt of "the people, artificers, and others, be fined and baniſhed (5)." Thus for the ſake of one man, not only Conſtantinople, but ſeveral other Cities ſuffered a very heavy perſecution, tho' it was not on the account of Religion, but only to ſatisfy the ambition of ſome haughty and perhaps revengeful Prelates.

(4) Two great enemies of Chryſoſtom; the former was Biſhop of Alexandria, and the latter of Antioch.

(5) Palladius, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 95, 96.

[*C*] *Diptychs.*] Theſe were Eccleſiaſtical Books or Tables. There were two ſorts of them; the firſt contained the names of the Patriarchs, Popes and Biſhops, who preſided over the largeſt Churches, and were ſtill alive: in the other were written the names of thoſe, who died in the peace and communion of the Church. The Deacon uſed to read thoſe names at the altar during divine ſervice. As the admitting of any Biſhop's name into theſe publick Tables was a token and pledge of communion, ſo the eraſing any one's name out of them was a denial of communion with him, and a kind of excommunication. The uſe of theſe Diptychs is very ancient, and can be traced up to the fourth Century at leaſt, if not higher. They contained ſometimes, beſides the names of Biſhops, thoſe alſo of other men, famous for their holineſs and piety, and eſpecially thoſe of the orthodox Emperors, nay even of General Councils; as appears by the Emperor Juſtinian's Letter to Epiphanius Patriarch of Conſtantinople (6). Theſe Diptychs are very often mentioned by the Fathers, Councils, and Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtorians (7).

(6) *Cod. de Summ. Trinit.* lib. 7. *prope fin.*

(7) Cave, *Diſſert. de lib. & Offic. Eccleſ. Græc. ad Calcem* vol. 2. *Hiſt. Eccl. apud* Reading, *in addend. ad Not. in Socratem.*

is Sozomen's account of Atticus's learning. Socrates, who in one place tells us (*k*), that this Prelate had but a very moderate ſhare of learning, and excelled chiefly by his natural wiſdom and prudence, ſays in another (*l*), that he was very learned, and ſpent much labour in ſtudying the books of the Ancients, paſſing whole nights in the reading of them, ſo that he was no ſtranger to the writings of the Philoſophers and Sophiſts. I do not know how to reconcile Socrates with himſelf and with Sozomen; for as there are but a few fragments of Atticus's writings extant [*D*], we are not able by them to form a true judgment of his learning. But whatever they may have been, his moral character, according to Socrates and Sozomen, was very amiable. He was very eminent for his piety attended with prudence; and though he ſometimes appeared in his words a little ſevere againſt the Hereticks, it was only to terrify them, for he ſoon behaved with great mildneſs towards them (*m*), though we are not told whether it was only after they were converted to the Orthodox faith, or even while they perſiſted in their hereſy. Yet from a letter of his to Calliopius we may infer, that his charity extended even to the Heretics [*E*]; nor was he inclined to perſecute the Novatians [*F*], though they were Schiſmaticks. He alſo abhorred ſuperſtition, particularly that which conſiſts in worſhiping the dead [*G*]. It is ſaid that he foretold the time of his death; for being upon his return from Nice, where he had been upon ſome particular occaſion, he ſaid to Calliopius, a Prieſt of that city, *Take care to come and ſee me at Conſtantinople before the Autumn, if you would find me alive, for if you come later I ſhall be dead.* He was not miſtaken in his prophecy, for he died the tenth of October in that very year, viz. 425, the nineteenth after he had been promoted to the Patriarchal See of Conſtantinople (*n*).

(*k*) Lib. 6. cap. 26. pag. 339.

(*l*) Lib. 7. cap. 2. pag. 348.

(*m*) Idem, ibid. *and* Sozomen, *ubi ſupra.*

(*n*) Socrates, lib. 7. cap. 25. pag. 375.

[*D*] *There are but a few fragments of Atticus's writings extant.*] Beſides his Letter to St. Cyril mentioned in the text of this article (8), and another Letter of his, of which we ſhall ſpeak in the remark [*E*], we find only ſome fragments of an Homily on the Birth of Chriſt, extant in the General Collection of the Councils (9), and a fragment of a Letter of his to Eupſychius, quoted by Theodoret (10). We ſhould entertain but a very indifferent opinion of his learning, if we were to judge of it by the fragments of his Homily.

(8) Quotat. (*g*).

(9) Tom. 3. pag. 116, 517, 849.

(10) Dial. 2. pag. 110.

[*E*] *His charity extended even to the hereticks.*] As his Letter to Calliopius, which contains the proof of this aſſertion, is not very long, we ſhall inſert a tranſlation of it here. *I have heard,* ſays he (11), *that there are in your city a thouſand indigent perſons, who ſtand in need of the charity of pious and well-diſpoſed men: when I ſay a thouſand, I mean a great many, and not that number exactly. Now, as I have received ſome money of him, who is uſed to give it with a liberal hand to thoſe, who know how to make a good uſe of it; and permits that ſome be in want, in order to try thoſe, who tho' they have wherewithal to aſſiſt them, yet are not inclined to do it; accept, my dear friend, theſe three hundred pieces of gold, and diſpoſe of them as you ſhall think proper. I know, that you will chuſe to give to thoſe, who are aſhamed to aſk, rather than to thoſe, who make a trade of begging. Only I beg, that in the diſtribution of this money you may have no regard to their Religion, minding only to feed the hungry, without conſidering, whether or not they be of our Religion.* This is certainly a noble and exalted ſentiment, worthy of a Chriſtian, who, if he be obliged *to do good, eſpecially to thoſe who are of the houſhold of faith,* is yet at the ſame time commanded to *do good unto all men* (12).

(11) *Apud* Socrat. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 7. cap. 25. p. 375.

(12) Gal. vi. 10.

[*F*] *Nor was he inclined to perſecute the Novatians.*] As ſome body was repreſenting to him, that the Novatians held religious aſſemblies within the city of Conſtantinople, *Don't you know,* anſwered he, *how much they ſuffered with us, during the perſecution of Conſtans and Valens? And beſides, they bear witneſs to our faith; for tho' they have long ago ſeparated themſelves from the Church, yet they have not made the leaſt innovation in matters of faith* (13). This ſhews that Atticus was for allowing the Novatians a liberty of conſcience; and yet he did not approve their ſeparation from the Church, as will appear by what follows. Being gone to Nice in order to conſecrate a Biſhop, he met there Aſclepiades, Biſhop of the Novatians, a venerable old man, and aſked him how long he had been a Biſhop; Aſclepiades anſwered, fifty years. "Happy "man, *replied Atticus,* for having been ſo long em- "ployed *in ſo good a work* (14)." By which it appears, that Aſclepiades, tho' a Separatiſt, was look'd upon by Atticus as a real and true Biſhop. He alſo told him, *I approve Novatus, but I blame the Novatians.* At which Aſclepiades, being aſtoniſhed, aſked him the reaſon of this; *I approve him,* anſwered Atticus, *for having refuſed to communicate with thoſe, who had offered incenſe to the Idols, for in his place I would have done the ſame: but I cannot but blame the Novatians, who deprive laymen of the Sacrament for very ſlight offences. Beſides the offering ſacrifices to the Idols,* replied Aſclepiades, *there are a great many other ſins unto death, as the Scriptures call them* (15), *for which you excommunicate only the Clergy, and we alſo the Laity, leaving to God alone the power of remitting them* (16).

(13) Socrates, *ubi ſupra,* pag. 374.

(14) Idem, ibid.

(15) 1 Joh. v. 16, 17.

(16) Socrates, *ubi ſupra.*

[*G*] *He abhorred ſuperſtition, particularly that, which conſiſts in worſhipping the dead.*] Socrates tells us (17), that Atticus laboured much to aboliſh ſuperſtition among men; and gives us the following inſtance. Some Novatians had transferred the corps of Sabbatius from the Iſland of Rhodes, where he died in exile, and having buried it (at Conſtantinople, I ſuppoſe), uſed to pray upon his tomb, which Atticus hearing, he ſent ſome perſons in the night time, who carried off the corps and buried it in ſome infame ſecret place; by which a ſtop was put to this ſuperſtitious worſhip of the Novatians, who left off worſhipping that tomb. It were to be wiſhed, that all the Biſhops had been equally careful to ſuppreſs this ſuperſtition in its infancy. P.

(17) Ibid. p. 373.

ATTILA, King of the Huns, ſurnamed the *Scourge of God,* lived in the fifth Century. He may be ranked amongſt the greateſt conquerors, ſince there was ſcarce any Province in Europe, which did not feel the weight of his victorious arms. He would not grant peace to the Emperor Theodoſius, but upon the terms that the latter ſhould be tributary to him [*A*]. The battle which he loſt in Champagne (*a*) in the year 451 did not weaken him ſo much, but that he was ſoon able to proceed and ravage Italy; and if the prayers

(*a*) *In campis Catalaunicis.*

[*A*] *He would not grant peace to the Emperor Theodoſius, but upon the terms that the latter ſhould be tributary to him.*] According to the maxim of Braggadochios, *that we ought to give honourable names to things,* the ſum, which the Emperor obliged himſelf to pay every year to Attila, was not called a tribute, but a penſion. Here follow the words of a modern author: *He obliged the Emperor Theodoſius the younger to deſire peace of him in a very diſhonourable manner, and he could not even obtain it but by mony, paying him down immediately ſix thouſand pound weight of gold* *, *and obliging himſelf to pay him a thouſand pound* † *every year, ſo that the Eaſtern Empire, notwithſtanding the ſpecious name of a penſion, in order to ſave the honour of*

* Six hundred and ſeventy eight thouſand crowns.

† An hundred and thirteen thouſand crowns.

prayers of Pope Leo had not ſtopped him, he would infallibly have taken the city of Rome. We muſt not believe what is related concerning the apparition of an old man holding a drawn ſword, and ſtanding by St. Leo, and threatning Attila. This King of the Huns was of a low ſtature (*b*); but this did not prevent him from caſting a terror upon the moſt intrepid by his lofty carriage and fierce countenance. He underſtood very well how to join policy with force [*B*]. Superſtition was one of his artifices [*C*]. He was a diſſembler, crafty and ſubtle, prudent in counſel, and bold in execution, cruel to his enemies, but mild enough to thoſe who addreſſed him in the poſture of ſupplicants. It is ſaid likewiſe that he valued himſelf upon keeping his faith inviolable to thoſe whom he had once received into his protection (*c*). He never ſuffered any exceſſive flatterers (*d*). The general opinion concerning the manner of his death is, that he was ſuffocated by the bleeding of his noſe the night of his marriage [*D*]. We ſhall obſerve in another place (*e*) how greatly he was courted by the ſiſter of Valentinian III. His life was writ-

(*b*) Maimbourg, *Hiſt. de l'Ariani/me*, tom. 3. pag. 5. *ex* Jornande, cap. 25. *and* Paulo Diacono *in Miſcell.* lib. 15.

(*c*) Idem, ibid. See note [*E*].

(*d*) See the article of MARULLUS of Calabria.

(*e*) In the article of HONORIA.

ten *of it, became tributary to the Huns* (1). The ſame author tells us, that Attila *having ſeen at Milan a picture, which repreſented an Emperor upon his throne, having under his feet the Scythians in chains, he ordered it to be removed, and another to be placed in the room of it, in which himſelf was drawn ſitting upon a throne, ſurrounded with Emperors loaded with bags of gold and ſilver, which they came to empty at his feet in a very humble poſture; intimating by this, that as he had obliged Theodoſius ſeven or eight years before to pay him tribute, he would force the Emperor Valentinian to do the ſame, in order to ſave his life and the miſerable remains of his Empire* (2).

(1) Maimb. *Hiſt. de l'Arian.* tom. 3. pag. 4. *ex* Paul. Diacono lib. 15. *in Miſcellan.*

(2) Maimb. *Hiſt. de St. Leon*, lib. 3. pag. 220. He quotes Suidas.

[*B*] *He underſtood very well how to join policy with force.*] This is evident from his management in the expedition againſt the Gauls. He endeavoured to divide the Romans, who were commanded by Aetius, from the Wiſigoths, whoſe King was Theodoric. For this purpoſe he told the Emperor Valentinian, that he did not intend any act of hoſtility againſt the ſubjects of the Empire; that he only propoſed to chaſtiſe the Franks and Wiſigoths, the former of whom had preſumed to invade the territories of the Empire, and the latter were only ſlaves to Valentinian. He informed Theodoric at the ſame time, that he had made the King of the Vandals believe, that he was come into Gaul againſt the Wiſigoths, but that this was only a pretence to deceive the Emperor; that his real deſign was to divide the Empire between the Huns and the Wiſigoths, and that he would invade Italy, if Theodoric would attack the Gauls (3). Valentinian and Theodoric eaſily diſcovered this ſnare, and united to repel this artful conqueror. *Homo ſubtilis, antequam bella gereret, arte pugnabat, cætera epiſtolas blandimentis oppleverat, ſtudens fidem adhibere mendacio* (4). i. e. "The artful man, before he engaged in "war, employed the weapons of artifice and policy, "and filled his letters with compliments, endeavouring to cover his treachery with the maſk of diſſimulation."

(3) Cordemoi, *Hiſt. de Franc.* tom. 1. pag. 116. *ex* Jornande. *See likewiſe* Maimb. *Hiſt. de l'Arianiſm.* tom. 3. pag. 9.

(4) Jornandes, *de Reb. Goth.*

[*C*] *Superſtition was one of his artifices.*] "He "found means to poſſeſs the minds of his ſoldiers "with a ſuperſtitious notion, that there was ſome"thing in him divine, upon which his good fortune "depended; for whether he thought ſo himſelf, or "rather pretended to be perſuaded of it, he made "them believe that he had found the ſcymitar of Mars, "which was adored among thoſe people, and that "the fates had promiſed the Empire of the whole "world to him, who ſhould be maſter of that fatal "ſword (5)." It is one of the moſt powerful ſtratagems, which a General can make uſe of, to be able to manage and work up the minds of his ſoldiers by the ſprings of a myſterious ſuperſtition, which fills them with reſolution or fear according as the occaſion requires; with reſolution, when it is neceſſary to fight; and with fear, when they begin to incline to mutiny. It is very uſeful for a ſoldier to be perſuaded, that his General has a familiar ſpirit, who can extricate him out of every difficulty (6). Attila was ſuperſtitious himſelf: *Religioni perſuaſionibuſque de Diis à ſuâ gente ſuſceptis uſque ad ſuperſtitionem addictus* (7). i. e. "He was ſuperſtitiouſly addicted to thoſe notions "of Religion and the Gods, which were received a"mong his countrymen." For a little before the battle of Chalons "he conſulted his Diviners, who "told him, that indeed all their obſervations did not pro"miſe any ſucceſs to the Huns; but that they predicted, "that the General of the enemies would be killed in "the battle. This was ſufficient to deceive Attila. "He imagined that Aetius's death was certain, and "that if this man was no longer an obſtacle to him, "the conqueſt of the Empire would be eaſy. He "did not value the loſs of his ſoldiers, and he "perſuaded himſelf, that he ſhould always have "a ſufficient number, if he did but ſurvive that great "General (8)." He was deceived; for Aetius was not even wounded in that battle.

(5) Maimb. *Hiſt. de l'Arianiſm.* tom. 3. pag. 6.

(6) See the notes [*A*] and [*B*] of the Article of ARISTANDER, and the article of AGRIPPA note [*P*] num. 1. towards the end.

(7) Callimach. *Experiens in Attilâ.*

(8) Cordemoi, pag. 120. *ex* Jornande.

[*D*] *That he was ſuffocated by the bleeding of his noſe the night of his marriage.*] It is ſaid, that after he was prevailed upon by the prayers of Pope Leo to ſpare the reſt of Italy, he returned to Pannonia, loaded with his ſpoils; and that tho' he had a great number of concubines, yet he would take a new one, who was the daughter of the King of the Bactrians. She was a perfect beauty, and he fell ſo deeply in love with her, that he reſolved to do her the honour of marrying her in form, in order to give her the firſt rank among his Ladies. He ſolemnized his marriage with a great deal of pomp; but he drank ſo liberally, and afterwards heated himſelf ſo exceſſively in the embraces of his new ſpouſe, that at laſt falling aſleep, he was ſeized with a bleeding at the noſe, which ſuffocated him. *Ildico puellæ ei fuit præ cæteris gratiſſima, Bactrianorum regis filia, miræ pulchritudine & incomparabili venuſtate, cujus amore ſuccenſus eam primariæ uxoris loco habere conſtituit. Comparatis pro regis dignitate nuptiis per omnem intemperantiæ licentiam in conjugali convivio ſibi indulſit. Baccho ac Venere corpus ita ea nocte confecit, ut inter dormiendum ſupino corpore, profluvio ſanguinis è naribus continuò ſuffocatus interierit* (9). There would be no improbability in this ſtory, if it was not added that Attila was then one hundred and twenty four years of age. It is difficult to conceive that at ſuch an age a man ſhould be in a condition to commit any great exceſſes with the ſex. An Hiſtorian of Frieſeland has quoted this fact as an argument in favour of the Hiſtorians of his Nation, who repreſent their ancient Kings as very long lived. He has borrowed it not from Bonfinius, but from Michael Rithius. *His adde teſtimonium Michaelis Rithii, qui Libro de Regibus Hungariæ primo ſcribit, Atthilam Italicâ prædâ opimiſque ſpoliis onuſtum in Pannoniam ſe recepiſſe, uxoremque ſuperduxiſſe regis Bactrianorum nomine Milzoth, etſi plures alias haberet in matrimonio, eumque cum nuptiales epulas apparatiſſimè celebraſſet, liberius ſolito crapulatum in cubiculum recepiſſe, erumpenteque è naribus ſanguine in os dormientis extinctum eſſe, anno ætatis ſuæ 124, regni ſui 44. Si tantam ætatem in hoc libidinoſo tauro Scythico credimus, cur non & eandem Friſiis accidere potuiſſe cenſeamus* (10)? i. e. "Add to theſe the teſtimony of Michael Ri"thius, who in his firſt Book concerning the Kings "of Hungary tells us, that Attila being loaden with "the rich ſpoils, which he had gained in Italy, went "to Pannonia, where he married the King of Bactria's "daughter, whoſe name was Milzoth, tho' he had "many other wives beſides, and that having made a "very magnificent feaſt on account of his marriage, "and drank more freely than uſual, he retired to his "chamber, where as he lay aſleep he was ſuffocated "by an eruption of the blood from his noſe, in the "124th year of his age, and the 44th of his reign. "If we believe that this laſcivious Scythian Bull could "live to ſo great an age, why may we not think, "that the ſame thing might happen to our Kings of "Frieſeland?

(9) Bonfin. *Hiſt. Hungar.* Decad. 1. lib. 7. p. 75.

(10) Bernard. Furmerius, *Annal. Phriſicor.* lib. 3. c. 9. pag. 243.

ten in the fifteenth Century by an Italian who fled to Poland, and whoſe name was Callimachus Experiens. Others have written it ſince that time [*E*].

It is ſaid that he had an ambition of eſtabliſhing his own language, and raiſing it upon the ruins of the Roman [*F*].

" Frieſeland!" There are ſome Writers who have aſſerted, that Attila did not die in this manner, but that *his new ſpouſe, who had no affection for him, ſeeing him drunk and faſt aſleep, like another Holofernes, ſtabbed him with a knife* (11).

(11) Malmb. *Hiſt. de l'Arian.* tom. 3. pag. 25. *ad ann.* 453. *ex* Caſſiodoro.

[*E*] *Others have written it ſince that time.*] Nicholas Olahus, Archbiſhop of Strigonium, wrote a Life of Attila much more compleat than that of Callimachus Experiens. He wrote it while he was Counſellor to Mary of Auſtria, Queen of Hungary, Governeſs of the Low-Countries. We may ſee there the Speech, which Attila made to his army a little before the battle of Chalons. All the common topics are introduced into this Speech, as we may perceive by the marginal notes. Sambucus has inſerted this work of Olahus and that of Callimachus Experiens in his edition of Bonfinius. Otrokocſi (12), who publiſhed a Book concerning the Origin of the Hungarians, has ſpoken very fully of Attila, and principally made uſe of the relation of Priſcus, who attended the Embaſſadors ſent by Theodoſius to this King of the Huns in 448. He extracts ſeveral remarks from this relation, to ſhew that Attila was a man of great probity. He does not omit the reproaches, which that Prince caſt upon the Emperor Theodoſius on account of the Eunuch Chryſaphius's attempt to engage Edeco, Attila's Envoy at the court of Theodoſius, to kill his maſter. The Envoy pretended to engage in this deſign, and procured the promiſe of a very conſiderable ſum of money, and then diſcovered the whole affair to Attila. The money was brought; the plot proved: the King of the Huns expoſtulated with Theodoſius like a great man, and with an air, which renders the character probable, which is given of him, that he was gentle to thoſe, who ſubmitted to him, and faithful to his word. *Supplicibus prope ad mollitiem facilis, & qui in fidem ſemel receptos, in perniciem uſque ſuam tueretur* (13). i. e. "Eaſy almoſt to too great a ſoftneſs to "thoſe, who were ſuppliants to him, and ſtrict in "defending thoſe, who had once put themſelves "under his protection, even to the endangering of "himſelf."

(12) He is a Proteſtant Miniſter, a Refugee from Hungary his own country. His book intitled, *Origines Hungariæ*, was printed at Franeker in 8vo, 1693.

(13) Callimachus Experiens.

[*F*] *It is ſaid, that he had an ambition of eſtabliſhing his own language, and raiſing it upon the ruins of the Roman.*] I have read this fact in a work of Alcyonius. John de Medicis who was Pope under the name of Leo X is introduced ſpeaking in the following manner: *In Bibliothecâ noſtrâ aſſervatur liber incerti Autoris Græcè ſcriptus de rebus à Gotis in Italiâ geſtis. In eo memini me legere Attilam regem, poſt partam victoriam tam ſtudioſum fuiſſe Goticæ linguæ propagandæ, ut edicto ſanxerit ne quis linguâ Latinâ loqueretur, magiſtroſque inſuper è ſuâ provinciâ accivisſe, qui Italos Goticam linguam edocerent* (14). i. e. "There is preſerved in our Library a Book written "by an unknown Author in Greek concerning the "Wars of the Goths in Italy. I remember to have "read in it, that King Attila after his victory was "ſo fond of propagating the Gothic tongue, that he "publiſhed an Edict to prohibit all perſons from "ſpeaking Latin, and ſent likewiſe for Teachers "out of his own Province, in order to inſtruct the "Italians in the Gothic language." The reader will ſee in the article of the Emperor CLAUDIUS (15) ſome collections concerning the zeal of ſeveral Princes for the language of their own country.

(14) Petrus Alcyonius *in Medice, Legato poſteriore*, fol. *b ij verſo.*

ATTILIUS, a Latin Poet, lived in all probability in the beginning of the ſeventh Century of Rome. Volcatius Sedigitus gives him the fifth rank among the ten Comic Poets. However he was a bad Author; his ſtyle was as hard as iron (*a*), not only according to Cicero's taſte, but likewiſe that of Licinius, whoſe ear was not near ſo exquiſite as Cicero's. Attilius's tranſlation of the *Electra of Sophocles* was extremely ill performed; however Cicero thought it worth reading (*b*). Suetonius remarks that ſeveral paſſages were extracted from it to be ſung during the funeral pomp of Julius Cæſar, becauſe they might be applied to the aſſaſſins of that Emperor (*c*). Caſaubon and Torrentius have in vain attempted to alter this paſſage of Suetonius [*A*]. They have only given us an inſtance of the diſorders, which criticiſm may ſometimes introduce.

(*a*) See the note [*I*] of the article of ACCIUS in the beginning.

(*b*) See the ſame note.

(*c*) Sueton. *in Cæſar.* cap. lxxxiv.

[*A*] *Caſaubon and Torrentius have in vain attempted to alter this paſſage of Suetonius.*] Caſaubon having found in all the copies of Suetonius, *ex Electrâ Attilii alia ad ſimilem ſententiam*, imagined, that we ought to read *Attii* inſtead of *Attilii*. *Sic emendavimus*, ſays he, *corruptam omnium librorum lectionem* Attilii. i. e. "Thus have we corrected the corrupt "reading of *Attilii* in all the copies." Torrentius was not ſatisfied with ſubſtituting Attius in the room of Attilius; but he removed likewiſe the word *Electra*, and pretended, that Suetonius ſpoke only of a piece of Attius, which was intitled like that of Pacuvius, which he had juſt before mentioned, *Armorum judicium*. Torrentius's reaſon is, that the manuſcripts differ extremely with regard to the Poet's name; but that they have moſt frequently *Accius* or *Attius*. In this manner the Criticks diſagree with regard to the readings of the manuſcripts, which is a matter of fact. Caſaubon acknowledges that he found *Attilius* in all of them. Torrentius on the other hand affirms, that he met leſs frequently with that reading than any other. Peter Crinitus complained that the Grammarians had inſerted *Accius* inſtead of *Attilius* in this paſſage of Suetonius (1). But let us proceed to ſomething of more importance. Tho' Caſaubon has not told us, why he altered the text, yet there is no doubt, but that he had the ſame reaſon for it as Torrentius. Now Torrentius's reaſon is as follows: He did not remember that he had ever read any thing relating to the *Electra* of Attius, nor concerning a Poet, whoſe name was Attilius. It is leſs ſurprizing, that a man of learning ſhould be induced by ſuch a principle to deny a fact, than to ſee that theſe two excellent Criticks knew nothing, that Cicero has mentioned the *Electra* of Attilius; that he has treated Attilius as a very harſh Poet; that Volcatius Sedigitus makes an honourable mention of him in Aulus Gellius; and that Varro has quoted him in the Vth and VIth Book concerning the Latin tongue (2). I ſhall ſay nothing of Crinitus or Gregory Gyraldus, who have mentioned him in the Lives of the Latin Poets by ſuch marks, that the latter has falſly charged Cicero with having ſtiled him a Tragic Poet (3). I ſhall not touch upon the complaints, which have been publiſhed againſt thoſe, who alter the readings of manuſcripts juſt as they underſtand or do not underſtand any point. This would be an improper place to introduce this, conſidering the great ſervice, which Caſaubon has done to the Republick of Letters by his learning, which was as extenſive as judicious. Torrentius's merit is not of equal importance; but it has its value, which I ſhall not pretend in the leaſt to leſſen.

(1) P. Crinitus *de Poet. Lat.* cap. 14.

(2) *See* Reineſius, *Variar. Lection.* lib. 3. cap. 3. pag. 379. *apud* Sueton. Grævii *in Cæſare*, c. 94.

(3) *Apud* Voſſ. *Poet. Lat.* p. 7.

ATTIUS (LUCIUS), a Tragic Poet. See ACCIUS.

AUBERI

AUBERI (N.) Author of *the History of Cardinal Richelieu* [A], and of *Cardinal Mazarin*. See the *Journal des Savans* (a). If some particular reason did not prevent, I should always make use of such a reference as this, when the book referred to is easy to be found, and contains only a short account of the life of a person.

(a) For the 14th of May 1695 pag. 185, & seq. Holland edition.

[A] *AUBERI, Author of* the History of Cardinal Richelieu.] It was printed at Paris in folio in 1660, with two other volumes, which contain *Letters, Instructions*, and *Memoirs*. Anthony Bertier, Bookseller of Paris, who printed them, had collected with great care the pieces, which are contained in the two last volumes; but he represented to the Queen Mother, that he could not venture to publish them *without the particular authority and protection of his Majesty, because there were divers persons, who were restored to favour at Court, whose past conduct not having been regular, and being represented extremely to their disadvantage in those memoirs, would infallibly bring him into some trouble. Go*, says the Queen to him, *proceed in your work without any apprehension, and cast such an infamy upon vice, that nothing but virtue may remain in France* (1).

(1) La Caille, *Hist. de l'Imprimerie*, pag. 285, 286.

AUBERTIN (EDMUND) (a) in Latin *Edmundus Albertinus*, a Minister of the Church of Paris in the seventeenth Century, was a man of eminent learning. He was born at Chalons upon the Marne in the year 1595. He was admitted a Minister at the Synod of Charenton in 1618, and promoted to the Church of Chartres, from whence he was removed to Paris in 1631 (a). He wrote, properly speaking, but one book [A]; but he gained more reputation by that single book, than other learned men have done by printing an hundred volumes. This work turns upon the controversy concerning the Eucharist. It was published in the year 1633, under the title of *The Eucharist of the ancient Church*. The Agents of the Clergy of France complained of Mr. Aubertin before the King's Council [B], and obtained a warrant to take him into custody, because he had called himself Pastor of the Reformed Church of Paris. This process had no consequences, for the times were not then proper to push such things very far (b). Now whether it was the excellence of the book, which without the assistance of this incident occasioned it to be sought for, or whether it was concluded to have been written with great strength of argument, since the Clergy only attacked it by way of the secular arm, it is certain, that the Author had great reason to be pleased with the success of his work [C]. This obliged him to revise, enlarge, and perfect it with so much application, that he seems to have devoted his whole labour and study to it. He composed his new work in Latin, but he had not the satisfaction to see it published. It was printed at Deventer after

(a) See the Preface to his book, *de Eucharistia*, by David Blondel.

(b) I have been informed, that after this, on account of some word, which escaped him in the Pulpit, the Court suspended him from preaching two or three years.

(a) *Edmund.*] Mr. Bayle says nothing of his parents, and this with his Christian name makes me believe that Aubertin was born a Roman Catholick (1). CRIT. REM.]

(1) Crit. Rem. at the end of the Paris edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

[A] *He wrote properly speaking but one Book.*] For the Essay, which he published upon St. Augustin, to shew that the sentiments of this Father with regard to the Eucharist were not agreeable to those of the Church of Rome, but to those of the Protestants (1), ought not to be considered but as a little specimen of the Book, which he published in folio in 1633. I say this after the learned Blondel. *Augustinum, quem obtorto collo in partes trahere conabatur Perronius, abducenti fortiter extorsit, vindicatumque in Dei castra feliciter reduxit. Hoc insigni virtutis specimine, & tirocinio, ut sic dicam, posito, de patrum universorum causâ asserendâ serio cogitans*, Antiquæ Ecclesiæ Eucharistiam *nobis accuratiore studio repræsentavit* (2). i. e. "He valiantly rescued St. Augustin from the hands of "Cardinal Perron, who endeavoured by violence to "draw him over to his party, and he brought him back "to the camp of God with great success. Having "given this noble specimen of his abilities, and gone "thro' the probation of his studies, if I may be allowed the expression, he resolved seriously upon a "Defence of the cause of all the Fathers in general, "and compiled a more complete account of *the Eucharist of the ancient Church*." I have never seen *the observations which he made out of regard to the Abbé de Marolles, upon a Book of Mr. de la Milletiere, who importuned him to answer some difficult questions*; but I have been informed, that it is a Book of 226 pages, printed in 1648, and relating to the controversy concerning the Eucharist. The Abbé des Marolles mentions it in the Catalogue of the Presents, which he received from Authors.

(1) This book was printed in 1626, and intitled, *The Conformity of the Faith of the Church with that of St. Augustin with regard to the Sacrament of the Eucharist.* It contains above 500 pages in 8vo.

(2) David Blondellus, *in Præfat. Libri Albertini de Eucharistiâ.*

[B] *The Agents of the Clergy of France complained of him before the King's Council.*] They represented in their petition, that Mr. Edmund Aubertin, Minister of the pretended Reformed Religion at Charenton, had published a Book, *in which he took upon him the title of Pastor of the Reformed Church at Paris, and addressed his Preface to the faithful of the Reformed Church of the said city of Paris*; and that in the approbation of that Book the other Ministers of Charenton *took upon themselves the title of Pastors of the Churches of the Isle of France, Champagne, and the Country of Chartres, and their Subscriptions call themselves Maistrézat and Drelincourt, Pastors of the Reformed Church of Paris, and Daillé* (3), *Minister of the holy Gospel in the said Church.* The same Agents complained, that the Cardinals Bellarmin and Du Perron were stiled *Adversaries of the Church* in the title of the work. The King ordered that Aubertin *should be taken into custody, and carried to the prison of Fort l'Evesque, if he could be apprehended; and if not, that he should be summoned by the publick Crier with three short days warning, his goods seized and an inventory made of them according to the Decree, in order to proceed to his trial*; and that *the said Maistrezat, Drelincourt, and Daillé should be summoned to appear in person to be heard and interrogated with relation to the facts mentioned in the petition.* His Majesty *enjoined the Ministers and others professing the pretended Reformed Religion to use the titles given them in the Edicts, and no others, prohibiting them to stile the Catholicks Adversaries of the Church* (4). This Decree was made in the privy Council of the King the 14th of July 1633 (5). The Author of the History of the Edict of Nantes informs us (6), that *this affair, which made a great deal of noise, and had very little effect, was terminated almost as soon as it began, and produced nothing at that time but verbal prohibitions* (7). He adds, that *the Book was the more sought after upon that account, and that the success encouraged the Author to revise and enlarge it, and treated of that subject more accurately in a large volume in Latin, which was not published till after his death, and that the Catholick Divines, who were unsuspected, never ventured to return a particular answer to it.*

(3) They have copied wrong the names of Mestrezat and Daillé.

(4) See the note [B] of the article (MATTHEW) BOCHART, towards the end.

(5) It is inserted in the *Recueil des Arrêts obtenus pour les Affairs de Clergé durant l'Agence & à la poursuite des Sieurs Abbé de Paimpont & Prieur de Monstiers.*

(6) Tom. 2. pag. 534.

(7) This ought not to be understood of the prohibitions contained in the decree of the 14th of July 1633.

[C] *He had great reason to be pleased with the success of his work.*] We have just seen the judgment of the Author of the History of the Edict of Nantes. He has only conformed himself to the judgment of Mr. Daillé the younger, whose words are as follows: *The name of Mr.* Aubertin *is immortal here below, and will always live in the great and incomparable work concerning the Eucharist, which hitherto has continued superior to all the attacks of those of the other Communion, in which not one Writer has ventured to attack him fairly, or to oppose him face to face, if we may so express*

after his death by the care of David Blondel (*c*). When this book began to be forgot, there aroſe a conteſt between the Divines of Port-Royal and Mr. Claude, which made known the name of Aubertin and the character of his work [*D*] to an infinite number of people who had never heard of it before, or did not remember it. Mr. Claude had a thouſand opportunities of ſpeaking of the merit of this book [*E*]. Mr. Aubertin died at Paris the fifth of April 1652, being fifty ſeven years of age. He was expoſed in his laſt agony to the inſults of the Rector of St. Sulpice [*F*]; and notwithſtanding his drouſineſs, which was one of the chief ſymptoms of his diſtemper, he had his mind free enough to declare, when this Miſſionary interrogated him, that he died in the perſuaſion of thoſe truths which he had always profeſſed. He had a very eaſy acceſs to the Duke de Verneuil, who was at that time Abbot of St. Germain des Prez. This Prince often invited him to his table, and found him to be a man of agreeable converſation, of univerſal

(*c*) In 1654. It is a folio of about a thouſand pages in two columns.

preſs it. Even thoſe, who are conſidered among them as pillars and heads of the party, have been able to do nothing elſe but touch ſometimes upon him in an oblique manner, according to the rules of this new art, which they have invented, and which the deſpair of their cauſe has obliged them to put in practice under the ſpecious name of a Method of Preſcription (8). Mr. Daillé means by this the Divines of Port-Royal, who in their Book concerning *the Perpetuity of the Faith* did not attack any part of the whole work of Mr. Aubertin except the Hiſtory of the Alteration of the Faith (*β*). Beſides they did attack this Hiſtory but by reaſonings, and not by oppoſing facts to facts. See the ſecond Chapter of the firſt Book of the large Anſwer of Mr. Claude, in which he ſhews, that the Author of *the Perpetuity of the Faith* attacked Mr. Aubertin's Book *in an oblique and indirect manner*.

(8) *Life of Mr. Daillé*, pag. 28.

(*β*) *The Hiſtory of the Alteration of the Faith.*] It is a matter of ſurprize, that Mr. Bayle was ſo little acquainted with what he mentions here. Daillé, who wrote in 1671, might very well ſay, the Author of the *Perpetuité*, printed in 1669, attacked nothing in Aubertin's whole work, but his hiſtory of the alteration, which happened in the belief of the Church. Daillé, who was no Prophet, could not foreſee that the ſame Author would ſhortly publiſh two other volumes, in which the whole work of Aubertin, with all the evaſions of the Miniſter Claude, who came to his aſſiſtance, would be cloſely examin'd and confuted. The ſecond volume of the *Perpetuité* was publiſhed in December 1671, and the third in December 1674. Mr. Bayle ſhould not have been ignorant of this, yet he ſays (Rem. *D*), that the Author of the *Perpetuité* owns, it were to be wiſhed, that ſome able perſon would confute the Book of Aubertin. Mr. Nicolle, who made that wiſh in the Preface to his firſt volume, accompliſhed it himſelf in the two following. Beſides, Mr. Bayle ought to have known that Aubertin's French work had been entirely confuted as early as the year 1646, by a new convert, whoſe name was Theophilus Brochet de la Milletiere. Mr. Bayle had ſeen Aubertin's Latin work, and even quotes ſome paſſages out of the Preface; but it appears that he never dipped into the book itſelf; for if he had, he would have ſeen in almoſt every page the name of la Milletiere, as of a man who had confuted Aubertin, and to whom the latter endeavours to reply. See the article MILLETIERE (2). CRIT. REM.]

(2) Crit. Rem. at the end of the Paris edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

[*D*] *A conteſt between the Divines of Port-Royal and Mr. Claude made known the name of Aubertin and the character of his work.*] The Author of *the Perpetuity of the Faith* choſe to confute no part of this Miniſter's large work but the Hiſtory of the Innovation. This furniſhed opportunities enough of bringing upon the ſtage Aubertin's name and work. Here follows a paſſage from the *Perpetuité de la Foi*. "Aubertin "likewiſe perceiving very well, that he was not "able to maintain ſo plain an abſurdity (9), thought "himſelf obliged to change the plan. And here is "the ſubſtance of what that Miniſter, who unhappily "ſpent his life in ſearching among the writings of "the ancients ſomewhat to obſcure the truth, found "moſt plauſible, in order to render it probable, that "there was ſuch a prodigious alteration in the ancient faith, as he is obliged to admit of, that he might "appear himſelf to be an innovator." Mr. Arnaud has treated him in a manner much leſs favourable, tho' he owns (10), that *it were extremely to be wiſhed, that ſome learned man would undertake to confute the writings of the new Miniſters, and among the reſt* AUBERTIN'S BOOK *and thoſe of Daillé.* He aſſerts, "that "Aubertin's Work is a very contemptible one; that "this Miniſter was a man of little genius, who was "only maſter of a low criticiſm without elevation or "judgment; who had read a great deal, becauſe nothing elſe was wanting for that purpoſe but eyes "and leiſure, but that he had read without any taſte "or diſcernment; that he does not at all diſtinguiſh "between good and bad reaſons; who makes a clamour every moment upon the ſlighteſt proofs; who "had corrupted common ſenſe by uſing himſelf to repeat "perpetually the ſame abſurdities; and that he is "ſo far from *having gained a conſiderable victory of "the School of Rome*, that he has only diſcovered the "weakneſs of the Calviniſts (11)."

(9) The Author means the ſuppoſition of Blondel, that Tranſubſtantiation came into the world a long time after Berengarius.

(10) In the Preface to the *Perpetuité defendue*.

(11) *Perpetuité defendue*, liv. 1. cap. 1. p. 5.

[*E*] *Mr. Claude had a thouſand opportunities of ſpeaking of the merit of this Book.*] Out of regard to thoſe, who would be glad to know the plan of Aubertin's Book without any other pains but that of reading this article, I ſhall tranſcribe the following words of Mr. Claude. "The whole Book of Mr. Aubertin is a "body of the controverſy relating to the Euchariſt, "which is divided in three parts. In the firſt he "treats of that ſubject from the ſcripture and human "reaſon. He produces his own quotations and arguments, and confutes objections; he mentions the "quotations and arguments of thoſe of the Romiſh "Communion, and replies to them; and he anſwers "almoſt all that is conſiderable, which has been urged by the controverſial Writers upon this ſubject. "In the ſecond part, he examines the belief of the "Church for ſix hundred years by an exact diſcuſſion "of all the paſſages on both ſides; and he ſhews, "that Tranſubſtantiation and the real Preſence were "Doctrines unknown during all that time. In the "third he gives the Hiſtory of the Introduction of "theſe doctrines (12)." Mr. Claude had obſerved before in his former Anſwer, that Mr. Aubertin, after having treated with the utmoſt accuracy all the queſtions relating to the Euchariſt *from the holy Scripture and reaſoning, and having gained a noble victory over all the ſubtleties of the School of Rome, examines at length all the paſſages of the Fathers, which had till then been produced upon that ſubject on both ſides; ſhewing by this means to all the world the alteration, which the Church of Rome had introduced, which he did by making a perpetual compariſon between the ancient belief and the modern; to which he added the Hiſtory of the origin and progreſs of Tranſubſtantiation and the real Preſence* (13).

THE judgment of the Port-Royaliſts upon Aubertin.

(12) Claude *Reponſe au Livre de Monſr. Arnaud*, liv. 1. cap. 2. pag. 25.

(13) Claude *Reponſe au II Traité*, chap. 1.

[*F*] *He was expoſed in his laſt agony to the inſults of the Rector of St. Sulpice.*] He came to the door of the ſick perſon with the Bailiff of St. Germain at nine a clock in the evening. The mob to the number of forty people followed him with arms. He that knock'd at the door, counterfeited the voice of the Phyſician, that it might be opened. When this was done, the whole body of them broke violently into the houſe, and cried out, that the ſick man wanted to make his abjuration to the Rector, but that he was hindered; and therefore they were come to deliver his conſcience from that yoke. The eldeſt ſon of the Miniſter, who lay at the point of death, defended the ſtairs as well as he could; but at laſt, to prevent the mob from breaking the chamber-doors, it was agreed, that the Rector and Bailiff ſhould go alone into the ſick man's chamber. The cries and noiſe of the people, which attended them, awakened Mr. Aubertin a little out of his lethargic ſlumber, ſo that

verſal knowledge, and well ſkilled in the cultivation of fruit-trees and flowers, in muſic, &c. One of the ſons of Mr. Aubertin was Miniſter of Amiens.

that he declared very diſtinctly, that he ſtill perſevered in the Reformed Religion [γ]. The Rector and Bailiff departed, and took a great deal of pains to perſuade the mob to retire. But they returned ſoon after, and cried out, that the Rector had been obliged by force to go away, and they would have broke into and plundered the whole houſe, if two men had not entreated them to deſiſt. *Viciniam non latuit extrema hæc calamitas, quæ pii viri ſpirans adhuc ſpolium cujuſvis illudere parati injuriæ exponebat. Lamentabili iſta occaſione infeliciter uſus præfervidi ſed tumultuoſi zeli vir Joannes Jacobus Ollerius, Baſilicæ S. Sulpicii Curatus, & Sodalitatis, quæ* de propagandâ fide *dicitur primipilus, &c.* (14). i. e. "The neighbourhood were ſenſible of this extreme violence, which expoſed the yet breathing remains of the pious man to the inſults of every perſon, who was ready to abuſe him. This melancholy occaſion was unhappily made uſe of by John James Ollerius, Rector of St. Sulpice, one of the chief men of the Society *de propagandâ fide*, a perſon of warm but outrageous zeal, &c." Can we think of this, without recalling to mind this pathetic line of Lucretius?

(14) David Blondell. *Præfat. lib. Albertini de Euchariſtiâ.*

Tantum Religio potuit ſuadere malorum.

What is not a furious zeal for Religion capable of doing?

Triſtius haud illo monſtrum, nec ſævior ulla
Peſtis & ira Deum Stygiis ſeſe extulit undis (15).

(15) Virgil. *Æneid.* lib. 3. verſ. 214.

"Monſters more fierce offended Heav'n ne'er ſent
"From Hell's Abyſs for human puniſhment."
Dryden.

It does not even ſuffer people to die in quiet. After having tormented them during their life, it lays ſnares for them even amidſt the ſeverity of a diſtemper, which takes away the uſe of their reaſon. It takes advantage of thoſe moments, when the ſoul is as ſick as the Body, and when

Claudicat ingenium, delirat linguaq; menſque (16).

(16) Lucret. lib. 3. ver. 454.

(γ) *His perſeverance in the Proteſtant Religion.*] It has been reported, that Aubertin, at the time of his death, was extremely irreſolute and diſturbed in his mind; and the violence of his ſon, and the cries and clamours of his wife, and of the other Proteſtants who attended him, were the only reaſons that prevented his converſion. The ſame fact is alſo to be found in Mr. le Maire's Book (3) againſt Mr. Claude. "Aubertin, *ſays le Maire* (4), lying at the point of death, "aſked for a Prieſt. Mr. Aulier (5) went to viſit him; "but the Proteſtants, fearing the conſequence of ſuch "an interview, barred the doors. Yet they were afterwards opened, and Mr. Olier being gone in, was "ſeized by Aubertin's ſon; .... but getting rid of "him he paſſed, not without danger of his life, to "the Miniſter's bed, which was ſurrounded by a great "many Proteſtants. The Prieſt no ſooner began to "ſpeak, but the Miniſter's wife clapt her arms about "her dying huſband's neck, crying with tears in her "eyes, *What will you do? Will you ruin us all? "Will you ruin your wife and children?* So that the "Miniſter, wavering between oppoſite paſſions, cried "out ſeveral times with a terrible voice, *I wiſh I "were dead: oh! that I were dead!* and expired "with theſe ambiguous words in his mouth, which "expreſſed the perplexity and irreſolution of his mind." Mr. le Maire was at Paris, and already a Prieſt and an Author, when Aubertin died in 1652. So that whatever the Proteſtants might alledge againſt Mr. le Maire's teſtimony, the Catholicks may alledge the ſame againſt David Blondel (6). Here follows another fact, which, I preſume, Mr. Bayle did not know, and which renders the former very credible; I take it from Mr. Arnauld's Apology for the Catholicks, printed in 1682. That Author having ſaid, that the bare reading of the Fathers is enough to convince any one, that they admitted the worſhip of the Saints, and the veneration of their Relicks, adds (7), "Therefore "I have not been much ſurprized at what Mr. "Ouvrard .... told me formerly of Mr. Aubertin, "who was, without doubt, one of the moſt learned Miniſters of this age. But on occaſion of "theſe diſputes I deſired, that Mr. Ouvrard would "confirm in writing, what he told me by word of "mouth; and I ought, I think, to give here the anſwer he made me January the 22d, of this year "1682; *I remember*, ſaid he, *the diſcourſe I had with "Mr. Aubertin concerning the worſhip of the Saints, "and the veneration of their Relicks as well as if it "had paſſed but two days ago. It was on occaſion "of the authority of the Fathers, whom he told me he "had read twice, but only curſorily, thoſe paſſages, "which were not to his purpoſe. I aſked him, whether he had ſome faith in them, or only read them to "confute them. His anſwer was, that he was of their "opinion; and paſſing to the worſhip of the Saints and the "veneration of their Relicks, he told me theſe very words: "That there was no truth better eſtabliſhed in all antiquity, and that he never preached nor wrote againſt "that truth. This he repeated ſeveral times in preſence of Mr. Corneillau, ancient Counſellor to the Chaſtelet; who can bear witneſs of it.* People may "think what they pleaſe of this converſation, *adds "Mr. Arnauld*; we don't expect that the Miniſters "will own it to be true; but we doubt very much, "whether men of honour will be able to perſuade "themſelves, it is only a piece of forgery. An account ſet out with ſo many circumſtances by a conſcientious man, who cannot be ſuppoſed to have had "any reaſon to tell a lye, does ſeldom fail of being "credited. It makes upon our minds ſuch an impreſſion "as is natural, and can hardly be prevented." It is ſcarce poſſible, that a man, who like Aubertin, thought that a doctrine, which his Church ſtiled a damnable error, that came from *Satan's ſhop* (8), was nevertheleſs true and apoſtolick, ſhould not have now and then ſome doubts and ſcruples againſt his Religion, and eſpecially at the approach of death, at which time men are moſt apt to be perplexed with ſuch kind of ſcruples (9).

(6) See Mr. Bayle's remark [F].

(7) Tom. 2. pag. 224.

(3) It is intitled, *La Defenſe de la Foy Catholique, & de ſa Perpetuité touchant l'Euchariſtie contre le Miniſtre Claude, Par Mr. le Maire, Preſtre, Docteur en Theologie, &c.* Paris, 4to, 1670.

(4) Pag. 667.

(5) It ſhould be Olier, Curate of St. Sulpicius, at Paris.

(8) See the *Confeſſion of Faith of the French Proteſtant Churches*, Art. 24.

(9) Paris edit. of Bayle's Dictionary, *ubi ſupra.*

AUBIGNE (D') (α).

(α) His Chriſtian name was *Theodore Agrippa*. We ſhall give a curious article of him under the Letter D. *See* D'AUBIGNE.

I have read in the *Mercure Galant* for January 1705 (1), that *John d'Aubigné was the favourite and Chancellor of Jane d'Albert, Queen of Navarre, and mother of Henry IV, and in great favour with* that Prince; that *he died at Geneva after having left him upon his turning Proteſtant; that he was then Admiral of Bretagne, Governor of Oleron and Maillezais, and Gentleman of the Bed-chamber to the King*; that *we have ſtill extant of his compoſing an* Hiſtory of France *written with a ſpirit of impartiality, which procured him the commendations of all his contemporary Writers, and of thoſe, who have ſucceeded him*; that *his work is conſidered as a maſter-piece with regard to Hiſtory*; *and* that *ſome Authors value it even more than that of Thuanus, which however is highly eſteemed*; that *Otto remarks, that when he came in his Hiſtory to the death of that great Prince* (2), *he ſays, that his pen fell out of his hand, and he was not able to write any further*; that *this Hiſtory is in two volumes in folio*; that *it was reviſed, corrected by himſelf, and printed upon very fine paper and in a very beautiful character at Maillezais, of which he was Governor*; that *Conſtant, his ſon, Vice-Roy of the Iſles of America, to which he ſailed in* 1643, *was father of Madam Maintenon and of the Count d'Aubigné, who died lately, Knight of the King's Orders, and Governor of Berri.* In the *Mercure Galant* for February 1705 (3) the error with regard to d'Aubigné's Chriſtian name has been corrected. We are told, that his name was *Agrippa* and not *John*; and that his *Univerſal Hiſtory* is in three volumes; that the third is very

(1) Pag. 233, & ſeq.

(2) Henry IV.

(3) Pag. 207.

AUDEBERT

AUDEBERT (GERMAIN) Preſident in the Election or Court of Aſſeſſors at Orleans, was a perſon of great merit, and an excellent Latin Poet in the ſixteenth Century. He was a ſcholar of Alciat at Bologna ſeveral years, and he returned from Italy ſo well pleaſed with the country and the people, whom he had converſed with there, that he employed all his ſkill in Poetry in the *Deſcription of Rome*, of *Venice*, and of *Naples* (*a*). Theſe three Poems are inſerted in the firſt volume of the *Deliciæ Poetarum Gallorum*. We ſhall ſee below in what manner the Venetians rewarded him for the deſcription of their city. He wrote other Poems, which might have been publiſhed, if his ſon, who was Counſellor in the Parliament of Bretagne, had ſurvived him much longer (*b*). Scævola Sammarthanus wrote an Elogium upon our Audebert with his uſual eloquence. He has aſcribed to him the moſt eſſential qualities of a good man. Moreri has faithfully given us the ſubſtance of that Elogium. I do not doubt but that he was ignorant of the favourable conſequences, which the Proteſtants have drawn from that chapter of Scævola Sammarthanus, in order to juſtify one of their moſt illuſtrious Miniſters from an horrid accuſation. We cannot ſufficiently lament the malice or the ignorance of mankind, when we conſider that Theodore Beza has been accuſed of an abominable crime upon ſo ſlight a foundation as his Epigram *de ſuâ in Candidam & Audebertum benevolentiâ*. Mr. Maimbourg revived this accuſation in his *Hiſtory of Calviniſm*. He has been very ſolidly confuted by an examination of the piece itſelf, without omitting to confirm the apology, by alledging the great merit of Audebert (*c*). Theodore Beza had before made uſe of that reaſon [*A*]. Mr. Graverol the Miniſter had a deſign of publiſhing the Epitaphs upon this famous Magiſtrate, in a Latin Diſſertation, which he printed at that time (*d*); but he received them too late. He has communicated them to me, and this is a very proper opportunity for publiſhing them [*B*]. We ſhall ſee in them the Hiſtory of our Audebert, ſuch as an Hiſtorical Dictionary ought to furniſh us with.

(*a*) Sammarthanus, *Elog.* lib. 2.

(*b*) *Relictis præter ea quæ commemoravi poemata, Silvarum aliquot libris, qui lucem expectare poterant ab ejus hæredi, &c.*

(*c*) Jurieu, *Apologie pour les Reformez*, Part 1. pag. 141, *& ſeq.*

(*d*) It is intitled, *De juvenilibus Theodori Bezæ poematis*, and was printed at Amſterdam 1683, in 8vo.

Konig

(4) Ibid. January 1705, pag. 232, 233.

ſcarce, and was printed at London; that *he wrote his own life, of which there is a manuſcript at Paris, written with his own hand*; and that *it is a curious piece*. The Marquis de Tigni, Brother of the Biſhop of Noyon, is the head of the eldeſt branch of the family of d'Aubigné. He is father to the count d'Aubigné, to whom the King gave the Royal Regiment (4).

[*A*] *Without omitting to confirm the Apology by alledging the great merit of Audebert. Theodore Beza had before made uſe of that reaſon.*] It is in the ſecond Apology againſt Claude de Sainctes. He tells us, that when he wrote the Epigram, Audebert was Advocate in the Parliament of Paris. The paſſage is in Latin as follows: *Qui quum eouſque proveheris, ut meam cum honeſtiſſimo viro, & qui jam tum in Senatu Pariſienſi Advocato, quem vocant, nunc verò in civitate Aurelienſi magnâ cum dignitate verſanti, amicitiam & familiaritatem ſummam ad nefarium & execrandum illud ſcelus transferas, quod à vobis ne nominari quidem ſine horrore poteſt, à vobis autem in veſtris illis gurguſtiolis, ut omnes norunt, pro ludo & joco ducitur, quis te ipſum vir honeſtus non execretur* (1)? i. e. "But ſince you "proceed ſo far, as to repreſent my intimate friend- "ſhip and familiarity with a man of great honour, "at that time Advocate in the Parliament, and now "poſſeſſed of an eminent poſt at Orleans, under the "imputation of the moſt ſhocking and execrable crime, "which cannot be named by us without horror, but "is treated of by you in your little cells as a mere "jeſt and ſport, as is notorious to every body, what "perſon of character muſt not deteſt you?"

(1) Beza, *Operum*, tom. 1. pag. 360.

[*B*] *This is a very proper opportunity for publiſhing them.*] That it may not be loſt, I ſhall inſert here word for word what the perſon, whom I have mentioned above, wrote and ſent to me. *I deſire you to accept of a faithful copy of the Epitaphs of Germain Audebert and his ſon. If I had received them at the time when they were promiſed me, I ſhould have added them to the little Apology, which I drew up in Latin in defence of Theodore Beza, and which a particular occaſion obliged me to publiſh. So authentic a piece appears to me to be the only method capable of putting an end to the ſhocking calumny, with which the memory of that excellent ſervant of God has hitherto been loaded, whatever evaſion may be made uſe of to elude the force of it; and you will do a ſignal ſervice to the truth by publiſhing this new method of vindicating him.*

" Here lies Meſſire Germain Audebert, born in the " city of Orleans, the Prince of the Poets in his time, " who merely on account of his virtue was ennobled " with all his deſcendants by the Moſt Chriſtian King " of France and Poland Henry III, and was made " a Knight. And to compleat his honour, his Maje- " ſty gave him two flower-de-luces of gold to be born " in his arms as an ornament to them. Our holy " Father Pope Gregory XIII, and the Duke and " Seignory of Venice made him likewiſe a Knight, " and the latter ſent him into France by their Embaſ- " ſador the Order of St. Mark. And yet notwith- " ſtanding theſe great honours, he continued ſtill to " act as an aſſeſſor in this juriſdiction for the ſpace " of fifty years, ſo great a reſpect had he for his " country. In conſideration of which his ſaid Ma- " jeſty having created and erected a Preſident and " Lieutenant in every juriſdiction of France, exempt- " ed the ſaid Meſſire Germain Audebert, and appoint- " ed him to preſide over and precede both the one and " the other. He wrote three Books of the city of " Venice, one of Rome, and one of Naples, and two " Books of Miſcellanies. He died in the year 1598 " the 24th of December, aged about eighty years. " And under the ſame marble lies Meſſire Nicholas Au- " debert, Counſellor of the King in his Court of Par- " liament of Bretagne, ſon of the ſaid Meſſire Ger- " main Audebert, a great imitator of his father's vir- " tues, who died five days after his father in the forty " ſecond year of his age. May their ſouls reſt among " the bleſſed."

Audebertorum, Germani Patris, & Nicolai filii Tumulus.

Audebertorum ſi quis depingere laudes
Cogitet, ille ſibi nihilo plus explicet, ac ſi
Inſanè ſapiens ſolem illuſtrare laboret.
Parcendum verbis igitur, vanoque labori.
Sit dixiſſe ſatis, ſitus hic jacet Audebertus,
Et pater & gnatus patris cito fata ſecutus.
Nominat hæc quiſquis ſincera nomina linguâ
Virtutum & laudum gazas ſimul eruit omnes.
Quas qui neſcierit communis luminis expers
Credatur furvis ſemper vixiſſe ſub antris.

Theſe three Epitaphs are written in Letters of gold upon a table of black marble fixed to the wall of the gallery in the church-yard belonging to the Church of the holy Croſs at Orleans, on the left hand about ſixty paces in the gallery. They were copied word for word from the original by a perſon, who may be depended upon. Here ends the extract of Mr. Graverol's Letter. We may conclude from what is ſaid concerning Audebert's office in the former of theſe Epitaphs, that Mr. Jurieu is miſtaken in aſſerting that Audebert died *after he had paſſed thro' all the moſt conſiderable offices of the long Robe* (2). Sammarthanus might have prevented him from falling into this miſtake; for he has expreſly remarked, that Audebert was ſo modeſt, that he contented

(2) *Apologie pour les Reformez*, Part 1. p. 145.

Konig has divided our Author into two [C]. Sammarthanus is not the only perſon who has written an Elogium upon this Gentleman [D].

tented himſelf with a poſt much below his merit. *Nec ſibi quicquam*, ſays he (3), *de ſolitâ modeſtiâ detraxit, contentus eâ, quam apud ſuos jamdudum exercebat, vectigalium indictionumque præfecturâ, humili fortaſſe illâ & obſcurâ, ſi hominis dignitatem reſpicias, ſed quam eo tantum animo ſuſceperat, ne nullam Reipublicæ partem attigiſſe, ſibique ſoli vixiſſe diceretur.* i. e. " Nor did he abate the leaſt of his uſual modeſty, " being content with the poſt, which he had held for " a long time of Preſident in the Court of Aſſeſſors of " the Taxes and Subſidies, which was a low and ob- " ſcure one, if we conſider his dignity, but he ac- " cepted of it with this view, that he might not be " ſaid to have avoided having any ſhare in the pub- " lick ſervice, and to have lived only for himſelf."

(3) Sammarthan. *in Elogiis.*

[C] *Konig has divided our Author into two.*] He gives us one *Germanus Audebertus* and one *Aurelius Audebertus*. He refers us for the former to the 191ſt page of the *Elogia* of Sammarthanus, and he tells us with regard to the latter, that he wrote three Poems in the year 1603. *Scripſit Venetias, Romam, Parthenopen, carmine, A.* 1603. i. e. " He wrote three Poems " upon the Cities of Venice, Rome, and Naples in " 1603." This date is a new error, ſince Audebert died in 1598. It is true, theſe three Poems were printed at Hanaw in 1603; but this was not the firſt edition. We may perceive from hence, that it is not ſo eaſy a taſk as it is imagined to compile a *Bibliotheca* of Authors in a proper manner. Thoſe, who are not ſkilled in the chronology of editions, or in the difference between Chriſtian names and the names of the country, are very liable to be miſtaken, *Germanus* is Audebert's Chriſtian name; *Aurelius* is his name from his country. What is wonderful is to ſee, that Mr. Konig refers us to an Author, whom he had not ſeen himſelf; for if he had taken the pains to caſt his eyes upon the paſſage, which he quotes from Sammarthanus, he would have ſeen there, that Germanus Audebert was he, who wrote the three Poems of Venice, Rome, and Naples; *Venetias, & Romam, & Parthenopen . . . . ea carminis majeſtate deſcripſit.* When a Writer refers his reader to any Book, he ought to ſet him the example, and conſult it firſt himſelf.

[D] *Sammarthanus is not the only perſon, who has written an Elogium upon this Gentleman.*] An Advocate in the Council, who ſtiles himſelf in Latin *Rodolphus Botereius*, has extolled Audebert highly in his *Hiſtory of France* (4). He does not mention the honours, which the Popes and the Republick of Venice conferred upon him; but whereas the Epitaph aſcribes to Pope Gregory XIII the honour, which Audebert received from the Court of Rome, he aſcribes it to Gregory XII. He tells us where the Embaſſador of Venice conferred the honour of the Order of St. Mark upon him, and before what concourſe of people. *Gregorius XIV ac Veneti illum civitatis jure & equeſtris ordinis dignitate donârunt; effuſius Veneti, qui per Oratorem ſuum in ſuburbano Tybure Gentiliaco, aſſidente ſpectaculo & convivio longâ coronâ hominum literatiſſimorum, Audebertum torque aureo Divi Marci inſigniverunt.* i. e. " Pope Gregory XIV and the Venetians made " him free of their Cities, and honoured him with " the Order of Knighthood. But the Venetians " more magnificently, for their Embaſſador inveſted " him with the golden collar of St. Mark at Gentilli " near Paris before a large aſſembly of men of the great- " eſt eminence in learning, who were likewiſe preſent " at the feaſt."

(4) Lib. 5. pag. 460, *& ſeq. ad ann.* 1598.

AUDIGUIER (N. D') (α), Author of ſeveral books [A], which were very much read when they were firſt publiſhed, but are abſolutely neglected now, flouriſhed in the beginning of the reign of Lewis XIII. Sorel having obſerved that the Author of the *Po-* with

(α) This is the title of a Romance, the Author of which was named Meliere.

(α) *N.*] His Chriſtian name was *Vital*. He was of a noble family; and Lord, or *Sieur de la Menor en Rouergue*, as he is ſtiled in the Privilege of his *Pourtrait du Monde*, a moral work, printed at Paris in 1604, in 12mo. We find in his dedication to Queen Margaret, that ſome years before, and while ſhe was in the caſtle of Uſſon, Audiguier had been one of her domeſticks. He was born in Rouergue, and probably at Menor, about the year 1565. His father, who was one of the King's Magiſtrates, was reſolved that his ſon ſhould ſucceed him, and made him perform ſome functions of that Magiſtracy in the year 1590. He enjoyed that poſt when he was aſſaulted and wounded by eleven men February the 26th 1591; and the 8th of April following, the firſt time he went out after he had been wounded, he was again aſſaulted and wounded with his father by the ſame men, who endeavoured to raiſe the Burghers againſt Henry IV, and in favour of the Leaguers (1).

(1) Paris edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

(γ) [A] *The Author of ſeveral Books.*] He publiſhed at Paris *The true and ancient cuſtom of Duels* printed in 1617 by Peter Billaine. It is a Book of 532 pages in 8vo, and deſerves a place in Libraries. He publiſh-

ed likewiſe ſome French verſes, *the Loves of Lyſander and Calliſta, thoſe of Ariſtander and Cleonice, Flavia, Minerva, &c.* Theſe are Romances, which were very well received (1). He tranſlated into French *the Novels of Miguel de Cervantes*. Sorel's judgment of this Author in a work of his, which was publiſhed a long time after his *Berger Extravagant*, is as follows: " I do not think, *ſays he* (2), that we ought abſo- " lutely to deſpiſe the Sieur d'Audiguier, Author of *the* " *Adventures of Lyſander and Calliſta*. Tho' he was " not a man of any conſiderable learning, he wrote " in a ſprightly and neat ſtyle for that time, as ap- " pears from ſeveral Romances which he wrote, and " from his Letters and ſome Tranſlations of his. At " firſt when he wrote a Book, intitled, *La Philoſophie* " *Soldade*, he had a little of the Gaſconade, but he " improved himſelf ſo much by his tranſlations of *the* " *Novels of Cervantes*, and the Book *of Chriſtian Per-* " *fection* written by *Rodriguez*, that he may be con- " ſidered as one of our valuable Tranſlators. His " laſt work, which was *the Loves of Ariſtander and* " *Cleonice*, was not the worſt performance of that " time."

(1) Obſerve that Sorel has criticis'd the two former in his Remarks upon the *Berger Extravagant*, eſpecially in the 13th book of theſe *Remarks*.

(2) *Biblioth. Franç.* p. 261.

(γ) *The Author of ſeveral Books.*] Beſides thoſe mentioned by Mr. Bayle, he wrote the following: *Le Pourtrait &c.* of which we ſpoke above (4); *Epitres Françoiſes & libres Diſcourſe*, i. e. " French Epiſtles " and free Diſcourſes" in 12mo, 1608. Another with the the ſame title, but very different, 8vo, 1625. *Les diverſes fortunes de Pamphile & de Niſe*; i. e. " The various adventures of Pamphilus and Niſa," taken from Lopez de Vega, 8vo, 1614. There is an edition of Amiot's French tranſlation of Heliodorus's Ethiopic Hiſtory, reviſed by d'Audiguier, printed in 1609 with a Privilege dated October the 28th, 1608, and reprinted in 1616 with a Privilege granted in 1613. One may diſcover d'Audiguier's ſtyle and genius in the Dedication, in which he ſubſcribes himſelf only thus, *Votre Valet*, i. e. " Your Servant." He looks upon that work as beneath him, and I believe that he was already dead, when his name was put to the edition of 1626. There is another French tranſlation of that Hiſtory, with cuts, 8vo, 1622, different from that which d'Audiguier reviſed. Mr. Bayle does not give us the date of d'Audiguier's works, which he mentions, except only of one; we will here ſupply this defect. His *Lyſander* was firſt printed in 1616, and reprinted in 1620, 1622. His *Ariſtander* in 1625. His *Minerva* in 1625. The ſix *Nouvelles of Cervantes* are in three volumes, 8vo, 1623. To what Mr. Bayle has borrowed from Sorel, we may add, that when the French Academy began in 1638 to draw up a catalogue of the moſt famous books written in French, which might be conſulted on occaſion, and quoted in the Academy's Dictionary, d'Audiguier's works in proſe were put in that Catalogue (5).

(4) Rem. (α).

(5) Paris edit. of Bayle's Dictionary.

lixena might ſome time or other have produced ſome *performance of more value, if he had not been as unfortunate as Audiguier*, adds, *that they were both killed by thoſe whom they took for their friends* (*b*). " I am of opinion, ſays he in another place (*c*), that Audiguier " had a good genius; but he was rather a ſoldier than a ſcholar, as he obſerves in the " dedications of his books, where he ſpeaks almoſt always of his ſword, or ſomething " to that purpoſe; and it is reported, that in order to ſhew that he wrote negligently, he " ſaid one day out of a Gaſcon bravado, that he *made his pen with his ſword*. Some " perſons affirm, that he was anſwered, that *this then was the reaſon why he wrote ſo ill*; " but it was wrong to be ſo ſatyrical. There is no manner of doubt, but that this boaſt " of his has a great deal of elegance, and deſerves a place among the French Apothegms." Audiguier had a nephew who paſſed for the Author of the tranſlation of *Stratonice*, an Italian Romance; but it was Malleville who made it, and being one of his moſt intimate friends, gave it to him (*d*). There was one AUDIGUIER, an Advocate in the Parliament of Paris, who publiſhed ſome pleadings (*e*). I cannot tell whether he was the ſame with the nephew of the other Audiguier (*β*), and Malleville's intimate friend; but I know that he lived in the ſeventeenth Century (*g*), and I believe that this nephew is the Author who was called *Audiguier the Younger*, and who publiſhed among other works the *Eromene*. A paſſage which I ſhall quote below, inclines me to think, that our Audiguier was killed in the year 1630 [*B*].

(*b*) Sorel, *Remarks upon the Berger Extravagant*, 13th Book, pag. 493. of the edit. of Roan, printed by Oſmont in 1646, in 8vo, 2 vol.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 486.

(*d*) See the *Socrate Chretien of Balzac*, Diſcourſe 2. pag. 263.

(*e*) Pelliſſon, *Hiſt. de l'Academie Franc.* pag. 292.

(*f*) Marolles, *Memoires*, p. 41.

(*g*) Marolles, *Denombrement des Auteurs*, pag. 407.

[*β*] *I cannot tell whether he was the ſame with the nephew of the other Audiguier.*] He was not the ſame; his name was *Henry Daudiguier, Sieur du Mazet*. In 1662 he had been already ten years Attorney General to the Queen-Mother (2). His *Cenſeur cenſuré*, i. e. " Reprover reproved" is a very indifferent piece, in 4to of ten pages only (3).

(2) Ann of Auſtria, mother of Lewis XIV.

(3) Paris edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

[*B*] *A paſſage, which I ſhall quote below, inclines me to think, that our Audiguier was killed in the year* 1630.] This paſſage is taken from a Letter of Mr. Balzac dated the 20th of Auguſt 1630. Audiguier is not named there, and there are ſtars put inſtead of the perſon's name, which Balzac had mentioned. But I do not doubt but it was the Author, whoſe article we are writing (*δ*). I think that his character is not ill repreſented in the following words (3). " And yet it is " better to be innocently merry in the *Hotel* of Ve- " nice, than to be killed in the Temple Marſhes, " like poor ***. I lament the fate of him, both as " he is dead and as he was unfortunate, and I am " ſorry, that he had not time to think of the ſalva- " tion of his ſoul, and aſk pardon of God. But as " for imagining, that one of the great lights of France " is extinguiſhed, and that we have loſt a great man, " I knew him too well to have ſo high an opinion of " him. He was really a man of ſpirit, and had cer- " tain ſallies of fancy, which would not have been " diſagreeable, if they had not been printed. But " he does not deſerve a place among the modern Au- " thors, and in a collection of the Poems of the pre- " ſent age. However he did not value himſelf up- " on his courage and all his military virtues, but " piqued himſelf entirely upon the elegance of his " converſation and writings. He was ſo ſtrongly poſ- " ſeſſed with the notion of his merit in that reſpect, " that becauſe I attempted one day to cure him of " that troubleſome diſtemper, he never loved me af- " terwards, and died, I am perſuaded, with this re- " ſentment againſt me."

(3) Balzac. lib. 8. Letter 42. p. 387, 388. of the 1ſt vol. of his Works, Paris edit. printed by Joly 1665, in 2 vol. in fol.

(*δ*) *But I do not doubt but it was the Author, whoſe article we are writing.*] I think that Mr. Bayle is miſtaken, for what Balſac ſays does not agree with Audiguier's character (6), as appears by the following verſes, taken from the Dedication of his *Libres Diſcours*, i. e. " free Diſcourſes:"

(6) See *la Bibliotb. du Richelet.*

Que ſi les horreurs de la Guerre
Reſſortent jamais des Enfers, . . .
Alors-je reprendray mes Armes, . . .
Pour vous faire voir par effet
Que je ſais mieux faire qu'écrire,
Et fais plus d'Eſtat du bien fait
Cent mille fois, que du bien dire.

" If war again ſhould riſe from Hell's Abyſs,
" To ſhake the world, again I'd ſeize my Arms,
" And prove my ſword ſuperior to my pen.
" To me one worthy act ſeems far more noble
" Than all the charms of eloquence and wit."

This is directly oppoſite to what Balſac ſays of the Poet he mentions, who reckoned his courage for nothing, and valued himſelf only upon his ſpeaking and writing well. D'Audiguier died unmarried (7).

(7) Paris edition of Bayle's Dictionary.

☞AVENPACE [ABU BECR MOHAMMED EBN BAJAH], commonly known among the Arabian Writers by the ſurname of Ebn al Sâyegh, the moſt ſubtil of the Mohammedan Philoſophers, was born in Spain; and his anceſtors, it is ſaid, were Jews (*a*). He was poiſoned at Fez, in the year of the Hejira 533 (*b*), A. C. 1137, or, according to others, 525 (*c*), A. C. 1129, and dying young, his Works are therefore very imperfect [*A*]. Avenpace ſpent a great deal of his time in ſtudying and commenting on Ariſtotle, and wrote ſeveral things, which having been tranſlated into Latin, were well known to St. Thomas Aquinas, and the old Schoolmen (*d*). He has been highly commended by moſt Writers for his acuteneſs and judgment [*B*], and cenſured by ſome as guilty of unſound notions

(*a*) J. Leo Africanus, *de Viris quibuſdam illuſtribus apud Arabes*, cap. 15.

(*b*) Ebn Khalecân, *in vita Ebn al Sâyegh.*

(*c*) *Vide* Pocockij *Elenchum Scriptorum, Vitæ Hai Ebn Yokdhan præfixum.*

(*d*) D'Herbel. *Bibl. Orient.* p. 736.

[*A*] *Avenpace dying young, his works are therefore very imperfect.*] This is the judgment of Abu Becr Ebn Tofail. " Avenpace, *ſays he*, was too much ta- " ken up with worldly buſineſs, and died before he " had time to open the treaſury of his knowledge, " ſo that moſt of thoſe pieces of his which are extant, " are imperfect; particularly his book about *the Soul*, " and his *Tadbîr almotawahked*, i. e. ' *How a man* " *ought to manage himſelf that leads a ſolitary life.*" " So are his *Logics* and *Phyſics*. Thoſe pieces of his " which are compleat, are only ſhort tracts and ſome " occaſional letters. Nay, in his Epiſtle concerning " the *Union* [*with God*], he himſelf confeſſes that he " had wrote nothing compleat, where he ſays, *That it* " *would require a great deal of trouble and pains to expreſs* " *that clearly which he had undertaken to prove*; and, " *that the method which he had made uſe of in explain-* " *ing himſelf, was not in many places ſo exact as it* " *might have been*; and, *that he deſigned, if he had* " *time, to alter it* (1).

(1) Ebn Tofail's Introduction to his *Life of Hai Ebn Yokdhan*, pag. 15. of Mr. Ockley's tranſlation.

[*B*] *He has been highly commended by moſt Writers for his acuteneſs and judgment.*] Ebn Tofail ſays, that among the latter Spaniſh Philoſophers, who advanced farther in the art of reaſoning, and made nearer approaches to truth than their predeceſſors, no one had a ſharper wit, or truer notion of things than Avenpace;

notions in religion, and even of infidelity [C]; his ſuperior merit having raiſed him a great many enemies, who gratified their envy by aſperſing him (e). At their inſtigation he was impriſoned by the father of Averroes, then Kadi of Corduba, (who little thought, ſays one (f), that his own ſon would prove much worſe) but was releaſed at the interceſſion of a great many perſons of dignity (g). It may be obſerved, by the way, that Averroes was one of his ſcholars (b). Avenpace was not only a great Philoſopher, but was alſo well ſkilled in Phyſic, the Mathematics, and Poetry (i). Thoſe who make him to have been Wazîr or prime Miniſter to Ziyâdat Allah, the laſt Prince of the race of Aglab, commit an anachroniſm of two hundred years (k). Leo Africanus is miſtaken with reſpect to the time and place of our Author's death, which he ſays happened in Spain in the year 550 (l).

(e) Poc. *ubi ſupra.*

(f) Ebn Juljul, *apud* Leon. Afric. *ubi ſupra.*

(g) Leo African. *ubi ſupra.*

(b) Ebn Abi Oſaibea, *in Hiſt. Med. apud* Poc. *ubi ſupra.*

(i) Ebn Khalec. *Vide* Leon. Afric. *ubi ſupra.*

(k) Nowairi, *apud* D'Herbel. *ubi ſupra.*

(l) *Ubi ſupra.*

pace; and that his contemporaries were far inferior to him (2). Abu'l Haſan Ali, who collected his works into one volume, ſticks not to prefer him to all the Mohammedan Philoſophers; aſſerting that none after Alfarabius is to be compared with him, and that his arguments are of much greater weight than thoſe of Avicen or al Ghazâli (3). The celebrated Maimonides alſo gives him a noble character in his Epiſtle to R. Samuel Aben Tibbon.

(2) Idem, ibid.

(3) *Vide* Pocock. *ubi ſupra.*

[C] *And cenſured by ſome as guilty of hereſy and infidelity.*] In this particular our Author has ſhared the fate of the moſt eminent Philoſophers among the Moſlems. Ebn Khakân (4) repreſents him as a man who had a very bad opinion of the Mohammedan Religion, and a dangerous enemy of revelation; but Ebn Khaleçan thinks that Writer has carried the matter much too far. Y.

(4) Kelâid al-ikyân, &c. MS.

AVENTINE (JOHN) famous for his *Annals of Bavaria*, flouriſhed in the ſixteenth Century [A]. He was born of mean parentage, and ſon of an inn-keeper at Abenſperg in Bavaria [B]. He ſtudied at firſt at Ingolſtad, and afterwards in the Univerſity of Paris under James Faber Stapulenſis and Joſſe Clictou. Upon his return to Germany in 1503 he ſtaid ſome time at Vienna, where he taught in his chamber Eloquence and Poetry. He went to Poland in the year 1507, and taught publickly the Greek Grammar at Cracow. He returned to Germany, and ſpent ſome time at Ratiſbon, from whence he removed to Ingolſtad in 1509, and explained there ſome books of Cicero. As he paſſed for a man of great learning, he was ſent to Munich in 1512 to be Preceptor to Prince Lewis and Prince Erneſt (a). He travelled with the latter of theſe two Princes (b). After this he undertook to compile the *Annals of Bavaria* [C], and was encouraged in his deſign by the hopes which the Dukes of that name gave him, that they would bear the charges of it. He neglected nothing in order to anſwer the expectation of his maſters. He conſulted with the utmoſt care the Records of Germany, and he applied himſelf entirely to this work. He did not loſe his pains, for he has gained a great reputation by it. He received an affront in the year 1529, which gave him an uneaſineſs, that

(a) They were the ſons of Albert the Wiſe, Duke of Bavaria.

(b) See le Blanc's *Hiſtory of Bavaria*, tom. 3. pag. 414, 415.

[A] *He flouriſhed in the XVIth Century.*] He was born in 1466, and died in 1534; from whence Voſſius concludes with a great deal of reaſon, that Genebrard is miſtaken in affirming, that this Hiſtorian flouriſhed in the year 1366 (1). Father Gaultier has followed Genebrard in this miſtake. In the epitome of Geſner's *Bibliotheca* Aventine's death is erroneouſly placed in the year 1529.

(1) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Latin.* pag. 655.

[B] *He was ſon of an Inn-keeper at Abenſperg in Bavaria.*] Jerom Zieglerus tells us, that his father's name was John Thurmair, and that it was upon this account that Leonard d'Eckh in an epigram gave the name of Thurniomarus (2) to John Aventine. He adds, that the Author of the *Annals of Bavaria* called himſelf *Aventinus*, becauſe the ancient name of Abenſperg was *Aventinium*. *The Emperor Antoninus*, continues he, *calls it Abuſina in his Itinerary.* Mr. Bullart did not underſtand this. *The city of Abenſperg*, ſays he (4), *is ſufficiently celebrated in the Roman Hiſtory, eſpecially by the Emperor Antoninus, who in his Itinerary calls it* Aventinum. This Author would be extremely perplexed, if he were required to prove, that this city is very famous in the *Roman Hiſtory*. The learned Lambecius is of opinion, that we cannot find, that it bore any other name than that of *Abuſina*, which is given it in Antoninus's Itinerary, upon which account he cenſures the Author of the *Annals* for not calling himſelf *Abuſinenſis*. *Patria ejus fuit Abuſina; unde falſo, cum ſe nominare debuiſſet* Abuſinenſem, *cognomine uſus eſt* Aventini (5). But would that name have been agreeable as that of one of the hills of Rome?

(2) It does not ſeem that one of theſe names was derived from the other. There is perhaps in one or other of them an error of the preſs.

(3) Zieglerus *in Vitâ Joan. Aventini.*

(4) Bullart, *Academié des Sciences*, tom. 1. pag. 147.

(5) Lambec. *Comment. Biblioth. Cæſar.* lib. 2. cap. 6. pag. 471. in Not. margin. n. 2. *apud* Magir. *Eponymol.* pag. 91.

[C] *He undertook to compile the Annals of Bavaria.*] He had a penſion ſettled upon him for that purpoſe. He began it a little before the death of the Emperor Maximilian. The work conſiſts of ſeven Books, and is continued down to the year 1533. Voſſius remarks all theſe particulars. *Annales Bojorum Libris VII reliquit . . . . Terminatur ejus hiſtoria anno* CIↃ IↃ XXXIII. *Extremis Maximiliani temporibus jam cæperat Hiſtoriam ſuam ſcribere auſpiciis & liberalitate fruens Guilielmi & Ludovici Bavariæ Ducum, qui patri ſuo Alberto ſucceſſerunt anno* 1508 (6). i. e. "He left the "Annals of Bavaria in ſeven Books. . . . His Hiſtory "ends in the year 1533. He began to write it in "the latter end of the reign of the Emperor Maximilian, being ſupported by the patronage and generoſity of William and Lewis Dukes of Bavaria, "who ſucceeded their father Albert in the year 1508." Theſe *Annals* were not publiſhed till the year 1554; which was done by Jerom Zieglerus, Profeſſor of Poetry in the Univerſity of Ingolſtad; but, as he acknowledges himſelf, he retrench'd the invectives againſt the Eccleſiaſtics, and ſeveral ſtories, which had no relation to the *Hiſtory of Bavaria*. *Multa ſine dubio emendaſſet* (Aventinus), *pleraque forſitan mutâſſet etiam, ſi per fata licuiſſet. . . . Invectivas quaſdam contra eccleſiaſticas perſonas, item fabuloſas narrationes nihil quidquam ad Hiſtoriam facientes non fraude ſed judicio omiſimus* (7). i. e. "Aventine would undoubtedly have corrected a great "many things, and perhaps the greateſt part of his "work, if he had not been prevented by death. . . . . "I have omitted with no ill deſign, but upon mature "deliberation, ſome invectives againſt the Eccleſiaſtics, and ſeveral fabulous ſtories, which had no "connection with the Hiſtory." Zieglerus's precaution, and his frankneſs in confeſſing the mutilations which he made in this work, were two things not very conſiſtent with each other; for this acknowledgment of his excited the curioſity of the Proteſtants, and induced them to endeavour to recover what had been ſuppreſſed; and they were ſo aſſiduous in ſearching for a manuſcript of theſe Annals, which had not been caſtrated, that they found one. It was publiſhed at Baſil in 1580 by Nicholas Ciſner. The title of this edition is as follows: *Joannis Aventini Annalium Bojorum Libri VII, ex authenticis manuſcriptis codicibus recogniti reſtituti, aucti, diligentiâ Nicolai Ciſneri.* i. e. "John Aventine's Annals of Bavaria in ſeven Books, "reviſed, reſtored, and enlarged by the care of Nicholas

(6) *De Hiſt. Latinis*, pag. 655.

(7) Zieglerus in *Præfat.* Ciſner ſhews in his Preface, that Aventine, if he had lived, would not have alter'd what Zieglerus pretends he would have altered.

that troubled him all the reſt of his life after. He was taken by force out of his ſiſter's houſe at Abenſperg, and put into priſon. The true reaſon of this violence offered to him was never known; but it would have been carried to a much greater length if the Duke of Bavaria had not taken this learned man into his protection. The incurable melancholy which attended Aventine from that time was ſo far from engaging him in a reſolution to continue unmarried, as he had done till he was ſixty four years of age, that it induced him perhaps to think of marrying. This new inclination was not ſo ſtrong, but that it left him the liberty of conſulting the holy Scriptures and his friends how he ſhould act. The advice given him was full of uncertainty [*D*], for which reaſon he was obliged to reſolve this problem himſelf, and he determined upon marriage [*E*]. The only point now remaining was to ſeek out for a wife, and he was imprudent enough to apply to a crafty old woman, who deceived him ſcandalouſly [*F*]; for ſhe brought to him a woman of the country of Suabia, who had three great defects; ſhe was poor, ugly, and ill-tempered, and gave him an opportunity of making a great many experiments [*G*]. He hired an houſe at Ratiſbon after his marriage, from whence he was ſent for to Ingolſtad in 1533 to be Tutor to the ſon of a Counſellor of the Duke of Bavaria (*c*).

" cholas Ciſner." Coeffeteau could not refrain from expreſſing his reſentments againſt Ciſner's Edition. He ſpeaks as follows: *Aventine is an Author, who deſerves no credit in theſe affairs relating to the Church, ſince he had no other view in his Annals than to diſgrace the Clergy; and he is particularly to be rejected with regard to the Hiſtory of Gregory VII. . . . The intemperance of his pen in theſe points was the reaſon, that Zieglerus in the firſt edition retrenched a great many ſpurious accounts and a great many reflections upon the Clergy; but the Proteſtants,* who turn their ears away from the truth, in order to give themſelves up to fables, *could not bear his correction, and have publiſhed his Annals with all their filth* (8).

(8) Coeffeteau, *Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquité du Sieur du Pleſſis*, pag. 673.

[*D*] *The advice given him was full of uncertainty.*] Here is what Mr. Bullart relates concerning the Anſwers, which he had from Books. " Socrates left him " in doubt, becauſe of the diſcourſe which he had an- " ciently with a young man, who was in the ſame " ſuſpence. *Whether you marry or not, you will cer- " tainly repent.* He would have had no occaſion for " any other counſel, if he had regarded that of Dio- " genes, who told the young men, *that it was not " time for them to marry*, and the old, *that it was " too late.* Euripides flattered his inclination, by " obſerving that *a wife is a comfort to her huſband in " his ſickneſs and adverſity.* But he perplexed him " by a great many other ſentences, which he pro- " nounced againſt that ſex (9)." This is a mere romance, and nothing but affecting an opportunity of introducing a common place; for the life of Aventinus ſhews expreſly, that he only examined with two of his friends ſeveral paſſages of Scripture. *Sæpius multos locos ex ſacris literis ſuadentes & diſſuadentes matrimonium protulit.*

(9) Bullart, *Academié des Sciences*, pag. 148.

[*E*] *He determined upon marriage.*] Let us continue to hear the ſame Mr. Bullart. " Aventine wea- " ry of conſulting the dead and the living, and hop- " ing to meet with a wife agreeable to his wiſhes, " cried out at once, *I am an old man; I have need of " a companion to aſſiſt me, and to ſerve me in the de- " cline of life.*" Zieglerus expreſſes himſelf as follows: *Senectutem ſuam omnino conſiderans, tandem prorumpens in hæc verba dixit*; " Senex ſum, mihi miniſtrari opus " eſt." i. e. " Reflecting upon his old age, he broke " out into theſe words; *I am an old man; and have " occaſion for ſome perſon to aſſiſt me.*" His concluſion was agreeable to the rules of Logic, *Concluſio ſequitur debiliorem partem*; i. e. " The concluſion fol- " lows the weaker part." On the one hand his books and friends adviſed him to deliberate upon it all his life; and on the other his infirmities adviſed him to marry. By this concluſion he determined upon the weaker part. But it will be ſaid, had he not two children within a few years; and this even tho' the ugline's and noiſe of his devil of a wife were by no means proper incentives for that purpoſe? He was in the wrong therefore to ſay, that he wanted a wife becauſe of the infirmities of old age, ſince he had occaſion for one on account of the remains of youth, which he was ſtill ſenſible of.

[*F*] *Who deceived him ſcandalouſly.*] The writer of his Life does him a great injury in this point; for he expreſſes himſelf as follows: *Duxit Suevam, moroſam mulierem, illepidam, & omnino pauperem, deceptus ab anu quadam, quæ ei illam ut famulam ſaltem adduxerat.* i. e. " He married a woman of Suabia, " who was ill-temper'd, ugly, and extremely poor, " being deceived by an old woman, who brought " her to him as a ſervant." The old woman did not bring him this Suabian for a wife, but merely as a ſervant. In what manner then did ſhe impoſe upon him? Zieglerus ought to have told us this; for if we underſtand his expreſſions in the proper ſenſe of them, we can eaſily acquit the old woman of any imputation, and throw the whole blame upon the old man. It will be imagined, that having taken a reſolution to marry, and having loſt too much time already conſidering his age, he took the firſt woman whom he met with, and that happened to be his own maid. And thus we have another inſtance very proper to be added to the liſt of the *Colletes* and a great many others, who married their maids (10).

(10) See the *Menagiana*, p. 252. and the note [*E*] of the article BRISEIS.

[*G*] *Gave him an opportunity of making a great many experiments.*] " Having broken thro' all obſtacles, and " determined all his deliberations by his marriage, he " had nothing to do but to reflect upon the alteration " of his manner of life, and to conſider whether it " was better to maintain a poor wife, than to bear " the haughtineſs of a rich one; to have ſuch an one, " as no body would have any inclination for, than to " be at the pains of guarding a beautiful one. As " his wife was every whit as bad as Socrates's Xan- " tippe, the example of that great Philoſopher might " likewiſe ſerve for ſome conſolation to him (11)." To ſpeak the truth, our learned German was extremely unhappy; he imagined that he ſhould enter into a ſafe port, and ſecure himſelf from a thouſand inconveniences; and he expoſed himſelf to a continual ſtorm, even tho' his wife had been handſome and rich; whereas ſhe had no other portion but uglineſs and ill temper. *Aventinus vir doctus, magni judicii integritatiſque, ſed fortuna admodum tenui, quam corrupit ulterius ductâ uxore rixosâ & malorum morum, ut cum duobus malis; paupertate & uxore malâ ipſi fuerit conflictandum* (12). i. e. " Aventinus was a man " of learning, great judgment and probity, but of " a ſlender fortune, which he injured ſtill more by " marrying a wife, who was of a peeviſh temper; ſo " that he was obliged to contend with two misfor- " tunes, poverty and a bad wife."

(11) Bullart. *Acad. des Scient.* pag. 148.

(12) Conringius, *Diſſert. de Reſpub. apud* Magirum, *Etymonolog. Critic.* pag. 90.

We ſhall do him juſtice perhaps by ſuppoſing, that he did not marry this woman without having reaſoned with himſelf profoundly upon the inconveniences of it. She could not impoſe upon him with regard to her uglineſs; ſince he had the uſe of his eyes. She was brought to him only as a ſervant; and therefore he could have no expectations of finding her rich. Here are two defects, which he was very ſenſible of; one of them was, that ſhe was ugly, and the other that ſhe was poor. But this knowledge of his cannot oblige us to conclude, that he acted imprudently; for ſhe might have promiſed him an exemption from a thouſand inſupportable inconveniences. As he was a perſon of extenſive reading, he knew the maxims of the ancients with regard to beauty's being incompatible with chaſtity (13), and the haughtineſs which attends fine women (14), and which entirely poſſeſſes thoſe who bring good fortunes (15). Theſe maxims are learned at the college, and we meet with a thouſand occaſions to

(13) *Rara adeo eſt Concordia formæ Atque Pudicitiæ.* Juven. Sat. 10. verſ. 297. *Lis eſt cum forma magna pudicitiæ.* Ovid. *Epiſt.* 16. ver. 288.

(14) *Faſtus ineſt pulchris, ſequiturque ſuperbia formam.* Ovid. Faſtor. lib. 1. ver. 419.

(15) *Ita iſta ſolent, quæ viros ſubſervire ſibi poſtulant ante feroces.* Plaut. *in Mænech.* Act. 5. Scen. 2. verſ. 16. See the *Electa Plautina* of Philip Pareus at the word *Conjugium.*

varia (c). He reſolved to remove his wife thither, for which purpoſe he took a journey to Ratiſbon during the Chriſtmas Holidays; but he came thither very ill of a diſtemper, of which he died the 9th of January 1534, being ſixty eight years of age. He left but one daughter, who was then but two months old (d). He was interred in the Church of St. Hemeran at Ratiſbon, where his epitaph tells us, that he was a good Catholic (e). However it appeared from the inquiries which the Jeſuits have made, that he was a Lutheran in diſguiſe [H]. This is the argument, which the adherents to the church of Rome

(c) Leonard ab Eck.

(d) He had a ſon who died before.

(e) Extracted from his Life, written by Jerom Zieglerus, and prefixed to his Annals.

to apply them. Hence they are imprinted deeply upon the memory, and this makes us more fearful of experiencing the truth of them, if we expoſe ourſelves to the hazard. We may therefore conclude with a great deal of probability, that Aventine conſidered, that by marrying an handſome young woman, he ſhould expoſe his fore-head to a ſhameful and ſhocking diſhonour. He knew undoubtedly that beauty does not exclude a very ſincere deſire of being chaſte; but on the other hand, he imagined that it renders the execution of that deſire very difficult. The courtſhip, which is almoſt inevitable in that caſe, has a wonderful power in overcoming his good reſolutions. When he conſidered his age, he muſt be ſtill more alarmed. His being in the ſixty fourth year of his age was a new reaſon for ſuch apprehenſions; and he ſaid perhaps to himſelf, *If theſe things are done to the green tree, what ſhall be done to the dry? A young huſband is not ſecure from this misfortune; how then ſhall I eſcape, who am old?* How natural ſoever it is to fear the real evils, which attend the ſtate of an old huſband, who has a young handſome wife; yet there is much leſs difficulty to avoid them than thoſe, which are imaginary. I mean, that ſuch an huſband has more reaſon to fear the torments of his jealouſy, than the treachery of his wife. It happens much oftner, that ſhe is faithful to him, without his being perſuaded of it, than that ſhe proves falſe to him, without giving him the leaſt pain. It is probable therefore, that Aventine was more diſtruſtful of himſelf, than of an handſome wife, and that he reaſoned in this manner: *I allow, that ſhe may be really chaſte; but I am well aſſured, that I ſhall not be weak enough to be jealous, when I perceive that ſhe appears agreeable to my friends and neighbours, and that they endeavour to pleaſe her* (16)*? Tho' my jealouſy be ever ſo ill grounded, yet it will ſtill be a torment equally uneaſy and painful to me. The ſafeſt way is not to expoſe myſelf to it, but to marry my maid, whoſe uglineſs will ſecure me from this apprehenſion; for* caſta eſt quam nemo rogavit, i. e. "*ſhe "is chaſte, whom no body has ever ſollicited.*" *Where can ſhe find any one to ſollicit her, tho' ſhe ſhould form a thouſand ill deſigns? And as on the other hand ſhe is poor, I ſhall have no ground to be fearful, that ſhe ſhould prove imperious to me. She will be a mere ſubmiſſive creature, who will not venture to clamour or contradict me. Do not I know well enough what the old Poets ſay* (17)*?* If we ſuppoſe, that he reaſoned in this manner, we ſhall find that he was rather unfortunate than imprudent; for in ſhort the reaſons, which would have determined his choice, are ſpecious and plauſible. But we muſt ſuppoſe likewiſe, that the third fault was not known to him; and that his maid had addreſs enough to conceal her peeviſh, grumbling, moroſe, and ſcolding humour. She took care not to diſcover it; ſhe ſoon found out, that her maſter was reſolved to marry at all adventures; and without doubt it was not long before he gave her ſome intimations, that he would ſeek a wife out of his own houſe. As we ought not to judge of things by the event, we ſhould be cautious of charging him with imprudence upon pretence that his marriage proved unfortunate. The wiſeſt men are caught in it. Cato was deceived by his own maxims in a point of the ſame nature (18). In ſhort, in order to ſay that Aventine was imprudent, we ought to know two things; one is, that he did not ballance the reaſons above mentioned with thoſe on the contrary ſide; the other is, that if he had married a young, rich, and beautiful Lady, he would not have been involved in as many anxieties as he ſuffered by marrying his maid. Here are two ſprings of raſh judgments; we condemn perſons without knowing either the ſecret motives, which they had well conſider'd, and examined, and were determined by, or what would have been their caſe, if they had acted in any other manner.

(16) *Magno periculo cuſtoditur quod multis placet.* Publius Syrus.

(17) One of them ſaid, *Sponſam ſine dote non habere loquendi libertatem.* i. e. "A wife without a portion "had no right to "ſpeak." Here is what Plautus ſays in *Aulular.* Act. 3. Scen. 5. verſ. 60. *Quæ indotata eſt, ea in poteſtate eſt viri. Dotatæ mactant & malo damnant viros.* i. e. "She, "who has no "portion, is in "her husband's "power. Thoſe, "who have "portions, may "uſe their huſ-"bands with "the utmoſt ri-"gour.

(18) See Note [L] of the article (MARCUS) PORCIUS.

[H] *It appeared from the inquiries, which the Jeſuits have made, that he was a Lutheran in diſguiſe.*] I ſay in diſguiſe; for ſince he was buried in a church belonging to the Catholicks with the uſual ceremonies, and ſince in his *Epitaph* there were theſe words *Veræ Religionis amator*, i. e. "a Lover of the true Religi-"on," we muſt conclude, that he did not declare himſelf publickly of the Proteſtant party, not even in the article of death, in that deciſive moment, when there is no longer any ground for diſſimulation. It is certain likewiſe, that the ſtyle of his Hiſtory is entirely agreeable to the character of a Roman Catholick, if we except thoſe paſſages, in which he ſpeaks ſo freely againſt the tyranny of the Popes, and againſt the vices of the Clergy (19). We ought not therefore to be ſurprized, that Mr. Du Pleſſis oppoſes him to the Roman Catholicks, as a witneſs who was of their own Religion. Mr. Du Pleſſis did not know any thing of the Anecdotes, which Father Gretſer had publiſhed. Here follows a paſſage from him: *Addit Pleſſæus invectivæ Aventinianæ hanc clauſulam*, Hæc quidem licet profeſſione Romanus, plura forte, ſi licuiſſet dicturus. *Profeſſione Romanus, hoc eſt, Catholicus non fuit Aventinus, ſed hæreticus, cujus criminis ut alia probamenta deeſſent, id tamen ſatis ſuperque liqueret ex Epiſtolâ Melanchthonis ad Aventinum, quam ex ipſo Autographo recitavi lib. 2. contra Calvinianum* Replicatorem *cap.* 19. (20). i. e. "Du Pleſſis adds to "the invective quoted from Aventine this Clauſe, *He "ſays thus, tho' he was a Roman by profeſſion, and "would perhaps have ſaid more, if he had been at "liberty.* Aventine was not a Roman, that is a Ca-"tholick, by profeſſion, but an heretick; of which "crime tho' other proofs were wanting, yet it is ſuf-"ficiently evident from the Letter of Melanchthon to "Aventine, which I have quoted from the original "itſelf in the ſecond Book, Chap. 19. againſt the "Calviniſtic Author of the *Reply*." Coeffeteau did not know this particular; however he aſſerted very confidently, that Aventine was an heretic: *As for Du Pleſſis's repreſenting Aventine of the Romiſh profeſſion*, ſays he (21), *we ſhall never agree to that... His language diſcovers him, and we ſee every where in his Annals how violently his paſſion tranſported him againſt the holy See. Upon which account, in order to cut the matter ſhort, all that is objected to us from him ſignifies not the leaſt trifle imaginable, and we do not think, that he deſerves any anſwer any more than the impoſtor Benno, upon whoſe Memoirs he wrote the Life of that Pope* (22). Aventine has been treated as a Lutheran Author in the *Index* of prohibited Books. However Fromond did not conſider him as an heretic, but only as ſuch a perſon as Eraſmus was, in ſpeaking too freely againſt the Vices of the Monks. *Liberrimæ enim linguæ (hereticæ dicere non auſim, neque puto) & plane Eraſmicæ in Monachorum & Eccleſiaſticorum vitia fuit Aventinus.* Plus etiam nimio faciens ſchiſmaticis, & parum integra fide res Romanorum Pontificum prodidiſſe perhibetur, *ideoque meruit in claſſe Auctorum caute legendorum ab Indice Expurgatorio recenſeri* (23). i. e. "Aventine took a great deal of "liberty, even as great as Eraſmus himſelf, in de-"claiming againſt the Vices of the Monks and the "Clergy; tho' I will not venture to ſay, that he was "an heretick, nor do I think ſo. *He is likewiſe ſaid "to have been too great a favourer of Schiſmatics, "and to have given an unfaithful account of the ac-"tions of the Popes*, for which reaſon he deſerved a "place in the *Index Expurgatorius* among the Au-"thors who are to be read with caution." Perſons of the moſt prodigious memory do not often know what is very common. I ſhall give an inſtance of this. Conringius had forgot, that thoſe who publiſhed at Ingolſtad the *Annals of Aventine*, retrenched what did not appear to them to be agreeable to the character of a good Catholick (24). *Libri ejus*, ſays he (25),

(19) *See* Rivet in his *Réponſe à Coeffeteau pour du Pleſſis*, tom. 2. pag. 167.

(20) Gretſer *in Examine Myſterii Pleſſæani*, cap. 45. pag. 354.

(21) Coeffeteau, *Réponſe au Myſtere d'Iniquite*, pag. 676.

(22) That is of Gregory VII.

(23) Libert. Fromond. *in Libro de Orbe Terræ immobili*, pag. 24, 25.

(24) See note [C].

Rome make uſe of in order to weaken the force of his teſtimony againſt the conduct of the Popes and the vicious lives of the Prieſts; for the Proteſtants have an hundred times quoted the *Annals of Aventine*, in order to ſhew the diſorders of the church. The greateſt part of the other writings of this Author have never been printed [*I*]. Moreri has ſucceeded very ill in this article [*K*].

he (25), *poſt mortem demum ab ipſis Pontificiis Ingolſtadii ſunt editi; ut hinc appareat primos ſaltem editores non improbâſſe, quæ ibi reperiantur.* i. e. "His books "were publiſhed after his death by the Papiſts themſelves at Ingolſtad; ſo that it is evident from "hence, that the firſt editors did diſapprove of what "we find there." He acknowledges, that Aventine kept a correſpondence by letters with ſeveral of the Proteſtants, and particularly with Melancthon, and that he inclined to their party; which did not prevent him from dying in the Romiſh communion. *Vixit ſuperiori ſæculo, quando maxima illa ſacrorum mutatio fieret, & multa Pontificiæ religionis dogmata improbavit. Per literas familiaritatem coluit cum Proteſtantium nonnullis, & cum Philippo quoque Melanchone; reperire tamen non potui reliquiſſe eum penitus Eccleſiam Romanam utut in Proteſtantes videatur propenſior; vixit enim & mortuus eſt in illa Eccleſia, ſepultuſque Reginoburgi in Monaſterio S. Emerani ceremoniis Pontificiæ Eccleſiæ uſitatis* (26), i. e. "He lived in the laſt age, "when that remarkable alteration of Religion hap"pened, and he diſapproved of a great many doc"trines of the Popiſh Church. He maintained a cor"reſpondence by Letters with ſome of the Proteſtants, "and even with Philip Melancthon himſelf. How"ever I cannot find that he abſolutely quitted the "Church of Rome, notwithſtanding that he ſeemed "more inclined to the Proteſtants; for he lived and "died in that Church, and was buried at Ratiſbon, "in the Monaſtery of St. Hemeran with the Ceremo"nies commonly uſed among the Papiſts." I obſerve, that we may very properly compare Aventine's fate with that of Father Paul.

(25) Conring. *apud* Magirum, *Eponymolog. Critic.* pag. 90.

(26) Idem, ibid.

[*I*] *The greateſt part of the other writings of the Author have never been printed.*] Voſſius obſerves, that Aventine tells his readers in page 236 of his *Annals*, (that is in p. 344 of the edition of 1580.) that he had publiſhed *the Hiſtory of Oetingen*, a city in Suabia; *publicatæ à ſe Hiſtoriæ Utinenſium meminit* (27). Geſner does not mention this Hiſtory. He ſpeaks only of *a Grammar* publiſhed by Aventine in 1519, and of a Book concerning the manner of counting on the fingers, publiſhed at Ratiſbon in 1532, to which the Author had added the Summary of a great work, which wanted nothing but the aſſiſtance of a Mecænas in order to be publiſhed. The title of the Book printed in 1532 is as follows: *Numerandi per digitos manuſque (quinetiam loquendi) veterum conſuetudines Abacus ſive Explicatio ex Beda cum picturis & imaginibus, unà cum capitibus rerum, quibus illuſtrabitur Germania ab Aventino, modo contingat benignus Mecænas.* Geſner gives us the ſubſtance of this great work of Aventine. We find by it, that this Author had formed an excellent and very extenſive plan for explaining the Antiquities of Germany. Even the general view of the ſubjects, which it was to treat of, is ſufficient to aſtoniſh one. See the Letter which he wrote to Vadianus in the year 1530 (28). He deſigned to publiſh very ſoon *a Chronicle* like that of Euſebius, *an Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory*, from the beginning of the world to his own time, ſome *ancient Grammarians, a Greek and Latin Dictionary, Notes upon Claudian* (29) *&c.* It is not known what became of theſe works. That we may form a notion how he was capable of compoſing ſo many Books, we muſt know that he began to ſtudy at day-break, and that he often returned to his ſtudy a little after ſupper till midnight (30). As he broke the ice for thoſe, who have laboured upon the Antiquities of Bavaria (31), we ought not to wonder that there are ſome errors in his Annals (32). He would have found more in their works, if they had preceded him. Lambecius has criticized upon him in a great many points (33).

(27) Voſſ. *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 655.

(28) It is the 49th of the *Century* publiſhed by Goldaſt.

(29) *See* Geſner's *Bibliotb.* folio 386.

(30) Ziegler. *in ejus vitâ.*

(31) Conring. *apud* Magirum, *Eponymolog. Critic.* pag. 90.

(32) Brunnerus in his *Annals of Bavaria* criticizes upon him frequently. *See* Zeiller, *de Hiſt.* pag. 13.

(33) Lambec. *Commentar. Bibloth. Cæſar.* lib. 2. cap. 1, 2. *Sed* Magir. *Eponym.* pag. 91.

[*K*] *Moreri has ſucceeded very ill in this article.*] I. It was a pardonable miſtake to have ſpoken of Aventine in his firſt edition under the letter I; but to repeat the ſame error, juſtly expoſes him to cenſure. He could not but know, that every body complained of him for placing of the famous men according to their Chriſtian names. Why did not he then remove the cauſe of this complaint in the following editions? II. Aventine was born in the year 1466, and not in 1460. III. As he had once committed this miſtake, he ſhould have told us, that he was ſixty eight years of age, when he died in 1534. He ſhould have committed one error more by making him ſeventy four years of age; and by not adding this ſecond miſtake to the former, he has been guilty of an egregious blunder. He pretends, that from the year 1460 to 1534 there were but ſixty eight years. IV. It is not true, that Nicholas Geſner publiſhed the *Annals* of Aventine. He ſhould have ſaid Nicholas Ciſner (34). It would be a very improper manner of ſpeaking, that Nicholas Ciſner publiſhed theſe *Annals* with Additions; for it is plain that this would intimate, that he muſt have added ſomething of his own to them; which is contrary to the truth. What he did was only this, that he publiſhed theſe *Annals* from a manuſcript of Aventine, which had not been caſtrated; ſo that his edition is more compleat than that of Zieglerus, becauſe it contains all the paſſages which Zieglerus had ſuppreſſed. Voſſius's words, which occaſioned Moreri to miſtake, would not have miſled a perſon of any attention; for they intimate plainly enough, that Ciſner only reſtored to Aventine what had been retrenched in his work. *Annales Bojorum libris VII reliquit; quos ex authenticis codd. reſtituit & auxit Nicolaus Ciſnerus* (35). Voſſius is a little blameable for not having ſaid any thing concerning the edition, which had been mutilated; for if he mentioned it, what I have juſt quoted would have been more clear. VI. A Prieſt, as Moreri was, acts a very ſtrange part, when he calls the additions of Nicholas Ciſner *conſiderable*; for theſe additions conſiſt only of reflections againſt the Popes and the Romiſh Clergy. VII. The *other pieces*, which Aventine *left behind him*, are not thoſe, which did not appear orthodox to Cardinal Baronius. That Cardinal was diſpleaſed with the Annals of Bavaria. VIII. It is a miſtake to quote Baronius *T. IX. Anni A. C. 772* (36); for this inſinuates as if Baronius had employed at leaſt nine volumes upon the year 722 only.

(34) In the Holland edition it is Nicholas Geſner.

(35) Voſſ. *de Hiſt. Latin.* pag. 625.

(36) Voſſius, who is the only Author, whom Moreri conſulted with regard to Aventine, might have prevented him from falling into this error, for he quotes *ex* tom. 9. *ad annum* 772.

☞AVENZOAR [ABU MERWAN ABDALMALEC EBN ZOHR], an eminent Arabian Phyſician, flouriſhed about the end of the eleventh or the beginning of the twelfth Century [*A*]. He was of noble deſcent, and born at Sevil, the Capital of Andaluzia, where he exerciſed his profeſſion with great reputation. His grandfather and father were both Phyſicians (*a*). The large eſtate he inherited from his anceſtors, ſet him above

(*a*) Nic. Anton. *Biblioth. Vet. Hiſpan.* tom. 2. pag. 232. edit. Romæ 1696.

[*A*] *He flouriſhed about the end of the 11th or beginning of the 12th Century.*] I take this latitude, becauſe I do not much rely on the dates of Leo Africanus, he being frequently miſtaken therein. If he is right here, Avenzoar died at ninety two years of age, in the 564th (1) year of the Hejira (2): but this ſeems not to agree ſo well with what he ſays before, viz. that Avenzoar was Phyſician to Joſeph Ebn Tâſefin, King of Morocco, and had before ſerved other Princes in the ſame capacity; for Joſeph Ebn Tâſefin died in the year 500; and Avenzoar, according to the account above, was then but eight and twenty. Dr. Freind writes that he lived to the age of 135; that he began to practice at forty, or as others ſay at twenty, and had the advantage of a longer experience than almoſt any one ever had; for he enjoyed perfect health to his laſt hour (3).

(1) A. C. 1167-8.

(2) Leo Afric. *de viris quibuſd. illuſtr. apud Arabes*, cap. 16.

(3) Freind's *Hiſt. of Phyſic.* Part 2. pag. 74.

above practiſing altogether for gain: he therefore took no fees from the poor, or from artificers, though he refuſed not the preſents of Princes and Great Men. His liberality was extended even to his enemies; for which reaſon he uſed to ſay, that they hated him not for any fault of his, but rather out of envy (*a*). Avenzoar was contemporary with Averroes, who, according to Leo Africanus, heard the Lectures of the former, and learned Phyſic of him (*b*); this ſeems the more probable becauſe Averroes more than once gives Avenzoar a very high and deſerved encomium, calling him *admirable*, *glorious*, *the treaſure of all knowledge*, and *the moſt ſupreme in Phyſic from the time of Galen to his own* (*c*). Avenzoar notwithſtanding is by the generality of Writers reckoned an Empiric, though, as it ſhould ſeem, unjuſtly [*B*]. I ſhall take notice of his works in the note [*C*]. Our Phyſician left a ſon, known alſo by the name of Ebn Zohr, who followed his father's profeſſion, and became very eminent therein. This ſon was in great favour with al Manſûr Khalif of Morocco; and is the Author of ſeveral Treatiſes of Phyſic (*d*). He was one of thoſe who brought an accuſation of hereſy againſt Averroes, as may be ſeen elſewhere (*e*).

(*a*) J. Leo Africanus, *de viris quibuſdam illuſtribus apud Arabes*, cap. 16.

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

(*c*) Freind's *Hiſt. of Phyſic*, Part 2. pag. 74.

(*d*) Leo Afric. *ubi ſupra*, cap. 18.

(*e*) See the remark [*M*] of the article AVERROES.

[*B*] *Avenzoar is by the generality of Writers reckoned an Empiric.*] Dr. Freind tells us, *that he cannot imagine why they pitched upon Avenzoar for this character, which ſuits him leſs than any of the reſt of the Arabians.* "He was bred, *continues that Author*, in a phyſical family, his father and grandfather being both practitioners, whom he always remembers with great gratitude and honour. We have his own teſtimony that he had a regular education, and that he not only learnt what properly belongs to a Phyſician, but, out of a great deſire of knowledge, every thing beſides which relates to Pharmacy or Surgery." Dr. Freind afterwards obſerves, "that he was averſe to Quackery, and rejects the idle ſuperſtitions of Aſtrologers; and throughout all his work profeſſes himſelf ſo much of the *dogmatical* or rational Sect, which was directly oppoſite to the *empirical*, that he has a great deal of reaſoning about the cauſes and ſymptoms of diſtempers; and as in his Theory he chiefly, if not only, follows Galen, ſo he quotes him upon all occaſions, oftener than the reſt of the Arabians do. Notwithſtanding he is ſo Galenical, there are ſeveral particulars in him which ſeldom or never occur in other Authors; and there are ſome caſes which he relates from his own experience, which are worth peruſing (4)."

(4) Idem, p. 75, 76, 78, 79.

[*C*] *I ſhall take notice of his works in the note.*] He wrote a Book intitled, *Tayaſſir fi'lmadâwât w'alıadbir*, i. e. "The method of preparing medicines and diet," which is much eſteemed, and ſhews him to have been a man of buſineſs and experience (5). This work was tranſlated into Hebrew, in the year of Chriſt 1280, and thence into Latin by Paravicius, whoſe verſion has had ſeveral editions (6). The Author added a Supplement to it, under the title of *Jâmé*, or *a Collection*. He alſo wrote a treatiſe *Fi'ladwiyat wa'laghdiyat*, i. e. "Of Medicines and Food;" wherein he treats of their qualities (7). Y.

(5) Idem, ibid.

(6) *Vide* Nic. Anton. *Bib. Vet. Hiſp.* tom. 2. pag. 232, &c.

(7) *Vide* D'Herbel. pag. 64, 847, and 938.

AVERROES (*a*) one of the moſt ſubtle Philoſophers, who ever appeared among the Arabians, was of Corduba (*b*), and flouriſhed in the twelfth Century [*A*]. He was extremely attached to Ariſtotle, and he wrote Commentaries upon Works in ſo admirable a manner, that he was ſtiled the *Commentator* by way of Eminence. It is ſurpriſing that though he did not underſtand Greek, he ſhould be able to penetrate ſo well into the ſenſe of the original. And therefore it is reaſonable to think, that if he had been ſkilled in that Language, he would have been a perfect maſter of the ſentiments of Ariſtotle. *Qui Græcè neſcius felicitèr adeo mentem Ariſtotelis, quid non feciſſet, ſi linguam ſciſſet Græcam* (*c*)? This is what ſome learned men have ſaid of him; but others aſſure us, that he has extremely miſunderſtood that Philoſopher [*B*], not only from the want of genius, but of the

(*a*) See all his names in the note [*C*].

(*b*) In the *Lindenius Renovatus* it is falſely ſaid, that Corduba is a city of Arabia.

(*c*) Voſſius, *de Philoſ. Sect.* pag. 90. *See* Keckerman's words in note [*I*].

[*A*] *He flouriſhed in the twelfth Century.*] I know of no other proof than this, that his two ſons were ſeen by Ægidius Romanus at the Court of Frederic Barbaroſſa (1). *Ætatem ex eo colligimus, quod Ægidius Romanus in nono Quodlibeto refert ſe duos ejus filios vidiſſe in aulâ Frederici Barbaroſſæ. Is verò regere cœpit anno* CIↃ CLII, *ac imperavit annos XXXVII.* i. e. "We collect the age in which he lived, from Ægidius Romanus's mentioning in his ninth Quodlibet, that he ſaw his two ſons at the Court of Frederic Barbaroſſa. Now that Emperor began his reign in 1152, and reigned thirty ſeven years." Theſe are Voſſius's words in page 114 of his Book *de Philoſophia*, C. xiv. See likewiſe Chapt. xvii. of his treatiſe *de Philoſophorum Sectis*, *p.* 91. in which he proves by the teſtimony of *Conciliator* and the ſame Ægidius Romanus, that Averroes flouriſhed in the year 1150. He refers us to the Quodlibets of this Ægidius *L.* 2. *Quæſtione de unitate Intellectus.* Reineſius obſerves, that the death of Averroes is placed in the year 595 of the Hegira, which is the 1198th of the Chriſtian Æra (2). I wiſh that Mr. Konig, who refers us to Reineſius, had not placed it in 1225. He ought to have referred us to Hottinger, and corrected him; for that learned Swiſs having aſſerted after John Leo, that Averroes died in the year 603 of the Hegira, makes that year correſpond to the year 1225 of our Æra (3). This is a great miſtake; it correſponds partly with our 1206, and partly with our 1207. Bartolocci's *Bibliotheca Rabbinica* informs us, that Averroes flouriſhed from the year 1131 to 1216, which was that of his death; that his Commentaries upon Ariſtotle's Phyſics were finiſhed at Seville in 1187; and that his Commentaries upon the Metaphyſics of the ſame Author were written in the year 1192 (4).

(1) Naudé *Apolog. des grans Hommes accuſez de Magie.* cap. 14. pag. 354. He quotes Ægidius Romanus, *Quodlib.* 9. *See likewiſe* Petri Petiti *Medici Pariſienſ. Obſervat. Miſcellan.* pag. 191.

(2) Reineſ. *Ep.* 15. *ad* Hofmannum, pag. 32.

(3) Hottinger. *Bib. Theolog.* pag. 279.

(4) Bartolocci *Bibl. Rabb.* tom. 1. pag. 13. He quotes Caſarr. *in Chronolog. Compendio.*

[*B*] *Others aſſure us, that he has extremely miſunderſtood that Philoſopher . . . . for want of the proper knowledge in polite Literature.*] This is the opinion of Ludovicus Vives. *Nomen eſt Commentatoris nactus*, ſays he (5), *homo qui in Ariſtotele enarrando nihil minus explicat quam eum ipſum, quem ſuſcepit declarandum. Sed nec potuiſſet explicare etiamſi divino fuiſſet ingenio, quum eſſet humano, & quidem infra mediocritatem. Nam quid tandem adferebat, quo in Ariſtotele enarrando poſſet eſſe probe inſtructus? Non cognitionem veteris memoriæ, non ſcientiam placitorum priſcæ diſciplinæ, & intelligentiam ſectarum, quibus Ariſtoteles paſſim ſcatet. Itaque videas eum peſſimè philoſophos omnes antiquos citare, ut qui nullum unquam legerit, ignarus Græcitatis ac Latinitatis, pro Polo Ptholomæum ponit, pro Pythagora Pythagoram, pro Cratylo Democritum, libros Platonis titulis ridiculis inſcribit; & ita de iis loquitur, ut vel cæco perſpicuum ſit literam eum in illis legiſſe nullam. At quam confidenter audet pronunciare hoc aut illud ab eis dici, & quod impudentius eſt, non dici, quum ſolos viderit Alexandrum, Themiſtium & Nicolaum Damaſcenum, & hos, ut apparet, verſos in Arabicum perverſiſſimè ac corruptiſſimè. Citat enim eos nonnunquam, & contradicit, & cum eis rixatur, ut nec ipſe quidem, qui ſcripſit, intelligat. Ariſtotelem verò quomodo legit? non in ſuâ origine purum & integrum, non in lacunam Latinam derivatam, non enim potuit linguarum expers, ſed de Latino in Arabicum tranſvaſatum.* i. e. "He obtained the name of the *Commentator*, tho' he has done nothing leſs

(5) *De Cauſis corrupt. Artium*, lib. 5. pag. 167.

the proper knowledge in polite Literature. He was Profeſſor in the Univerſity of Morocco [C], and made a great progreſs in Phyſic, but he underſtood the theory much better than the practice of it [D]. He is thought to have been the author of a notion which is

" leſs in his Explication of Ariſtotle, than explain that " Author. But this he could not have performed, " tho' he had been a maſter of a divine genius; " whereas he was of a very ordinary one. For what " qualifications had he for explaining Ariſtotle in a " proper manner? He had no acquaintance with an- " tiquity, or the ancient doctrines of Philoſophy, " nor any knowledge of the different ſects, which are " every where mentioned in Ariſtotle. Upon which " account we find, that he quotes all the old Philoſo- " phers very erroneouſly, having never read one of " them, as he was ignorant of the Greek and Latin " tongues. He puts Ptholemy for Polus, Pythagoras " for Prothagoras, Democritus for Cratylus, and " quotes Plato's Books by abſurd titles, and ſpeaks " of them in ſuch a manner, that it is evident even " to a blind man, that he never read a letter in them. " He preſumes very confidently to aſſert, that ſuch " or ſuch a thing was ſaid by them, or, what is ſtill " more impudent, not ſaid by them, while he had " ſeen only Alexander, Themiſtius, and Nicholas " Damaſcenus, and even theſe, as appears plainly, " tranſlated into Arabic very corruptly. For he " quotes them ſometimes, and contradicts and diſ- " putes againſt them; ſo that even the Writer him- " ſelf does not underſtand the points in queſtion. But " how does he read Ariſtotle? not in the original, ge- " nuine and entire; not tranſlated into Latin to leſs ad- " vantage; for he could not do this, ſince he knew no- " thing of thoſe languages; but tranſlated to ſtill great " diſadvantage from the Latin into Arabic." He ſhews afterwards by a particular inſtance how much this interpreter of Ariſtotle is miſtaken in his Author (6). See Celius Rhodiginus (7), who tells us in general almoſt the ſame thing. We muſt not truſt Father Rapin, who repreſents him as ſaying this of Avicenna (8). This Jeſuit did not always quote from the original. However we ought not to deſpiſe the following paſſage of his. " As Averroes knew nothing of Ariſto- " tle except from an incorrect tranſlation of him, he " has fallen into ſo many ſhocking miſtakes of his " ſenſe, that Bagolin a Philoſopher of Verona, Zi- " mara, and Mantinus have in vain attempted to " correct him (9)."

(6) That is, by the quotation of a paſſage in Ariſtotle's *Metaphyſics*.
(7) Cœlius Rhodig. *Antiq. Lect.* lib. 3. cap. 2. pag. 110.
(8) *Reflex. ſur la Philoſophie*, num. 15. pag. 339, 340. of the Holland edition.
(9) Ibid.

[C] *He was Profeſſor to the Univerſity of Morocco.*] It was under the third King of the race of the Almohades after the expulſion of the Almoravides. Read the following paſſage of Reineſius. *Quem Averroem appellant vulgò ſcholæ, ejus nomen integrum eſt Abual-Walid Mohammed, ebn Achmed, ebn Mohammed, ebn Roſhd; docuitque in Academia Maroccana auſpiciis Jacobi, tertii ex Almohadis, poſt ejectos Almoravidas reges* (10). i. e. " The entire name of him, whom " the Schools commonly call Averroes, is Abual- " Walid, ebn Achmed, ebn Mohammed, ebn Roſhd; " and he taught in the Univerſity of Morocco under " Jacob the third King of the Almohades, after the " expulſion of the Almoravides."

(10) Reineſ. *Epiſt.* 15. *ad* Hofmann. p. 32.

[D] *He made a great progreſs in Phyſic; but he underſtood the theory much better than the practice of it.*] His chief work in Phyſic is that, which is entitled *Colliget*. He treats in it of the Science in general. The reader will not be diſpleaſed to read the following paſſage from the Preface of it. *Ex præcepto* nobilis domini Audelach Sempſe, *qui pro conſilio ſuorum Philoſophorum Avoſait & Avenchalit injunxit mihi ut conſcriberem opus, quod Arabico ſermone totam medicinæ ſcientiam contineret, ad approbandum judicandumve ſententias veterum, collegi hoc opus* Colliget, *id eſt*, Univerſale, *ſic inſcriptum propter ordinem doctrinæ obſervandum, qui paulatim ab univerſalibus ad particularia procedet. In hoc enim libro univerſales regulas inchoavi, & deinceps favente Deo alium librum de iis, quæ particularia ſunt inſtituam, &c.* (11). i. e. " At " the deſire of the noble Lord Audelach Sempſe, who " by the advice of his Philoſophers Avoſait and Aven- " chalit enjoined me to write a Book in Arabic, which " ſhould contain the whole Art of Phyſic, in order " to approve and form a judgment of the opinions of " the ancients, I collected this work *Colliget*, that is, " *Univerſal*, which is intitled ſo, on account of the " order to be obſerved in teaching, which proceeds " by degrees from univerſals to particulars. For in " this Book I have begun univerſal rules; and here- " after thro' the mercy of God I ſhall undertake an- " other treatiſe upon particulars, &c." To ſhew, that he valued himſelf upon his ſkill in Phyſic, it will be ſufficient for me to obſerve, that he was a rival of the great Avicenna, and ſo zealous an enemy of him, that he avoids mentioning of him in his writings. *Avicennæ Medici æmulus & inimiciſſimus fuit, ut eum nominare in ſuis libris vereatur* (12). His affectation in that point is very evident. This was probably the reaſon why in refuting a doctrine maintained by Avicenna, he only attacked it as Galen's opinion. I mean the doctrine that the animal ſpirits, which occaſion joy, are bright, and that thoſe, which cauſe melancholy, are black. Mr. Petit did not take notice of this affectation of Averroes. *Nunc quibus mentis penetrationibus Averrois hanc Avicennæ opinionem impugnat, videamus; quanquam eo loco directè Avicennam non petit, ſed Galenum, ſpontaneum melancholicorum metum ab humeris, qui in iis abundat, nigritudine repetentem; verum quæ ibi Galeno objicit, pari impetu in memoratum Avicennæ opinionem redeunt* (13). i. e. " Let " us now ſee with what Arguments Averroes attacks " this opinion of Avicenna; tho' he does not directly " fall upon Avicenna in that paſſage, but upon Galen, " who aſſerts, that the ſpontaneous fear of melan- " choly perſons proceeds from the blackneſs of the " humours with which they abound. But what he " objects to Galen upon that point, falls with equal " force upon the abovementioned notion of Avicenna." Averroes, either out of deſign or forgetfulneſs, had acted in a very different manner with regard to Avenpace; for he mentions him as the Author of a Remark, which he might have read in Philoponus (14). This may be obſerved by the bye. Now it appears, that he was more ſkilful in the theory than in the practice of Phyſic from his own confeſſion, as Mr. Petit obſerves. *Averrois fatetur de ſe ultro in ſeptimo eorum librorum, quos* Colliget *vulgus appellat, cap.* 6. Ego, inquit, non ſtudui ei ſcientiæ (medicinæ,) ut videar mihi in eâ eſſe ſufficiens; *& alibi negat ſe in eorum numero eſſe, qui ægris remedia adhibent* (15). i. e. " Averroes acknowledges with regard to him- " ſelf in the ſeventh of thoſe Books, which are com- " monly called *Colliget*, c. 6. *I*, ſays he, *have not ſtu- " died that art* (Phyſic) *that I might make myſelf perfect " in it*; and in another place he declares, that he was " not one of thoſe, who gave medicines to the ſick." This paſſage of Mr. Petit is much more exact than the following words of Voſſius: *Aver-roes Cordubenſis cognomento* Commentator, *Medicus non tam practicus, quàm theoreticus. Fuit Medicus Memarolini Regis* (16), i. e. " Aver-roes of Corduba, ſurnamed the *Commenta- " tor*, was not ſo much a Phyſician in practice as in " theory. He was Phyſician to King Memarolinus." The laſt words weaken rather than confirm the former; for to be Phyſician to a Prince requires a great deal of practice. I ſhall ſay nothing of Memarolini (17), which was not a proper name, but that of a dignity, and conſequently by no means proper to be joined to the word *Regis*. Mr. Mercklinus did not reflect upon this, when he tells us, that he ſeems to have been Phyſician to King Miramolinus; *videtur Medicus Regis Miramolini* (18). Symphorian Champier was a very ill guide in this point. He tells us, that Averroes lived *tempore Miramolini Regis apud Cordubam* (19); i. e. " in the time of King Miramolinus at Corduba." We may obſerve that the Phyſicians of Paris, who are ſtrenuous partiſans for bleeding, will not readily agree, that Averroes was but indifferently ſkilled in the practice of Phyſic; for it is ſaid, that his example contributed very much to remove an error, which they diſapprove of. Read the following words of Stephen Paſquier. " How many Ages have we practiſed Phy- " ſic, imagining, that we ought not to bleed a child " till he comes to be fourteen years old; and that " bleeding before that time was not a remedy, but " certain death? This was an hereſy, in which we " ſhould have continued to this day, if it had not " been

(11) *Præfat.* Averrois *apud* Geſner. *in Biblioth.* folio 101.

(12) Symphorianus Campeg. *apud* Geſner. ibid. fol. 100. *See* Cœlius Rhodiginus, cap. 12. lib. 30. p. 1684. *and* Scaliger *againſt* Cardan *Exercit.* lxi. num. 5.

(13) *Differt de Homeri Nepenthe*, pag. 89.

(14) *See the ſame* Petitus's *Miſcellan. Obſerv.* lib. 3. cap. 18.

(15) Idem, ibid. lib. 2. cap. 7. pag. 99, 100.

(16) Voſſ. *de Philoſ.* cap. 14. pag. 114.

(17) This dignity is not well Latiniz'd.

(18) Mercklin. *in Lindenio renovato*, pag. 94.
(19) Symph. Campegius *de claris Medicis.*

is very abſurd, and very contrary to the Chriſtian faith [E], and yet made ſo formidable a progreſs

" been for Averroes the Arabian, who was the firſt " perſon, that ventured to make the experiment up- " on his own ſon, between ſix and ſeven years " of age, who was cured of a pleuriſy by that " means (20)."

(20) Paſquier, tom. 2. of his *Letters*, lib. 29. pag. 548.

[E] *He is thought to have been the Author of a notion, which is very abſurd, and very contrary to the true Chriſtian faith.*] It would be much more proper, in my opinion, to ſay that he explained and illuſtrated it, and that having maintained it with more application than had been done before, he in a manner revived it; for the ſame Pomponatius, who aſſures us in the ſecond chapter, that it was a monſter invented by Averroes, *Figmentum & monſtrum ab Averroe confictum* (21), had ſaid in the third chapter, that Themiſtius and Averroes taught the ſame thing. *Averroes itaque & ut exiſtimo ante eum Themiſtius concordes poſuere animam intellectivam realiter diſtingui ab anima corruptibili, verum ipſam eſſe unam numero in omnibus hominibus, mortalem verò multiplicatam* (22). i. e. " Averroes therefore, and, as I think, before him " Themiſtius agree in aſſerting, that the rational ſoul " is really diſtinct from the corruptible; but that it " is only one in all mankind; whereas the mortal " ſoul is multiplied." The Jeſuits of Coimbra go ſtill higher than this; for they affirm, that Theophraſtus underſtood the doctrine of Ariſtotle his maſter in this manner. *Occurrit alia ſententia exiſtimantium in diſciplinâ Ariſtotelis ponendam eſſe unam duntaxat animam intellectricem, ſive unum intellectum, qui omnibus hominibus aſſiſtat, ut ſolis lumen univerſitati. . . . Sic enim Ariſtotelem interpretati ſunt ejus diſcipulus & ſcholæ ſucceſſor Theophraſtus, Themiſtius, Simplicius, Averroes, aliique non pauci, & ſi non omnes eodem modo de hujuſmodi intellectu locuti fuerint* (23). i. e. " We " meet likewiſe with another opinion, which is that " of thoſe perſons, who imagine that according to " Ariſtotle's Philoſophy there is but one rational ſoul, " or one intellect, which ſerves all men, as the ſun " does the univerſe. For in this manner Ariſtotle is " explained by his ſcholar Theophraſtus, who ſuc- " ceeded him in his ſchool, and by Themiſtius, Sim- " plicius, Averroes, and many others, tho' all of " them have not expreſſed themſelves in the ſame " way concerning this intellect." They add that ſe- " veral moderns have acknowledged, that according to Ariſtotle's hypotheſes, the underſtanding of all mankind is but one and the ſame ſubſtance. *Hoc quidem argumentum permovit etiam ad prædictam intellectus unitatem in Ariſtotelis doctrinâ aſſerendam non paucos è recentioribus Peripateticis, in quibus ſunt Thom. Anglicus, Achillinus, Odo Jandunus, Mirandulanus, Zimara, Vicomereatus, & quidam alii* (24). i. e. " This ar- " gument likewiſe induced not a few of the modern " Peripatetic Philoſophers to aſſert, that the above- " mentioned unity of the intellect is contained in " Ariſtotle's Philoſophy; in which number were Tho- " mas Anglicus, Achillini, Odo Jandunus, Miran- " dulanus, Zimara, Vicomereatus, and ſome others." But that ſome among theſe moderns affirm that this intellect is in all men as an aſſiſtant form, and that others maintain, that it is only an informing form. The latter opinion is that of Mirandulanus (25), and Achillini (26). But here we may take notice of a miſtake like that of Pomponatius. The Jeſuits of Coimbra aſcribe to Averroes in another paſſage the invention of the doctrine of the Unity of the Intellect of all mankind. This will appear more ſurprizing, when we ſhall ſee the words, which precede the paſſage, in which they affirm this. *Secunda* (ſententia) *fuit Avicennæ 9 Metaph. cap. quarto, & in lib. Natur. parte 5. Avempace in epiſtolâ de lumine, & Græci cujuſdam Marini, cujus mentionem facit hoc loco Philopanus, aientium intellectum agentem eſſe ſubſtantiam quandam ſeparatam, quam Avicenna Cholcodæam nuncupebat. Item placuit Averroi in libello* de Beatitudine Animæ, *cap. 5. & in* Epitome Metaph. *tractatu 4. qui errori errorem ſubnectens, aliorum veſtigia ſecutus, unum omnium hominum finxit communem intellectum, ut alibi retulimus* (27). " The ſecond opinion was that " of Avicenna 9. *Metaph. c. IV, & in Lib. Natur. part. 5.* of Avempace in his Epiſtle *de Lumine*, and " of a Greek, whoſe name was Marinus, mentioned " by Philoponus in this place; who all aſſert that the " *Intellectus agens*, or *acting Intellect* is a ſeparate ſub- " ſtance which Avicenna calls *Cholcodæa*. The ſame " notion was approved of by Averroes in his book " *de Beatitudine Animæ*, c. 5. and in his *Epitome Me- " taph. Tractat.* 4. who adding one error to another, " and following the footſteps of others, pretended " that there is one common Intellect among all " mankind, as we have obſerved in another place." This ſignifies, that the unity of the underſtanding is a fiction, which Averroes added to the errors of others, and yet it is evident, that this fiction is not at all different from the doctrine, which was juſt before aſcribed to Avicenna, &c. We may recollect, that the human underſtanding, according to the ſentiments of Averroes, is the loweſt of intelligences, and holds the meaneſt place in the univerſe (28). *Eſſe mentium infimam omnium & unicam. Nam ſicuti cæleſtes globi ſingulas habere mentes videntur, ita & orbis hic inferior unam, ut ipſe vult, habet, quæ non hujus hominis ſit, vel illius, ſed humanæ ſpeciei mens ſit, & dicatur, ut ſpeciei unicæ unicus ſit intellectus in hoc orbe inferiori, ut plerique intelligunt, ubique totus compingi* (29). i. e. " That it is the loweſt of all intelli- " gences, and ſingle. For as the celeſtial ſpheres " ſeem to have each of them particular intelligences, " ſo this lower orb has one, according to his doc- " trine, which does not belong to this or that particu- " lar man; but it is the ſoul of the human ſpecies; " ſo that there may be ſaid to be one intellect to " one ſpecies in this lower orb, as moſt underſtand " it, that the whole is contained every where." However that be, when the Jeſuits confute this pretended unity of the underſtanding in all mankind, they only attack this Philoſopher, ſo firmly were they perſuaded, that he ought at leaſt to be conſidered as the principal defender of that Chimera. They obſerve that Scotus declares, that Averroes deſerved to be exterminated by mankind; and that others aſſert, that his doctrine is ſo ſhocking a monſter, that the Deſarts of Arabia never produced a greater. *Hæc Commentatoris ſeu Commentitoris potius de unitate intellectus ſententia adeo ſtulta eſt, ut merito Scotus in 4. d. 43. q. 2. dixerit dignum eſſe Averroem, quo ob has ineptias ex hominum communione averruncetur. Alii verò hoc ejus figmentum monſtrum vocârint, quo nullum majus Arabum ſylvæ genuerint. Certè hoc unum ſat eſſe debuiſſet ad eos coarguendos, qui filium Rois tanti faciunt, & ejus animam Ariſtotelis animam eſſe dicant* (30). The laſt part of this paſſage informs us, that among other compliments given to this Arabian, it was ſaid that he had the ſoul of Ariſtotle tranſmigrated into him. The Jeſuits of Coimbra affirm, that in order to confute this, it is ſufficient to fix only upon his notion of the unity of the underſtanding. This reflection is falſe; for this doctrine, as a great many of the moderns acknowledge, is only an improvement and illuſtration of Ariſtotle's principles. I could make ſeveral remarks to prove this; but I ſhall content myſelf with the following one; that according to the hypotheſis of this Philoſopher, the multiplication of individuals can have no other foundation but matter, from whence it follows, that the underſtanding is one, ſince according to Ariſtotle it is ſeparate and diſtinct from matter. *Viderunt Ariſtotelem ſimpliciter probare intellectum poſſibilem eſſe immixtum & immaterialem* (31). This is the obſervation of Pomponatius. *Quod verò unicus ſit intellectus in omnibus hominibus ſive poſſibilis ponatur, patere poteſt ex eo, quoniam apud Peripateticos eſt celebrata propoſitio, multiplicationem individuam in eadem ſpecie non poſſe eſſe, niſi per materiam quantam, ut dicitur 7, & 12. Metaph. & 2. de Anima* (32). i. e. " That there is but one intellect in all mankind, " and that it is poſſible to be ſo, appears from this, " that it is a celebrated propoſition among the Stoics, " that the multiplication of individuals in the ſame " ſpecies cannot poſſibly be unleſs by matter and " quantity, as is obſerved in 7 & 12 *Metaph.* 92. *de* " *Anima.*" Whatever foundation there may be in Ariſtotle for this opinion of Averroes, it is at the bottom an impious and abſurd one. It is impious, becauſe it leads us to imagine, that the ſoul, which is properly the form of man, dies with the body (33). And it is abſurd, becauſe there can be nothing more ridiculous than to maintain, that two men who kill each

(21) Pomponatius *de Immortal. Animæ*, cap. 4. pag. 9.

(22) Idem, ibid. cap. 3. pag. 7.

(23) Conimbricenſes *in IV. lib. de Animâ*, cap. 1. Quæſt. 7. Art. 1. pag. 59.

(24) Ibid.

(25) Mirandulan. *de Everſione ſingularis certaminis*, lib. 32. §. 1. and lib. 33. § 2. and 6.

(26) Achillin. lib. *de Intelligentiis.*

(27) Conimbric. *in lib. 3. de Animâ*, cap. 5. *Quæſt. 1. Art. 1.* pag. 226.

(28) *Commentator ipſe Comm. xix. lib. 3. de Animâ ponit ipſam eſſe ultimam Intelligentiarum.* Pompon. *de Immort. Animæ*, cap. 4. pag. 11.

(29) Cœlius Rhodiginus, *Antiq. Lect.* lib. 3. cap. 2. pag. 109.

(30) Conimbric. *in lib. 2. de Animâ*, cap. 1. Quæſt. 7. Art. 2. pag. 60.

(31) Pomponat. *de Immortat. Animæ*, cap. 4. pag. 7.

(32) Idem, ibid. pag. 8.

(33) See note [H] towards the end.

a progreſs among a great many of the Italian Philoſophers, that it was neceſſary to have it

each other, being directed each of them by the ſame intellectual acts, have the ſame ſoul. What can be imagined more chimerical, than that two Philoſophers, one of whom denies, and the other affirms the ſame theſis at the ſame time, are but one with regard to their underſtanding. Let us examine what Pomponatius's antagoniſt anſwers to this extravagant aſſertion.

In the firſt place he confutes it, as it ſuppoſes, that the intellect is not in man, and then as it ſuppoſes, that all men have but one and the ſame intellect. Upon the firſt head he aſks why an intellect, which muſt unite its operations to that of a man, and this in the moſt intimate manner, which can be conceived in that kind, ſhould think itſelf diſhonoured, if it were to unite itſelf to the organs, in order to form one individual with them (34). It is eaſy to comprehend the intimate union, which is ſpoken of here, if we obſerve, that according to the Averroiſts the ſoul of man is not capable of underſtanding without the help of the aſſiſtant intellect. It is neceſſary therefore that this intellect ſhould ſupply by its own action what is wanting to the human ſoul; and conſequently our intellectual acts depend upon two principles, one of which is as the paſſive and imperfect ſubject, and the other an active and perfective principle. It is true therefore, that the concurrence of theſe two principles terminates in the ſame effect; and by this means the action of the intellect, according to the Averroiſts, unites itſelf in a very intimate manner with the ſoul, which underſtands. This difficulty is not of any great importance; for the union which is objected, is not more intimate than that of the operation of the Deity with the operation of a creature, according to the doctrine of co-operation; and yet it does not follow, that theſe two cauſes muſt perſonally be united. The Author pretends to obviate this anſwer, by alledging that the operation of the intellect of the Averroiſts is immanent and particular; which cannot be ſaid of the co-operation of God (35); but this may be replied to in a very ſtrong manner; ſo that the diſpute is not carried with advantage with regard to the firſt point, as it is with reſpect to the ſecond; for he preſſes Averroes in this manner: *This Intellect which you ſpeak of is either God, or a creature. If it be God, I aſk you this queſtion; Does he act within or without himſelf? If he acts without, what an abſurdity muſt it be to ſuppoſe an act of intelligence, which is without the intellect, and in another perſon* (36)? This proves too much; for we ought to conclude, that the divine Intellect cannot produce an act of intelligence in the human ſoul, without producing it in itſelf; which is falſe and abſurd. The other part of the queſtion reduces the Averroiſts to the laſt extremity. If God forms in himſelf the acts of intelligence, which are in man, what a variety of errors muſt he entertain? *Sed neque intra Deum contineri poteſt* (intellectio) *quod immenſos in eum errores toties inveheret, quoties opinione ſua fallerentur homines; neque enim prorſus ulla valeret excuſatio, quin prima ac ſumma veritas à ſe ipſa monſtroſè deficeret, ſi aſſignanda ipſi eſſent, ſi in ſinu ejus & complexu reponenda quæcunque eſſe poſſunt falſa hominum judicia* (37). i. e. "But neither can "it (*the Intellect*) be contained within God, ſince "this would involve him in very great errors as often "as men were deceived in their actions; for no ſalvo "can be made uſe of to prevent the conſequence, that "the firſt and ſovereign truth muſt differ monſtrouſly "from itſelf, if all the falſe judgments of mankind "are to be aſcribed to him, and ſuppoſed to be con-"tained in him." If they anſwer, that this Intellect is created, the Author replies, that a creature cannot be ſufficient to modify ſo effectually all the different ſouls of men at the ſame time (38). Beſides this, the contrary opinions, which are current among mankind, cannot be contained together in one ſingle intellect. *Quomodo in unam & eandem intelligentiam ſimul cadet contrarietas illa opinionum & ſententiarum, quam toties in hominibus experimur, cum unus ait, alter negat de eodem idem? Quæ eadem quæſtio impedire poteſt adverſarium in reſponſione jam jam expoſita de intellectu divino.* i. e. "How can ſuch a contrariety of opinions and "notions, as we meet with ſo often among mankind, "when one affirms and another denies the ſame thing, "be included in one and the ſame intellect? The "ſame queſtion may perplex an antagoniſt with re-"ſpect to the anſwer concerning the divine Intellect, "which has already been exploded." This latter objection is equally ſtrong againſt thoſe, who ſhould aſſert that this Intellect is God. It is likewiſe an invincible confutation of Spinoziſm (39). We may obſerve that the Author confeſſes, that the whole force of his objection conſiſts in this, that he pretends to have proved, that the operation of the Intellect of the Averroiſts upon the ſoul of man is immanent (40). I do not think, that they are obliged to allow, that he has proved this. As for what remains, he declares, that he ſhould not have any thing to except againſt Averroes's opinion, if that Philoſopher had not ſpoken of the operation of the divine Intellect conſidered as the firſt cauſe. *Reſtat ergo, ut ſuum iſtud ſomnium integrum Averroes ſomnii loco & mendacii haberi ſinat, aut certè interpretetur ipſe de actione intellectus divini, quâ parte non intellectus quidem præciſè, ſed eſt prima cauſa, in omnes cauſarum ſecundarum, adeoque inferiorum intelligentiarum effectus ex virtute ſuâ influens aliquid* (41). . . . *An ita poſſet accipi non diſputo, illud contentus oſtendiſſe, quod niſi quid ſimile ſonet ejus doctrina, inanis ac ſtulta ſit, ſi quid autem ſimile, ne pilum quidem nobis adverſantem habeat* (42). He tells us, that he has not mentioned the objections, which Thomas Aquinas has urged againſt the hypotheſis of this Arabian. I muſt inform the reader, that it is perfectly confuted in a work of Mr. Du Pleſſis Mornai (43).

It is ſurprizing that ſo ſublime genius's as Ariſtotle and Averroes ſhould invent ſo many chimera's with regard to the underſtanding; but I dare aſſert, that they never would have invented them, if they had not been men of ſuperior parts. It was their great penetration, which diſcovered to them ſuch difficulties as obliged them to go out of the common road, and to avoid ſeveral other paths, in which they could not meet with what they deſired. The moſt certain knowledge which they had of the nature of the ſoul, was, that it is capable of thinking ſucceſſively of a thouſand ſubjects; but they could not comprehend how it reduces that faculty into act. The operation of the objects, their ſpecies, their images in the brain, how refined ſoever, did not any of them ſeem capable of giving actual intelligence to the ſoul. See with what force Father Mallebranche refutes all that has been advanced concerning the manner, in which we know things (44). He has found no other expedient than to ſay, that we ſee them in God, and that ideas are not produced in our ſoul. Some of the ancient Philoſophers have affirmed, that God is the general Intelligence of all Spirits, that is to ſay, he diffuſes knowledge among them, as the ſun does light upon bodies. Read the following paſſage of the Jeſuits of Coimbra: *Prima ſententia fuit Alexandri libro ſecundo de Anima, cap.* 20 & 21, *exiſtimantis intellectum agentem eſſe intellectum univerſalem omnium conditorem, hoc eſt Deum; quod etiam Platonis dogma libro ſexto de republica fuiſſe creditur, qui intellectum agentem noſtros animos cœlitus irradiantem comparavit ſoli, ut ex Themiſtio hoc in libro refert divus Thomas Aquinas* 1 *part. quæſt.* 79. *articulo quarto. In eundem errorem lapſus fuit Priſcianus Lydus aſſerens intellectum agentem non eſſe partem animæ, ſed mentem primam atque divinam, vel ideam boni* (45). i. e. "The firſt opinion was "that of Alexander in the ſecond Book *de Anima*, "*c.* 20 & 21, who thought that the acting Intellect "is the univerſal Intellect, the Creator of all things, "that is, which is likewiſe ſuppoſed to have been the "doctrine of Plato in his ſixth Book *of a Common-"wealth*, who compared the acting Intellect, which "enlightens our minds from heaven to the ſun, as "St. Thomas Aquinas tells 1 *part, quæſt.* 79. *ar-"tic.* 4. from Themiſtius upon this Book. Priſcianus "Lydus fell into the ſame error by aſſerting, that "the acting Intellect is not a part of the ſoul, but "the ſovereign and divine mind or idea of good." When a ſubject is very abſtruſe, there is no wonder, that the greateſt Philoſophers expreſs themſelves a little

(34) Antonius Sirmondus *de Immortalitate Animæ adverſus Pomponat. & Aſſeclas*, p. 368.

(35) Idem, ibid. pag. 369.

(36) *Quid hoc portenti intellectio ut extra intellectum conſiſtat, & quidem toto ab eo disjuncta ſuppoſito? Sirmondus*, pag. 370.

(37) Idem, ibid.

(38) Idem, ibid. pag. 371, 372.

(39) See the article of SPINOZA, note [*N*], num. 111.

(40) Anton. Sirmond. *de Immortal. Animæ*, pag. 372.

(41) Idem, ibid.

(42) Ibid. pag. 373.

(43) That of *The Truth of the Chriſtian Religion*, ch. 15.

(44) *Recherche, de la Verite*, lib. 3. cap. 1, *& ſeq.* of Part 2.

(45) Conimbric. *in lib.* 5. *de Animâ*, cap. 5. *Quæſt.* 1. *Art.* 1. pag. 226.

it condemned by the authority of the Pope [F]. This notion is, that there is an intelligence, which, without multiplying itſelf, animates all the individuals of the human ſpecies, as far as they exerciſe the faculties of a reaſonable ſoul. There is no book in which Averroes appears to have had better intentions than that which is intitled, *Deſtructiones Deſtructionum contra Algazelem* [G]. The religion of this Philoſopher is ſpoken very diſadvantageouſly

tle obſcurely, and upon ſuppoſitions not eaſy to be underſtood. But if ever any ſubject was difficult, it is that of the formation of thought. It is perhaps more impenetrable than that of the origin of the ſoul. This is ſaying a great deal; for the reflection of Bartholine upon a ſtory related of St. Anſelm is a very ſenſible one. We are aſſured, that this Archbiſhop of Canterbury finding himſelf near death at the age of ſeventy ſix years, wiſh'd for a ſhort reſpite, in order to finiſh a very obſcure diſquiſition, which he had begun concerning the Origin of the ſoul (46). "If he had "been granted ſeventy ſix years more, *ſays Bartho-* "*line*, I doubt whether he would have been able to re- "ſolve ſo deep a queſtion." *Valde dubito, ſi vel totidem annis quot vixerat illi addidiſſet Deus vitæ arbiter, ad finem quæſtionis dubiæ unquam poterat pervenire* (47). We may remark, that the greateſt part of the Carteſians teach, that as no Being but God can give motion to bodies, there is none but he who can modify ſouls. They except thoſe actions, which render the ſoul criminal. But with regard to what is called ſenſation, imagination, paſſion, memory, and idea, they affirm, that God is the efficient and immediate cauſe of them, and that the action of objects, or the motion of our animal ſpirits is only the occaſional cauſe. This opinion is only an improvement of that, which is aſcribed to a celebrated interpreter of Ariſtotle, and which Mr. du Pleſſis Mornai confutes by plauſible arguments, tho' our Carteſians would not be the leaſt embaraſſed with them. *With regard to the opinion of Alexander* (Aphrodiſienſis), *who aſſerts that there is an univerſal acting Intellect, which impreſſes the poſſible intellect, that is to ſay, the capacity of every perſon, and reduces it to action, the greateſt part of the arguments propoſed above againſt Averroes will ſerve likewiſe here. But ſince by this acting Intellect he ſeems to mean God himſelf, there is yet this further to be ſaid, that God, who is perfectly good and wiſe, would not impreſs upon our mind the follies and vices which we obſerve in it, nor leave ſo much ignorance and darkneſs, as we experience in it; but would ſubdue in all men the contagion, which attends this body; and tho' he ſhould not inſpire or influence one perſon ſo much as another, according to the different capacities of this* tabula raſa, *yet he would never paint in it ſo many falſe images, as we find every one in ourſelves. Again, this influence would either be perpetual or interrupted. If perpetual, we ſhould underſtand every thing, which our imagination ſhould preſent to us, without labour or art. If interrupted, we ſhould not be able to underſtand any thing whatever, nor will when he would. Now on the contrary, we find it difficult to comprehend ſome things, and we are obliged to conquer the ignorance of our minds as it were ſtep by ſtep; and there are other points, which we underſtand as ſoon as they are preſented, and whenever we pleaſe* (48).

(46) See the article of ANSELM, note [A].

(47) Tho. Bartholin. *Diſſert.* 6. *de legendis Libris*, pag. 264.

(48) Du Pleſſis Mornai, *ubi ſupra*, chap. 15. fol. 208.

[F] *And yet it made ſo formidable a progreſs among a great many of the Italian Philoſophers, that it was neceſſary to have it condemned by the authority of the Pope.*] I have quoted in another place (49) the words of a Bull of Leo X, approved in the Council of the Lateran. I ſhall add here, that Raymond Lullius ſollicited Pope Clement V with great zeal to condemn the Commentaries of Averroes upon Ariſtotle, and endeavoured to engage Philip the fair King of France to ſollicit the ſame. He repreſented, that they were Books full of pernicious opinions and which might by degrees lead young men to irreligion; he begged, he preſented petitions, and wrote a Book upon the ſubject, but he found both the Pope and the King of France deaf (50). At preſent it is not at all neceſſary to ſollicit this, or to deſire, that at leaſt there ſhould be a prohibition to prevent this Philoſopher from being conſidered as an Oracle; his authority is ſunk, and no body loſes his time in reading him. But there have been Ages, which were infatuated with his doctrine. Read what follows: *Congruentior & ex auditu facilior fuiſſet petitio, pro qua nunc, (quæ Dei benignitas eſt,) non eſt ſatagendum. Nimirum ut Averrois oraculi loco eſſet in ſcholis; quod cum ſuperiore ſeculo, & paucis anterioribus invaluiſſet, præſertim in Italia, ut Canus lib.* 10. *de locis c.* 5. *notavit; occaſio fuit magnorum in oris illis errorum & inutilis diligentiæ, qui aliqui non minus in pervolutando Averroe collocabant operæ, quam in ſacris literis ponant, qui iis maximè delectantur; nec fidei minus Averroi tribuerunt, quam optimi quique fideles canonicis ſcriptoribus; quod indigniſſimum fuiſſe, nemo non videt. Nunc Averroes in ſcholis depontanus evaſit* (51). i. e. "It would have "been a more proper petition, and at the ſame time "more eaſy to be granted, though we have now "through God's mercy no occaſion to ſollicit ſuch "an one; namely, that Averroes ſhould not be e- "ſteemed as an Oracle in the ſchools; which being "the caſe in the laſt and ſome of the preceding "Ages, eſpecially in Italy, as Melchior Canus has "obſerved in his 10th Book c. 5. *de Locis*, was the "occaſion of very enormous errors in theſe parts, "and of the loſs of a great deal of labour; for ſome "perſons employed as much time in turning over "the writings of Averroes, as others, who are moſt "delighted with the Scriptures, ſpend in reading "them; and they paid the ſame regard to Averroes, "as the beſt Divines do to the Canonical Writers; "which every perſon ſees to be a very culpable man- "ner of acting. But now Averroes has loſt his au- "thority in the ſchools." Ludovicus Vives complains extremely of the authority, which this Philoſopher had obtained. *Quem philoſophi de noſtra ſchola, qui poſt eum ſcripſere, ita ſunt amplexati, ut pene authoritate Ariſtoteli adæquârint, nec ſolum qui longo poſt intervallo vixerunt, ſed illi, qui illius quoque ætate; quod factum eſt & ignorantia meliorum, & admiratione mercimonii lingua & ſenſis peregrini; ut gratiam ei conciliaret apud primos novitas, apud poſteros vetuſtas* (52). i. e. "The Philoſophers of our Schools have "paid ſo great a regard to him, that they have al- "moſt equalled him in authority to Ariſtotle him- "ſelf; and this has been done not only by thoſe "who have lived long ſince his time, but even by his "contemporaries; which has ſprung from their ig- "norance of more valuable Books, and their humour "of admiring every perſon, who is foreign both in "language and ſentiments; ſo that his novelty was "the reaſon that the former eſteemed him, and his "antiquity that the latter admired him." Vives obſerves here a remarkable piece of good fortune; for ſome lucky genius's pleaſe us at firſt by their novelty, and afterwards by their antiquity. The reader may examine, if he pleaſes, the following reflection of a modern Writer. *We are not to be ſurprized to ſee that men have ſo much eſteem for Averroes, ſince Cardan's father, who ſtudied Magic, aſſures us that the Devils themſelves admired his doctrine, and Bajazet amuſed himſelf in his ſevereſt fits of the gout by reading him; which is a proof no leſs capable of ſhewing his merit, than his having been admired by the intelligences* (53). If what relates to Bajazet is not more faithfully told than the reſt, I doubt very much of the truth of it (54); for in order to have given an exact account of what concerns Cardan's father, it ſhould have been obſerved, that one of the Spirits, which appeared to him, declared himſelf an Averroiſt, and not that Averroes was admired by the intelligences; and that Cardan himſelf inſinuates this ſtory of his father to be fabulous. *Ille verò palam Averroiſtam ſe profitebatur. Hæc ſeu hiſtoria ſua fabula ſit, ita habuit. Quod fabula videatur ſatis argumento eſſe debet, quod &c.* (55). i. e. "He openly profeſſed "himſelf an Averroiſt. And this was the ſtory or "fable. But it ſeems to be a fable from this conſi- "deration &c."

(49) In the article of SPINOZA, note [D] at the end.

(50) Theoph. Raynaudus, Erotem. *de malis ac bonis Libris*, num. 340. pag. 200. He quotes Charles Bouille in the *Life of Raymond Lullius*.

(51) Idem, ibid.

(52) *De Cauſ. corruptar. Art.* lib. 5. pag. 167.

(53) Clavigny de Sainte Honorine, *de l'uſage des Livres ſuſpects*, p. 48, 49.

(54) I find nothing in Paulus Jovius, *Elog. Viror. bellicâ virtute illuſtr.* lib. 4. pag. 334. but that Bajazet II, *Peripatetici Averroïs opinionibus oblectabatur*; i. e. "was "pleaſed with "the opinion of "Averroes the "Peripatetic "Philoſopher.

(55) Cardanus, *de Subtilitate*. lib. 9. pag. 682.

[G] *There is no Book, in which Averroes appears to have had better intentions than that, which is intitled* Deſtructiones Deſtructionum contra Algazelem.] Or rather *Deſtructorium Deſtructorii*. The Arabic title is,

disadvantageously of [*H*]; for it is said, that he despised not only Judaism and Christianity,

is, *Habapalah Altabapalah* (56). Averroes in this work confutes the metaphysical opinions, which Algazel had maintained in opposition to the Philosophers. The greatest part of these opinions of Algazel are very pernicious; for he attacks for instance the assertions of the Philosophers, that the world is the production of God, and that God is an Agent, that he is one simple and incorporeal Being, and that there cannot be two uncreated natures in him (57). As Averroes defends the part of the Philosophers in all these propositions, it cannot be denied, that he has exerted himself in favour of orthodoxy. This is one of his best works, according to Father Rapin (58). But if we consider the matter in another light, could the good cause receive any advantage from the services, which such a defender could do it; since he denied the possibility of breathing, and maintained that all spiritual Beings are eternal, and that God does not know particular things, nor extends his Providence to the individuals of this world (59)?

(56) *See* Reinesius, Epist. 15. *ad* Hofman. pag. 33.

(57) *See* Gesner's *Bibliotheca*, fol. 100 *verso*.

(58) *Reflex. sur la Philosophie*, num. 30. pag. 363.

(59) *See* Possevini *Biblioth. selectæ*, lib. 12. cap. 36.

[*H*] *The religion of this Philosopher is spoken very disadvantageously of.*] The reader will find in Moreri's Dictionary, that Christianity, according to him, was an impossible religion; that Judaism was a religion for children, and Mahometism a religion for swine; and that he afterwards cried out, *Moriatur anima mea morte Philosophorum*, i. e. "Let my soul "die the death of the Philosophers." This is the manner in which he imitated Balaam, who said, *Let me die the death of the righteous, and let my last end be like his* (60). Moreri does not tell us exactly what relates to the Christian Religion. *Averroes*, says he, *called it an impossible religion on account of the mystery of the Eucharist*. It is certain that this Philosopher did not express himself in such civil terms, when he made a reflection upon the practice of the Communion in the Church of Rome. Read the following words of Mr. Daillé addressed to Father Adam. "The wise "men of the world have not excused you for this "strange belief any more than the Jews; as appears "from the saying of Averroes the Philosopher, mentioned by Cardinal du * Perron upon the credit of "Sarga, one of the Fathers of your Society, *that he "did not find any Sect worse or more absurd than that "of the Christians, who eat and broke to pieces the "God whom they worshipped.*" Before I proceed any further, I must make two observations against this learned Minister. The first is, that Cardinal du Perron is not properly the Author who related this saying upon the credit of the brethren of Father Adam, for he only quotes it as mentioned by Mr. du Plessis; for it was Mr. du Plessis, who alledged upon this subject what the Jesuit Scarga observes concerning the reflection of this Arabian Philosopher (61). The second is, that instead of *Sarga* he should have said *Scarga*. Let us now quote a passage from another Minister (62). *If we receive the holy Sacrament upon our knees . . . we should be a scandal and stumbling-block to the weak; but we should give occasion to Infidels to blaspheme the sacred name of God, and to abhor Christianity. For we cannot forget the sad example of that Pagan Philosopher* *, *who, having seen the Sacrament which the people had worshipped, eaten by them, said,* That he had never seen any Sect more absurd and ridiculous than that of Christians, who worship what they eat; *and it was upon this occasion that this wretch cried out,* Let my soul be with that of the Philosophers, since the Christians worship what they eat (63). The same Minister quotes in another place a passage from Cicero, which corresponds very much with the reflection of Averroes (64). *Ecquem tam amentem esse putas qui illud, quo vescatur, Deum credat esse* (65)? i. e. "And whom do you think so senseless, as to believe "that what he eats is God?" Cicero speaks thus, when he considers, that the name of Ceres was given to bread, and that of Bacchus to wine. *Cum fruges Cererem, vinum Liberum dicimus, genere nos quidem sermonis utimur usitato* (66). Father Lescalopier acknowledges, that this famous Pagan Writer speaks very justly, when he reasons in that manner with regard to Ceres and Bacchus; "but, *continues he* (67), it is a "great wisdom under Christianity to eat what is believed to be God, and we consider those persons as guilty "of a very absurd and stupid infidelity, who do not "understand these words of Christ, *This is my body*, "in a literal sense, and object to us these words of "Cicero in the way of ridicule." *Amentissimæ ac stolidissimæ infidelitatis damnamus hæreticos homines, qui Christi Domini, hoc est ipsius veritatis planissima disertissimaque verba, &c. . . . .* (68). *Illud Academicum, jublato cachinno procaciter usurpant, Academicorum non Fidelium nepotes:* Ecquem tam amentem esse putas, qui illud, quo vescatur, Deum credat esse? *At cum Apostolo Catholici respondemus,* Nos stulti propter Christum; utinam vos sitis prudentes in Christo (69). i. e. "We condemn those heretics as guilty of the most "absurd and stupid infidelity, who reject the plainest "and most express words of our Lord, that is, of the "truth itself . . . and make use of that saying of "the Academic Philosopher by way of insult, descendents as they are of the Academicks and not of "the Faithful: *Whom do you suppose to be so void "of sense, as to believe what we eat to be God?* But "we Catholics answer with the Apostle, *We are "fools for Christ's sake; would to God that you were "wise in Christ.*" The point here is not to examine into the nature of reflections, but only to consider the sentiments of Averroes. I remark that Vossius only speaks in general of this Philosopher's contempt of the Christian Religion; he did not consider it in particular as the result of Transubstantiation. *Quam parum viderit tantus Philosophus in verâ & unicâ salutis viâ arguit illud quod diceret, malle se animam esse cum Philosophis quam cum Christianis* (70). i. e. "How little "this great Philosopher understood of the true and "only way of salvation appears from what he said, "that he had rather his soul should be with the Philosophers than with the Christians." Some Writers say, that Averroes was born a Christian, and turned Jew, and afterwards Mahometan. *De Christiano Judæus, de Judæo factus est Mahumetanus* (71). Others tell us, that he wrote against the three great Lawgivers, Moses, Christ, and Mahomet, and that he furnished the materials for the book *de tribus Impostoribus* (72); i. e. "of the three Impostors." Others observe, *that he never believed the existence of Devils* (73), and therefore that Cardan does violence to his doctrine, *when he introduces a Devil, who said, that he was one of his scholars and followers* (74). There cannot be any thing expressed more strongly than this judgment or wish of Erasmus, *Utinam prodiisset ingens illud opus adversus Averroem impium καὶ τρὶς κατάρατον* (75); i. e. "I wish that great work had been "published against the impious and thrice accursed "Averroes." He wrote this to a person, who had informed him, that his great work against Averroes was printed. *Alterum magnum opus sectum in libros sex & quadraginta ex Peripateticâ disciplinâ confecimus adversus Averroem, quod etiam excusum est* (76). i. e. "I have composed another great work against A-"verroes upon the principles of the Aristotelian Phi-"losophy, divided into forty six books, which is "likewise printed." Is not this a sign, that when he answered his friends he did not always lay their letters before him, but forgot some circumstances of them? However that be, his wish recalls to my mind a letter of Petrarch, in which he advises a learned Divine to confute Averroes, that mad dog, who had barked so furiously against Jesus Christ. Petrarch adds, that he had made collections for such a work, but that he had neither leisure nor learning sufficient to write upon that subject. He charges the silence of so many great men upon that point with impiety; and he wishes, that the work, which he advised his friend to compose, might be dedicated to him, even though he were dead. *Extremum quæso, ut cum primum perveneris quò suspiras, quod cito fore confido, contra canem illum rabidum Averroem, qui furore actus insano, contra dominum suum Christum, contraque catholicam fidem latrat, collectis undique blasphemiis ejus, quod ut scis, jam cæperamus, sed me ingens semper, & nunc solito major occupatio, nec minor temporis quam scientiæ retraxit inopia, totis ingenii viribus ac nervis incumbens, rem a multis magnis viris impie neglectam, opusculum unum scribas, & mihi illud inscribas, seu tunc vivus ero, seu interim abiero* (77). Let us quote likewise

(60) Numbers xxiii. 10.

(61) Daillé, *Replique au Pere Adam & à Cottiby*, Part 1. ch. 16. pag. 116.

(62) Du Plessis, *Treatise of the Sacrament*, p. 1106.

* Averroes.

(63) Drelincourt, Dialogue 9. *contre les Missionnaires sur le service des Eglises Réformees*, pag. 305, 306.

(64) Id. Dial. 6. pag. 236.

(65) Cicero, *de Naturâ Deorum*, lib. 3. pag. 619.

(66) Idem, ibid.

(67) Lescalopierius *in Cicer. de Natur. Deor.* pag. 622.

* Du Perron *del' Eucharist.* lib. 3. ch. 29. pag. 973.

(68) Idem, ibid.

(69) Idem, ibid.

(70) Vossius, *de Philos. Sectis*, cap. 17. p. 91.

(71) Anton. Sirmond. *de Immortal. Animæ*, pag. 29.

(72) Claudius Berigardus, *in Procemio Circuli Pisani*, pag. 5.

(73) Naudé, *Apolog. des grans hommes*, p. 320.

(74) Cardan. *de Subtilitate*, lib. 19. pag. 682.

(75) Erasm. Ep. 29. lib. 10. pag. 532.

(76) Ambros. Leo, *Epist. ad Erasm.* This Letter is the 28th of the 10th book among those of Erasmus, p. 531.

(77) Francisc. Petrarcha, *Ep. ult. Libri sine titulo*, pag. 656.

anity, but even Mahometiſm, which he made an external profeſſion of. Divers Authors have employed their pains in tranſlating his Works into Latin [*I*]. I ſhould have been glad

wiſe a paſſage from Mr. du Pleſſis: *Ariſtotle, according to ſeveral Writers, had little religion, and Averroes his interpreter was abſolutely an impious man* . . (78). *Every body knows that Averroes principally inſiſted upon the eternity of the world, and the univerſal intellect, which are not at all compatible with the principles of religion* (79).

(78) Du Pleſſis Mornai, *de la Verité de la Religion Chrétienne*, cap. 20. fol. 258 *verſo*.

(79) Idem, ibid. fol. 259.

To compleat this account of the irreligion of Averroes, we muſt not omit to obſerve thoſe touches, which his hypotheſes concerning the ſoul of man will furniſh. It is certain, that he did not admit of puniſhments and rewards after this life, for properly ſpeaking he taught the mortality of the human ſoul. I know indeed, that he acknowledged that the underſtanding will never die, and that he repreſented it as an eternal nature, but in that reſpect he did not conſider it as a ſubſtance appropriated to every particular perſon; and conſequently though he granted that the principle of the actual operations in Peter and Paul ſubſiſted after their death, yet he believed that all that particularly belonged to Peter and Paul both with reſpect to their body and ſoul, ceas'd to live, when they died. He muſt therefore have denied the exiſtence of heaven and hell. Voſſius, who underſtood this doctrine very well, ought not to have aſcribed it abſolutely to Mirandulanus, ſince that Author did not adopt it as true in itſelf, but only as the proper interpretation of Ariſtotle's words (80). Would he have ventured in a printed book to declare in favour of an impious notion, which would have expoſed a man to the puniſhment of death from the Inquiſition? The paſſage of Voſſius, which I am going to quote, will ſerve for a proof, that the moſt learned Writers do not always diſtinguiſh what they ought to have done. They ſometimes impute to a Philoſopher not what he abſolutely thought himſelf, but what he muſt have thought, if he were to follow the opinions of Ariſtotle, or ſome other Founder of a Sect. *Bifarium jubet conſiderare hominis intellectum* (Averroes), *ut eſt intellectus, & ut eſt forma, quam obtinet, dum nobis unitur. Priori modo ait eum à morte noſtra ſupereſſe, quippe æternum; nec dare homini eſſentiam, ſed uniri illi per operationem ſuam phantaſmatum interventu. Hanc ſententiam etiam ſequitur Antonius Mirandulanus Everſ. ſingul. certam. lib.* XXXII. *ſect* I. *& lib. ſeq. ſect.* II *&* VI. *Similiterque Cardanus, quem propterea reprehendit ac refellit Cæſar Scaliger Exercit.* CCCVI (81), *ſect.* 30. *Et ſanè ea ſententia Scripturis è diametro averſatur; utque ſuam cuique animam, ſua etiam à morte præmia & pœnas aſſignent* (82). i. e. "Averroes directs us to conſider the intellect of man in "a twofold ſenſe, as it is the intellect, and as it is "the form, which is produced by being united to "us. In the former view he ſays it ſurvives after "our death, becauſe it is eternal, and that it does "not form the eſſence of man, but is united to him "thro' its own operation by the intervention of ideas. "This opinion is embraced likewiſe by Anthony Mi"randulanus *Everſ. ſingul. certam. L.* XXXII. *ſect.* I. "*&* *lib.* XXXIII. *ſect.* II. *&* VI. and alſo by Car"dan, who upon that account is cenſured and con"futed by Julius Cæſar, Scaliger *Exercit.* CCCVI. "*ſect.* 30. And indeed this notion is directly oppo"ſite to the Scriptures, ſince they aſſign to every "perſon his own reſpective ſoul, and his reſpective "rewards or puniſhments after death."

(80) See above note [*E*] quotation (23), what I have quoted from the Jeſuits of Coimbra.

(81) It ſhould be CCCVII.

(82) Voſſius, *de origine & progreſſu Idololatriæ*, lib. 3. cap. 42. pag. 952.

[*I*] *Divers Authors have employed their pains in tranſlating his works into Latin.*] Here follows a paſſage from Huetius, which will acquaint us with the names of ſome of theſe tranſlators, and at the ſame time ſhews us a miſtake of Scaliger. *Vix ullos Averrois Arabicos codices in Europa reperiri poſſe putabat Scaliger, ſolamque converſionem ab Armegando Blaſio, Jacobo Mantino, Johanne Franciſco Burana, Abrahamo de Balmis, Vitale Niſſo, Calo Calonymo, Johanne Bruyerino Campegio, Paulo Iſraelitâ, aliiſque adornatum in lucem veniſſe. Ego tamen his verſavi manibus Arabicum Averrois librum ex oriente huc olim à Poſtello devectum; quod miror Scaligerum fugiſſe, Poſtello olim amicitiâ & literariâ conſuetudine conjunctum. Eo libro continentur in Logicam, Rhetoricam, & Poeticam commentaria; quæ ad Jacobi Mantini & Abrahami de Balmis interpretationem à me expenſa, fidem eorum & artem apertè mihi comprobârunt* (83). i. e. "Scaliger "thought that ſcarce any Arabic manuſcripts of A"verroes could be found in Europe, and that no"thing had been publiſhed of him except a tranſla"tion by Armegandus Blaſius, Jacobus Mantinus, "John Francis Burana, Abraham de Balmis, Vitalis "Niſſius, Calus Calonymus, John Bruyerinus Cam"pegius, Paulus Iſraelita, and others. But I have "ſeen myſelf an Arabic book of Averroes brought "hither from the Eaſt by Poſtellus, and I am ſur"prized, that this ſhould eſcape Scaliger's knowledge, "who was very intimate with Poſtellus, and kept a "correſpondence with him upon literary ſubjects. "That book conſiſted of Commentaries upon Logic, "Rhetoric, and Poetry; which being examined by "me with the tranſlation of Jacobus Mantinus and "Abraham de Balmis, convinced me of their ac"curacy and abilities." We may obſerve, that there were ſeveral Rabbins, who tranſlated ſome of Averroes's works into Hebrew (84). It is proper to remark here, what I find in Poſſevinus. This Jeſuit aſſures us, that thoſe who were ſo fond of the Arabian Philoſopher, could only read him in ſome wretched tranſlations, before the edition, which John Baptiſta Bagolin publiſhed at Venice, and printed by the Junta's in 1552 (85). *This edition*, continues he, *could not be of any value; ſince Bagolin made uſe of the tranſlation of a Jew, whoſe name was Jacobus Mantinus, for one part of Averroes's works; and with reſpect to the reſt of them, he inſerted the preceding tranſlations, and even thoſe, which Niphus and Zimara had not corrected in their labours upon Averroes.* Mantinus the Tranſlator followed the ſteps of Abraham de Balmis, who had ſucceeded very ill. It could not therefore be expected, that a Tranſlator, who had ſuch bad guides, ſhould do juſtice to the original; and as Bagolin underſtood nothing of the Arabic, he could not form any proper judgment of theſe verſions (86). I ſhall tranſcribe a long paſſage from Keckerman, wherein he prays that God would raiſe up a Tranſlator, in order to reſcue the works of Averroes from the groſs ignorance and barbarity of the preceding undertakers. And that then we ſhould be ſenſible of the great ſervices, which that Arabian had done to Philoſophy. *Quid & quantum univerſæ philoſophiæ Averroes iſte profuerit, tum clarum perſpectumque haberemus, ſi quem nobis Deus virum excitaret, qui Latinam ejus verſionem ab iſta, qua ſcatet undique, moleſta barbarie liberaret, & ſtylo Latino ſaltem mediocri & intelligibili in gratiam philoſophiæ ſtudioſorum verteret. Ad quam rem illa, quæ nuper Avicennam Arabicum nitidiſſimis typis dedit clariſſima Typographea Medicea plurimum adjumenti adferret, ſi lingua Arabica Averroem ederet, atque ita occaſionem viris ejus linguæ peritis faciliorem præberet barbaræ verſionis emendandæ, & ad intelligentiam traducendæ. Aliàs certam eſt Averroem à multis neglectum iri, à quibus legeretur diligenter, niſi tam multis non intelligeretur. In poſterioribus Anal. apparet ſingularem operam præſtitiſſe, & immortalitate digniſſimam; & epitome Logicæ, quam ſcripſit, laudatiſſima eſt ob varias cauſas, ut & Logica ejus quæſita. Nemo tam interpretum veterum videri poteſt proximus Ariſtotelis menti atque hic Arabs* (87). i. e. "What and how "great ſervices Averroes has done to all Philoſophy, "would appear evident, if God ſhould raiſe up ſome "perſon, who might reſcue the Latin Tranſlation of "him from thoſe barbariſms, which it is full of, and "turn it into a tolerable and intelligible Latin ſtyle "out of regard to the ſtudents in Philoſophy. This "deſign would be greatly aſſiſted by the Medicean "Preſs, which lately publiſhed a beautiful edition of "Avicenna in Arabic, if it would likewiſe give us an "edition of Averroes in the ſame language; and by this "means enable thoſe perſons, who underſtand that lan"guage to correct the barbarous tranſlation, and render "it capable of being underſtood. Otherwiſe it is cer"tain, that Averroes will be neglected by a great "many who would read it carefully, if it were not "impoſſible to make ſenſe of it in a multitude of "places. In the latter part of the *Anal.* it is evi"dent that he has laboured with great ſucceſs and in "a man-

(83) Huet. *de claris Interpretibus*, pag. 185.

(84) See the *Biblioth. Rabbinica* of Father Bartolocci, tom. 1. pag. 13, & *ſeq.*

(85) Poſſevin. *Biblioth. Selecta*, lib. 12. cap. 16. pag. 43. tom. 2.

(87) Keckermannus *in Præcognitis Logicis*, Tract. 2. cap. 2. num. 32. pag. 103.

glad that before this Article was ſent to the preſs, I could have had the ſatisfaction of conſulting the book, in which Don Nicholas Antonio treats very fully of Averroes; but I am deprived of this advantage, and obliged to content my ſelf with the extracts of it only publiſhed in the *Journal des Savans*. What I have collected from thence is as follows. "Averroes of Corduba was inſtructed by his father in the knowledge of the Law "and in the Religion of the Country. He was exceſſively fat, though he eat but once a "day. He ſpent all his nights in the ſtudy of Philoſophy, and when he found himſelf "fatigued, he diverted himſelf by reading ſome books of Poetry or Hiſtory. He was "never ſeen to play at any game, or to ſeek any other amuſement. The errors, of "which he was accuſed, gave occaſion for a ſentence againſt him, by which he was de-"prived of his eſtate, and obliged to retreat. After his condemnation he took a voyage "to Fez, from whence he returned to Corduba, where he continued, till upon the earneſt "entreaty of the people he was ſent for again to Morocco, where he ſpent the remainder "of his life, and died in 1206" (*d*). The Authors of the Leipſic *Journal* inform me, that Don Nicholas Antonio in that part of his Work made great uſe of a piece of John Leo, which was publiſhed by Hottinger (*e*). I can therefore, with regard to that point, have recourſe to the original as well as he. I ſhall obſerve therefore, that we find in that piece, that the people of Corduba raiſed Averroes to two conſiderable poſts, which his father and grandfather had held [*K*], and which were that of Grand Juſticiary, and that of Chief Prieſt. He was capable of diſcharging them both very well, ſince he was eminently ſkilled in Law and Divinity. After he had ſtudied both theſe Sciences, he applied himſelf to Natural Philoſophy, Phyſic, Aſtrology, and Mathematics. While he held the offices abovementioned, the King of Morocco ſent Deputies to him to offer him the poſt of Judge of Morocco and all Mauritania, upon this condition likewiſe, that he ſhould keep all the employments which he had in Spain. This propoſition pleaſed him; he went to Morocco, but having eſtabliſhed Judges as his Sub-delegates there, he returned to Corduba. Surprizing things are related of his patience, liberality, and mildneſs of temper [*L*]. He referred to his Lieutenant all the criminal cauſes, and never gave his opinion in thoſe caſes. All theſe good qualities did not prevent him from having a great many enemies, who harraſſed him extremely, and accuſed him of hereſy, which

(*d*) *Journal des Savans*, for July the 1ſt 1697, pag. 475 of the Holland edition.

(*e*) *Acta Eruditorum*, Lipſ. 1697. p. 305.

"a manner, which ought to immortalize his name; and "the Abridgment of Logic, which he wrote, is valuable "upon ſeveral accounts; and his Logic much ſought "after. None of the interpreters of Ariſtotle ſeems "to have come ſo near the ſenſe of that Philoſopher, "or this Arabian Writer." I doubt, that there are not now many perſons, who would make ſuch a wiſh, and expect ſuch great things from a perfect tranſlation of the works of Averroes, or give him ſuch prodigious commendations.

[*K*] *That the people of Corduba raiſed Averroes to two conſiderable poſts, which his father and grandfather had held.*] His grandfather was one of the moſt celebrated Lawyers of his time. He was conſidered as a ſecond Malich, who was one of the four great Caſuiſts of the Mahometan Religion: *Unus ex quatuor primariis Juris Mahummedanorum Canonici Interpretibus* (88); and he was likewiſe an able Divine. He was ſent by the people of Corduba, when they ſhook off the yoke of their Prince, and reſolved to chooſe the King of Morocco for their Lord, with a Commiſſion to that King, in order to negotiate that important affair. He obtained all the favours, which he required of him on the part of theſe revolters, and returned home loaded with preſents and civilities, having been created chief Prieſt, and chief Judge of the Kingdom of Corduba. He died after he had enjoyed theſe dignities a long time, and left a ſon, who was a Lawyer, and was appointed to ſucceed in the ſame poſts by the votes of the inhabitants of Corduba. The King of Morocco confirmed this election; and by this means our Lawyer was advanced to a conſiderable ſtation. We find, that the authority of theſe poſts extended over all Andalouſia and the Kingdom of Valencia. He lived a long time with great ſatisfaction; and upon his death his offices were conferred upon his ſon by the votes of the people (89). We may obſerve, that at the requeſt of ſeveral great perſons, who deſired his clemency in favour of Ibnu Saigh, a famous Phyſician, kept in priſon for the crime of hereſy, he ſet him at liberty. Ibnu Giulgiul ſaid during this proceeding, *The father of Averroes does not know that he has a ſon, who will be a much greater heretic than this man* (90). And he was not deceived in it.

(88) Hotting. *Bibl. Theolog.* lib. 2. cap. 3. p. 272.

(89) Taken from a book *de Viris Illuſtrib. apud* Arabes, tranſlated into Latin by John Leo Africanus, and publiſhed by Hottinger, *Bibl. Theol.* cap. 3. pag. 272.

(90) Idem, ibid. pag. 269.

[*L*] *Surprizing things are related of his patience, liberality, and mildneſs of temper.*] There was at Corduba ſeveral perſons among the Nobility and Men of Letters, who hated and oppoſed him. One day when he read a Lecture in the auditory of Civil Law, the ſervant of one of his enemies came to whiſper ſomething in his ear. Upon which he changed countenance, and anſwered only *Yes, Yes.* The next day the ſame ſervant returned to the auditory, and aſked pardon, and confeſſed before all the ſcholars, that he had ſaid a very rude thing to Averroes, when he whiſpered him in the ear. *God bleſs you*, replied Averroes to him, *for having declared, that I am endowed with patience.* He gave him afterwards a ſum of money, and ſaid to him, *Do not do to others, as you have done to me.* Tho' he was rich both by his marriage and his poſts, he was always in debt, becauſe he was very charitable to Men of Letters who were in neceſſity, whether they had a love for him or not. His friends cenſured him one day for his liberality to his enemies. *You are unhappy*, anſwered he, *ſince you do not know, that to ſerve one's relations and friends is not an act of liberality. We are led to that by the affections of nature. To be liberal is to communicate one's eſtate to one's enemies; and ſince my riches did not ariſe from myſelf, or my anceſtors having followed merchandize, or any art, or a military life, but the profeſſion of virtue, is it not juſt that I ſhould diſpoſe of them in acts of virtue? I find, that I have not miſplaced them; they have ſerved to make thoſe my friends who had been my enemies* (91). Add to this what I have obſerved concerning his ſobriety, vigilancy, application to his ſtudies, &c. (92). He would not agree, that the youngeſt of his ſons ſhould be advanced to the honours, which were offered him at the court of Morocco; and he was ſo far from ſhewing any peculiar ſatisfaction, when he obſerved the deference, which was paid to this young man, and by which they intended to do a pleaſure to his father, that he was abſolutely uneaſy at it (93). What a pity it was, that ſo many virtues and excellent qualities ſhould not have been attended with orthodoxy, but on the contrary be joined to the moſt enormous errors! The writings of his enemies reproached him only on account of hereſy, and his Panegyriſts have only extolled him on account of his virtue and learning, &c. *Hic à multis laudatus, à nonnullis vero aliis vituperio affectus eſt. . . . Adverſarius ejus ſcripſit Epiſtolam, qua vituperabatur Averroes eum de hæreſi infamando, & alius ſcripſit aliam laudando eum de*

(91) Hotting. *Biblioth. Theolog.* lib. 2. cap. 3. pag. 273, 274.

(92) See above in the text of this Article, the paſſage of the *Journal des Savans*, quotation (*d*).

(93) *Apud* Hotting. *Biblioth. Theol.* p. 274, 275.

which was attended with very grievous conſequences to him [*M*]. But he was acquitted very honourably before he died. What he anſwered to a young Gentleman, who deſired him to give him his daughter in marriage, is very curious [*N*]. There is ſomething extremely remarkable related concerning an imprecation, which he pronounced againſt his youngeſt ſon [*O*]. He wrote a great many amorous verſes, but when he grew old he

de nobilitate, juſtitiâ, & doctrinâ, quæ quidem Epiſtolæ ſunt longiſſimæ (94). i. e. "He was applauded by a "great many perſons; but he was condemned by "ſome few. An antagoniſt of his wrote a Letter, in "which Averroès was ſeverely reproached, and ac-"cuſed of hereſy, and another perſon wrote another "Letter, in which he extolls Averroes on account of "his nobility, juſtice, and learning. Theſe Letters "are very long ones."

(94) Ibid. pag. 279.

[*M*] *His enemies accuſed him of hereſy, which was attended with very grievous conſequences to him.*] A great many of the Nobility and Doctors of Corduba, and particularly Ibnu Zoar the Phyſician, envied him, and reſolved to proſecute him on account of irreligion. They ſuborned ſome young men to deſire him to read them a philoſophical Lecture, which he conſented to, and diſcovered to them in this Lecture his philoſophical Creed: *Inter legendum autem ſuam philoſophalem fidem detexerunt* (95). They procured an Act to be drawn up by a Notary, and declared him an heretic. This Act was ſigned by an hundred witneſſes, and ſent to Manſor King of Morocco. This Prince having ſeen it, fell into a paſſion againſt Averroes, and ſaid aloud, *It is evident, that this man is not of our Religion.* "Hunc noſtræ legis non eſſe patet." He ordered all his eſtate to be confiſcated, and obliged him to keep within the quarter of the Jews. Averroes obeyed; but going ſometimes to the moſque in order to perform his devotions, and the children driving him away with ſtones, he removed from Corduba to Fez, and lay concealed there. He was diſcovered within a few days after, and put into priſon, and Manſor was aſked what ſhould be done with him. That Prince aſſembled together a great many Doctors in Divinity and Law, and enquired of them what puniſhment ſuch a man deſerved. The greateſt part of them replied, that as an heretic he deſerved death; but ſome of them repreſented, that a man of his character ought not to be put to death, ſince he was particularly eminent as a Lawyer and a Divine; *ſo that the general report would be, not that an heretic was condemned, but that a Lawyer and a Divine had ſuffered that ſentence. The conſequences of this will be,* 1. *that no more Infidels will embrace our Faith, and ſo our Religion will be diſcouraged*; 2. *that there will be a complaint, that our African Doctors ſeek out and find reaſons to take one another's lives away. The moſt proper expedient will be to oblige him to make a retractation before the gate of the great Moſque, where he ſhall be aſked whether he repents. We are of opinion, that your Majeſty ſhould pardon him in caſe he repents; for there is no man upon the earth, who is exempt from all crimes.* Manſor approved of this advice, and gave orders to the Governor of Fez to ſee the execution of that ſentence. In conſequence of this one Friday at the hour of prayer our Philoſopher was conducted to the gate of the Moſque, and placed bare-headed upon the higheſt ſtep, and all thoſe, who entered into the Moſque, ſpit in his face. Prayers being done, the Doctors with the Notaries, and the Judge with his Aſſeſſors came thither, and aſked this unhappy man, whether he repented of his hereſy? He anſwered *Yes*; upon which he was ſent back. He ſtaid at Fez, where he read Lectures in Law. Manſor having given him leave ſome time after to return to Corduba, he went thither, and lived in a miſerable manner, being deprived of his eſtate and books. In the mean time the Judge, who had ſucceeded him, acquitted himſelf ſo ill in his office, and juſtice in general was ſo badly adminiſtred in that country, that the people groaned under the oppreſſion. Manſor being deſirous to remedy this diſorder, aſſembled his Council, and propoſed to reſtore Averroes. The greateſt part of the Counſellors were of that opinion; upon which account he ſent an order for him to come immediately to Morocco, and diſcharge the duties of his former poſt. Averroes removed thither ſoon with his family, and ſpent the remainder of his life at Morocco (96). He was buried there without the Gate of the Curriers (97). His tomb and epitaph were to be ſeen there for a long time after (98).

(95) Ibid. pag. 276.

(96) Hottinger. *Bibl. Theolog.* pag. 276, & *ſeq.*

(97) Ibid. pag. 279.

(98) Ibid.

We muſt not omit to mention what he anſwered to thoſe, who aſked him in what ſituation his mind was, while he was under perſecution. *That condition*, ſaid he, *pleaſed me and diſpleaſed me. I was well ſatisfied to be diſcharged from the troubleſome employments of my place as Judge; but I was uneaſy to be oppreſſed by falſe witneſſes. I did not wiſh*, continued he, *to be reſtored to my poſt as a Magiſtrate, and have not accepted it again till my innocence had been made appear* (99).

(99) Ibid. pag. 278.

[*N*] *What he anſwered to a young Gentleman, who deſired him to give him his daughter in marriage, is very curious.*] "Give me her, ſays the Gallant to "him, and I will pay you her weight in gold." *O Domine judex, da mihi in uxorem filiam tuam, & quanti eam ponderaveris itidem aurum tibi reddam* (100). "Do you know, anſwered Averroes, whe-"ther my daughter be beautiful or ugly; or whether "you ſhall be pleaſed with her or not?" *I have ſeen the copy of her*, replied the other, that is her brother (101). *I am fearful*, anſwer'd Averroes (102), *that your violent paſſion for her has hindered you from knowing her.* The young Gentleman went away in confuſion, and did not return to ſollicit him again. This daughter of his was afterwards married by her father to a relation of the King of Morocco (103). When I remarked, that Averroes's anſwer was curious, I had a regard to two things; firſt the circumſtances of it; and then the obſcurity of the Tranſlator. I ſuſpect that he has expreſſed himſelf improperly. He did not underſtand the Latin tongue. It is probable, that the Arabic words have more acuteneſs in them than the tranſlation, and therefore perſons of curioſity will be pleaſed with an examination of this little fact. It is a remarkable incident enough to ſee a Gallant, who will give her weight in gold for a young Lady, whom he never ſaw. The price would be very high even in Spain, where people are not near ſo fat as in many other countries. Averroes would have been in the right to have aſked the Gallant, *Do you know whether my daughter be little or luſty?* This explanation might have been of conſequence, ſince in the latter caſe the price would have been greater, and the value leſs. According to our cuſtoms, nothing would have been more remarkable, than that a Gallant ſhould not have ſeen the daughter of the chief Magiſtrate of the place where he lived; but among the Mahometans this is common. They do not permit their daughters to appear at the windows and doors of their houſes, to go from one place to another, and to receive viſits every day. And yet I dare ſay, that there was ſomething remarkable in this caſe, that the Nobleman of Corduba (104) did not know but by conjecture, that Averroes's daughter was handſome. Theſe are ſome of the circumſtances which I had in my view.

(100) Ibid. pag. 275.

(101) *Comparationem ejus vidi, fratrem ſcil. ejus.* ibid.

(102) *Teneo te eam non cognoviſſe ob impetum tuum.* Ibid. pag. 276.

(103) Ibid.

(104) *Juvenit quidam ex nobilibus civitatis.* ibid. pag. 275.

[*O*] *There is ſomething extremely remarkable related concerning an imprecation which he pronounced againſt his youngeſt ſon.*] I ſhall not amuſe myſelf with tranſlating into our language, what I ſhall make uſe of as a Commentary upon this text. It would appear to very little advantage in our tongue. I ſhall only obſerve, that Averroes wiſhed the death of his ſon rather than to ſee him undutiful, and that he uttered an imprecation againſt him, which the young man did not ſurvive above ten months. Here follows a long Latin quotation. I do not tranſcribe it from Hottinger; for I find it more correct in another Author. *De Averrois carminum efficacia hanc hiſtoriam hiſtoricus Arabs refert. Quadam die eo exiſtente cum amicis quibuſdam, colloquentibuſque ingreſſus eſt filius ejus cum aliquibus ſociis juvenibus, quos cum animadvertiſſet Averroes, protulit duo Carmina hujus ſenſus: Rapuerunt pulchritudines tuæ capreolo pulchritudinem ſuam, donec miratus eſt omnis pulcher in te. Tibi eſt pectus ejus, & oculi ejus, & ſtupor ejus. Verum cras cornua ſua patri tuo erunt. Poſt quæ dixit: Sit maledicta peregrinatio; quando*

he caſt them into the fire (*f*) [*P*]. I cannot tell from whence Du Verdier Vau-Privas took theſe words; *Averroes was broken by a wheel placed on his breaſt.* The Reader will find them in the chapter, which he intitles, *Of ſeveral Men of Learning among the Antients and Moderns who died in a miſerable manner* (*g*). I have been ſurprized to find ſo very ſlight an account of this famous Philoſopher in the *Bibliotheque Orientale* of Mr. d'Herbelot [*Q*]. One would have imagined, that a perſon, who had ſo extenſive a knowledge

(*f*) Taken from a book *de Viris quibuſdam illuſtribus apud Arabes*, tranſlated by John Leo, publiſhed by Hottinger, cap. 3. lib. 2. of his *Bibliotheca Theologica.*

(*g*) It is the 18th of the 2d book of his *Diverſes Leçons.*

verroes was the chief Judge of the Country, they applied themſelves to him. They repreſented to him, that this Abraham had debauched the whole city by his Poems, and eſpecially the youth of both ſexes, and that nothing elſe was ſung at the marriage-feaſts. Averroes was incenſed againſt the Poet, and forbid him to continue writing under ſuch a penalty as the caſe required, or as the Judge ſhould think proper. He was informed, that his prohibition would not ſtop the poetical humour of the Jew, and he reſolved to be aſſured of the truth of it. He ſent to him a perſon, whom he could confide in, who came back and ſaid to him; *I have found no body at his houſe but your eldeſt ſon, who writes verſes.* He added, that there was neither man, woman, nor child at Corduba, who had learned any of Abraham Ibnu Sahal's verſes. Upon this Averroes ceaſed his enquiry: *Can one ſingle hand,* ſays he, *ſtop a thouſand mouths?* Obſerving one day at a Bookſeller's ſhop, that the Koran was ſold but for a ducate, whereas the Poems of this Jew were bought for ten piſtoles at the firſt word (110), he cried out; "This city will be ſoon deſtroyed; for "I ſee the people's neglect of ſacred things, and their "regard for thoſe, which are prohibited and crimi-"nal." *Tunc dixit Averroes omnibus adſtantibus, Scitote hanc civitatem mox ruituram, quoniam vidi populum, quæ ad fidem pertinent, viluiſſe; atque prohibita atque inhoneſta grata extitiſſe, majoriſque feciſſe. Et ſicut dixerat ſucceſſit. Non adhuc elapſis quinquaginta annis Chriſticolæ oppugnârunt Cordubam, & multas alias civitates* (111). "And as he ſaid, "it happened; for within fifty years after the Chri-"ſtians beſieged this and ſeveral other cities." We may collect from this, that there are ſome vices, which are common to all Countries, Religions, and Ages. Here are Mahometans in Spain, who did in the twelfth Century what a great many Chriſtians at Paris have done in the ſeventeenth. If a perſon wants to buy Mr. Godeau's verſion of the Pſalms, he diſputes a long time about the price of it, and will not purchaſe it at laſt but at a very low one. But if the queſtion is about the *Parnaſſe Satyrique*, he will readily give the moſt enormous price, which the ſeller ſhall aſk for it. We may obſerve likewiſe, that there are ſome good actions, which we find inſtances of in every Country, Age, and Religion. If Chriſtians in the latter Ages have thrown their profane, amorous, or laſcivious verſes into the fire (112), Averroes did the ſame under the profeſſion of Mahometiſm. I ſay under the profeſſion; for it is doubted, whether in his heart he believed any thing of Religion (113). His prediction with regard to the misfortunes of Corduba does not at all confute this; for it is very natural to think, that a dreadful coruption of manners, and ſuch a degeneracy of mind, as leads men to contemn what is eſteemed ſacred, and to love what is thought vicious, will occaſion great diſorders in a city.

(110) *Prædictus emptor nihil reſpondens, ſed manus crumenæ imponens, decem aureos numerawit & perſolvit, & librum accepit, & in pace receſſit.* Ibid. pag. 290.

(111) Ibid.

(112) Picus of Mirandola did ſo. See the end of the note [*D*] of the article of ADONIS. Petrarch was deſirous to do the ſame. *See* Baillet, *Jugemens ſur les Poetes*, tom. 3. pag. 24. He repented of having written his Poems. See the 3d Letter of his 8th book of *Familiar Letters*, p. 278.

(113) See the notes [*H*] and [*M*].

quando eram juvenis, aliquando patrem meum puniebam; nunc autem Senex filium meum punire non poſſum. At Deum deprecor, ut priuſquam videam aliquid contra voluntatem meam, eum mori faciat. Sicque priuſquam tranſirent menſes decem, filius ejus mortuus eſt, & major ſolus remanſit, qui judex opinionis, & ſectæ effectus eſt (105). i. e. "The Arabian Hiſtorian relates the "following ſtory concerning the efficacy of Averroes's "Poetry. As he was one day in converſation with "ſome of his friends, his ſon came in with ſeveral "young men his companions; and when Averroes "ſaw them, he ſpoke two verſes to this purpoſe: "Your beauties have robbed the wild goat of his "beauty, ſo that every beauteous perſon admires "you. You have his heart, his eyes, and his ſtupi-"dity; but to morrow your father will have his "horns. After this he ſaid; Let travelling be ac-"curſed; when I was young, I puniſhed my father; "but now I am old I cannot puniſh my ſon. But I "pray to God that he will cut him off, before I ſee "him do any thing contrary to my will. And thus "before ten months were paſt his ſon died, and none "but his elder ſurvived, who became a defender of "his opinions and ſect." Bartholine, who furniſhes me with this paſſage, erroneouſly aſcribes to the Poetry of this Philoſopher the great effect which is here mentioned, and which ought only to be attributed to the imprecation which Averroes pronounced in proſe. The Compilers have collected a great many inſtances of effects of that nature which have followed ſuch imprecations (106).

(105) Thomas Bartholinus, *de Medicis Poetis*, pag. 105, 106.

(106) *See* Camerarius's *Hiſtorical Meditations*, tom. 1. lib. 5. cap. 6. *and* tom. 3. lib. 2. cap. 15, 16.

[*P*] *When he grew old, he caſt his amorous verſes into the fire.*] What he ſaid upon that occaſion is full of good ſenſe. *Man,* ſays he, *will be judged by his words; and if I have ſpoken ill, I will not let my folly be known. If my verſes ſhould pleaſe any perſon, he would take me for a wiſe man, and I do not find that I am ſo.* We ſee here a good character. Averroes having committed a fault, atones for it; he reſolves to decline equally the approbation, which he thought he did not merit, and the blame which he deſerved. He would have met with a great number of people, who would have read his love-verſes with prodigious approbation, and admired him, and bleſſed his memory. Ovid and Catullus are inſtances of this. He would not accept of theſe applauſes. Other perſons would have been diſpleaſed, that ſo great a man, who was a Lawyer and Philoſopher of ſuch merit, ſhould write verſes of Gallantry. He prevented their cenſures by taking an effectual method, that no perſon ſhould read what he had written in that kind. His other Poems are all loſt, except a ſmall piece, in which he declares, that when he was young, he acted againſt his reaſon; but that when he was in years he followed the dictates of it; upon which he utters this wiſh; *Would to God I had been born old, and that in my youth I had been in a ſtate of perfection.* This, I preſume, is the true ſenſe of theſe Latin words of John Leo (107). *De ſuis quidem carminibus tantum duo reperiuntur, ad verbum ſignificantibus:* "*In-*"*obediens enim fui voluntati meæ juvenis, ac quando* "*tempus cum calvitie ſenectuteque agitavit me, tum pa-*"*rui voluntati meæ. Utinam natus fuiſſem ſenex, &* "*in juventute abſolutus* (108)!" What wiſh can there be formed more worthy a Philoſopher?

(107) *Apud* Hottinger. *Bibliotb. Theol.* pag. 278.

(108) *In juventute abſolutus.* The Tranſlator has perhaps put *in* inſtead of *ab*; and ſo it might be tranſlated, *exempt from youth.*

Let us mention here Averroes's conduct with regard to the Love-Verſes of another Poet. There was at Corduba a Philoſopher, Phyſician, and Aſtrologer, whoſe name was Abraham Ibnu Sahal, who thro' ill luck fell in love, and began to write verſes, without any regard to his character as a Doctor. *Poſtea ob diſgratiam ſuæ fortunæ, amore capitur, & dignitate Doctorum poſtpoſitâ, cæpit edere carmina* (109). The Jews, his brethren in Religion, adviſed him not to publiſh theſe looſe Poems. He returned them a profane anſwer in verſe. This obliged them to have recourſe to the authority of the Magiſtrate; and as Averroes, [*Q*] *I have been ſurprized to find ſo very ſlight an account of this famous Philoſopher in the* Bibliotheque Orientale *of Mr. d'Herbelot.*] In the firſt place it is ſtrange, that we do not find in this *Bibliotheque* our Arabian Philoſopher under the name which all the Weſtern nations gave him, I mean that of AVERROES. I grant that this name is not the true one, but a name very much corrupted by being transferred from one idiom to another very frequently; but is it not a juſt motive for placing it in its proper place in a Dictionary, to obſerve, that there is ſcarce any other name made uſe of by the Writers of the Weſtern nations? If our Author ſhould chooſe to give the Article of that Philoſopher under the Arabic name, written according to the proper Orthography, he ſhould at leaſt have given the reader notice of it under the word AVERROES; and therefore Mr. d'Herbelot, who has not done ſo, has forgotten a thing, which ought by no means to have been neglected. We do not find in the body of his work either Averroes,

(109) Hotting. *Bibl. Theolog.* pag. 288.

knowledge in the Arabian Book, would have furniſhed us with a variety of curious collections concerning the adventures and opinions of Averroes; whereas we find inſtead of this ſuch an aſtoniſhing brevity, as is ſo far from inſtructing us in what we know nothing of, that it rather confounds what we knew before.

roes, or Aben-Roes, or Aben-Rois. We are therefore obliged to have recourſe to the Index of the ſubjects treated of, which is not at all agreeable. But what do we meet with there? Averores (114) with a reference to p. 303, 719, 815. What do we find at page 303? That Averroes was a Philoſopher, who thought that the world was eternal. We find at page 815, that Mohammed Al-Gazali was of opinion, that Averroes *held principles very contrary to thoſe of Muſulmaniſm*. But in page 719 we find the Article of our Philoſopher under the word *Roſchd*. This Article does not contain twenty lines. Here follows the latter half of it. "Averroes was the firſt who tranſ-
" lated Ariſtotle from Greek into Arabic, before the
" Jews had made their verſion of him; and we have
" not had for a long time any other text of Ariſtotle,
" than that of the Arabic verſion of this great Phi-
" loſopher, who has added to them very large Com-
" mentaries, which were made uſe of by St. Thomas
" and the other ſcholaſtic Writers, before the Greek
" Originals of Ariſtotle and his Commentators were
" known to us (115)." I find here ſeveral things which I cannot credit; for I obſerve, that learned men affirm, that Averroes did not underſtand the Greek Language (116). I know likewiſe, that the Califs Almanzor, Abdalla, and Almamon, who lived ſome ages before Averroes, procur'd a great many Greek books to be tranſlated into Arabic (117). So that there is no probability that the firſt Arabic verſion of Ariſtotle's works was made by Averroes, even though it be ſuppoſed, that he was not ignorant of the Greek Tongue. Alfarabius, who flouriſhed in the tenth Century, found in Meſopotamia the Phyſics of Ariſtotle (118). The tranſlation of the Analytics of that Author is generally aſcribed to him, as Mr. d'Herbelot himſelf informs us (119). Rigord tells us, that a council held at Paris in 1209 condemned to the flames ſome books of Ariſtotle, which were explained in the Colleges, and had been brought from Conſtantinople not long before, and had been tranſlated from Greek into Latin. *Delati de novo a Conſtantinopoli, & à Græco in Latinum tranſlati* (120). This does not agree with Mr. d'Herbelot; for it appears from hence, that about the time when Averroes died, a tranſlation of Ariſtotle from the Greek was made uſe of at Paris. It is certain, that before the middle of the twelfth Century the Philoſophy of Ariſtotle was taught in the Univerſity of Paris. See the complaints of St. Bernard related by Mr. de Launoi (121). The ſame paſſage of Rigord ſhews, that the Greek books of Ariſtotle were in France in the time of Averroes. In ſhort, I ſhould have been glad, that ſome of the Tranſlators of the Ariſtotle and the Arabic Commentary of Averroes, who lived between Averroes and St. Thomas Aquinas, had been named. All the Latin Tranſlators of this Arabic Philoſopher, who are come to my knowledge, are later than this Angelical Doctor. I don't ſay this, as if I would reject what we read in ſome Authors, that the Emperor Frederic II, who flouriſhed before St. Thomas, and after Averroes, procured a Latin Tranſlation of the books of this Philoſopher. We may infer this from the words of Cuſpinian (122): *Libros multos ex Græco & ex Arabico Latinos fieri curavit, inter quos & Ariſtotelis volumina fuerunt, & multa medicorum*; i. e. "He ordered a great number
" of books to be tranſlated into Latin out of Greek
" and Arabic, among which were the volumes of
" Ariſtotle, and many others of the Phyſicians;" and from this paſſage of Wolphgang Hungerus in his notes upon Cuſpinian (123): *Curavit quoque eas fieri tranſlationes operum Ariſtotelis & Scriptorum Medicinæ, ex linguâ Græcâ & Arabicâ, quæ in hunc uſque diem in Scholis lectæ ſunt, atque etiamnum leguntur; & Bononiam eaſdem miſit, ut Academiæ offerentur, quod ex Epiſtolis apparet*: i. e. "He procured thoſe Tranſ-
" lations to be made of the works of Ariſtotle and
" the Writers in Phyſic out of the Greek and Arabic
" Languages, which are read to this very day in the
" ſchools; and he ſent them to Bononia as a preſent
" to the Univerſity, as appears from his Letters."
See likewiſe the Chronicle of Cario (124), in which we are expreſly told, that this Emperor ordered the Almageſt of Ptolemy, and ſeveral of the works of Ariſtotle, Galen and Avicenna, &c. to be tranſlated (125). We find the ſame names in the Theatre of Matthias (126) under the quotation of the 7th book of the Annals of Aventine and in the Chronicle of Cario. I cannot tell why Averroes is not named; and yet I imagine, that he was one of thoſe, who were tranſlated by the direction of that Emperor. I ſhould be glad to know, as I obſerved above, what were the names of thoſe whom he employed to tranſlate theſe Writers. Let us take notice of one thing, which we find in the *Bibliotheque* of Mr. d'Herbelot, and which is, that the Mahometans conſidered the doctrine of thoſe, who though they admit of a firſt Mover, yet maintain likewiſe the eternity of the world, as mere Atheiſm (127). This opinion is aſcribed to the moſt famous Philoſophers among the Arabians, to our Averroes, to Avicenna, and Alfarabius (128). The Chriſtians generally paſs the ſame judgment upon this doctrine; and it is certain that it cannot be maintained without treating the holy Scriptures as a fable.

(114) It is an error of the preſs.

(115) D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.* pag. 719. col. 1.

(116) See above quotations (5) and (9).

(117) *See* Father Rapin, *Comparaiſon de Platon & d'Ariſtote*, pag. 403, 404. *See likewiſe* d'Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.* p. 546.

(118) Rapin, *Compar. de Platon & d'Ariſtote*, pag. 404.

(119) D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient.* pag. 337.

(120) Rigordus *in Vitâ Philippi Auguſti, apud* Launoium, *de variâ Ariſtotelis fortunâ*, cap. 1. pag. 6.

(121) Launoius, ibid. cap. 3. pag. 24, *& ſeq.*

(122) Cuſpin. *in Frederico II. init.* pag. 419.

(123) Hungeri *Annot. in Cuſpinian.* pag. 130.

(124) Pag. 480.

(125) Peucer. *in Chronico Curionis*, l.b. 5. pag. 684.

(126) Pag. 480.

(127) D'Herbelot, *Bibl. Orient* pag. 337. col. 2.

(128) Ibid. *and* pag. 303. col. 1.

☞We ſhall give an extract from Dr. Freind's *Hiſtory of Phyſic* (*a*), containing ſome obſervations upon this article of Mr. Bayle [*R*].

(*a*) Pag. 118, *& ſeq.* 2d edit. 1727.

AUGE

[*R*] *We ſhall give an extract from Dr. Freind's* Hiſtory of Phyſic, *containing ſome obſervations upon this article of Mr. Bayle.*] "Mr. Bayle has collected a
" great many paſſages out of Authors, relating to A-
" verrhoes; and as he ſeems never to have been ac-
" quainted with the original, he follows theſe Au-
" thors implicitly, who often miſlead him. As where
" he tells us from Champerius, that he was a bitter
" enemy of Avicenna, and that for this reaſon he
" avoids ever naming him: which he does in this
" very book often, and in his *metaphyſical* Diſputati-
" ons, not to mention the Comment he has writ ex-
" preſly upon that Author's *Cantica*. And as to his
" being his *enemy*, as is here ſuggeſted, if we look
" into this very Comment, we may eaſily be con-
" vinced of the contrary: for he thinks this treatiſe
" of Avicenna, one of the beſt introductions to *Phy-*
" *ſick*, which ever appeared; and therefore becauſe it
" was conciſe, and ſometimes wanted an explanation,
" he undertook that taſk himſelf. And to ſhew his
" candor, even when Avicenna ſeems to lay down
" ſome wrong poſitions, he explains in what ſenſe
" they ſhould be underſtood, ſo as to be conſiſtent
" with truth; as particularly in the doctrine about
" bleeding (*a*) old men, (which he diſtinguiſhes perfect- (*a*) Pag. 280.
" ly right) and the making uſe of ſubterraneous (*b*) (*b*) Pag. 277.
" caverns. The laſt rule particularly, he ſays, would
" not ſo well ſuit his climate, which was the *fifth*,
" i. e. *Spain*; but might be very proper for the *fourth*,
" which was hotter, and where Avicenna lived. What
" Mr. Bayle recites from Mr. Paſquier, about Aver-
" rhoes bleeding his ſon at three years old, is equally
" a miſtake; for Averrhoes himſelf tells us, that it
" was Avenzoar, who (*c*) uſed this practice in the caſe (*c*) Pag. 54.
" of his own ſon. So where he quotes Mr. Petit for
" ſaying, that Averrhoes never gave any medicine to
" the ſick, and that he owns as much himſelf, is di-
" rectly contrary to what this book will inform us:
" tho' I agree, that it is probable, he was no very
" great practitioner.
" Mr. Bayle wonders, why Mr. Herbelot is ſo ſhort
" in his account of this famous Writer: and I ſhould
" wonder why Mr. Bayle is ſo prolix upon the ſame
" head, did I not conſider, that he picks up a few
" bad ſtories which have been handed about concern-
" ing his *irreligion*, particularly the celebrated ſaying
" he

AUGE (DANIEL D') in Latin *Augentius*, was of Villeneuve l'Archevêque in the Dioceſe of Sens in Champagne (*a*). He lived in the ſixteenth Century, and was eſteemed on account of his Learning and Writings [*A*]. The office of the King's Profeſſor in the Greek tongue in the Univerſity of Paris was deſigned for him in the year 1574 (*b*), and he took poſſeſſion of it in 1578. It was vacant by the death of Lewis le Roi (*c*). He had been Preceptor to the ſon of that Francis Olivier, who was Chancellor of France. This is what I have been informed of by the preliminary Epiſtle of a book, which he dedicated to Anthony Olivier Biſhop of Lombes, and uncle to his pupil (*d*). It is dated from Paris the firſt of March 1555. I do not know the time of his death; but only, that Francis Parent, his ſucceſſor in the Profeſſorſhip of the Greek tongue, entered upon it in the year 1595 (*e*).

(*a*) La Croix du Maine, *Bibliotheq. Franç.* pag. 68.

(*b*) Du Breul, *Antiquitez de Paris*, pag. 566.

(*c*) Ibid.

(*d*) It is a Poem of Sannazarius, intitled, *De Morte Chriſti Lamentatio. Dan. d'Auge* publiſhed it at Paris with his notes in 4to, 1557.

(*e*) Du Breul, *Antiq. de Paris*, pag. 566.

" he is charged with, *Sit anima mea cum Philoſophis:* " a ſaying, which perhaps there was no more ground " to faſten upon Averrhoes, than any of thoſe particu- " lars I have mentioned. This Writer has, with no " little pains, amaſſed together all he could meet with " upon this article in modern Authors; and in a " more emphatical manner enlarges upon what he " found quoted from the Diſputations which this Ara- " bian wrote againſt Algazel, a man famous in the " preceding Century for being the founder of a Sect " called the *Motazelas*, and who died A. H. 505: a " piece finely writ, as he tells us from *Rapin*; but, " in his own opinion, very pernicious. In this are " contained a great many ſpeculations concerning the " Soul, conſonant to the doctrine of Ariſtotle; among " the reſt the *Unity of the Intellect* is explained; from " which Mr. Bayle would infer, that he was a very " impious perſon, and one who muſt of courſe main- " tain the *Mortality of the Soul*, and conſequently de- " ny any future rewards or puniſhments. Why he " ſhould be ſo fond of drawing Averrhoes into theſe " opinions, I will not take the liberty ſo much as to " gheſs; only give me leave to obſerve, that if he " would have conſulted the Author himſelf, inſtead of " the Collectors he here quotes, he would have found " a very different account of his notions: for in one " (*a*) Diſſertation Averrhoes aſſerts, that the ſoul is not " *material*; and in another (*b*), that it is *immortal*. " So uſual is it with theſe compilers of ſecret Hiſtory " to run into infinite miſtakes, merely becauſe they " take every thing at ſecond hand, and upon truſt; " whereas would they have been at the pains to go " to the Fountain head, and caſt an eye only upon the " original, their Memoirs would have been much more " exact."

(*a*) *Phyſic.* Diſput. 3.
(*b*) 4.

[*A*] *Was eſteemed on account of his writings.*] They are as follow: *A conſolatory Oration upon the Death of Meſſire Francis Olivier, Chancellor of France*, printed at Paris in 1560; *Two Dialogues concerning poetical Invention, the true Knowledge of the Art of Oratory, and of the Fiction of Fable*, printed at Paris in 1560; *A Diſcourſe upon the Decree made by the Parliament of Dôle in Burgundy with relation to a man accuſed and convicted of being a Were-Wolf* * printed (1); *The Inſtitution of a Chriſtian Prince tranſlated from the Greek of Syneſius, Biſhop of Syrene*, with an *Oration concerning the true Nobility, tranſlated from the Greek of Philo Judæus*, printed at Paris in 1555; *Four Homilies of St. Macarius the Egyptian*, printed at Paris, and afterwards at Lyons in 1559; *A Letter to the noble and virtuous Youth Anthony Thelin, ſon of the noble Thelin* (2), *Author of the Book entitled* Divine Tracts, *in which is repreſented the true patrimony and inheritance, which fathers ought to leave to their children.* This Letter is printed in the beginning of the abovementioned *Divine Tracts* at Paris 1565. He reviſed and corrected them, publiſhed at Paris in 1556. *A French Tranſlation of the moſt beautiful ſentences and forms of ſpeaking in the familiar Epiſtles of Cicero* (3). This is what I find in la Croix du Maine & du Verdier. I have not ſeen the Notes upon the Poem of Sannazarius, which I ſpoke of in the body of this article.

(2) He was a Gent'eman of Auvergne.

(3) Du Verdier, *Bibl. Franç.* pag. 248.

Of all the performances of Daniel Auge, I think his Diſcourſe upon the Decree againſt the Were-Wolf, is the moſt curious. Bodin tells us, that this Decree was made by the Parliament of Dôle the eighteenth of January 1583 againſt Giles Garnier of Lyons, and was printed at Orleans, Paris, and Sens. He mentions the principal circumſtances; " namely, that the " ſaid Garnier on St. Michael's day in the ſhape of a " wolf, ſeized upon a girl of ten or twelve years of " age near the wood of Serre in a vineyard of Châ- " tenoy, about a quarter of a league from Dôle, where " he killed and tore her, both with his hands, which " were like paws, and with his teeth, and eat the " fleſh of her thighs and arms, and carried ſome of " it to his wife. That under the ſame form a month " after this he took another girl, and killed her, and " would have eaten her, if he had not been prevent- " ed by three perſons, as he acknowledged himſelf. " That fifteen days after this he ſtrangled a young " child of ten years of age in a vineyard of Gredi- " ſans, and eat the fleſh of the thighs, legs, and belly. " And that in the ſhape of a wolf he killed another " little boy twelve or thirteen years old, in the wood " of the village of Perouſe, with an intention to have " eaten him, if he had not been prevented, according " to his own voluntary confeſſion. He was condemned " to be burnt alive, and the Decree was executed (4)."

* One, who is reported to turn himſelf into a wolf.

(1) La Croix du Maine, *Bibl. Franç.* pag. 68.

(4) Bodin, *Demonomanie des Sorciers*, lib. 2. cap. 6. pag. 208, 209. Lyons edit. 1598, in 8vo.

AUGUSTIN (ST.) one of the moſt illuſtrious Fathers of the Church, was born at Tagaſte in Africa the 13th of November 354. His father, whoſe name was Patricius, was only a mean Citizen of Tagaſte. His mother's name was Monica, and was a woman of great virtue. Their ſon had no manner of inclination to ſtudy [*A*]. However he was obliged to it; for his father was reſolved to raiſe him by that means, and ſent him to Madaura to be inſtructed in polite Literature. He took him hence at ſixteen years

[*A*] *He had no manner of inclination to ſtudy.*] By the repreſentation, which St. Auguſtin gives us of himſelf in his youth, we may ſee, that he was what we call *a Rake*. He avoided the ſchool as the plague; he loved nothing but gaming and public ſhews; he robbed his father of every thing he could find; he invented a thouſand lies to eſcape the rod, which they were obliged to make uſe of to puniſh his irregularities. *Furta etiam faciebam de cellario parentum & de menſâ vel gulâ imperitante, vel ut haberem quod darem pueris ludum ſuum mihi, quo pariter utique delectabantur, tamen vendentibus, ... Fallendo innumerabilibus mendaciis & pædagogum, & magiſtros, & parentes amore ludendi, ſtudio ſpectandi nugatoria & imitandi ludicra inquietudine* (1). By this paſſage we may confute what Leo Allatius has related, " that at the age " of twelve years, St. Auguſtin had ſtudied, and un- " derſtood by himſelf, without the aſſiſtance of any " maſter, all the Books of Ariſtotle, which relate " to Logic, and that at the ſame age he had written " ſeveral excellent Books in order to diſcover and con- " fute the errors of a great many Authors (2)." The Writer, who has aſſumed the name of Chriſtianus Liberius, has aſſerted the ſame thing (3). Mr. Baillet confutes both of them very ſolidly from St. Auguſtin's Confeſſions; and diſcovers the ſource of their miſtake: *We may ſuppoſe*, ſays he (4), *that thoſe who led them into this error, might have read* twelve *inſtead of* twenty, *in*

(1) Auguſtin. *Confeſſ.* lib. 1. cap. 9.

WHETHER St. Auguſtin was learned and an Author from his childhood.

(2) Leo Allat. *in Apibus Urbanis*, pag. 146. *apud* Baillet, *Enfans celebres*, pag. 59.

(3) Chriſtianus Liberius *de ſcrib. & legend. Libris*, pag. 178. quoted by Baillet, ibid. pag. 60, 61.

(4) Baillet, ibid.

years of age in order to ſend him to Carthage to ſtudy Rhetoric. St. Auguſtin went thither about the end of the year 371 (a). He made a great progreſs in the Sciences, but he plunged himſelf into great debauchery among the women [B]. He was deſirous of reading the holy Scriptures, but the ſimplicity of the ſtyle diſpleaſed him; and he was ſtill too great an admirer of the Pagan Eloquence to have any reliſh for the Bible. He had in general a ſtrong deſire to know the truth; and imagining that he had found it in the Sect of the Manicheans, he entered himſelf among them, and maintained the greateſt part of their opinions with a good deal of warmth. Having continued at Carthage for ſome time, he returned to Tagaſte, where he taught Rhetoric with ſo much applauſe, that his mother was congratulated upon having a ſon of ſuch admirable merit. This did not hinder that pious woman from being extremely afflicted on account of her ſon's hereſy, and the debauched manner of life into which he plunged himſelf. He returned to Carthage in the year 380, and taught Rhetoric there with prodigious applauſe. It was there that he fixed his incontinency, which had before been rambling in purſuit of different objects. He took a concubine, whom he contented himſelf with, and had a ſon by her, to whom he gave the name of *Adeodatus*, God's Gift, and who had a very good genius [C]. He became a little wavering in his Sect, becauſe he found no perſon who

(a) Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* tom. 3. pag. 158.

in the paſſage where St. Auguſtin ſpeaks of it. This Saint acknowledges, that he was almoſt twenty years of age, when there fell into his hands a treatiſe of Ariſtotle, entitled the ten Categories, *which he had heard ſpoken of at Carthage with a great deal of applauſe* *. ..... *He read it by himſelf, and underſtood it perfectly well; ſo that when he had afterwards converſed with thoſe, who ſaid that they had learned it with great application under excellent maſters, who had explained it to them not only in words, but likewiſe by figures, which they traced out in the ſand, they could not tell him any thing more than what he had learned by himſelf in private. He declares alſo that at that age he read and underſtood, without the aſſiſtance of any perſon, all the books of the liberal Arts, which he could meet with. And he ſays the ſame thing with regard to the Mathematics, and particularly Geometry, Muſic, and Arithmetic.*

* *Confeſſ.* lib. 4. cap. 16.

[B] *He plunged himſelf into great debauchery among the women.*] He began very early; for at the age of ſixteen years he reſigned himſelf to the inſtincts of this violent paſſion. *Ubi eram*, ſays he (5), *& quam longè exulabam à deliciis domus tuæ, anno illo ſexto decimo ætatis carnis meæ, cum accepit in me ſceptrum, & totas manus ei dedi veſaniæ libidinis, licentioſæ per dedecus humanum, illicitæ autem per leges tuas?* He ſpent that year without any employment, becauſe his father not having ſufficient to maintain him at Carthage, was raiſing by degrees a ſum of money neceſſary to ſend him thither. His good father was extremely glad, when he was in the bath with his ſon, and diſcovered an unuſual forwardneſs of nature in him (6). He could not refrain from acquainting his wife with it; he felt a kind of ſatisfaction from the expectation of being a grandfather, by perceiving that his ſon was ſo early fit for marriage. *Quinimo ubi me ille pater in balneis vidit pubeſcentem & inquietâ indutum adoleſcentiâ, quaſi jam ex hoc in nepotes geſtiret, gaudens matri indicavit* (7). St. Auguſtin's mother was more uneaſy than pleaſed with this account; ſhe was apprehenſive that he would immediately run into irregular pleaſures; and therefore exhorted him in a very ſerious manner to abſtain from the ſex, but eſpecially to avoid committing adultery. *Secreto memini ut monuerit cum ſolicitudine ingenti ne fornicarer; maximèque ne adulterarem cujuſquam uxorem. Qui mihi monitus muliebres videbantur, quibus obtemperare erubeſcerem* (8). i. e. "She adviſed me ſecretly "and with a great deal of earneſtneſs not to commit "fornication, but eſpecially not to be guilty of adul- "tery with any man's wife. Theſe ſeemed to me "mere womaniſh exhortations, which I was aſhamed "to obey." But he paid no regard to this good advice; he contracted ſo ſtrong an habit of incontinence, that even when he had renounced Manicheiſm, and prepared himſelf for Baptiſm, he took a new concubine in the room of Adeodatus's mother, till the young Lady, whom he was to marry, was grown up to the proper age for it (9). He was obliged to wait almoſt two years (10). It is remarkable, that in the diſpute between St. Auguſtin and Alypius upon marriage and celibacy, Alypius ſhould be ſo far from perſuading St. Auguſtin to continue in celibacy, that he ſuffered himſelf to be perſuaded to marry. Alypius led a chaſte life; he had taſted by the by and as it were in ſtealth the pleaſures of love when he was very young; but he reformed himſelf immediately. He adviſed St. Auguſtin againſt marriage, as it was an obſtacle to the deſign, which they had formed of living together in the ſtudy of wiſdom. *Prohibebat me ſanè Alipius ab uxore ducendâ, cauſans nullo modo nos poſſe ſecuro ocio ſimul in amore ſapientiæ vivere, ſicut jam diu deſideravimus, ſi id feciſſem* (11). St. Auguſtin confeſſed to him ingenuouſly, that it was impoſſible for him to contain himſelf, and urged to him the examples of ſeveral wiſe men, who were married, and had been faithful to God and to their friends. He added, that there was a great difference between thoſe tranſient pleaſures, which Alypius had taſted and afterwards forgot, and thoſe, which himſelf had made habitual to him, and which would become more agreeable under the honourable name of marriage. Alypius was ſo much moved by this diſcourſe, that he reſolved to marry himſelf, "in order, as he ſaid, to "know by experience what St. Auguſtin thought was "more agreeable than life itſelf." *Cum me ille mirareturr, quem non parvi penderet, ita hærere viſco illius voluptatis, ut me affirmarem quotieſcunque inde inter nos quæreremus, cœlibem vitam nullo modo poſſe degere, atque ita me defenderem, cum illum mirantem viderem, ut dicerem, multum intereſſe inter illud quod ipſe raptim & furtim expertus eſſet, quod pæne jam nec meminiſſet quidem, atque ideo nullâ moleſtiâ facile contemneret, & delectationes conſuetudinis meæ, ad quas ſi acceſſiſſet honeſtum nomen Matrimonii, non eum mirari oportere cur ego illam vitam nequirem ſpernere. Cœperat & ipſe deſiderare conjugium nequaquam victus libidine voluptatis, ſed curioſitatis. Dicebat enim ſcire ſe cupere quidnam eſſet illud ſine quo vita mea, quæ illi ſic placebat, non mihi vita, ſed pœna videretur* (12). However neither of them married, but they lived very chaſtly.

(5) *Confeſſ.* lib. 2. cap. 2.

(6) It was thought contrary to the laws of decency even among the Pagans for a father and ſon to bathe in the ſame place. *See* Cicero *de Officiis*, lib. 1. cap. 35. Valer. Maxim. lib. 2. c. 1. n. 1. *and* Plutarch in the *Life of Cato the Elder*, pag. 348.

(7) *Confeſſ.* lib. 2. cap. 3.

(8) Ibid.

(9) Ibid. lib. 6. cap. 15.

(10) Ibid. cap. 13.

(11) Ibid. cap. 12.

(12) Ibid.

[C] *He took a concubine .... and had a ſon by her, to whom he gave the name of* Adeodatus, *or God's Gift, and who had a very good genius.*] The reader will undoubtedly be pleaſed to find here ſome account of this natural ſon of St. Auguſtin. I ſhall relate what I find in Mr. Baillet. "Adeodatus was but fifteen years "of age, when his father was baptized; but he was "then ſo ripe in knowledge, and had made ſo great "advances in learning, that he ſurpaſſed many per- "ſons in years, and even ſeveral of thoſe, who were "eſteemed in the world for their gravity and learn- "ing. St. Auguſtin compoſed about the ſame time a "Book in the form of a dialogue, intitled, *Of the "Maſter*. Adeodatus and himſelf are the two inter- "locutors, and he takes God to witneſs, that all that "he introduces his ſon ſpeaking in that work, is "entirely his own, tho' he was then but fixteen years "of age. St. Auguſtin adds, that he had ſeen ſeve- "ral things ſtill more wonderful of that child, than "thoſe, which we have mentioned. In ſhort, as great "a genius as he was himſelf, he declares, that "the greatneſs of his ſon's parts aſtoniſhed him. A- "deodatus received the Grace of Baptiſm with his "father, and died not long after (13)."

(13) Baillet, *des Enfans célébres*, pag. 63. *ex* Auguſt. *Confeſſ.* lib. 9. cap. 6.

who could fully anſwer the difficulties which he had to propoſe [*D*]. However he did not change his profeſſion, but waited for better explications of his opinions. His good mother Monica went to him to Carthage, in order to endeavour to reſcue him from hereſy and his vicious courſe of life; and did not deſpair of ſucceſs, though ſhe found that her remonſtrances were to no purpoſe. He wanted a new theatre to diſplay his genius, and reſolved to go to Rome; and that he might not be diverted from this deſign, he embarked without acquainting his mother, or Romanian his relation, who had maintained him at ſchool (*b*). He taught Rhetoric at Rome with the ſame ſucceſs as he had done at Carthage; ſo that Symmachus, Prefect of the city, being informed that they wanted an able Profeſſor of Rhetoric at Milan, appointed him for that employment in the year 383. St. Auguſtin was highly eſteemed at Milan; he went to viſit St. Ambroſe, and was very kindly received by him. He frequented his Sermons, though not near ſo much from a principle of piety, as from that of a critical curioſity. He wanted to know whether the eloquence of that Prelate deſerved the reputation which he had gained. But God made uſe of this means to convert him; for St. Ambroſe's Sermons made ſuch an impreſſion upon him, that St. Auguſtin became a Catholic in the year 384. His mother, who was come to ſee him at Milan, adviſed him to marry, in order that he might abandon that irregular manner of life which he led. He agreed to this propoſal, and ſent his concubine back to Africa; but as the young Lady, who was deſigned for his wife, would not be fit for marriage till two years after, he could not reſiſt his natural inclinations ſo long, but returned to his former debaucheries. At laſt the reading of St. Paul's Epiſtles, the ſollicitations and tears of his mother, and the good diſcourſes of ſome of his friends, compleated in him the work of grace; he felt himſelf a ſincere Chriſtian, ready to abandon every thing for the ſake of the Goſpel. He renounced his Profeſſorſhip of Rhetoric, and was baptized by St. Ambroſe on Eaſter-Eve in the year 387. The year following he returned to Africa. He loſt his mother at Oſtia, when they were going to embark from thence (*c*). He was ordained Prieſt in the year 391 by Valerius Biſhop of Hippo. Four years after this he was made Coadjutor to that Prelate, and did very important ſervices to the church by his pen and his exemplary piety, till his death, which happened the 28th of Auguſt 430 (*d*). A particular account of his life in his epiſcopal character, and of his writings, would be ſuperfluous here, ſince the reader may find it in Moreri's Dictionary, and Mr. Du Pin's *Bibliotheque*; and if thoſe Gentlemen had not paſſed very curſorily over the irregular part of St. Auguſtin's life, I might have excuſed myſelf from this article. But in order to inſtruct the public in a more ample manner, it is expedient to ſhew great men in every part of their character. The approbation which has been given by Councils and Popes to St. Auguſtin's opinion relating to the Doctrine of Grace, has been a great advantage to his reputation, for without that the Moliniſts in theſe latter ages would have raiſed their banner againſt him in a very confident manner, and have made nothing of his authority. We have ſhewed in another place (*e*), that all their policy could not oblige them to preſerve appearances, or reſtrain them from falling upon him in a very ſevere, though oblique way. It is certain, that the neceſſity which the Church of Rome is under to regard St. Auguſtin's ſyſtem, has thrown it into a perplexity, which is very ridiculous [*E*]. The Arminians, who have

(*b*) His father died about the year 372.

(*c*) Taken from the *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory* of John le Sueur, tom. 3. *ad ann.* 388. p. 484, *& ſeq.* ed. in 12°.

(*d*) Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Aut. Eccleſiaſtiq*; tom. 3. pag. 158.

(*e*) Below in the remarks [*C*] and [*D*] and [*L*] of the article (JOHN) ADAM the Jeſuit, you will find ſeveral judgments which have been given of St. Auguſtin. See likewiſe *l'Etat de la Faculté de Theologie de Louvain*, in 1701, pag. 207.

[*D*] *He found no perſon who could fully anſwer to the difficulties, which he had to propoſe.*] St. Auguſtin had a penetrating genius; he was a Rhetorician by profeſſion, and he underſtood Logic. It is eaſy for a ſubtle and eloquent Diſputant to form doubts, and find anſwers; ſo that we are not to be ſurprized that he ſhould perplex the Manichean Doctors. Nor indeed is it at all ſtrange, that he ſhould embarraſs a great many of the Catholics, and that the weak anſwers, which they made to his objections, ſhould confirm him in his hereſies. He acknowledges that to his own loſs he had gained a thouſand advantages over them; ſo true it is, that every orthodox perſon ought not to engage in diſputation; and that unleſs he has to contend with an heretic of his own ſtrength, he can do nothing, naturally ſpeaking, but harden his antogoniſt. *Quædam voxia victoria pænè mihi ſemper in diſputationibus proveniebat, differenti cum Chriſtianis imperitis; quo ſucceſſu creberrimo gliſcebat adoleſcentis animoſitas, & impetu ſuo in pervicaciæ magnum malum imprudenter urgebat* (14). i. e. "I almoſt always "gained ſome unhappy victory in the diſputes, which "I had with ſome ignorant Chriſtians: by which "frequent ſucceſs the preſumption of my youth was "encreaſed, and imprudently hurried me by its vio"lence into that great fault of obſtinacy."

(14) Auguſt. *de duabus Anim.*

[*E*] *The neceſſity, which the Church of Rome is under to regard St. Auguſtin's Syſtem, has thrown it into a perplexity, which is very ridiculous.*] It is ſo plain to every one, who examines things without prejudice, and with the neceſſary qualifications, that the doctrine of St. Auguſtin and that of Janſenius Biſhop of Ipres are exactly the ſame, that one cannot obſerve without indignation, that the Court of Rome has boaſted of having condemned Janſenius, and yet has notwithſtanding maintained the reputation of St. Auguſtin entire. Theſe are two things abſolutely incompatible. Beſides, the Council of Trent in condemning the doctrine of Calvin concerning Free-Will, has neceſſarily condemned that of St. Auguſtin; for there is no Calviniſt, who does or can deny the concurrence of man's will, and the liberty of the ſoul in the ſenſe which St. Auguſtin has given to the words concurrence, cooperation, and liberty. There is not a ſingle Calviniſt, who does not acknowledge Free-will, and the uſe of it in converſion, if the word is underſtood according to St. Auguſtin's definition. Thoſe, who are condemned by the Council of Trent, do not reject Free-will, any further than as it ſignifies a liberty of indifferency. The Thomiſts reject it alſo under this notion, and yet are conſidered as very good Catholics. But here is another ſcene of the comedy. The phyſical predetermination of the Thomiſts, the neceſſity of St. Auguſtin, that of the Janſeniſts, and that of Calvin, are all at the bottom exactly the ſame thing; and yet the Thomiſts diſavow the Janſeniſts, and both of them pretend to be miſrepreſented, when they are accuſed of preaching the ſame doctrine as Calvin. But if a man were allowed to judge of another's thoughts, one would be tempted to affirm, that the Doctors act the Comedians here, and know well enough, that the Council of Trent has condemned

have not the same cautions to observe, deal very plainly with this holy Father of the Church [F]. A learned French Critic with all the terms of respect which he makes use of, has shewn sufficiently, that he thoroughly despises the Commentaries of St. Augustin upon the Scriptures [G]. Mr. Claude, who has condemned this Father for approving

ed only a chimera, which never entered into the head of the Calvinists, or that it has condemned St. Augustin, and the physical predetermination; so that when they boast of maintaining the faith of St. Augustin, and never having varied in the doctrine (15), it is only done to keep a *decorum*, and to avoid the ruin of the System, which a confession of the real truth would necessarily produce. There are some persons, whom it is very happy for, that the people do not take care to oblige them to give an account of their doctrine, or are not capable of doing it; for they would murmur much oftener against these Doctors, than against the Tax-gatherers. *If you do not know*, they would say, *that you deceive us, your stupidity deserves that you should be sent to plow; and if you do know it, your roguery deserves that you should be shut up between four walls with bread and water.* But there is nothing to be feared of this kind: the people require only to be led in the usual track; and if they should require more, they would not be capable of entring into the enquiry; for their employments have cut them off from gaining the necessary qualifications.

(15) Mr. Basnage shews clearly, that the Church of Rome in the Council of Trent and elsewhere has determined against St. Augustin, and against other Councils. See his *Histoire de la Religion des Eglises Reformées*, tom. 2. p. 452, &c.

WHETHER the people might not sometimes make their ecclesiastical guides stand in fear of them, if they had any considerable capacity.

[F] *The Arminians . . . . deal plainly with this holy Father of the Church.*] It was in their power to have amused and perplex'd the world, as the Jesuits have done; but they thought it more proper to leave St. Augustin entirely to their antagonists, and to acknowledge him to be as great a Predestinarian, (which is the usual term among them) as Calvin himself. The Jesuits would have done as much without doubt, if they durst venture to condemn a Doctor, who has been approved by Popes and Councils.

[G] *A learned French Critic . . . . . thoroughly despises the Commentaries of St. Augustin upon the Scriptures.*] I mean Mr. Simon. See his *Critical History of the Old Testament* (16), where the chief commendation which he gives to his father, is, that he knew his own insufficiency. *He has well observed*, says he (17), *the necessary qualifications for interpreting the Scriptures; and as he was modest, he confesses ingenuously, that he wanted most of these qualifications; and therefore it is not strange that we find sometimes a great want of exactness in his Commentaries upon the Scripture. . . . . He soon perceived that his attempt* TO ANSWER THE MANICHEES *was above his abilities. In Scripturis exponendis tyrocinium meum sub tanta sarcinæ mole succubuit* *. I confess, that Mr. Simon does not quote Peter Castellanus without blaming him. But as he wrote in France, was it not necessary to make use of this precaution? *I cannot*, says he (18), *approve of the warmth of Peter Castellanus Grand Almoner of France, who accuses St. Augustin with too much freedom, and reproaches him* WITH DOING NOTHING BUT DREAMING, *when he attempted to explain the holy Scripture.* Those, who have written against him, knew very well how to reproach him with the inconsistency between *the regard, which he would seem to shew for the writings of St. Austin, and the judgment, which he has given of him*; and they have made use of this opportunity to give a very disadvantageous idea of that Father (19). *One cannot*, say they, *form any other notion of the blessed St. Austin, than of a declaimer, who says every thing that comes into his head, whether to the purpose or not, if it does but agree with a certain system of Platonism, which was then formed of the Christian Religion; we can consider him only as an Author, who loses himself every moment in the clouds, and indulges himself in dry impertinent allegories, which he gives us as if they were Oracles; in short as a man, who had none of those qualifications, which are necessary to an interpreter of the holy Scripture.* They give several strong instances of this. Mr. Simon in his *Reply* has not engaged himself in defending St. Augustin. We see plainly, that he had not much mind to do that; he gives something to the Decorum, which was necessary, but much more to the desire of criticizing upon his antagonist (20). We may observe in divers places of his writings, that he is of opinion, that since Augustin has not scrupled to abandon the Greek Fathers upon the point of Grace, no person is under any obligation to follow him preferably to the Greek Fathers. This evasion would be very convenient; but it is not in his power to make use of it; for as the doctrine of St. Augustin concerning Grace has received the approbation of the Church, it necessarily follows, that every doctrine contrary to this must be rejected; and thus all that St. Chrysostom can say, which is favourable to Molinism, is only a private opinion, and exploded, at least implicitly, by the authentic approbation, which has been given to St. Augustin. This is what I called above the perplexity, which has exposed the Church of Rome to some kind of ridicule. I shall quote the words of Castellanus, which are very remarkable, and his Life is not a very common book in this country. *Ut divum Augustinum contra hæreticos de hominis Christiani justificatione disputando, proxime ad divi Pauli sententiam accessisse fatebatur, ita linguarum ignoratione somniâsse frequenter atque etiam deliràsse sacra explicando asseverabat; cumque bonarum artium magis non ignorans quam peritus dici posset, non satis idoneum esse judicabat, cui de artibus disserenti legendo tempus transmitteretur, qui minimè otio abundaret. Eam quoque stili Augustiniani anfractuosam sinuositatem esse, & sermonis omni elegantiâ vacui impuritatem addebat, ut ab homine liberaliter in literis educato citra fastidium legi vix posset* (21). i. e. "As he confessed that St. "Augustin in his Dispute against Heretics concerning "the Justification of a Christian, approached very near "to St. Paul's doctrine; so he affirmed, that this Fa"ther thro' his ignorance of the languages was guilty "of great reveries and even extravagances in explain"ing the Scripture. And as he might be said rather "to be not ignorant than well versed in arts and scien"ces, he thought it was to little purpose, that one, who "had little time to spare, should spend it in reading "him upon those subjects. He added, that St. Au"gustin's stile was so rough, and obscure, and inele"gant, that a man of good taste and learning can "scarce read it without tediousness."

(21) Petrus Callandius *in Vitâ Castellani*, pag. 44, 45.

Since the first edition of this Dictionary, I have seen the explanation, which Mr. Simon has given to remove the complaints of the Jansenists. *My intention*, says he (22), *was not to lessen in any point the authority of St. Augustin, whom I have always acknowledged to be the most able Divine of the Western Churches, and to have deserved the great character, which has been given him by so many Popes. . . . . I allow*, that the Church assures us, that those, who have taught Divinity after a systematical way, have taken him as their master and guide. *These are the words of the Roman Breviary; but they do not mean, that those Teachers of Divinity, who have followed St. Augustin in his manner of treating that science, were obliged never to depart from the opinions of that learned Bishop, nor that those opinions of his are articles of faith, nor in short that we must quit the other Fathers, when they do not entirely agree with him. The Church tells us in the same lessons of the Breviary, speaking of St. John Chrysostom* *, that all the world admires his manner of interpreting the holy Scriptures according to the Letter, and thinks him worthy of the honour which is ascribed to him, namely, that St. Paul, whom he had a singular reverence for, dictated several things to him. *I always had a great veneration for these two great men, who are still the admiration of the Eastern and Western Churches; but as I was treating only of the explication of certain passages of Scripture, in which St. Augustin and St. Chrysostom do not always agree, I thought, that I might be allowed to follow the interpretations of St. Chrysostom, when they seemed to me the most exact and literal. This difference, which has no regard to the ground of the doctrine, does not hinder them from agreeing in the essential points of our faith. I might indeed, when I spoke of St. Augustin in my History of the Commentators, have been more moderate with respect to my expressions, and it is true I quoted some words of Cardinal Sadolet, which appear too harsh; but I never had any design to attack the doctrine of this holy Doctor, who has confuted the heresies of his time with so much strength.* He adds, that *he toook for his*

(22) Simon in his Preface to his *Nouvelles Observations sur le Texte & les Versions du N. T.* printed at Paris in 1695, in 4to.

* *Interpretandi rationem & inhærentem sententiæ sacrorum Librorum explanationem omnes admirantur, dignumque existimant, cui Paulus Apostolus, quem ille mirificè coluit, scribenti & prædicanti multa dictasse videatur.* Breviarium Romanum.

(16) Book 3. cap. 9.

(17) Ibid. pag. 397, 398.

* Lib. 1. *Retractat.* cap. 18.

(18) *Hist. Critique du Vieux Testam.* p. 399.

(19) See the book intitled, *Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande sur l'Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament*, pag. 357, *& seq.* and the *Defence of those Sentiments*, pag. 348, *& seq.*

(20) See *Reponse aux Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande*, pag. 202, *& seq* and the *Reponse a la Defense des Sentimens*, pag. 198, *& seq.*

proving of penal laws in matters of conſcience and religion, would have expoſed himſelf to a very ſevere cenſure, if he had lived three or four years longer [*H*].

A

his guide Cardinal Gaſpar Contarin, who thought, that a medium was to be taken between thoſe, who under pretence of being enemies to the Lutherans, approach too near to the hereſy of Pelagius, and thoſe, who *having ſome tincture of St. Auguſtin's writings; but being far from his modeſty and charity, preach to the people a ſett of very perplexed doctrines which they do not underſtand themſelves, nor are capable of explaining to others without running into extreme paradoxes.* "I "thought, *continues he*, that I could not do better, "than to imitate this great Cardinal, when I was to "anſwer ſome Divines of Holland, who had objected "to me, that the tradition of the Church was not "conſtant and certain, alledging as an inſtance the "doctrines of Grace and Predeſtination, in which the "Church had followed and authorized the doctrine "of St. Auguſtin, tho' he had departed, as they ſaid, "both from the Greek and Latin Fathers, who went "before him. I ſhewed them, that the difference, "which was to be found between them, was only in "points, which were never determined as articles of "faith, and in ſome paſſages of Scripture, which "might receive different explications; and therefore "the Church ought not to be accuſed of not being "conſtant and uniform in her tradition." If we examine this ever ſo little, we ſhall find, that it is nothing but a mere diſguiſe or paint, which can deceive none but the ignorant; for I would aſk, whence ariſe the moſt capital controverſies? Do not they ſpring from different explications of ſome paſſages of Scripture? Why then do you make uſe of the notion of this difference, to give us to underſtand, that St. Chryſoſtom and St. Auguſtin differ in nothing eſſential? It is only an accident, and merely an acceſſory to the doctrine of Grace, to know in what the powers of a ſinner conſiſt, and what the eſſence of liberty is? Is it not rather a fundamental part of this doctrine? If theſe two Fathers therefore are directly oppoſite in explaining the nature of Free-Will, it is certain, that their difference regards the ground of the doctrine itſelf, and that the Church cannot adopt the hypotheſis of the one without rejecting that of the other. Or elſe we muſt ſay, that ſhe approves a truth, without condemning the contrary error; for in ſhort, tho' it were poſſible that both of them may be deceived, yet it is not poſſible that the opinions of both ſhould be true. It follows therefore, either that thoſe, who follow the explications of St. Chryſoſtom, are miſtaken, or that thoſe, who follow St. Auguſtin's, teach an error. Here is once more the great perplexity of the Romiſh Communion. She is obliged to approve of thoſe, who aſcribe every thing, and thoſe, who take away every thing from Grace, with reſpect to the aſſent of man. One part of the Doctors ſay, that man forms this aſſent with a full liberty of refuſing it; another part teach, that grace produces this aſſent, without leaving man the leaſt power to refuſe it. One or other of them muſt be guilty of an error, which does not turn upon a trifle, but upon a point of the greateſt importance. And yet in the mean while the Church of Rome with all her pretended infallibility, has condemned nothing in this affair. If ſhe condemns Janſeniſm, ſhe is obliged to declare at the ſame time, that ſhe does not condemn St. Auguſtin (23); this is pulling down with one hand, what ſhe builds with the other. Obſerve by the way the words of Mr. Simon; *The difference . . . . was only in points, which were never determined as articles of faith.* That is, if a man publiſhes an error only in points, which have not been determined *as articles of faith*, he may notwithſtanding be an orthodox good Chriſtian: obſerve here, I ſay, this privilege of an erroneous conſcience. We may remark likewiſe, that tho' it was allowed not to be of St. Auguſtin's ſentiments, when the doctrines of Grace were not yet determined, as they were in that Father's time, it does not follow, that ſince theſe deciſions the Writers of the 17th Century ſhould have the liberty of returning to St. Chryſoſtom's opinion; for we have the following ſolid remark of a Divine, who cannot be ſuſpected by Mr. Simon. "In the Diſputes concerning Grace, Elec- "tion, and Predeſtination, leſs regard is paid to the "ancient Fathers, who lived before the Pelagian He- "reſy, than to thoſe, who lived after; and much "greater deference is ſhewn to the Latins, than to the "Greeks, tho' they were later than this Hereſy. . . . "Now amongſt the Latins, whoſe authority we have "ſhewn ought to be ſuperior to that of the other "Fathers, it is agreed by Divines, that St. Auguſtin is a "Father, who is moſt to be depended upon; for not only "all the Fathers and Doctors, who came after him, but "even the Popes themſelves, and the Councils of other "Biſhops, have maintained his doctrine concerning "Grace as certain and catholic, and they have ALL "OF THEM BEEN OF OPINION, that it was a ſuf- "ficient proof of the truth of any opinion, that this "Saint had taught it (24)."

(24) Petav. *Dogmat. Theolog.* tom. 1. lib. 9. cap. 6. quoted by Monſ. Arnaud *Difficult. propoſ. a Monſieur Steyaert*, Part ix. pag. 200.

[*H*] *Mr. Claude . . . . . would have expoſed himſelf . . . . to a ſevere cenſure, if he had lived three or four years longer.*] I have two things to ſhew; the firſt, that Mr. Claude objected againſt St. Auguſtin for approving penal laws againſt heretics; and the ſecond, that if he had lived three or four years longer, he would have been cenſured for cenſuring St. Auguſtin.

I. To prove the former of theſe two points, I ſhall only quote the expreſſions of Mr. Claude in a letter, which has been publiſhed. He owns that St. Auguſtin *had an admirable genius, a copious and happy imagination, and ſhews every where an exemplary piety, juſtice, and charity.* But he adds, that *there is one thing, which has done a great injury to his memory, which is, that after he had been in the ſentiments of gentleneſs and charity, with regard to the conduct, which ought to be ſhewn towards heretics, the diſputes, which he had with the Donatiſts, enflamed him ſo much, that he changed his opinion entirely, and maintained expreſly that heretics ought to be perſecuted* (25).

(25) See the *Letter written from Switzerland*, printed at Dort in 1690, pag. 20.

II. The Acts of the Synod of the Walloon Churches of the United Provinces, held at Amſterdam in Auguſt 1660, prove inconteſtably the ſecond point, which I have aſſerted; for this is one of the propoſitions, condemned by that Aſſembly, *that the Magiſtrate has no right to make uſe of this authority to deſtroy Idolatry, and reſtrain the progreſs of Hereſy.* This propoſition, I ſay, is one of thoſe, which the Synod *ſolemnly and unanimouſly declares to be falſe, ſcandalous, pernicious, equally deſtructive to Morality and the Doctrines of Religion. The Synod proſcribes and forbids, and condemns them as ſuch, prohibiting under the ſevereſt cenſures all eccleſiaſtical and ſecular perſons to declare them either in the pulpit, or in private converſations . . . and ordering very expreſly all the Conſiſtories of their Juriſdiction to redouble their care and paſtoral vigilance in proportion to the danger that threatens their flocks, to reſtrain without diſtinction or favour all, whom they ſhall find guilty, by ſuſpending private perſons from the Lord's Supper; and with reſpect to Miniſters, to ſuſpend them from their function till the next Synod, by calling in two Paſtors of the neighbouring Churches to that ſentence* (26). But it will be ſaid, that if Mr. Claude had been living when this Synod was held (27), the propoſition which I have mentioned, would not perhaps have been condemned; I cannot tell that; but however that be, it is certain, that this opinion was cenſured by them; for it is plain, that St. Auguſtin has aſſerted nothing elſe, but that the Magiſtrate ought to reſtrain Heretics, by ſubjecting them to certain penalties. Now the Synod of Amſterdam has maintained this ſo ſtrongly, that they have ranked the contrary propoſition amongſt the pernicious errors, for which they order that Lay-men ſhould be excommunicated, and the Miniſters ſuſpended. It follows therefore, that they have determined the ſame doctrine, which Mr. Claude condemned in St. Auguſtin; ſo that the opinion of Mr. Claude has been anathematized by this Synod.

(26) See what has been publiſhed of the Acts of this Synod in the *Tableau du Socinianiſme*, pag. 563.

(27) He died in January 1687.

If Mr. Claude was ſurprized, that St. Auguſtin ſhould *change his opinion entirely, and eſpouſe a quite contrary one*, other people are much more ſurprized, that the Refugee French Miniſters (28) ſhould fall into the ſame conduct. For whereas St. Auguſtin changed his opinion, becauſe the laws of the Emperors had put a ſtop to the ſchiſm, the Refugee Miniſters have altered their opinion, while the ruin of their Churches by the authority of the King was yet freſh, and the wound ſtill bleeding. If they had been aſked, while the Edicts of perſecution were ſtill executing upon their party, what they thought of the conduct of a Sovereign, who expoſed to a variety of puniſhments thoſe ſubjects

(28) They were much ſuperior in number to the Walloon Miniſters in the Synod, and they acted in concert with the Refugee Miniſters in England. See the Acts of this Synod relating to the Fact in the 8th Letter of the *Tableau du Socinianiſme* p. 559, & *ſeq.* The Author of this *Tableau* affirms, p. 558. that *the Reſolutions and Definitions of this Synod were carried unanimouſly.*

(23) See the Anſwer written by a Janſeniſt againſt Mr. Leydecker. It is mentioned in the *Hiſtoire des Ouvrages des Savans* in 1697. pag. 251.

A Physician of Paris has published a very singular observation; he pretends, that this great Saint was able to drink a great deal, and that he did so sometimes, but without being drunk. We shall give an account of his reasons, and those of the Journalist, who confutes them [*I*]. I shall not say much of the editions of St. Augustin's works.

subjects of his, who desired only the liberty of worshipping God according to the dictates of their conscience, they would have answered, that it was unjust; and yet as soon as they have got into another country, they have declared an anathema against those, who condemned the use of penal laws against those, who err. This may serve as an instance of the uncertainty of things in this world: there is great scope for moral reflections upon this subject.

The person, who was the promoter of these determinations in the Synod, had before absolutely changed his opinion, but it was in some measure by a special privilege, and a prophetical dispensation, from which others could draw no manner of consequence to themselves. His *Politics of the Clergy*, his *Preservative*, &c. had expressly condemned the use of penal laws in matters of Religion. He had treated fully of this point in his *Answer to the History of Calvinism*, at least he shewed himself willing to give us a solid confutation of the writers in defence of penal laws. It is true, he pulled down with one hand what he attempted to build up with the other, and fell into a miserable contradiction, which exposed him to terrible reproaches in several pieces, which were published against him; but in short he could not till now be proved to have clearly and expressly asserted either the affirmative or the negative. It was only in consequence of the revelations, which he imagined he had from heaven concerning the approaching destruction of Popery; it was only, I say, in consequence of this, that he has fallen upon those, who do not allow the lawfulness of extirpating Sectaries by the authority of the secular arm. He imagined, that such persons made a personal attack upon him, and had conspired against his Explication of the Apocalypse (29). The Clergy of France made use of St. Augustin's arguments, to justify the conduct of that Court towards the Reformed. They published separately in elegant French all that St. Augustin had wrote upon that point. A Protestant has given a confutation of it in the third part of the *Philosophical Commentary* upon the words *Compel them to come in*. See (30) the Reflections, which have been made upon the prejudice, which the authority of this Saint has done to the right cause. It is surprizing, that Monsr. Poiret should attempt to excuse him. See the *History of the Works of the Learned* for May 1692 p. 358, and for August the same year, p. 552.

(29) See the *Apologie pour les vrais Tolerans*, by Mr. Huet, Minister of Dort, p. 133, 134.

(30) In the *Defense des Sentimens de quelques Theologiens de Hollande sur l'Histoire Critique*, pag. 365, & *seq.*

[*I*] *A Physician . . . . . pretends that this Saint was able to drink a great deal, ... but without being drunk. We shall give an account of his reasons, and those of a Journalist, who confutes him.*] The Physician, whom I speak of, is Mr. Petit. The chapter in which he treats of this point is entitled, *Videri B. Augustinum non invalidum potorem fuisse* (31); that is, *that St. Augustin seems to have been an hard drinker.* He grounds at first his pretences upon these words of St. Augustin: *Ebrietas longe est à me; miserereris, ne appropinquet mihi. Crapula autem nonnunquam surrepit servo tuo; miserereris, ut longe fiat à me* (32). That is, "Drunkenness is far from me; have mercy on me, "O Lord, that it may not come near me. The *Crapula* "sometimes surprizes thy servant; have mercy on "him, that it may be far from me." Here seems to be some kind of contradiction; for the *crapula* being the effect of drunkenness, how is it possible for a man without contradicting himself to confess, that he never drinks to be drunk, and yet that he sometimes is overcome by the *crapula*? Mr. Petit proves from the authority of Aristotle, that the *crapula* is the last period of drunkenness, that it is the head-ach, which remains, when sleep has dispersed the fumes of the wine, and when a person, who has been drunk, recovers his senses, and continues no longer under that stupidity of mind, occasioned by the liquor. He confirms this by a passage of Pliny and by the verses of the Poet Alexis; and the way, in which he solves the seeming contradiction, is as follows. He supposes, that this Saint had a very strong head, able to bear a great deal of wine, without losing his senses, but not without suffering some inconvenience from it the next day. *Quod eâ esset cerebri ac mentis firmitate, ut posset in eadem vini quantitate, quæ multos ad insaniam redigeret, rationis usum conservare* (33). Upon this foot a man may say, that he never was drunk, tho' upon some occasions he has found himself troubled with the *crapula* from having drunk too freely; and he ought to acknowledge this a fault, and desire the forgiveness of his heavenly Father. *Sic nobis dubitatio illa vanescit, vindicaturque Augustinus à turpitudine eorum, qui rationem suam vino obruere non dubitant; non tamen à culpa omnino, ipso judice, qui tantum vini hauriret, inde ut crapulam aliquando incurreret, nec posset sibi inter pocula temperare, quin nimio potu interdum valetudini suæ incommodaret. Quâ de re ibi misericordiam implorat* (34). Mr. Petit excuses St. Augustin on account of the climate where he lived, and the custom of the Africans, and proposes to himself this objection. It is probable, that this great man put in practice what he advised others to: now he commends those, who content themselves with living upon herbs and bacon, and drinking two or three glasses of pure wine. *Duæ vel tres vini meracæ potiones propter diligentiam valetudinis sumptæ cum olusculis & lardis laudantur* (35). It is answered, that very likely St. Augustin did not oblige himself so strictly to this rule, as not to break thro' it sometimes amongst his friends, and those, whom he invited to his episcopal table. *Velim & mihi illud concedi, non minus probabile, non ita hunc regulæ illi addictum vixisse, ut non eum vini modum nonnunquam inter amicos & mensæ episcopalis hospites bibendo excederet* (36). For otherwise we must conclude, that he lived only upon herbs and bacon; which can never be imagined without even a monkish stupidity: *Quod putare cucullatæ esset dementiæ* (37).

(33) Petrus Petitus, *Homeri Nepenth.* pag. 138.

(34) Idem, ibid. pag. 139.

(35) Augustin. *in Libro de Moribus Manichæorum, apud* Petitum, ib. p. 140.

(36) Petitus, ibid.

(37) Idem, ibid.

Let us see what Mr. Cousin has replied to this *strange* paradox of Mr. Petit, as he calls this opinion (38). He insists upon reading *the whole chapter of the Confessions*, from which this passage was taken (39). We shall find, that *St. Augustin represents there the disposition, which he was in with regard to drinking and eating, and declares that he had learned of God, to seek food only as he would seek a remedy, and to use one in the same manner as the other. He says that following this principle he is always upon his guard against pleasure, when he satisfies the wants of nature; that he is in a continual struggle with himself by fastings and abstinence; that he frequently brings his body into subjection, and regards without ceasing the voice of God, who cries,* NE GRAVENTUR CORDA VESTRA IN CRAPULA ET EBRIETATE (40). Mr. Cousin asks, *Whether a Bishop, who lived in this manner, could be suspected of drinking sometimes to excess?* He asserts *that the case will admit of no distinction*, that St. Augustin *never drank more than necessity required; and therefore, when he says,* Crapula autem nonnunquam obrepit servo tuo, *he takes the word* crapula *in another sense* (41). *Besides that of Aristotle, where it signifies the* heat *and* pain *occasioned by drinking to excess, it may have two other senses, in one of which it is taken for excess in eating, and in the other for the pleasure itself of eating and drinking. It was not in the former sense that St. Augustin took it, for he was as far from eating to excess, as from drinking to excess. He could therefore take it only in the second sense; and tho' he owns that he endeavoured continually to resist the temptation of pleasure, which laid in wait for him at the entrance of the necessary food for satisfying his hunger and thirst, and maintaining his health, yet he found himself sometimes surprized. This surprize happens to the most perfect of mankind, to those, who refuse every gratification to their bodies, and nourish them only with fastings and abstinence.* Mr. Cousin confirms this by instancing in several things, which Possidius has related concerning St. Augustin's Sobriety. I think he would have done well to have given good proofs of the two senses of the word *crapula*, which he has added to that, which has been so well proved by Mr. Petit.

(38) *Journal des Savans*, for the 27th of June 1689, pag. 426. Holland edition.

(39) Ibid. pag. 427.

(40) Ibid.

(41) Ibid. pag. 428.

(31) It is the 15th of his book intitled, *Homeri Nepenthes, sive de Helenæ Medicamento*, printed at Utrecht in 1689, in 8vo.

(32) Augustin. lib. 10. *Confess.* cap. 31.

I leave

works [*K*]. Several of his Treatiſes have been tranſlated into French.

I leave the reader to give his judgment upon this diſpute, aad content my ſelf with having repreſented the reaſons of both parties. I ſhall only add, that I have conſulted ſeveral Dictionaries without finding the leaſt trace of the ſignification, which Mr. Couſin applies to the word *Crapula* in this place. I have found, that ſome Phyſicians maintain, that Drunkenneſs and *Crapula* mean the ſame things, and that thoſe who attempt to diſcover any difference, amuſe themſelves with mere diſputes about words. *Qui differentiam inter* CRAPULAM *&* EBRIETATEM *fingunt* λογομαχοῦσι. *Foës. pag.* 353. *Dict. num.* 475 (42). It is certain, that in Cicero the expreſſions *crapulam edormire, crapulam exhalare*, mean the ſame thing, as the French *cuver ſon vin*, that is, to *ſleep one's ſelf ſober* (43). Plautus uſes in the ſame ſenſe *crapulam amovere* (44), *crapulam edormire* (45), *crapulam edormiſcere* (46). We know very well too that at preſent the French word *Crapule* is more odious than that of *Ivreſſe* or Drunkenneſs; for it ſignifies the moſt exceſſive degree of drunkenneſs. It is, as Furetiere remarks, *a ſhameful and continual debauch of wine or other liquors, which intoxicate. Crapuler*, adds he, *ſignifies to drink without intermiſſion, to be drunk ſcandalouſly and continually.* The Dictionary of the French Academy confirms theſe definitions. But there is no conſequence to be drawn from one age to another with regard to the ſignification of words. Cuſtom makes it vary prodigiouſly. The difference between Drunkenneſs and *Crapula* was certain in Ariſtotle's and St. Auguſtin's time. This appears more evident from the paſſage of the Father, than from that of the Philoſopher. The queſtion is in what the difference conſiſted in St. Auguſtin's time. If Mr. Petit had replied to Mr. Couſin (47), he would without doubt have ſhewn a great ſcope of learning; and I ſuppoſe he would not have forgot this obſervation, that Authors, who treat dogmatically upon a ſubject like Ariſtotle, deſcend even to a minute diſtinction of *Genius's* and *Species*, and obſerve the propriety of the terms deſigned to ſignify the differences of the *Species*, or the different degrees of the ſame quality; but Poets and Orators ſoon quit this exactneſs, and introduce a freer uſe, or rather accommodate themſelves to the publick uſage, in which the terms, which the Doctors have diſtinguiſhed with ſo much accuracy, are taken one for the other upon a thouſand occaſions.

(42) Jacob. Pancratius Bruno *in Lexico Medico*, pag. 385.

(43) *See* Ciceron. *Philippic.* cap. 12. *& contra Verr.* 8. lib. 3. cap. 11.

(44) Plaut. *in Pſeudolo*, Act. 5. Scen. 1. verſ. 35.

(45) Idem *in Moſtell.* Act. 5. Scen. 2. verſ. 1.

(46) Idem *in Rudente*, Act. 2. Scen. 7. verſ. 28.

(47) He could not do this, for he died before his *Nepenthes* was publiſhed.

[*K*] *I ſhall not ſay much of the editions of St. Auguſtin's works.*] Mr. Du Pin has given us a catalogue of them (48), which is not ſo full nor exact as that, which the Journaliſts of Leipſic have publiſhed (49). As it is very eaſy to conſult theſe Authors, it would be ſuperfluous to copy them here. I ſhall only ſay, that the beſt edition of this Father's works is that, which was publiſhed at Paris by the care of the Benedictines of St. Maur. It is divided into ten volumes in folio, as ſome others are; but we have a new order or œconomy of the ſeveral pieces in each volume. The firſt and ſecond were printed in 1679; the third in 1680; the fourth in 1681; the fifth in 1683; the ſixth and ſeventh in 1685; the eighth and ninth in 1688; and the tenth in 1690. This laſt volume contains the works which St. Auguſtin wrote againſt the Pelagians.

(48) See his *Nouvelle Bibliotheque des Auteurs Eccleſiaſtiques*, tom. 3. pag. 257. Holland edition.

(49) For January 1613, p. 2.

There was publiſhed *a Letter from the Abbot D*** to the Reverend Fathers the Benedictine Monks of the Congregation of St. Maur concerning the laſt volume of their edition of St. Auguſtin* (50). The Author of this Letter pretends, that their deſign was to favour Janſeniſm, and that the proofs which he alledges are convincing. I have been informed, that this Letter has ſo much the more perplexed the Benedictines, as ſome of the Biſhops have queſtioned them upon their conduct, and threatened them to prohibit the reading of their edition of St. Auguſtin in their Dioceſes. The learned Fathers have given us an explanation upon this point, and ſatisfied the publick with regard to that imputation. See *The Letter of a Divine to one of his friends concerning a Libel intitled, A Letter from the Abbot *** &c.* It was printed off the 22d of February 1699, and contains eighty eight pages in 12mo; but it did not put an end to the diſpute. There was publiſhed *a Memorial of a Doctor of Divinity, addreſs'd to the Prelates of France concerning an Anſwer of a Divine of the Benedictine Order to a Letter from a German Divine* (51), in which memorial it is aſſerted, that all the imputations which have been caſt upon the Benedictines are well grounded, and that theſe Fathers have anſwered but very weakly. It is remarked there (52), that they had ſent from Roan to Paris a ſecond anſwer to the German Abbot, and that Father de Sainte Marthe *was very well pleaſed*, it is ſaid, *that it ſhould be aſcribed to him.* The Benedictines have replied to this, and yet have not ſilenced their adverſaries. There have been other pieces publiſhed on both ſides, but I cannot give a particular account of them, having ſeen but a ſmall part of them. I have ſeen the book intitled, *The Conduct of the Benedictine Fathers ſince their edition of St. Auguſtin has been attacked.* It contains ſeventy nine pages in 12mo, and was printed in 1699. We are informed there among other things, 1. that before they had publiſhed any thing in their defence, *an unknown perſon .... had addreſs'd a piece to them, which he took care to diſperſe all over Paris, before he had ſent them a ſingle copy* (53). 2. That he intitled his piece, *A Letter from a Commendatory Abbot to the Reverend Benedictine Fathers of the Congregation of St. Maur.* 3. That as the piece which was written by the German Abbot againſt theſe Fathers, was called, *The German Benedictine*, this was called, *The Little Benedictine*; and every body ſaid that the younger was as good as the elder: 4. *That the Author diſguiſed himſelf from the beginning to the end, and ſpeaks only the language of the Janſeniſts, that he might be better underſtood by the Benedictines* (54): 5. That *the Little Benedictine* provoked and exaſperated the party, ſo that from that moment they reſolved to maintain their new Auguſtin, and the Abbot du Guet went to the Abbey to offer his pen to the Congregation of St. Maur (55): 6. That the *Little Benedictine* was no ſooner read by every body, but another ſmaller and more agreeable one appeared on a ſudden (56); it was intitled. *A Letter from a Benedictine not reformed to the Reverend Benedictine Fathers of the Congregation of St. Maur*, and came from the ſame hand as the *Little Benedictine:* 7. That the Benedictines were ſtill deliberating, when a fourth *Benedictine* was publiſhed, *which was written with ſo ſerious an air, that one would imagine it really came from ſome Cloyſter*; it was intitled, *A Letter from a Reformed Benedictine Monk of St. Dennis, in anſwer to the German Abbot, the Commendatory Abbot, and the Benedictine not Reformed* (57): 8. That the firſt anſwer of the Benedictines came from St. Dennis, which every body aſcribed to Dom Lamy; it is intitled, *A Letter from a Divine to one of his Friends, on a Libel intitled, a Letter from the Abbot *** to the Reverend Benedictine Fathers, &c.* (58): 9. That another anſwer appeared, which was not expected; it was that which Dom St. Marthe boaſted he had written in leſs than two days, and is intitled, *Reflections upon the Letter of the German Abbot, &c.* (59): 10. That every body agrees, that the beſt piece, which appeared yet in relation to the edition, is that intitled, *A Memorial of a Doctor of Divinity addreſſed to the Prelates of France upon the anſwer of a Benedictine Divine to the Letter of a German Abbot* (60): 11. That a Gentleman of greater learning than politeneſs handed about a Manuſcript againſt Dom de Sainte Marthe, which he intitled, *Sainte Marthe a bad Divine, but a good Janſeniſt* (61); that the Manuſcript of this learned man was followed by a Manuſcript written by ſome melancholy perſon of a very weak judgment, intitled, *Antimony to ſerve as a preſervative againſt the Calumnies of Father de Sainte Marthe* (62); and that the Manuſcript of this melancholy perſon was followed by another, which was aſcribed to a Jeſuit, and intitled, *Vindiciæ Petavii*, i. e. *a Vindication of Petavius* (63): 12. That in the book intitled, *A Solution of divers Problems*, and aſcribed to Mr. de Guet, the Janſeniſts reſolutely undertake the defence of the Benedictines (64); 13. That there appeared a third anſwer of the Benedictines (65), intitled, *Vindiciæ Editionis S. Auguſtini a P. P. B. B. adornatæ*, i. e. *a Vindication of the edition of St. Auguſtin publiſhed by the Benedictine Fathers*; that it preceded moſt of the writings which I have mentioned, and is ſcarce any thing but a tranſlation of the anſwer of Father Lamy,

(50) This piece was printed in 1699, and contains 72 pages in 12mo.

(51) Printed in 1699; it contains 128 pages in 12mo.

(52) Pag. 121.

(53) *Conduite des Benedictins*, pag. 24.

(54) Pag. 25.

(55) Pag. 28.

(56) Pag. 29.

(57) Pag. 31.

(58) Pag. 35.

(59) Pag. 40.

(60) Pag. 44.

(61) Pag. 47.

(62) Pag. 50.

(63) Pag. 51.

(64) Pag. 67.

(65) It is without doubt that which is mentioned in pag. 64, in quoting theſe words extracted from a Manuſcript of Mr. Simon to Father Martianas. *A Benedictine Monk named Dom Bernard de Montfaucon, .. has written a ſmart anſwer to the German Abbot, printed with the permiſſion of the Maſter of the Sacred Palace.*

(b) It is surprising that Gabriel Sionita and his Collegue should place this city on the Euphrates; miſtaking it, as it ſeems, for Baſra. See their Treatiſe *de Nonnullis Orientalium urbibus, &c.* annexed to the *Geogr. Nubienſ.* cap. 3.

AVICENNA (ABU ALI AL HOSAIN EBN ABDALLAH EBN SINA)

a moſt celebrated Philoſopher and Phyſician among the Mohammedans, was born in the year of the Hejira 370 (*a*), at Affhana, a ſmall town near Bokhâra (*b*), in the Province of Mawara'lnahr [*A*]. His mother, whoſe name was Sitâra, was of Affhana; but his father

(a) A. C. 980.

(66) *Conduite des Benedictins*, pag. 68.

Lamy, and publiſhed under a borrowed name, &c. (66).

I have likewiſe ſeen a piece, which is aſcribed to Dom Lamy; it is *A complaint of the Apologiſt of the Benedictines to the Prelates of France on the defamatory libels, which are diſperſed againſt thoſe Monks, and againſt their edition of St. Auguſtin, with a ſummons to the authors of thoſe libels to appear before the Archbiſhop of Paris; and an account of the proceedings, which have been carried on againſt the Benedictines with relation to their edition of St. Auguſtin.* The whole contains eighty eight pages in 8vo. The Author having deſired the Prelates to puniſh his adverſaries, obſerves, that *the difficulty . . . is to know who are thoſe unquiet and ſeditious perſons*, who have attack'd the Benedictines (67). *It is not ſo great*, continues he, *as may be imagined. It is true, they take care not to name themſelves in their libels; but the reverend Fathers the Jeſuits are ſo anxious of aſcribing the honour of them to themſelves, and diſcover themſelves in ſo many paſſages of thoſe ſeditious writings, that they cannot but be detected by every one, who does not wilfully ſhut his eyes.* He propoſes then his own conjectures, and after ſome general conſiderations, he advances *ſomething more preciſe and definitive* (68).

(67) Plainte *de l'Apologie des Benedictines*, pag. 10.

(63) Pag. 12.

" And now, *ſays he*, with reſpect to the letter of the " German Abbot, tho' theſe Fathers had not diſco- " vered themſelves by their air, their voice, their ac- " cent, their principles and doctrine, yet it is a fact, " which appears now uncontested, and allowed by " every body, that Father Langlois, a Jeſuit of the " College of Lewis the Great, is the author of it. And " certainly the good Father could not pretend to con- " ceal it; ſince that piece was ſold even in the Col- " lege itſelf in a very public manner. As for the " other libels, particularly the letter of *A Commenda- " tory Abbot*, and that of *The Monk not reformed*, be- " ſides that it is notorious now, that they made pre- " ſents of them every where, and raiſed trophies up- " on their pretended victories, how often have they " taken pleaſure in characterizing and naming them- " ſelves, in order to be conſidered as our adverſaries. " It is proper, my Lords, to ſhew you in what dreſs " and with what colours they ſhew themſelves; I ſhall " only make uſe of their own expreſſions. *Conſider*, " ſay they in theſe letters, *what the Jeſuits do, a ſett " of men, whom you may ſuſpect to be your Antago- " niſts. Take them for a model to you in this affair. " They anſwer every thing.*" And then having particularized in ſeveral other characters, he proceeds thus, " I do not think, that from all theſe ſtrokes there " is any doubt but that the Jeſuits are the men. But it " will be ſaid, that they are only a few particulars " of them. I agree to it; we know they muſt be " but ſome particular perſons; for we have never " ſeen the whole Society join their aſſiſtance in com- " poſing a ſingle book. But have not we reaſon to " aſcribe writings to the whole body, when they " are mentioned amongſt them in general with ap- " probation and pleaſure? When, I ſay, they claim " the honour of them, make preſents of them, raiſe " trophies every where, as we know the Jeſuits have " ſo often done on account of theſe fine letters? In a " word, my Lords, however ſcandalous the writings " of particular men belonging to a body are, there " is reaſon to aſcribe them to the whole body, when " their ſuperiors take no care to ſtop the progreſs of " them; when, if it be not in their power, yet they " do not teſtify by a public Act, that they diſapprove " them; or when they do not themſelves make as " public reparation to the parties offended, as the " injuries and calumnies caſt upon them have been. It is " by this rule, that the ſcandalous piece called *the " Comedy of the Monks* has always been conſidered the " work of the body of the Jeſuits, in which piece al- " moſt all the Religious Orders are treated with an " indignity and ridicule, which would ſcarce be ex- " cuſed in the moſt inveterate heretics. This, I ſay, " has been juſtly aſcribed to the whole body, tho' it " was written and acted only by their young pupils; " becauſe it never appeared, that their Superiors made " any ſatisfaction for the injury (69)." He ſhews then, that it belongs to the Archbiſhop of Paris to decide this diſpute (70); and he ſummons the adverſe party to appear in perſon at that Tribunal, and *to prove their ſeveral accuſations, under penalty, they if they failed either in one or the other, of being condemned as ſlanderers, and their libels cenſured as defamatory. But that we may not give them occaſion of abuſing this citation as too uncertain and undetermined in point of time, and for fear of preſſing them too ſuddenly, we allow them two months time, reckoning from the day, when our Citation ſhall be publiſhed at Paris* (71). At laſt he ſhews the ſtate of the affair, and then in drawing up the Proceſſes he confutes ſeveral things publiſhed againſt the Benedictines.

(69) Pag. 21.

(70) Pag. 23.

(71) Pag. 24.

I dare ſay, that the Archbiſhop of Paris, and even a National Council itſelf, would find themſelves perplexed in the determination of ſuch a cauſe; for, beſides that the queſtions of Janſeniſm are all of them full of equivocations, two Societies of great power and learning, who have each their friends and enemies, are capable of opening a very extenſive ſcene of buſineſs, and ſtarting new incidents to infinity. The beſt expedient, when ſuch diſputes ariſe, is to have recourſe to the ſecular Arm, like a God from a machine, in order to cut the knot. This was made uſe of in the caſe before us. The King ordered the Chancellor to write a letter to the Archbiſhop of Paris, that this diſpute might be ſtop'd, and both parties ceaſe from publiſhing any thing more upon it (72). But however that be, it appears the Benedictines took the moſt reaſonable method, as well to ſhew that they were ſure of the fact, as to put a ſtop to libels againſt them. They demanded a regular procedure, in which their accuſers ſhould be obliged to name themſelves, and prove in form the facts in queſtion. Without this, there was no expectation of any good iſſue of it; for even in cauſes, which have the leaſt grounds, thoſe, who have the liberty of pleading only at the Tribunal of the Public, by anonymous pamphlets, have it always in their power to be inſolent, and clamorous, and abuſive, if they have but Writers and Printers on their ſide. A mere private perſon, whether he is in the right or not, is reduced to ſilence, when his factums do not meet with a ſale; he cannot continue them without bearing the expence of printing them, which he cannot afford. This inconvenience never happens to rich and powerful Societies, ſuch as that of the Jeſuits.

(72) You will find it in the *Lettres Hiſtoriques* of January 1700, pag. 99.

They are about reprinting this edition at Amſterdam, *in a ſmaller character*, ſo that it will be ſold *much cheaper than that of Paris* (73). They deſign to add to it the critical Notes of a learned man, who conceals himſelf under the name of *Joannes Phereponus* (74); but I am informed ſince, that this deſign is changed, and that theſe critical Notes will be printed ſeparately, with the Commentary of Ludovicus Vives upon St. Auguſtin's book *de Civitate Dei &c.* They were apprehenſive of diſpleaſing the Roman Catholics; and for that reaſon they will give them an entire liberty of buying ſuſpected Notes, or not, as they think proper. Theſe Notes will be printed in a diſtinct volume, and the whole works of St. Auguſtin publiſhed exactly after the Paris Edition, will be ſold to thoſe, who do not care to purchaſe the reſt.

(73) *See* Mont. Bern. *Nouvelles de la Repub. des Lettres*, for March 1699, pag. 358.

(74) Ibid.

[*A*] *Avicen was born in 370, at Affhana near Bokhâra.*] This is his own account. Ebn Khalecan (1) ſays he was born at Harmatein. The Writers who make him a native of Bokhâra (2), are, tho' not exact, yet far more excuſable than thoſe who tell us he was of Balkh (3), or Hamadan (4): but they are moſt groſly miſtaken who make him an Egyptian, or a Spaniard born at Corduba (5), and contemporary with Averroes (6). " It is amazing, *ſays Dr. Freind*, " where Neander could pick up the materials to fur- " niſh out ſuch a romance as he has made of this " Writer's Life. He tells us very formally that he " was born at Edeſſa, the capital of Comagena, in " 1145; that he went from thence to Alexandria, " where

(1) *In vita Ebn Sina.*

(2) Pocock. *in Elencho Scriptor. præfixo Vitæ Hai Ebn Yokdhan.* D'Herbel. *Bibl. Orient. Art.* SINA. Dr. Freind's *Hiſt. of Phyſic*, Part 2. p. 69. Ed. Lond. 1727. And. Alpagus, *in Vita Avicennæ.*

(3) Voſſius, *de Philoſ.* lib. 14.

(4) J. Leo Africanus, *de Viris quibuſdam illuſtr. apud Arabes*, cap. 9.

(5) Lud. Nonnius, *apud* Gab. Sionit. & Joh. Heſronit. *de nonnullis orient. urbibus*, cap. 3. *See* Freind, *ubi ſupra*, p. 71.

(6) *V.* Pocock. *loco ſupra citato*; (where inſtead of *Avicennæ cœvum*, read *Averrois*, &c.)

father was a native of Balkh in Khoraſân, whence he removed to Bokhara in the reign of Nûh Ebn Manſûr, and was employed by him to collect the public revenues at Harmatein, a principal town in that territory. Avicenna's parents retiring to Bokhara, put him to ſchool there; and by that time he was ten years old he had perfectly learnt the Korân, and made a wonderful progreſs in polite Literature. He was next ſent to a man who dealt in herbs, and was ſkilled in the Indian method of accounts, to learn Arithmetic: after which Abu Abdallah al Nâyeli coming to Bokhara, and profeſſing Philoſophy, Avicen's father took him into his houſe to teach his ſon. This tutor read to him the rudiments of Logic, but was ignorant of the nicer parts of that Science; he alſo explained to him the firſt five or ſix propoſitions of Euclid. Avicenna then began to read books by himſelf, conſulting the Commentaries, and went through the reſt of Euclid without farther aſſiſtance. When he entred on the Almageſt, al Nâyeli left him. He afterwards applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Phyſic [*B*], and viſited patients to gain experience. By this time he was ſixteen. The following year and half he employed in reading books with incredible application, and on any difficulty his immediate recourſe was to heaven [*C*]. Having attained a perfect knowledge of Logic, Natural Philoſophy, and Mathematics, he proceeded to the ſtudy of Divinity, and preparatory thereto read the Metaphyſics of Ariſtotle, which he took infinite pains to underſtand (*c*) [*D*]. About this time Nûh Ebn Manſûr [*E*] al Samâni, King of Khoraſân and Mawâra'lnahr, falling ſick, Avicen, though ſo very young a man, was recommended to him as a Phyſician; whereupon that Prince ſent for him, and being recovered by his preſcriptions, kept him near his perſon for ſome time, and allowed him free acceſs to his Library, which was a very noble one, in reſpect both to the number and value of the books, many of them being no where elſe to be found. Our Philoſopher, we may imagine, made the beſt uſe of this opportunity; but the Library happening by ſome accident to be burnt ſoon after, Avicen's enemies laid the blame on him, and accuſed him of having ſet it on fire, that no body elſe might enjoy the ſame advantage, and what he had learned thence might be taken for his own (*d*). When Avicenna was eighteen he had entirely finiſhed his ſtudies; after which time, as he himſelf declared, his knowledge received no addition, though his judgment became more mature as he advanced in years. Having loſt his father in the 22d year of his age, he was by the Soltan appointed Intendant of the revenues of certain territories; but that Prince's affairs taking an ill turn, Avicen was obliged to leave Bokhâra, and go to Jorjân, deſigning to retire to the Court of Kabûs, the Sovereign of that country; but Kabûs in the mean time being depoſed by his ſubjects, and dying in priſon (*e*), he went thence to Daheſtân where he had a ſevere fit of illneſs (*f*). This circumſtance makes me doubt the truth of a ſtory which is related as an inſtance of Avicen's ſagacity [*F*]. From Daheſtân our Philoſopher returned to Jorjân, and there compoſed the firſt book of his Canon, a Compendium of the Almageſt,

(*c*) Ebn Sina, *apud* Abulfarag. *Hiſt. Dynaſt.* p. 229, 230. Ebn Khalecân, *in vita Ebn Sina.*

(*d*) Ebn Khaleć ibid.

(*e*) This happened in the year of the Hejira 403, and of Chriſt 1012.

(*f*) Ebn Sina, *apud* Abulfarag. & Ebn Khaleân, *ubi ſupra.*

"where he ſtudied under Rhazes; and that afterwards he travelled into Spain, where he was the diſciple of Averroes at Corduba. But it is no new thing, in this extraordinary Author, to write as many falſities and contradictions as he does pages (7)."

(7) Freind, *ubi ſupra*, p. 71.

[*B*] *He applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Phyſic.*] His maſter in this ſcience, it is ſaid, was Abu Sahl, an eminent Chriſtian Phyſician of Khoraſân, and a very learned man; who wrote a famous Syntagm, intitled, *Miyahketâb*, i. e. "An hundred Books," and died at the age of forty (8).

(8) Abu'lfarag. *Hiſt. Dyn.* pag. 233.

[*C*] *He employed a year and half in reading with incredible application; and on any difficulty his immediate recourſe was to heaven.*] Hear his own words. "Whenever "I was puzzled about any queſtion, or could not find "the middle term in a ſyllogiſm, I went to the "Moſque, and humbly poured out my prayers to "the Creator of all things, that he would be pleaſed "to make plain to me what appeared abſtruſe and "difficult; and returning home at night, I ſet a "lamp before me, and applied myſelf to reading "and writing: and ſo often as I was overcome by "ſleep, or found myſelf faint, I drank a glaſs of "wine to recover ſtrength, and then returned to read-"ing again. If I ſlept ever ſo little, I dreamed of "thoſe very queſtions, ſo that the reaſons of many of "them were made known to me in my ſleep (9)."

(9) Ebn Sina, *apud* Abulfarag. ibid. pag. 230.

[*D*] *Avicen took infinite pains to underſtand the Metaphyſics of Ariſtotle.*] Having read the book over forty times, and even got it by heart, without being able to comprehend the Author's meaning, he was obliged to lay it by, as unintelligible. But it happened, one day, as he viſited the Bookſeller's ſhops, that a Broker offered him a book of Metaphyſics to ſell, which Avicen immediately rejected with ſcorn, ſaying it was a uſeleſs ſcience: the Broker, however, telling him the owner was obliged to ſell it, and he might have it cheap, he was at laſt prevailed on to buy it. The book proved to be a treatiſe of Al Farabius *Concerning the Objects of Metaphyſics*, which Avicen had no ſooner ran over at home, than he plainly perceived the ſenſe of Ariſtotle, whoſe work he retained in his memory; and out of joy gave a conſiderable alms to the poor (10).

(10) Idem, *apud eundem*, ibid. See the 4th book of Picus Mirandulanus, *de Vanitate doctrinæ*, and Baker's *Reflections on Learning*, ch. 9. pag. 125.

[*E*] *Nuh Ebn Manſur.*] It muſt be this Prince who invited Avicen to his Court, and not Nuh Ebn Naſr, his great grandfather, as Ebn Khalekân writes: for Nuh Ebn Naſr died twenty ſeven years before Avicen was born. I attribute this ſlip to Ebn Khalekân himſelf, and not his tranſcribers; becauſe I not only find it in my Arabic copy, and in a Turkiſh Tranſlation of that Author's work now before me, but the manuſcript which Dr. Pocock made uſe of agreed likewiſe in the ſame reading (11).

(11) *See* Dr. Pocock's *Elenchus Scriptor. ubi ſupra.*

[*F*] *A ſtory related as an inſtance of Avicen's ſagacity.*] They tell it thus: Sultân Mahmûd Ebn Sebecteghin, being informed that there were at the court of Mâmûn, King of Khowarezm, ſeveral learned men of diſtinguiſhed merit, of whom Avicen was one, deſired that Prince by meſſengers to ſend them to him into Khoraſân. Orders were accordingly given for their departure, and Avicen, full againſt his will, ſet out among the reſt; but, inſtead of taking the road to Khoraſân, he went to Jorjân. Mahmûd ſeeing Avicen appeared not at his court with the others, highly reſented his refuſal, and cauſed pictures of that Philoſopher to be ſent about all the adjacent countries, with orders to ſtop him; but in vain: for Avicen was already arrived at Jorjân, where he performed admirable cures. Kabûs, who reigned there at that time, hearing that a ſtranger practiſed Phyſic in his capital with great ſucceſs, ſent for him to viſit his nephew, who was confined to his bed by a diſtemper which none of the Phyſicians of that country could find out.

Avicen

Almageſt, and other Treatiſes. Then he went to Rey, where for ſome time he ſerved al Seyyidah, and her ſon Majdo'ddawla, a Prince of the family of Bûyah. Leaving Rey, he removed to Kazwin, and thence to Hamadân, where he became Wazir, or prime Miniſter, to Shamſo'ddawla. After a while the ſoldiery, who ſuſpected he meant them no good, raiſing a ſedition againſt him, hurried him out of his houſe to priſon, and not contented with plundering him of all he had, ſollicited Shamſo'ddawla to put him to death; but this was refuſed, though to pleaſe them the Prince ſeemed inclined to baniſh him. However, Avicen was releaſed, and having lain concealed forty days in a friend's houſe, he was ſent for, and reinſtated in his office, which he exerciſed to the death of Shamſo'ddawla: his ſon and ſucceſſor was deſired to continue the Doctor in the ſame high poſt, but he refuſed; whereupon Avicen ſhutting himſelf up in the houſe of one Abu Ghâleb, an Apothecary, he there finiſhed ſo much of his work intitled *al Shefâ* as treats of Phyſics and Metaphyſics, except the two books of Animals and Plants. It being diſcovered that he had privately written to Alâo'ddawla Ebn Cacûyeh, Soltân of the Perſian Irâk, deſiring leave to wait on him, he was ſeized on ſuſpicion of treaſonable practices, and clapped up in the Caſtle of Berdawân, where he lay four months, and was then carried back to Hamadân; but eſcaping thence in the habit of a Sûfi, he repaired to Iſpahân, and was honourably received by Alâo'ddawla. He wrote ſeveral of his works during his abode in that city. Avicen died of the colic at Hamadân (*g*), whither he had accompanied Alâo'ddawla, in the year of the Hejira 428 (*h*), being fifty eight lunar years old, and was buried there (*i*). The method he took to cure himſelf of that diſtemper was of fatal conſequence [G]. Some Authors write that he died in priſon (*k*). He was of a good conſtitution, but much addicted to wine and women, wherein he indulged himſelf to the prejudice of his health. It is ſaid he was the firſt Philoſopher who took ſuch liberties, which were indeed not very conſiſtent with his philoſophic character, tho' he was therein greedily imitated by thoſe who came after him (*l*). The number of books which Avicen wrote, including his leſſer Tracts, is computed at near a hundred (*m*), much the greater part of which are either loſt, or not known in Europe: I ſhall ſpeak of three or four of them in the note [H]. Some charge him with being a plagiary, and having ſtollen

(*g*) Ebn al Athir writes that he died at Iſpahân; but, as Ebn Khalecân obſerves, againſt the general current of Hiſtorians.

(*h*) A. C. 1036.

(*i*) Abulfar. & Ebn Khal. *ubi ſupra.*

(*k*) Kemâlo'ddin Yuſo', *apud* Ebn Khalec. *Vide* Leon. Afric. *de Viris q. ibuſd. illuſtr. apud* Arabes, cap. 9.

(*l*) Abulfarag. & Ebn Khalec. *ubi ſupra.*

(*m*) Ebn Khalec.

Avicen had no ſooner felt the young man's pulſe, and ſeen his urine, than he judged his illneſs to proceed from concealed love. To clear the matter, he cauſed the chief Eunuch of the Palace to be called in, and while he kept his finger on the patient's pulſe, deſired him to name over the ſeveral apartments, and obſerved a great emotion in the ſick man at the naming of one particular apartment. He then obliged the Eunuch to name all the women in that apartment, and finding his patient's pulſe to beat extremely high at the name of one perſon, he no longer doubted but that ſhe was the object of his paſſion, and declared the only way to cure him would be the enjoyment of that Lady. Kâbûs, being informed of this diſcovery, had the curioſity to ſee the Doctor, and having received one of the pictures abovementioned, immediately knew him, and loaded him with honours and preſents, without obliging him to wait on the Sultan Mahmûd (12). Dr. Freind (13) obſerves the caſe to be ſo parallel, that one would be apt to think this account ſtollen from what is related of Eraſiſtratus, in a like illneſs of Antiochus the ſon of Seleucus (14).

(12) Nigâriſtan, *apud* D'Herbel. *Bibl. Orient.* Art. SINA.

(13) *Hiſt. of Phyſic.* Part II. pag. 70.

(14) *V.* Appian. *in Syriacis.*

[G] *The method he took to cure himſelf of the colic, was of fatal conſequence.*] Being impatient to procure himſelf eaſe, he took no leſs than eight clyſters in one day, which exulcerated his bowels, and cauſed an excoriation; and his colic being attended with with an epilepſy, he was weakened to that degree that he could not ſtand (15). Some charge the perſon, who made up the clyſter, with having miſtaken the preſcription, and uſed five drams of one ingredient inſtead of a ſcruple: and others ſay his ſervants, who had cheated him, and feared they ſhould be puniſhed if he recovered, put a large quantity of opium into one of his medicines (16). However he perſiſted to phyſic himſelf till he was ſo far amended as to be able to walk; but not taking proper care, and trying various remedies, his illneſs ſtill continued on him, ſometimes encreaſing, and ſometimes abating. He had been afflicted with this diſtemper before he left Iſpahân, and was attacked by it again on the road to Hamadân; where finding his ſtrength gone, he made no farther uſe of medicines, ſaying, They would be to no purpoſe, ſince his inward Phyſician failed him. Hence an Arabian Poet took occaſion to ſay, "Avicen's ſkill in Phyſic was of no ſervice to him, nor "his judgment in Aſtrology; *Healing* did not heal "him of the pain of death, nor did *Deliverance* de"liver him (17);" alluding to his two books, intitled,

(15) Abu'lfarag. *ubi ſupra*, pag. 232. Ebn Khal.

(16) Ebn Khalec.

(17) Abulfarag. *ubi ſupra.*

Al Shefâ, i. e. *Healing*, and *Al Najât*, i. e. *Deliverance.*

[H] *I ſhall ſpeak of three or four of his books.*] The moſt famous of our Author's works are: I. His *Canon*, or *Syſtem of Phyſic*, which gained him a prodigious reputation. The fame of it was ſo great throughout Aſia, that it was epitomized and commented on by ſeveral Arabian Writers in the 12th and 13th Centuries (18): and even long before this it began to prevail ſo much in Europe, that there was no other doctrine taught in the ſchools of Phyſic; and it happened to be the good fortune of Avicenna to continue his empire there till the reſtoration of learning (19). The different judgments which have been made of this work will be mentioned below (20). II. His work intitled, *Al Shefâ*, i. e. "Healing;" which contains almoſt all parts in Philoſophy, and the liberal Arts (21). In the beginning of it he ſays, that the truth was, in his opinion, different from what he had there delivered; that he had written that Book according to the Philoſophy of the Peripatetics, but thoſe who would know the truth without obſcurity, he refers to the work which I am going to mention (22). III. His Book *Of the Eaſtern Philoſophy*, wherein he took a much greater liberty than in the preceding, and more fully expreſſed his own ſentiments. The greater part of this work, by the injury of them, is loſt; and therefore what the deſign of it was cannot eaſily be ſaid. He ſeems to have therein examined the opinions of the Orientals, i. e. the Indians, and to have compared them with thoſe delivered by the Peripatetics. This has been conjectured, becauſe Al Birûni, who flouriſhed at the ſame time with Avicen, travelled into India and learned their Philoſophy, and taught them the Philoſophy of the Greeks (23). IV. The ſhort treatiſe of our Author concerning Hai Ebn Yokdhan deſerves to be mentioned; that being the foundation of the larger treatiſe, under the ſame title, written by Abu Jâfar Ebn Tofail: or at leaſt it was from thence that this latter borrowed what he delivers concerning Hai's production from the earth without father or mother; which kind of production from matter rightly diſpoſed, God contributing the like aſſiſtance as in the ordinary way of generation, Avicen thought not abſolutely impoſſible (24).

(18) *See* D'Herbel. *Bibl. Orient.* pag. 250.

(19) Freind, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 72, 73.

(20) In the notes [K] and [L].

(21) Pocock. *ubi ſupra.*

(22) Ebn Tofail, *de vita Hai Ebn Yokdhan.* p. 19. *See* Ockley's *Engliſh Tranſlation*, p. 17.

(23) Pocock, ibid.

(24) *V. Ejuſdem præfat. ad Epiſt. Hai Ebn Yokdhan.*

Avicen's *Canon* was publiſhed at Rome, in 1593, in folio; together with [ſome other of] his Tracts in Logic, Phyſics, and Metaphyſics (25). There have been divers Tranſlations of theſe into Latin, by Gerard of Cremona,

(25) *See* Pope Blount's *Cenſura celebrior. Auctor.* pag. 358. ed. Genev. 1694. 4to.

ſtollen what he publiſhed from a Phyſician who had been his maſter [I]; and a late Writer aſſures us that he compiled his books out of Rhazes (n), one of the oldeſt Arabian Authors extant in Phyſic (o). Learned men differ widely in their judgments of the merit of Avicen; ſome highly extolling him [K], and others depreciating him as much [L]. He was one of the three great Mohammedan Philoſophers (p) who were ſuſpected of infidelity among thoſe of their own religion, and accuſed of believing the eternity of the world (q). This was occaſioned by their attachment to the Ariſtotelian Philoſophy, which the more rigid Divines judge inconſiſtent with the doctrines delivered in the Korân, and has therefore been publickly inveighed againſt from the pulpit (r). It muſt not be forgotten that Avicen, beſides his other accompliſhments, was alſo a great Poet; and that ſome have imagined him to have been a Prince [M]. The account which Leo Africanus has given of this eminent perſon ſeems to be made up of fabulous traditions; and he is egregiouſly miſtaken in ſaying, that he died about the eighticth year of his age, and

(n) Al Razi.

(o) Freind, *ubi ſupra.*

(p) The other two were Alfarabius *and* al Kendi.

(q) *Vide* Poc. *ubi ſupra.* D'Herbel. *Bibl. Orient.* pag. 303, 311, 337.

(r) Pocock. ibid.

Cremona, Andrew Alpagus, Arnold de Villa Nova, and others; and ſeveral learned men have written Annotations on them. Vopiſcus Fortunatus Plempius publiſhed a Tranſlation of ſome of his pieces, with Notes, at Louvain, in 1658 (26), and is allowed to have ſucceeded better than thoſe who went before him. For a fuller account of Avicen's printed works, and their verſions, I refer you to Mercklinus (27) and Bartoloccius (28).

(26) Idem, ibid.

(27) *In Lindenio renovato.*

(28) *Bibl. Rabbinic.* tom. 1. p. 6, &c.

[I] *Some charge him with having ſtollen what he publiſhed from a Phyſician who had been his maſter.*] The ſtory ſeems apocryphal: I ſhall relate it as I find it in my Authors; who name not their vouchers. There lived in the Eaſtern parts, ſay they, a celebrated Phyſician, who excelled all others in his profeſſion, and had gained ſo much honour and riches, that ſeveral perſons ſollicited him, by offers of money and entreaty, to take their ſons to be his ſcholars, and even his ſervants; but he, being reſolved to diſcover the ſecrets of his art to none, would admit no ſpies into his houſe. Avicen's mother, however, formed the following ſtratagem. She went to the Phyſician, and offered him her ſon as a ſervant, pretending he was naturally deaf and dumb, ſo that there could be no danger of his coming to the knowledge of any thing; and the youth, by his mother's inſtructions, counterfeited the defects ſhe mentioned ſo well, that the Phyſician, having made uſe of ſeveral artifices to diſcover the reality of them, was at length perſuaded there was no fraud in the affair, and imagining himſelf ſecure from the incapacity of a boy who could underſtand nothing but by ſigns, took him into his ſervice, and by degrees truſted him ſo far, as to leave his writings open in his room when he went abroad; and Avicen took the opportunity to tranſcribe them, and carried the copies to his mother, which, after his maſter's death, he publiſhed under his own name (29).

(29) Gab. Sionit. & J. Heſron. *ubi ſupra.*

[K] *Some learned men highly extol Avicen.*] Voſſius (30) tells us that he has delivered a complete ſyſtem of Phyſic in an admirable method, (meaning his Canon,) and that he has ſurpaſſed Galen himſelf in that reſpect. Sir Henry Savil (31) obſerves, that he was the firſt Writer who has given us a regular body of that art, whereas Galen had only written occaſional Treatiſes. John Heurnius affirms that Avicen's works contain a vaſt variety of remedies, and that all thoſe which were in uſe in his own time were deriv'd from him (32); and to him, it is ſaid, we abſolutely owe ſeveral valuable medicines (33). Julius Scaliger (34) gives him the epithet of *Divine*, and his ſon Joſeph Scaliger recommended the reading of him as neceſſary to all Phyſicians, being of opinion that no perſon could attain any conſiderable knowledge in that art, without being converſant in the writings of Avicen (35). Scheffer ſays he was a man of an extraordinary genius, a great Philoſopher, an excellent Phyſician, and eſteemed a conſummate Divine among thoſe of his own Religion; and that being endowed with ſo fine a genius, ſo uncommon a ſkill in Philoſophy, and ſo great a knowledge of Phyſic, he undertook a taſk which had never been attempted by the Greeks themſelves, to reduce the whole art of Phyſic into one ſyſtem. He adds, that though it muſt be owned there are a great many things in his *Canon* which want correction, yet the work deſerves admiration, and that Leonard Fuchſius and other enemies of the Arabian Phyſicians have in vain endeavoured to explode that excellent performance. *Fuit Avicenna vir ſummi ingenii, magnus Philoſophus, excellens Medicus, & ſummus apud ſuos Theologus. Quum itaque tanto ingenio, tantâ Philoſophiæ cognitione, tantâ denique peritiâ artis inſtructus eſſet, rem hactenus Græcis ipſis intentatam aggreſſus eſt, integram artem Medicam in unum Syſtema redigere conatus. Quanquam enim non negaveris multa in illo opere Canonis occurrere, quæ correctionem mereantur, fatendum tamen eſt eſſe opus admiratione dignum. Leonardus ſane Fuchſius, & alii Arabum medicorum hoſtes, eximium illud opus damnando nihil egerunt* (36).

(30) *De Philoſ.* cap. 14.

(31) Lectur. 2. *in Euclid.*

(32) *Cuncta enim hujus ævi remedia ex eo manant.* Heurn. *Diſſert. de ſtudio medicinæ bene inſtituendo*, publiſhed in a collection intitled *H. Grotij & alior. Diſſert. de ſtudiis inſtituendis.* p. 570. Ed. Amſtel. 1645.

(33) *Huic debemus coctūram Sacchari, item Caſſiam fiſtularem, Myrobalanum, Tamarindum, & Rhabarbarum.* Konig. *Bibl. vet. & nov.* pag. 73.

(34) *Comment. in prim. lib. Theophraſti Hiſt. plant.*

(35) Scaligerana *prima*, pag. 18.

(36) Sbaſt. Scheffer. *Introd. in Art. Medic.* pag. 63. *apud* Pope Blount, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 358.

[L] *Others depreciate him as much.*] John Manard (37) is of opinion that he ought to be ranked neither among the Ancients nor among thoſe Authors who have made improvements in the art of Phyſic, ſince his writings are tranſcribed word for word from others, with a great number of errors, occaſioned by his own ignorance, or that of his Tranſlators: [but ſure the faults of theſe latter, which I ſuſpect to be both conſiderable and frequent, are not to be imputed to him]. The ſame writer ſays, in another place (38), that tho' Avicenna has been adored as a Deity by many perſons, yet there is a prodigious obſcurity and confuſion in his book. Nicholas Leonicenus (39) calls our Philoſopher a Tyrant, and objects to him a variety of groſs miſtakes. Ludovicus Vives (40) condemns his Metaphyſics, as well as Averroes's doctrines, and all the Arabian writings of that kind, becauſe they ſavour extremely of the abſurdities of the Koran; and adds that nothing can be more trifling and inſipid than thoſe tracts. Dr. Freind ſays, that one would naturally expect to find ſomething in this Author anſwerable to the great character which he has had in the world; "but tho', *continues he*, I have "very often look'd into his writings upon ſeveral oc"caſions, (for you won't ſuppoſe, I believe, that I "have gone thro' him in any regular courſe of read"ing) I could meet with little or nothing there, but "what is taken originally from Galen, or what "at leaſt occurs with a very ſmall variation in Rhazes "or Haly Abbas. He in general ſeems to be fond "of multiplying the ſigns of the diſtempers without "any reaſon; a fault too much imitated by our mo"dern writers of Syſtems. He often, indeed, ſets "down ſome for eſſential ſymptoms, which ariſe "merely by accident, and have no immediate con"nection with the primary diſeaſe itſelf. And to "confeſs the truth, if one would chooſe an Arabic "ſyſtem of phyſic, that of Haly ſeems to be leſs con"fuſed and more intelligible, as well as more con"ſiſtent, than this of Avicenna (41)." I ſhall only add, that notwithſtanding the Arabians generally give Avicen the firſt degree in Phyſic, and the ſecond, next Alfarabius, in Philoſophy, yet ſeveral of their learned men ſtick not to ſay, that he was one-eyed in the former ſcience, and ſtark blind in the latter. *Multi docti Arabes aiunt, Avicennam in medicina fuiſſe luſcum, in philoſophia cæcum* (42).

(37) Lib. 9. Epiſt. 3. *apud eundem*, ibid.

(38) Lib. 1. Ep. 1.

(39) In his book concerning the errors of Pliny.

(40) *De Cauſis corrupt. Art.* l. 5.

(41) Freind, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 73.

(42) J. Leo Afric. *ubi ſupra.*

[M] *Some have imagined him to have been a Prince.*] Nay, others have aſſerted that he was a King, though they do not agree whether he reigned in Corduba or Bithynia (43). The miſtake was occaſioned by the honourable title given him by the Arabian writers, who uſually call him *Al Sheik al Rayis*, i. e. *The "prime Doctor*, and ſimply, *Al Rayis*, i. e. *The Prince* "or *Chief:* which he may alſo ſeem to have ſome right to, from his advancement to the dignity of Vizir (44).

(43) See Freind, ibid. pag. 71.

(44) Idem, ibid. Pocock *ubi ſupra.*

and in the 442d of the Hejira. I ſhall however preſent the reader with one of his ſtories for a ſpecimen [*N*].

[*N*] *I ſhall preſent the reader with one of the ſtories related of Avicen by Leo Africanus.*] I make choice of this, becauſe he pretends to have taken it from Ebn Khalekan, tho' I find no ſuch thing in that Author. Avicen, ſays he, uſed ſilver inſtead of iron to adorn the furniture of his mule, according to the cuſtom of the Princes of thoſe countries; which being objected to him, as inconſiſtent with the character of a man of letters, he excuſed himſelf by ſaying he did it not out of pride, but to give encouragement to the ſtudy of Phyſic, which was ſo much neglected in that Age. This is the ſubſtance of the following Latin of Leo: *Dixit Ibnu Chalican Chroniſta, quòd Avicenna loco ferri uſus eſt argento ad mulæ ſuæ ornatum, ſecundum morem principum ejus regionis. Et dictum ei fuit; O magnifice! hic non fuit mos neque conſuetudo doctorum hominum. Reſpondit Avicenna; Filioli mei: hoc argentum, quo ferri loco utor, & aurum pro clavis, ſuperbiæ non aſcribatur, ſed his temporibus: vidi hanc artem eſſe mortuam, Medicinam; volui etenim ut ei adhibeatur fides, quouſque videantur fructus ejus; forſitan reſurget, & ejus ſtudia multiplicabuntur* (44). Y. (44) Leo Afric. *ubi ſupra.*

AULNOI (MARY CATHERINE LE JUMEL DE BERNEVILLE, Counteſs d') ſo famous for her writings [*A*], was married to Francis de la Motte, Count d'Aulnoi. She was a widow, when he died in January 1705. Her mother who was married a ſecond time to the late Marquis de Gadaigne, died at Madrid, where ſhe enjoyed a conſiderable penſion, which was allowed her by King Charles II, for an important ſervice, which ſhe had done the Kingdom, whilſt ſhe was at Rome. Philip V continued that penſion to her. The Counteſs d'Aulnoi left four daughters (*a*).

(*a*) *Mercure Galant*, Januar. 1705, pag. 244, & *ſeq.*

[*A*] *She is well known for her writings.*] The firſt, which was publiſhed, was intitled *A Voyage to Spain*. She attended the Queen of Spain, the firſt wife of Charles II. Her other pieces are *Memoirs of the Court of Spain*, which was printed three times in France, and once in Holland; *Memoirs of the Court of England*; *Hippolytus, Earl of Douglaſs*; *the Hiſtory of John de Bourbon, Prince of Carency*; *the Earl of Warwick*. Theſe are ſo many little romances, which are read every where. She has likewiſe given us ſeveral *Fairy-Tales*, and a paraphraſe upon the *Miſerere* (1). (1) *Mercure Galant*, Januar. 1705, pag. 247, & *ſeq.*

AURAT, or D'AURAT (JOHN) in Latin *Auratus*. See DAURAT.

(*a*) The Emperor Claudius writing calls him only Valerius Aurelianus. Vopiſcus *in Aureliano*, cap. 17.

AURELIAN (LUCIUS DOMITIUS) (*a*), Emperor of Rome in the third Century, was one of the great Generals in Antiquity. The place of his birth is not certainly known [*A*]; but it is generally agreed that his extraction was very mean, and that his mother, who undertook to foretel things, was Prieſteſs of the ſun (*b*). He was a perſon of a noble ſtature, beautiful, robuſt, and of a very lively genius (*c*). He was fond of labour, wine and good cheer (*d*), but had no paſſion for women (*e*). He was an exact obſerver of diſcipline, himſelf, and kept it up with the greateſt ſeverity [*B*]. There (*b*) Idem, ibid. cap. 14. (*c*) Ibid. cap. 4. and 6. (*d*) Ibid. cap. 4. (*e*) Ibid. cap. 6.

(1) *Ortus, ut plures loquuntur, Sirmii familiâ obſcuriore; ut nonnullii, Daciâ Ripenſi. Ego autem legiſſe memini auctorem, qui eum Mœſi genitum prædicaret.* Vopiſc. *in Aurelian.* cap. 3. (2) Idem, ibid.

[*A*] *The place of his birth is not certainly known.*] Vopiſcus having mentioned three opinions (1), adds, that it generally happens, that the country of thoſe, who are born meanly, is unknown. He gives this reaſon for it, that they tell us wrong upon that ſubject, that they may recommend themſelves to poſterity from the honour of the place of their birth. *Evenit quidem, ut de eorum virorum genitali ſolo neſciatur, qui humiliori loco nati, plerique ſolum genitale confingunt, ut dent poſteritati de locorum ſplendore fulgorem* (2). I am of opinion, that there is another thing, which has contributed much more to this; I mean the variety of places, which claim the honour of having produced illuſtrious men. They take advantage of the uncertainty of the fact; they are in hopes, that they cannot be ſolidly confuted; and therefore they aſſert without any proof and out of mere vanity, that theſe great men were born in ſuch or ſuch a place. Hence aroſe the diſputes concerning Homer's country (3). I agree with Vopiſcus, that the grand point is, not to know where the great Princes were born, but how they governed: *Nec tamen magnorum principum virtutibus ſumma ſciendi eſt, ubi quiſque ſit genitus; ſed qualis in republicâ fuerit.* However as we are naturally very curious of knowing the time and place of the birth of great men, I think that an Hiſtorian is obliged to make all the enquiry poſſible for the ſatisfaction of his readers, and that we have a right to complain of the negligence of an infinite number of writers, who have not given themſelves this trouble.

(3) See the remark [*A*] of the article of ROTTERDAM.

[*B*] *He kept up diſcipline with the greateſt ſeverity.*] Let us add to this, that he had the happineſs of ſeeing, that this ſeverity did not provoke his ſoldiers, and render them refractory, but only kept them in awe and within the bounds of their duty. This was without doubt a happineſs; for Generals have ſometimes as much reaſon to fear the conſequences of too great a ſeverity, as thoſe of too great a lenity. Our Emperor found it very uſeful to puniſh vigorouſly and without any relaxation. *Militibus ita timori fuit, ut ſub eo poſteaquam ſemel cum ingenti ſeveritate caſtrenſia peccata correxit, nemo peccaverit. Solus denique omnium militum, qui adulterium cum hoſpitis uxore commiſerat, ita punivit, ut duarum arborum capita inflecteret, & ad pedes militis deligaret, eademque ſubito demitteret, ut ſciſſus ille utrinque penderet. Quæ res ingentem timorem omnibus fecit* (4). That is, "He was "ſo much feared by his ſoldiers, that under his com- "mand, after he had once puniſhed the crimes com- "mitted in his camp with great ſeverity, no body "ever ventured to offend again. In ſhort he alone "of all others gave the moſt remarkable inſtance "of rigour in puniſhing a guilty perſon, that we "can read of: a ſoldier of his had debauched his "landlord's wife, which crime he puniſhed by bend- "ing down the tops of two trees, and tying the ſol- "dier's feet to them, and then unlooſing the trees on "a ſudden, ſplit his body in two. Which puniſhment "ſtruck a prodigious terror upon the whole army." We find by this paſſage, that in puniſhing this ſoldier he made uſe of the ſame method, which Alexander did to puniſh the traytor Beſſus, who had murdered King Darius. There is nothing finer than the orders of Aurelian directing what the ſoldiers ought to do, and what not. St. John the Baptiſt could not have forbid them more things, if he had thought proper to have given them a particular direction (5). Aurelian would not have them touch any fruit, nor receive any ſalt, or wood, or oil, nor paſs the bounds of ſtrict chaſtity. Would not one imagine, that he had a deſign to introduce the diſcipline of Monks into the army? *Hujus Epiſtola militaris eſt ad Vicarium "ſuum data hujuſmodi*; Si vis tribunus eſſe, imo ſi vis "vivere, manus militum contine. Nemo pullum alie- "num rapiat; ovem nemo contingat; uvam nullus "auferat; ſegetem nemo deterat; oleum, ſal, lignum, "nemo exigat: annonâ ſuâ contentus ſit. De prædâ "hoſtis, non de lacrymis provincialium, habeat; ar- "ma terſa ſint; ferramenta ſamiata . . . . alter alteri "quaſi ſervus obſequatur: à medicis gratis curentur; "aruſpicibus nil dent; in hoſpitiis caſtè agant; qui "litem fecerit, vapulet (6)." That is: *His military Epiſtle* (4) Vopiſc. *in Aureliano*, cap. 7. pag. 434. (5) St. Luke iii. 14. (6) Vopiſc. *in Aureliano*, cap. 7. pag. 434.

There was one very remarkable quality in him, which was, that he continued ſtill poor amidſt all the various poſts of importance which were conferred upon him [C]. He was ſo very fond of having his ſword drawn, that the ſoldiers gave him the ſurname of *Sword-in-Hand*, to diſtinguiſh him from another Captain of the ſame name with him [D]. He made ſuch a ſlaughter in his battles, that he killed eight and forty Sarmatians in one day; and they made uſe of the number a thouſand to repreſent the mortal blows which he had given the enemies (*f*). This thought was introduced in the common ſongs and ballads (*g*). In this point he equalled the honour of the firſt King of the Jews (*h*); and he merited it much more, for it is never ſaid that Saul had killed with his own hand the thouſand enemies which the ſongs aſcribed to him the ſlaughter of; but it was really underſtood ſo with regard to Aurelian. He was adopted by Ulpius Crinitus, one of the greateſt men of that time (*i*); the Emperor Valerian, who managed that affair (*k*), made him Lieutenant to this Crinitus (*l*), who was General of the frontiers of Illyrium and Thrace (*m*), and appointed him Conſul in the year 258. Theſe rewards and ſeveral others

(*f*) Vopiſc. *in Aurel.* cap. 6.
(*g*) Idem, ibid. and cap. 7.
(*h*) See the 1ſt book of Samuel, ch. xviii. ver. 7.
(*i*) Vopiſc. *in Aurel.* cap. 14.
(*k*) Idem, ibid. cap. 15.
(*l*) Ib. cap. 10.
(*m*) Ibid. cap. 13.

Epiſtle to his Lieutenant is as follows: "If you would "be a Tribune, nay if you would deſerve your life, "put a proper reſtraint upon the ſoldiers. Let none "of them take away another man's fowls, or ſheep, "or grapes; let none tread down the corn; let none "of them demand oil, or ſalt, or wood; but every "one be contented with his own allowance. Let "them get their booty from the enemy, and not "from the ſpoils of the people in the Provinces; let "their arms be kept clean and bright; and their "ſwords and ſpears ſharp. . . . . Let one aſſiſt another "as a ſervant, let the Phyſicians cure them for no-"thing, and the Soothſayers take nothing of them. "Let them live chaſtly in their quarters; and let "him, that begins a quarrel, be beaten." He was ſo rigid, that the Emperor Valerian, who had a ſingular eſteem for him, would not venture his ſon under his care; for he was apprehenſive, that this young Prince, who loved gaiety and mirth, would feel too ſenſibly the ſeverity of ſuch a maſter; and upon that account he choſe for him a Governor of leſs rigour. It was thus he anſwered Antoninus Gallus the Conſul, who thought it wrong to give this office to any other than Aurelian: "*Culpas me familiaribus literis quod* "*Poſthumio filium meum Gallienum magis quam Au-*"*reliano commiſerim, quum utique & ſeveriori & puer* "*credendus fuerit & exercitus; nec tu id diutius judi-*"*cabis, ſi benè ſcieris quantæ ſit Aurelianus ſeverita-*"*tis. Nimius eſt, multus eſt, gravis eſt, & ad noſtra* "*jam non facit tempora. Teſtor autem omnes deos, me* "*etiam timuiſſe ne quid etiam erga filium meum ſeve-*"*rius, ſi quid ille feciſſet, ut eſt naturâ pronus ad lu-*"*dicra, ſævius cogitaret.* Hæc Epiſtola indicat quan-"tæ fuerit ſeveritatis, ut illum Valerianus etiam ti-"muiſſe ſe dicat (7)." We muſt not forget his ſeverity towards his domeſtics. He ordered thoſe, who failed in their duty, to be ſcourged in his preſence, and he committed ſeveral of his ſervants into the hands of Juſtice, that they might be chaſtiſed for their faults. He put one of his maids to death, for having committed adultery with his man. *Servos & miniſtros peccantes coram ſe cædi jubebat, ut plerique dicunt, cauſa tenendæ ſeveritatis; ut alii ſtudio credulitatis. Ancillam ſuam, quæ adulterium cum ſervo ſuo fecerat, capite punivit. Multos ſervos è familiâ propriâ, qui peccaverant, legibus audiendos judiciis publicis dedit* (8). What reaſon had Valerian to ſay, that ſuch a man was too ſevere for the Age, in which he lived? *Ad noſtra jam non facit tempora* (9). He was fit only for the ſect of the Montaniſts. The Chriſtians of the following Ages would have thought him too rigid; and a great many modern Caſuiſts would have ſaid of his morals, what they ſay of thoſe of the Fathers, that they are too ſtrict, and that ſo harſh and corroſive a remedy is by no means agreeable to our diſeaſes. Where are the ſoldiers, or even the citizens, who trouble themſelves with animadverting upon the amours of their men and maids? They put them away, when they find them guilty; which is all the puniſhment they inflict on them. Nay ſometimes they are good-natur'd enough to marry them to each other. We may obſerve, that the Hiſtory mentions but one of Aurelian's maids, who was puniſhed for her lewdneſs. It is a ſign, that ſuch faults were very uncommon in his family; which is extremely ſurprizing, when one conſiders what happens every day, and that a General and an Emperor as he was muſt neceſſarily have a great number of ſlaves of both ſexes.

(7) Idem, ibid. cap. 8. pag. 439, 440.
(8) Idem, ibid. cap. 49. p. 585.
(9) Idem, ibid. cap. 8. pag. 439.

[C] *He continued poor amidſt all the various poſts of importance, which were conferred upon him* (10).] The Emperor his maſter gave a ſufficient teſtimony to this virtue, when he charged the public with the expence, which the Conſulſhip, that he had promiſed to Aurelian, required. *Conſulatum cum eodem Ulpio Crinito in annum ſequentem à die undecimo Calend. Juniarum, in locum Gallieni & Valeriani, ſperare te convenit ſumptu publico. Levanda eſt enim paupertas eorum hominum, qui diu reipublicæ viventes pauperes ſunt, & nullorum magis* (11). The Hiſtorian, who mentions this, produces the Letter, which the Emperor wrote to the Prefect of Rome, to let him know what he deſired ſhould be given to the new Conſul. *Aureliano, cui conſulatum detulimus ob* PAUPERTATEM, *qua ille magnus eſt cæteris major, dabis ad editionem Circenſium Antonianos trecentos &c.* (12). Some Writers have ſaid that the poverty of Aurelian obliged Valerian to give orders, that Ulpius Crinitus ſhould adopt him: *Memini me in quodam libro Græco legiſſe . . . . . mandatum eſſe Crinito à Valeriano, ut Aurelianus adoptaretur, idcirco præcipuè quod pauper eſſet* (13). We may obſerve, that when he was Emperor, he never departed from the rules of mediocrity in ſerving his friends. He acted thus perhaps from the habit, which he had gained of renouncing wealth, and from the opinion which he had, that a moderate ſhare of riches was ſufficient for a great man. Perhaps too he was unwilling to give umbrage to the people by too extravagant a profuſion; for ſubjects are never pleaſed to ſee a Prince heap riches and favours upon his friends without any bounds. Vopiſcus tells us, that this Emperor was willing to keep a medium, which would ſecure them from the inconveniences of poverty without expoſing them to envy. *Amicos ſuos honeſte ditavit & modice, ut miſerias paupertatis effugerent, & divitiarum invidiam patrimonii moderatione vitarent* (14). It is added, that he ſuffered no perſon to go dreſt in ſilk, which he ſet an example of himſelf, and obliged his own wife to the ſame law; for when ſhe aſked him to grant her at leaſt one ſuit, he replied, *God forbid, that you ſhould buy thread, which would coſt as much as gold.* It appears, that at that time a pound of ſilk was worth a pound of gold. *Veſtem holoſericam neque ipſe in veſtiario ſuo habuit, neque alteri utendam dedit. Et quum ab eo uxor ſua peteret, ut unico pallio blatteo ſerico uteretur, ille reſpondit,* Abſit ut auro fila penſentur; *libra enim auri tunc libra ſerici fuit* (15). See Mr. de Tillemont, who finds ſomething of inconſiſtency between this fact and ſome particulars related by the ſame Hiſtorian or others, with regard to the luxury of this Emperor (16). But we muſt not omit to mention, that he did not cloath his ſervants more magnificently after he was raiſed to the throne than before (17), and that he permitted the Senators to have the ſame liveries with himſelf (18).

(10) See the particular account of them in Vopiſcus, cap. 10.
(11) Idem, in cap. 2. pag. 445.
(12) Idem, cap. 12.
(13) Idem, cap. 15.
(14) Vopiſc. *in Aurel.* cap. 14. pag. 539.
(15) Idem, ibid. pag. 540.
(16) Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 3. p. 1074, 1075.
(17) Vopiſc. *in Aurel.* cap. 1.
(18) Idem, ibid. cap. 49.

[D] *The ſoldiers gave him the ſurname of* Sword-in-hand, *to diſtinguiſh him from another Captain of the ſame name.*] Such a diſtinction as this is the greateſt gratification imaginable to the pride of a brave Warriour. Let us give the words of Vopiſcus himſelf: *Gladii exerendi cupidus. Nam quum eſſent in exercitu duo Aureliani tribuni, hic & alius, qui cum Valeriano captus eſt, huic ſignum exercitus appoſuerat* manum ad ferrum, *ut ſi forte quæreretur quis Aurelianus aliquid vel feciſſet vel geſſiſſet, ſuggeretur,* Aurelianus manu ad ferrum, *atque cognoſceretur* (19).

(19) Idem, ibid. cap. 6. pag. 426.

others were attended with all the agreeable circumſtances imaginable, if we conſider the commendations and marks of eſteem which were uſed as a preface to the Emperor's declarations [*E*]. We do not find that Aurelian made any figure under the Emperor Gallienus; but under Claudius he was honoured with the firſt poſts in the Empire, and commanded the armies with ſo much glory, that after the death of that Emperor all the Legions agreed to place him upon the throne (*n*). This happened in the year 270. He went a little after to Rome, and having eſtabliſhed his authority there, marched towards Pannonia, where the Goths had made an irruption (*o*). He gave them battle, and obliged them to repaſs the Danube, and ſue for peace. After this, being informed that the Marcomanni, Juthungi (*p*), and ſeveral other nations, had formed a reſolution to carry the war into Italy, he marched againſt them, and conquered them near the Danube in a great battle. He ſlew a great many more of them as they were endeavouring to repaſs that river, and prevented the reſt from returning to their own country, and ſhut them up in the Roman territories. The want of proviſions, and an hundred other inconveniences, which forced them to deſire peace, yet could not reduce them to ſuch a ſubmiſſive temper as might be agreeable to him. Their Deputies ſpoke in a very haughty manner, ſo that he ſent them back with a great deal of diſdain; for as he imagined that he had cut off this army from any retreat, he thought they could never have any opportunity of eſcaping. But he was miſtaken in this; the enemies diſengaged themſelves, and having got before him entered Italy, and made great devaſtations about Milan. He could not follow them with the neceſſary expedition, for his army was much heavier than theirs. They ſurprized and defeated him near Placentia (*q*), and if they had underſtood the art of war as well as he, they would have been able to ruin the Empire after ſuch an advantage which they had gained; but as they knew not how to make uſe of it, and did not march cloſe and firm, he defeated them in ſeveral engagements, and reduced them to

(*n*) Ibid. cap. 17.

(*o*) Zoſim. lib. 1. pag. 654, 655.

(*p*) They were ſituated the neareſt to Rhetia and Italy.

(*q*) Vopiſc. *in Aurel.* cap. 21.

[*E*] *The commendations of him ſerved as a Preface to the Declarations of the Emperor.*] I ſhall report them, becauſe they contain an account of the important ſervices, which Aurelian had done to the Empire. *Valerianus Auguſtus Ceionio Albino Præfecto urbi. Vellemus quidem ſingulis quibuſque devotiſſimis Reipub. viris multo majora deferre compendia quam eorum dignitas poſtulat, maxime ubi honorem vita commendat. Debet enim quid præter dignitatem pretium eſſe meritorum. Sed facit rigor publicus, ut accipere de provinciarum oblationibus ultra ordinis ſui gradum nemo plus poſſit. Aurelianum fortiſſimum virum ad inſpicienda & ordinanda caſtra omnia deſtinavimus; cui tantum à nobis atque ab omni Republicâ, communi totius exercitus confeſſione debetur, ut digna illi vix aliqua vel nimis magna ſunt munera. Quid enim in illo non clarum? quid non Corvinis & Scipionibus conferendum? Ille liberator Illyrii, ille Galliarum reſtitutor, ille Dux magni totius exempli. Et tamen nihil præterea poſſum addere tanto viro ad muneris gratiam quam patitur ſobria & benè gerenda Reſpublica. Quare ſinceritas tua, mi parens chariſſime, ſupradicto viro efficiet, quandiu Romæ fuerit, panes militares mundos ſedecim, &c.* (20). That is: "Valerianus Auguſtus to Ceionius Albinus Prefect "of the city greeting. We ſhould be very glad to "give much greater rewards to all thoſe, who have "eminently ſerved the Commonwealth, than their "dignity demands, eſpecially when their lives add a "grace to their honour: for there ought to be ſome "other reward of their merits beſides the dignity "itſelf. But the public rigour requires, that no per"ſon ſhall receive of the revenues of the Provinces "above what is neceſſary to his rank and office. "We have appointed Aurelian, a man of diſtin"guiſh'd bravery, to take care of all our camps; he "has deſerved ſo well of us and of the whole Com"monwealth, by the general confeſſion of the army, "that ſcarce any rewards are great enough for his "ſervices. For what is there, that is not great and "noble in him? What is there, that cannot equal "him to the Corvinus's and Scipio's? He was the "Deliverer of Illyrium, he was the Reſtorer of Gaul, "he was a General of the moſt exemplary conduct. "And yet I can add nothing elſe to ſo great a man, "in order to recommend the office to him, but what "the regular and ſober adminiſtration of the Com"monwealth will permit. Therefore, my deareſt "couſin, I doubt not but your honeſty will take care "to furniſh him, as long as he ſhall continue at "Rome, with ſixteen good military loaves, &c." In this manner Valerian wrote to the Prefect of Rome; and to Aurelian himſelf he wrote as follows: *Ego de te tantum, Deo favente, ſpero quantum de Trajano, ſi viveret, poſſet ſperare Respub. Neque enim minor eſt* (21), *in cujus locum fidemque te legi. Conſulatum cum eodem Ulpio Crinito in annum ſequentem à die undecimo Calend. Juniarum, in locum Gallieni & Valeriani, ſperare te convenit ſumptu publico.* That is: "I expect as much "from you, thro' the favour of God, as the Com"monwealth would of Trajan himſelf, if he were "living. For the perſon, in whoſe place and truſt I "have choſen you, is not inferior to him. You muſt "expect to enter at the public charge upon the Con"ſulſhip with the ſame Ulpius Crinitus, on the ele"venth of the Calends of June, in the room of Gal"lienus and Valerian." We have likewiſe the following ſpeech, which Valerian addreſſed to him before the Army and the Court. *Gratias tibi agit, Aureliane, Reſpublica, quod eam Gotthorum poteſtate liberaſti. Abundamus per te prædâ, abundamus gloriâ, & his omnibus, quibus Romana felicitas creſcit. Cape igitur tibi pro rebus geſtis tuis coronas murales quatuor, coronas vallares quinque, coronas navales duas, coronas civicas duas, haſtas puras decem, vexilla bicolora quatuor, tunicas ducales ruſſas quatuor, pallia proconſularia duo, togam prætextam, tunicam palmatam, togam pictam, ſubarmalem profundum, ſellam eboratam. Nam te conſulem hodie deſigno, ſcripturus ad ſenatum, ut tibi deputet ſcipionem, deputet etiam faſces. Hæc enim imperator non ſolet dare, ſed à ſenatu, quando ſit conſul, accipere* (22). That is: "The Commonwealth, Au"relian, returns you thanks for reſcuing her from "the power of the Goths: By your valour we have "plenty of ſpoils, and enjoy the greateſt glory; and "every thing neceſſary to advance the Roman Feli"city. Receive therefore for your great actions four "mural crowns, five vallar crowns, two naval crowns, "two civic crowns, ten *haſta pura's*, four ſtandards "of two colours, four military tunics, two proconſu"lar cloaks, a *toga prætexta*, a *tunica palmata*, an "embroidered gown, a ſuit to wear under armour, "an ivory ſeat. For I appoint you Conſul this day, "and ſhall write to the Senate, that they may ſend "you the ſtaff and the faſces. For the Emperor does "not uſe to give theſe, but to receive them from the "Senate, when he is made Conſul."

(20) Idem, ibid. cap. 9. pag. 440.

(21) Caſaubon would have it read *es*, that is, that Valerian thought Aurelian equal to Crinitus. This ſeems to be the true ſenſe.

(22) Vopiſc. cap. 13. pag. 449, 450.

The firſt of theſe three paſſages of Vopiſcus contains a remarkable particular, which does not agree with the common notions of the diſorders of the Empire. It is generally imagined, that after the ſoldiers had accuſtomed themſelves to create and murder their Emperors, there was nothing but oppreſſion and tyranny in the Roman Provinces. This cannot be always true; for we ſee here, that Valerian managed the public expences, in order to eaſe the Provinces, with more care, than is obſerved now in Chriſtian Kingdoms.

to nothing (r). It was during this war that the books of the Sibylls were conſulted at Rome: it is proper to relate ſome circumſtances, which will ſhew the religion of Aurelian, and the irreligion of his flatterers [F]. It is probable he purſued the enemy as far as Germany; and he was obliged to ſtop ſome time to repel the Vandals who had paſſed the Danube. He overcame them, and obliged them to deſire peace, which he was very glad to grant them (s). He returned to Rome full of rage, on account of the ſeditions which had been raiſed, and puniſhed the promoters of them with extreme cruelty (t). This was his predominant vice; and it occaſioned a great many not to rank him among the good Princes; and as Diocleſian uſed to ſay, he was more fit to command an army than to be an Emperor [G]. We muſt obſerve however, that his ſanguinary diſpoſition did not prevent him from being beloved by the people. His liberality, and the care that he took to maintain plenty, and to puniſh miſdemeanours, made them forget his cruelty [H]. He undertook an expedition into the Eaſt againſt Zenobia (u), after he had puniſhed the ſeditious, and regulated the diſorders at Rome (x). He concluded this war, having taken that brave Princeſs captive, with prodigious expedition, though he met with in his way a great many enemies to fight, and many cities to be reduced. We have ſeen in another place (y) what hindered him from ruining that of Tyre. He expoſed his perſon ſo much, while he beſieged Zenobia in the city of Palmyra, that he was wounded with an arrow (z). He defeated the Perſians, who came to the aſſiſtance of the beſieged, and gained prodigious honour by his conqueſt of all the dominions

(r) Taken from Mr. de Tillemont's *Hiſt. des Empereurs*, tom. 3. p. 1030, & *ſeq.* He quotes Dexippus chiefly. See likewiſe his notes.

(s) *See* Tillemont, ibid.

(t) See Remark [H].

(u) In 272.

(x) Vopiſc. cap. 22.

(y) In the Remark [E] of the Article APOLLONIUS TYANÆUS.

(z) Vopiſc. *in Aurel.* cap. 26.

[F] *There are ſome circumſtances, which will ſhew us the Religion of Aurelian, and the Irreligion of his flatterers.*] The conſternation at Rome was very great, when they received the news, that the Marcomanni had entered Italy, and made prodigious devaſtations there (23). Seditions were raiſed in the midſt of this agitation; upon which account Ulpius Syllanus, Chief of the Senate, propoſed to conſult the Sibyll's Books; but there were ſome Senators, who oppoſed this motion by reaſon, that under ſo valiant an Emperor as Aurelian, there was no neceſſity of informing themſelves concerning the will of the Gods. This difference of opinion delaying the conſultation of the Sibyll's writings, Aurelian was obliged to interpoſe. He wrote therefore to the Senate, that he was ſurprized they ſhould heſitate upon an affair of that nature, as if they were deliberating in one of the churches of the Chriſtians, and not in a temple of all the Gods. *Miror vos, patres ſancti, tamdiu de aperiendis Sibyllinis dubitaſſe libris, perinde quaſi in Chriſtianorum Eccleſia, non in templo Deorum omnium tractaretis* (24). He preſſed them very ſtrongly, he aſſured them that he would ſupply all the neceſſary expences, and that he had given orders to his Treaſurer for that purpoſe; "for, *continues he*, it is no diſgrace to conquer by the "divine aſſiſtance: it was thus, that our anceſtors "ended and begun many of their wars." *Neque enim indecorum eſt Diis juvantibus vincere: ſic apud majores noſtros multa finita ſunt bella, ſic cæpta* (25). Syllanus had reaſon therefore to ſay to the flatterers of Aurelian, that this great man honoured the Gods, and placed his confidence in them; and that their aſſiſtance was never any diſgrace to men of valour. *Meminiſtis P. C. me in hoc ordine ſæpe dixiſſe jam tum, quum primum nuntiatum eſt Marcomannos erupiſſe, conſulenda Sibyllæ decreta, utendum Apollinis beneficiis, inſerviendum Deorum immortalium præceptis: recuſaſſe verò quoſdam, & cum ingenti calumnia recuſaſſe, quum adulando dicerent tantam principis eſſe virtutem ut opus non ſit Deos conſuli, perinde quaſi & ipſe vir magnus non Deos colat, non de Diis immortalibus ſperet. Quid plura? audivimus literas, quibus rogavit opem Deorum, quæ nunquam cuiquam turpis eſt, ut vir fortiſſimus adjuvaretur* (26). After the receipt of Aurelian's Letter there was no longer delay: the Senate ordered the Sibyll's Books to be conſulted; which brought after it a long train of devotions (27). We may obſerve by the way how much ſome perſons approved of Ajax's maxim (28). We have here a ſett of flatterers, who imagine, that there is no occaſion to have recourſe to the aſſiſtance of Heaven, but when we have a diſtruſt in the valour and prudence of the Princes of the world. I ſhall give two proofs, that Aurelian was not of this opinion: *Credo adjuturos Rom. Remp. Deos, qui nunquam noſtris conatibus defuerunt* (29). That is: "I believe that the Gods, who have never been "wanting to our endeavours, will aſſiſt the Roman "Commonwealth." This is what he wrote during the perplexity he was in, occaſioned by the long reſiſtance of Zenobia. He acknowledges in another Letter, that his victories were the gift of the Gods. *Unde apparet nullam mihi à Diis immortalibus datam ſine difficultate victoriam* (30). It is true, he adds, that they had always granted them to him after a thouſand difficulties. This is the fate of every thing; it is not virtue only, that is to be obtained by the ſweat of one's brows, but it is the property of all other good things; *Sic Diis placitum: Such is the pleaſure of God.*

(23) Idem, cap. 18.

(24) Idem, ibid. cap. 20. p. 463.

(25) Vopiſc. *in Aurel.* cap. 20. pag. 464.

(26) Idem, cap. 19. p. 459, 460.

(27) Idem, cap. 20.

(28) See the Remark [E] of the Article AJAX the ſon of Telamon.

(29) Idem, cap. 26.

(30) Idem, cap. 38.

Τῆς δ' ἀρετῆς ἱδρῶτα θεοὶ προπάροιθεν ἔθηκαν
Ἀθάνατοι, μακρὸς δὲ καὶ ὄρθιος οἶμος ἐπ' αὐτὴν,
Καὶ τρηχὺς τὸ πρῶτον (31).

(31) Heſiod. *Oper. & Dies*, ver. 287.

"—— Th' immortal Gods have made
"Labour the means of virtue; and the way
"To gain that prize, at firſt is difficult."

There are no free-gifts in that ſenſe; and we muſt own, that this heavenly diſpoſal of things has the marks of great goodneſs; for we feel a much more exquiſite ſatisfaction from the acquiſition of thoſe good things, which have coſt us a great deal of labour.

[G] *His cruelty has occaſioned a great many not to rank him among the good Princes; and as Diocleſian uſed to ſay, he was more fit to command an army, than to be an Emperor.*] Vopiſcus aſſures us of theſe particulars. *Et Aurelianum quidem*, ſays he (32), *multi neque inter bonos, neque inter malos principes ponunt, idcirco quod ei clementia, imperatorum dos prima, defuerit. Verconius Herennianus præfectus prætorio Diocletiani, teſte Aſclepiodoto, ſæpe dicebat, Diocletianum frequenter dixiſſe, quum Maximiani aſperitatem reprehenderet, Aurelianum magis ducem eſſe debuiſſe, quam principem. Nam ejus nimia ferocitas ei diſplicebat.* Theſe expreſſions of Diocletian ſhew that he was a man of judgment; for he uſed to ſay, that there was nothing more difficult than to govern well (33), and he knew perfectly the reaſons of that difficulty. You may find them in Vopiſcus (34), an Author, who remarks, that in the great number of Roman Emperors, there were reckoned but few good Princes (35); and he commends the expreſſion of a Jeſter, who uſed to ſay, that all the good Princes might be painted in a ring: *Vides quæſo quam pauci ſint principes boni, ut benè dictum ſit à quodam mimico ſcurrâ Claudii, hujus temporibus*, In uno annulo bonos principes poſſe perſcribi atque depingi (36).

(32) Vopiſc. cap. 44. p. 532, 533.

(33) Idem, ibid. cap. 43.

(34) Ibid.

(35) Idem, cap. 42.

(36) Idem, ibid. pag. 529.

[H] *His liberality, and the care, which he took to maintain plenty &c. . . . . made them forget his cruelty.*] The manner, in which he puniſhed the ſeditions, that had been raiſed at Rome during his abſence, was carried ſo much beyond the bounds of a lawful and neceſſary ſeverity, that it was a blemiſh to his reputation, and render'd him very odious: *Magnum illud, & quod jam fuerat, & quod non fruſtra ſperatum eſt, infamiæ triſtioris ictu contaminavit imperium. . . . . Timeri cæpit princeps optimus, non amari, quum alii dicerent, perfodiendum talem principem, non optandum; alii bonum quidem medicum, ſed mala*

dominions of Zenobia (*aa*). Upon his return towards the Weſt, he was informed that the Palmyrenians had revolted, which news obliged him to return to Syria, and he arrived at Antioch before it was known that he was coming (*bb*). He chaſtiſed Palmyra with an exceſſive cruelty, for he put all to the ſword (*cc*). He was at Carræ in Meſopotamia, when he heard of the revolt of the Egyptians. He marched againſt them with his uſual good fortune and diligence. He defeated their Chief, took him priſoner, and put him to death; and ſo reduced Egypt in a very ſhort time (*dd*). His inclination to reunite to the Empire, Gaul, Spain and Britain, which had ſubmitted to Tetricus, induced him to return into the Weſt. He gained a battle near Chalons upon the Marne, which determined the whole diſpute, eſpecially as Tetricus had ſurrendered himſelf to him during the fight (*ee*). He returned to Rome and triumphed over Zenobia and Tetricus with an extraordinary pomp (*ff*). He marched back to Gaul, and being informed that the Barbarians were entered into the country of the *Vindelici* (*gg*), he went thither with great expedition, and put a ſtop to the danger. He marched thence to Illyrium, and being of opinion that he could not maintain Dacia, which Trajan had made a Province of beyond the Danube, and had been loſt under Gallienus, he drew off his troops and the inhabitants from thence, and gave the latter a part of Mæſia and Dardania, which he formed into a new Province (*hh*). He had in Thrace a fine army, which he reſolved to march againſt the Perſians after winter, when he was killed by one of his Generals (*ii*). This was done in January 275. We know but in general the great actions of his life; but if we had a more exact and particular account of them, ſuch as we have now of conqueſts and battles, we could not ſufficiently admire him, and we ſhould ſee the reaſonableneſs of Junius Tiberianus's complaint [*I*]; for in ſhort Aurelian was a man, who transferred a war from the Eaſt to the Weſt with the ſame eaſe, as it

(*aa*) See in Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 3. pag. 1035, the catalogue of the people who ſent him preſents. See likewiſe below quotation (61).

(*bb*) Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 3. p. 1056.

(*cc*) See the note [*L*].

(*dd*) Vopiſc. *in Aurel.* cap. 32.

(*ee*) *See* Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 3. p. 1058, 1059.

(*ff*) See the deſcription of it in Vopiſcus, chap. 33, *& ſeq.*

(*gg*) It is partly the country now called *Bavaria* and *Suabia*.

(*hh*) Which was likewiſe called *Dacia*, or *New Dacia*. See the proofs of this in Mr. Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 3. p. 1067.

(*ii*) Vopiſc. *in Aurel.* cap. 35.

mala ratione curantem (37). This hatred of him did not continue long amongſt the people: his diſtributions of bread, and fleſh (38), and oil (39), with ſeveral other favours, which they enjoyed under his Government, made them converts to him. The people were then juſt in the ſame diſpoſition, as they were in Juvenal's time; they formed no other deſires than for bread and public ſhews; and nothing was more chearful than they, if their belly was but full.

(37) Idem, cap. 21. pag. 467.

(38) Idem, cap. 35.

(39) Idem, cap. 48.

——— *Jam pridem ex quo ſuffragia nulli*
Vendimus, effugit curas. Nam qui dabat olim
Imperium, faſces, legiones, omnia, nunc ſe
Continet, atque duas tantum res anxius optat,
Panem, & Circenſes (40).

(40) Juven. Sat. 10. ver. 77.

" ——— Since now no longer votes are ſold,
" The people's free from care; that mighty people,
" Whoſe voice once Conſuls, Kings, and Generals
" made,
" Now ſunk in ſlav'ry, wiſh for nothing more
" Than bread and public ſhews."

It was by this means that this Emperor ingratiated himſelf with the multitude. Read the Letter, which he wrote to an Overſeer of the proviſions. *Aurelianus Auguſtus Flavio Arabiano Præfecto annonæ. Inter cætera, quibus Diis faventibus Romanam Rempub. juvimus, nihil mihi eſt magnificentius, quam quod additamento unciæ omnè annonarum urbicarum genus juvi; quod ut eſſet perpetuum, navicularios Niliacos apud Ægyptum novos, & Romæ amnicos poſui. Tiberinas extruxi ripas: vadum alvei tumentis effodi, Diis & perennitati vota conſtitui, almam Cererem conſecravi. Nunc tuum eſt officium, Arabiane jucundiſſime, elaborare, ne meæ diſpoſitiones in irritum veniant. Neque enim populo Rom. ſaturo quicquam poteſt eſſe lætius* (41). He had a deſign to eſtabliſh perpetual diſtributions of wine, and had taken meaſures for that purpoſe (42). It is ſaid, that his Præfect of the Prætorium prevented him from executing it, by telling him, that if he gave wine to the people, he muſt of neceſſity give them fowls and geeſe too. *Si & vinum populo Romano damus, ſupereſt ut & pullos & anſeres demus* (43). Such largeſſes as theſe are capable of making them forget the effuſion of ſome men's blood. Tho' Aurelian had put to death his ſiſter's ſon or daughter, or both of them, for trifling reaſons (44), tho' he had applied the puniſhment of death in a very unjuſt manner (45); yet all this was not able to extinguiſh the people's affection for him, whom he ſupplied with all the advantages of proviſion and fine cloaths (46). Beſides his ſeverity had put an end to many diſorders, which were odious to the populace. He deſtroyed the informers, extortioners, public bloodſuckers, and others of that brood. " Quicquid ſane ſcelerum " fuit, quicquid malæ conſcientiæ, vel artium funeſta- " rum, quicquid denique factionum Aurelianus toto " penitus orbe purgavit. . . . (47)." *Item quadruplatores ac delatores ingenti ſeveritate perſequutus eſt: tabulas publicas ad privatorum ſecuritatem exuri in foro Trajano ſemel juſſit. Amneſtia etiam ſub ea delictorum publicorum decreta eſt de exemplo Athenienſium: cujus rei etiam Tullius in Philippicis meminit. Fures provinciales repetundarum ac peculatûs reos ultra militarem modum eſt perſequutus, ut eos ingentibus ſuppliciis cruciatibuſque puniret* (48). He enlarged the circuit of Rome, and reſtored to the Empire its ancient boundaries. The people were ſoon ſtruck with this ſhew of grandeur. He began a reformation of ſeveral abuſes, and limited the number of Eunuchs, becauſe they were raiſed to a very great price (50). He prohibited the having concubines of a free condition (51). It was in ſhort a ſatisfaction to the Roman people, to ſee, that this Emperor had made himſelf feared by the Senate: perhaps that body had aſſumed a little too much to themſelves; however that be, I imagine, they were pleaſed to find, that the Senators were obliged to take care of their conduct under ſuch a maſter, like ſcholars under the diſcipline of a ſchool-maſter: *Populus autem Romanus eum amavit, Senatus & timuit* (52). *Senatus mortem ejus gravitèr tulit, gravius tamen populus Romanus, qui vulgò dicebat Aurelianum Pædagogum eſſe Senatorum* (53). That is: " The Roman " people loved him, and the Senate feared him. The " Senate was ſorry for his death, but the Roman " people much more ſo, who generally called him " the Pedagogue of the Senate."

(47) Idem, cap. 37.

(48) Idem, cap. 39. pag. 522, 523.

(49) Idem, cap. 39.

(50) Idem, ibid.

(51) Idem, ibid.

(52) Idem, cap. ult.

(53) Idem, cap. 37.

[*I*] *If we had a more exact and particular account of his great actions, we ſhould ſee the reaſonableneſs of Junius Tiberianus's complaint.*] *How is it*, ſays he, *that a Therſites, a Simon, and the other monſters of antiquity are known to us, and will be known to our poſterity; and yet ſhall they know nothing of Aurelian, an illuſtrious Prince, a very ſevere Emperor, who reſtored the whole world to the Roman name? Heavens grant, that we be not guilty of ſo much ſtupidity!* Upon that account he engaged Flavius Vopiſcus to undertake the Hiſtory of that Emperor, and promiſed him all the Memoirs which the Library of Trajan could furniſh him with. I ſhall give the very words of this Hiſtorian: *Quæſivit a me* (Junius Tiberianus) *quis vitam* Aureliani *in literas retuliſſet? Cui ego quum reſpondiſſem, neminem a me Latinorum, Græcorum aliquos lectitatos, dolorem gemitus ſui vir ſanctus per hæc verba profudit:* Ergo Therſitem, Sinonem, cæteraque illa prodigia vetuſtatis, & nos benè ſcimus, & poſteri frequentabunt: divum Aurelianum, clariſſimum Principem, ſeveriſſimum Imperatorem, per quem totus Romano nomini orbis eſt reſtitutus, poſteri neſciant?

(41) Vopiſc. cap. 47. p. 576, 577.

(42) Idem, cap. 48.

(43) Idem, cap. 48. pag. 578.

(44) Idem, cap. 36 and 39.

(45) *See* Julian's Cæſars, and Mr. Spanheim's notes upon them, pag. 107.

(46) Vopiſc. cap. 48.

it is now carried from Alſace to Flanders. He was extremely regretted, and the moſt magnificent monuments were erected to his honour. He was deified [K], and had a temple built to him. We may obſerve, that there was no Deity to whom he teſtified more reverence than to the Sun [L]. He left but one daughter, whoſe grandſon was living in Diocleſian's time (*kk*). He was a Senator venerable for his virtue, and had been Proconſul of Cilicia. We may conſider as a falſity what Abulpharagius ſays, *that Aurelian upon his making peace with Sapores King of Perſia, gave him his daughter in marriage* (*ll*). It is pretended likewiſe that he ſent him Greek Phyſicians to inſtruct the Perſians in Hippocrates's method of Phyſic (*mm*). We may obſerve, that Phyſicians were a ſet of men whom he never made uſe of in his ſickneſs; his only remedy was abſtinence (*nn*). It was happy for the Chriſtians, that a Prince of ſo cruel a diſpoſition, never attempted to deſtroy them. I own that one of the perſecutions of the church is placed under his reign; but there are ſome Hiſtorians who make no mention of it, and thoſe

(*kk*) Idem, cap. 42. pag. 528.

(*ll*) Tillem. *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 3. pag. 1182.

(*mm*) Abulpharagius quoted by Tillem. ibid.

(*nn*) Vopiſc. *in Aurel.* cap. 50.

ant? Deus avertat hanc amentiam. Et tamen, ſi benè novi, ephemeridas illius viri ſcriptus habemus, etiam bella charactere hiſtorico digeſto, quæ velim accipias, & per ordinem ſcribas, additis quæ ad vitam pertinent. Quæ omnia ex libris linteis, in quibus ipſe quotidiana ſua ſcribi præceperat, pro tua ſedulitate condiſces. Curabo autem ut tibi ex Ulpiâ Bibliothecâ & libri lintei proferantur. Tu velim Aurelianum ità ut eſt, quatenus potes, in literas mittas (54). We may obſerve that Vopiſcus writes in this manner about thirty years after Aurelian's death; which is an inſtance of the ignorance or negligence of the Latins at that time. None of them had then publiſhed any thing concerning the great actions of this Prince, who was the reſtorer of the Empire, *Orbis Reſtitutor*, as he is ſtiled in an antient medal. He apprehended ſuch a diſgrace, when he took care to have the courſe of his exploits ſet down every day in writing (55).

(54) Vopiſc. cap. 1. pag. 416.

(55) This appears from the words of Vopiſcus quoted above.

[K] *He was very much regretted . . . . . he was deified.*] Even thoſe perſons who were the Authors of his death, erected a noble monument for him, and dedicated a temple to him (56): for they diſcovered, that they had been engaged in the conſpiracy againſt him by a horrid piece of fraud; which was thus. He had threatned Mneſtheus his Secretary: who, giving up himſelf for loſt, as he knew that this Emperor's menaces were always put in execution (57), reſolved to prevent it, and made ſeveral perſons believe, that Aurelian had determined their death. He ſhewed them a liſt, in which his own name was, and adviſed them to take proper meaſures to ſecure themſelves. They were all perſons who had either incurred his diſpleaſure, or elſe from the merit of their ſervices had reaſon to ſuppoſe they were in his favour, and ſo at the bottom had nothing to fear from him (58). All of them engaged in a conſpiracy againſt his life, which they put in execution. But having detected afterwards the treachery of the Secretary, they were the moſt zealous in doing honour to Aurelian. Mneſtheus was thrown to the wild beaſts, and they ordered the memory of this puniſhment to be preſerved upon the Emperor's tomb (59). The ſoldiers refuſed to confer the Empire upon any one of the conſpirators, and deſired the Senate to chooſe another Emperor, and to deify Aurelian (60). The Senate would not take upon them the choice of an Emperor; but with reſpect to the divine honours which the army demanded for Aurelian, they were decreed without any delay. Tacitus (61), who gave his opinion firſt in the Senate, made a fine ſpeech, which deſerves to be ſet down here, as it contains an handſome abridgment of his moſt eminent actions, and ſeveral thoughts, which are very curious. *Rectè atque ordine conſuluiſſent Dii immortales, P. C. ſi boni ferro inviolabiles extitiſſent, ut longiorem ducerent vitam; neque contra eos aliqua eſſet poteſtas iis, qui neces infandas triſtiſſima mente concipiunt. Viveret enim princeps noſter Aurelianus, quo neque utilior fuit quiſquam. Reſpirare certè poſt infelicitatem Valeriani, poſt Gallieni mala, imperante Claudio cæperat noſtra Reſpublica; at eadem reddita fuerat Aureliano toto penitus orbe vincente. Ille nobis Gallias dedit; ille Italiam liberavit; ille Vindelicis jugum Barbaricæ ſervitutis amovit. Illo vivente Illyricum reſtitutum eſt, redditæ Romanis legibus Thraciæ. Ille (proh pudor) Orientem fœmineo preſſum jugo in noſtra jura reſtituit, ille Perſas inſultantes adhuc Valeriani nece, fudit, fugavit, oppreſſit. Illum Saraceni, Blemyes, Axomitæ, Bactriani, Seres, Hiberi, Albani, Armenii, populi etiam Indorum, veluti præſentem penè venerati ſunt Deum. Illius donis, quæ a Barbaris gentibus meruit, refertum eſt Capitolium: quindecim millia librarum auri ex ejus liberalitate unum tenet templum, omnia in urbe fana ejus micant donis. Quare P. C. vel Deos ipſos jure convenio, qui talem principem interire paſſi ſunt, niſi forte ſecum cum eſſe maluerunt. Decerno igitur divinos honores; id quod vos omnes exiſtimo eſſe facturos. Nam de imperatore diligendo ad eundem exercitum cenſeo eſſe referendum. Etenim in tali genere ſententiæ niſi fiat quod dicitur, & electi periculum erit, & eligentis invidia.* Probata eſt Sententia Taciti (62). That is, "The immortal Gods would "have done well, O Conſcript Fathers, to have made "good men invulnerable, that their lives might have "been extended, and ſecured from the power of "thoſe who conceive wicked deſigns againſt them. "Then we ſhould have had our Emperor Aurelian "alive, who was one of the beſt men in the world. "Our Commonwealth began to revive, after the unfortunate reigns of Valerian and Gallienus, under "the government of Claudius, but it was abſolutely "reſtored by Aurelian, who was victorious in every "part of the world. He gave us Gaul; he freed "Italy; he reſcued the Vindelici from the oppreſſion "of the Barbarians; under his care Illyricum was "reſtored, and Thrace recovered to the Roman Empire. He reduced the Eaſt, which laboured under "the diſhonourable yoke of a woman, to our command; he defeated and humbled the Perſians, who "were grown inſolent upon Valerian's death. The "Saracens, Blemyes, Axomitæ, Bactrians, Seres, "Hiberi, Albanians, Armenians and Indians, revered him almoſt as a preſent Deity. The Capitol is full of the ſpoils which he gained from barbarous nations; one temple poſſeſſes fifteen thouſand "pounds of Gold by his liberality, and all the other "temples of the city are adorned with his gifts. "Therefore, Conſcript Fathers, I may juſtly expoſtulate with the Gods, who have ſuffered ſuch "a man to die, unleſs they choſe to take him to "themſelves. I decree then divine honours to him, "which I believe every one of you will readily agree "to. For I think the choice of another Emperor is "to be referred to the army; becauſe unleſs that be "done in this caſe, the perſon choſen will be in danger, and thoſe who chooſe him be expoſed to envy. "*This opinion of Tacitus was approved of.*" The ſame Tacitus being choſen Emperor a few months after (63), began his reign with ordering four ſtatues to be erected to Aurelian, one of gold in the Capitol, and three of ſilver in other places, and that every perſon ſhould have a picture of this great Prince. The three ſilver ſtatues were dedicated, but not that in the Capitol. *In eadem oratione Aureliano ſtatuam auream ponendam in Capitolio decrevit; item ſtatuam argenteam in Curia, item in templo Solis, item in foro Trajani. Sed aurea non eſt poſita: dedicata autem ſunt ſolæ argenteæ. In eadem oratione cavit, ut ſi quis argento publicè privatumque æs miſcuiſſet, ſi quis auro argentum, ſi quis æri plumbum, capital eſſet cum bonorum proſcriptione . . . . . Addidit, ut Aurelianum omnes pictum haberent* (64).

(56) Vopiſc. cap. 37.

(57) *Qui ſciret Aurelianum, neque fruſtra minari ſolere, neque ſi minaretur, ignoſcere.* idem, cap. 36.

(58) *Mixtis iis, quibus Aurelianus verè iraſcebatur, cum iis, de quibus nihil aſperum cogitabat.* Vopiſc. cap. 36.

(59) Idem, cap. 37.

(60) Idem, cap. 41.

(61) He was choſen Emperor a few months after.

(62) Vopiſc. cap. 41. pag. 526, 527.

(63) It was by the Senate; for the army, to whom the Senate left the choice of a new Emperor, ſtill referred it to the Senate, who at laſt undertook it.

(64) Vopiſc. *in Tacito*, cap. 9. pag. 608.

[L] *There was no Deity, to whom he teſtified more reverence, than to the Sun.*] I preſume his firſt education was the cauſe of this; for it is probable his mother, who was a Prieſteſs of the Sun, inſpired him from

(oo) *See* Tillemont, *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 3. pag. 1085, *& ſeq.*

(pp) *Hic finis Aureliano fuit, principi magis neceſſario quam bono.* Vopiſc. *in Aurel.* cap. 37.

thoſe who ſpeak of it, agree that it was of very ſhort continuance (*oo*). I muſt not conclude this article without obſerving a diſtinction which Vopiſcus makes, and which few perſons are capable of making [*M*]: *Such was the end of Aurelian*, ſays he (*pp*), *a Prince more neceſſary than good.* What is reported by Angeloni concerning ſeveral pieces of marble, which were found in the reign of Pope Urban VIII, while they were levelling the place, where Aurelian had built a temple upon Mount Quirinal (*qq*), may juſtly give us a grand idea of the magnificence of that edifice.

(qq) Franceſco Angeloni, *Hiſtoria Auguſta da Giulio Ceſare in fino a Conſtantino il Magno, illuſtrata con la Verita delle antiche Medaglie*, pag. 332.

from his infancy with a particular devotion for this God (65). However that be, we find, that when he returned his thanks to Valerian, who had appointed him Conſul, he made uſe of theſe expreſſions, *Dii faciant, & Deus certus Sol, ut & Senatus de me ſic judicet* (66): i. e. "May the Gods, and eſpecially the "Sun, an undoubted Deity, grant, that the Senate "likewiſe may have the ſame opinion of me." A learned man (67) pretends, that he ſpoke thus in a Letter (68), *as if the other Gods were doubtful, except the Sun only.* In the battle, which he won near Emeſſa over the forces of Zenobia, it is ſaid that he was aſſiſted by a Deity, who encouraged his ſoldiers, and cauſed the foot to ſupport the horſe, who were ready to give ground (69). Upon his entry into Emeſſa as Conqueror, he went to the Temple of the Sun; *Statim ad Templum Heliogabali tetendit, quaſi communi officio vota ſoluturus*; and found there the ſame figure of a God, who had been favourable to him in the battle. Upon this account he built ſeveral temples in that place (70), and afterwards cauſed a temple to be dedicated to the Sun at Rome (71). He commanded likewiſe the temple of that God to be rebuilt in Palmyra. I ſhall give the very orders, which he diſpatched for that purpoſe, becauſe they will ſhew us at the ſame time the cruelty of this Emperor, and his devotion for the Sun. *Aurelianus Auguſtus Ceionio Baſſo. Non oportet tot ulterius progredi militum gladios. Jam ſatis Palmyrenorum cæſum atque conciſum eſt. Mulieribus non pepercimus, infantes occidimus, ſenes jugulavimus, ruſticos interemimus; cui terras, cui urbem relinquemus? Parcendum eſt iis qui remanſerunt. Credimus enim tam paucos tam multorum ſuppliciis eſſe correctos. Templum ſane ſolis, quod apud Palmyram aquilifer legionis tertiæ cum vexilliferis & draconario & cornicinibus atque liticinibus diripuerunt, ad eam formam volo quæ fuit, reddi. Habes trecentas auri libras à Zenobiæ capſulis; habes argenti mille octingenta pondo. De Palmyrenorum domis habes gemmas regias. Ex his omnibus fac coheneſtari templum: mihi & Diis immortalibus gratiſſimum feceris. Ego ad Senatum ſcribam, petens ut mittat pontificem, qui dedicet templum* (72). That is: "Aurelianus Auguſtus to Ceionius Baſſus "Greeting. It is not fit that the ſwords of my ſoldiers "ſhould proceed any further. A ſufficient number "of the Palmyrenians have been ſlain. We have "not ſpared the women; we have killed the infants, "and old men, and peaſants; to whom then ſhall "we afterwards leave the lands and the city? We "muſt ſpare thoſe, who remain: for we believe that "ſuch a few will be corrected by the puniſhment of "ſo many. As for the Temple of the Sun at Palmyra, which the Standard-bearer of the third Legion with his Enſigns, and colours, and trumpets, "and fifes plundered, I would have it reſtored to its "original form. You have three hundred pounds "from Zenobia's cabinets, and a thouſand eight hundred pounds of ſilver; and the royal jewels from "the ſpoils of the Palmyrenians. With theſe riches "I would have you adorn the Temple; which will "be very acceptable to me and to the immortal "Gods. I ſhall write to the Senate, to deſire them "to ſend a Prieſt to dedicate the Temple."

(65) Idem *in Aurelian.* cap. 4.

(66) Idem, ibid. cap. 14.

(67) Spanheim, *Not. in Cæſar. Julian.* pag. 109.

(68) Vopiſcus repreſents him as ſpeaking in this manner.

(69) Vopiſc. cap. 25.

(70) *Illic templa fundavit donariis ingentibus poſitis.* Idem, cap. 30.

(71) Idem, ibid. cap. 35.

(72) Idem, cap. 31. pag. 489.

[*M*] *Vopiſcus has made a diſtinction, ... which few perſons are capable of making.*] The defects of Aurelian were uſeful: the State had occaſion for them; but in Vopiſcus's opinion it does not follow from thence, that he was a good Emperor. This expreſſion ſhews, that the Author was a perſon, who did not confound things. A vaſt number of people know nothing of this diſtinction. They conſider ſimply and abſolutely that as a good and juſt Government, which has prevented or put a ſtop to any great evil; and if they can imagine with themſelves, that a Government is unjuſt, they regard it as ſimply and abſolutely as bad, without any reſpect to the neceſſary advantages, which the public reaps from it.

AUREOLUS (PETER) a Franciſcan Friar, and afterwards Archbiſhop of Aix, was one of the moſt ſubtile and celebrated Divines of his age. He flouriſhed about the end of the thirteenth Century, and in the beginning of the fourteenth. He was born at Verberie upon the Oiſe, and his name was *Oriol* (*a*); but as he is known only by the Latiniz'd name which was given him, I place him here, without following Moreri's example, who refers us from Aureolus to Oriol. We might more eaſily excuſe this, if we could find under the article ORIOL all that we might reaſonably expect from an Hiſtorian, who quotes the life of this illuſtrious Archbiſhop of Aix (*b*); but here we are diſappointed. I am not able to remedy this defect, for I do not think, that in all the United Provinces there is one perſon who can ſupply me with the book in which this life of Aureolus is publiſhed. All that I can ſay is reduced to theſe few particulars; Aureolus was Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Paris (*c*); he had the title of *Doctor facundus* (*d*), *the Eloquent Doctor*, given him. He was Provincial of Aquitain, when he was made Archbiſhop of Aix (*e*), and lived but a ſhort time after he was raiſed to this high dignity [*A*]. It is ſaid, that he was promoted to a Cardinalſhip. He was a man of a ſubtile genius, but too fond of diſtinguiſhing himſelf by new opinions [*B*]. It

(a) Labbe, *Diſſert. de Script. Eccleſ.* tom. 2. pag. 183.

(b) Plac'd, as he tells us, before Oriol's *Commentaries upon the Maſter of the Sentences*, printed at Roan in 1595.

(c) Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. 2. p. 183.

(d) Idem, ibid.

(e) Bellarm. *de Script. Eccleſiaſt.* pag. 365.

[*A*] *He lived but a ſhort time after he was raiſed to the dignity of Archbiſhop of Aix.*] The Archbiſhoprick was given him in 1321, and we find that James de Concos de Cabrairez a Dominican was inſtalled in the ſame Archbiſhoprick the 10th of July 1322 (1); ſo that the 27th of April, in which Aureolus died (2), muſt at the lateſt be in the year 1322. We ſee the negligence of that Age; they ſatisfied themſelves even with reſpect to an Archbiſhop with marking only the day on which he died, without ever mentioning the date of the year.

(1) Labbe, *Diſſert. de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. 2. pag. 184.

(2) Idem, ibid.

[*B*] *He was too fond of diſtinguiſhing himſelf by new opinions.*] This is the characteriſtic of a very dangerous ſpirit; it is a rock very much to be feared; we have ſcarce ever ſeen, that thoſe, who have genius and learning enough to oppoſe ſtrongly the common received opinions, have judgment enough to ſtop where they ſhould, and to diſcern what has no occaſion to be reformed. In the following paſſage we have a juſt character of ſuch men, amongſt whom our Aureolus is particularly named. *Ex hac claſſe, inſignia ingenia duo, Durandus & Aureolus, minus benè audiunt, quod ingeniis quibus valebant plurimum indulſerunt in pleriſque; & novas cudere ac comminiſci opiniones, communem tramitem ſine cauſa deſerendo non dubitârint. Eſtque haud dubiè argumentum judicii minus exquiſiti, nec ſatis maturi vel emuncti, ferri facilè, & abſque urgenti ratione, extra viam, ita ut quamvis*

It is pretended that he maintained the impoſſibility of the creation [C]. The Dominicans had in him a formidable adverſary, and employed one of their beſt pens [D] to confute him with a great deal of ſpirit and vigour. I ſhall ſay ſomething of his writings [E]. The

vit res de qua agitur, ad ſcholæ tricas merè pertineat, nec inde diſpendium ullum doctrinæ fidei vel ſanis ac puris moribus ſit timendum, tamen conſultiſſimum ſit, quando manifeſta ratio non urget, ab anteriorum placitis non diſcedere (3). We muſt confeſs, however, that ſuch innovating genius's (4), and even thoſe, which are a little reſtleſs and unfixed, are ſometimes neceſſary; for without them could we poſſibly make any conſiderable progreſs? Should we not be tempted to continue in indolence under pretence that every thing is diſcovered already, and that we ought to be content with the opinions of our Fathers, as well as with their Earth and Sun? The diſputes and diſturbances raiſed by men of ambitious, bold, and raſh tempers, are not always a real abſolute evil; they may be as great an evil as you pleaſe, but there are ſome advantages riſing from them with regard to the ſciences and the cultivation of the mind. We may ſay this even of civil wars. A very honeſt Gentleman obſerved this with reſpect to thoſe, who laid France waſte in the 16th Century. He pretends that they refined the genius, or the language of ſome perſons; that they rectified the judgment of others, and ſerved as a bath to cleanſe ſome, and as a curry-comb to rub off the filth of others. Here are his own words; his thoughts and expreſſions are ſo juſt, that they deſerve to be particularly ſet down. *Ut ſæpe res adverſæ inexpectatis bonis locum faciunt, ita in hac publicâ, & omnium maxima calamitate res autor dari poteſt, quibuſdam ingenium evaſiſſe limatius, acumen perſpicacius, judicium reſecatius, os mundius, ſcripta purgatiora, prorſus ut agnoſcere liceat ærumnarum procellas, quibus æſtuavimus, his eſſe balneus, quæ ſordes eluerint, aliis ſtrigilem, quæ ſquammam deterſit, quibuſdam uredinem, quæ abſumpſit quicquid luxurians & inutile. Denique ſi quis verè æſtimet, nunc demum intelligemus, eam, quæ Reipublicæ tempeſtas fuit, privatim & pauculis eſſe cotem, qua acuitur, & jaculam qua accenditur quicquid in ſingulis eſt optimum* (5). Indeed the public would readily be without ſuch ſevere purgations, or curry-combs, or files, or whetſtones, as they may be called; it were much better to continue ſick, than to be cured by a remedy ſo terribly ſevere. However that be, we have a Doctor here, who values himſelf upon being of a different opinion from every body in his Commentary upon the Maſter of the Sentences; but on the other hand, he was ſingle in his opinion; every one was proud to attack him; he was compared to Iſhmael. *Quem* (Petrum Aureolum) *Antoninus ait, * ita ſcripſiſſe in librum Sententiarum, ut quia manus ejus contra omnes, qui jam antea ſcripſerant, etiam manus omnium contra eum fuerint* (6).

(3) Theoph. Raynaudus, *Erotem. de malis ac bonis lib.* num. 430. pag. 250.

(4) I would not be underſtood to mean thoſe, who endeavour after neceſſary reformations of things.

(5) Carolus Paſchalius *de optimo genere Elocutionis*, pag. 124.

* Ant. tit. 24. cap. 8. parag. 2.

(6) Spondanus *ad ann.* 1337, num. 10. p. 460.

[C] *It is pretended, that he maintained the Impoſſibility of the Creation.*] The proofs, which I have in this affair, are very ſmall; for I can only acquaint the reader, that Theophilus Raynaud, after he has rejected ſome reaſons of Averroes as very weak, adds that the arguments, with which Aureolus had ill employed his genius to ſhew that the Creation is impoſſible, are reduced to the ſame. *Eodem recidunt argumenta, quibus Aureolus apud Capreolum in 2. d. 1. q. 2.* in argumentis contra quartam, *parum feliciter ingenium exercuit, ut probaret creationem eſſe impoſſibilem* (7). We may obſerve, that he never read Aureolus, and that he knew no more of his opinion, than what is related by his antagoniſt Capreolus. This puts a new neceſſity upon me to grope in the dark; but I think I am not miſtaken in the conjecture, which I am going to advance. I ſuppoſe that Aureolus did not ſimply and abſolutely deny, that the Creation was poſſible; for this would have been to ſtart an opinion directly contrary to the Roman Faith. He only maintains, that for ſuch and ſuch reaſons he ſhould have thought it impoſſible for any Being to be made of nothing, if faith had not told him, that we muſt underſtand the words, which the Scripture makes uſe of concerning the firſt Formation of the world, in the proper ſenſe of creation. Having recovered himſelf with this ſhield, he might ſafely employ all the ſtrength of his genius to prove the Impoſſibility of the Creation: he ventured only a philoſophical diſpute, in which he had no reaſon to fear the want of querks and ſubtilties to defend himſelf, I am ſure, that thoſe, who ſhall have in their ſtudy a copy of Capreolus, when they read this, will be curious enough to conſult him, that they may ſee whether this great antagoniſt of Aureolus has faithfully repreſented the ſtate of the queſtion. There are a great many perſons, who upon ſuch an occaſion would ſatisfy themſelves with telling us only, that they are confuting a certain Doctor, who has maintained that the Creation is impoſſible, and with exaggerating the pernicious conſequences of ſuch a notion, without acquainting us that ſome Doctor ſecured the intereſts of orthodoxy, and ſubmits to the authority of tradition the moſt ſubtile arguments, which the light of nature can ſuggeſt to him. I know that Aureolus upon another occaſion has governed himſelf in the ſame manner as I am ſuppoſing he did with regard to the Creation; which adds a greater probability to my conjecture. He tells us, that nothing but the authority of the Saints could induce him to believe that Tranſubſtantiation is a real change of the whole bread into the whole Body of our Saviour. I have read this in a work of Dr. Allix. *Petrus Aureolus Romanæ Eccleſiæ Cardinalis hoc profitetur:* Propter ſolas authoritates Sanctorum teneo, quod Tranſubſtantiatio eſt verus tranſitus & converſio totius panis in totum corpus Domini. *in 4. diſt. 11. q. 1. n. 2* (8).

(7) Theoph. Raynaud, *in Theol. Naturali, Diſt.* 8. num. 334. pag. 1039.

(8) Petrus Allix. *Præfat. Hiſtorica de Dogmate Tranſubſtantiationis*, pag. 66.

[D] *The Dominicans employed one of their beſt pens to confute him.*] It was the ſame Capreolus, whom I have mentioned above. Conſult his *Commentary upon the Maſter of the Sentences.* He preſſed him with a great deal of vehemence, and attacked with all his force Aureolus's Commentary upon the ſame Maſter. *Quæ* (Commentaria Aureoli) *in ſuis in eaſdem ſententias Commentariis ſæpius excuſſit excogitavitque Joannes Capreolus* (9). He inſinuates, that the falſe interpretations, which Aureolus made uſe of, and which ſerved as a foundation for his horrid inferences, were not always the reſult of his ignorance, but ſprung partly from his prejudices and paſſion. I am informed of this only by Father Baron, who expreſſes himſelf thus: *Memini me Capreolum neſcio quo ex quæſtionibus in primum Sentent. loco legere, ſoluto quodam argumento Aureoli, quod ad grande aliquod impium, & abſurdum ex falſâ interpretatione noſtræ ſententiæ rem deduxerat, hæc modeſtè adjunxiſſe Capreolum; ex noſtrâ reſponſione patet hanc objectionem Aureoli profectam eſſe ex perverſo intellectu, quicquid ſit de affectu* (10). We may obſerve, that Conſtantius Sarnanus, a Franciſcan Monk and Cardinal wrote a Book, in which he pretends to reconcile Aureolus's opinions with thoſe of Capreolus (11). He attempts to ſhew likewiſe the agreement between St. Thomas Aquinas's doctrines and thoſe of Scotus (12). It was in this manner that attempts have been to ſhew a correſpondence between Plato and Ariſtotle. This is mere trifling with the readers, or indeed expoſing thoſe, whom they endeavour to reconcile, to ridicule, without intending it. Such an agreement is diſhonourable to the parties, and there would be ſome reaſon to apprehend ſevere reproaches from them, for undertaking the office of a mediator, if the heads of the diſpute ſhould ever return into the world. They would expoſtulate in this manner: *What, do you pretend, that there was only a diſpute about words in this point; and that we agree together in the main of the doctrines without our perceiving it, ſo poſſeſſed were we with prejudice, which hindered us from underſtanding what we ſaid? This is a direct Satyr upon us; we'll accept of no reconciliation upon ſuch ſhocking terms as theſe. Away with your projects for reuniting us; we had rather have a perpetual conteſt with each other, than ſee it concluded by ſo ſcandalous an imputation upon our ſenſe and learning.* It is remarkable, that there are ſome occaſions, where the warmeſt controverſies have riſen only from the parties miſunderſtanding each other; but I am of opinion that this is not the caſe of the doctrines of St. Thomas Aquinas and Scotus, and conſequently of the difference, which there is between the Scotiſt Aureolus, and the Thomiſt Capreolus.

(9) Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. 2. p. 184.

(10) Vincent. Baron. *Apologetic.* lib. 1. Sect. 2. pag. 240.

(11) Oldoini, *Athen. Roman.* pag. 176.

(12) Idem, ibid.

[E] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of his writings.*] Thoſe, who have mentioned them, have been ſo very negligent,

The reader will find in the remark [*A*] the time of his death.

gent, that they have not obſerved any diſtinction either between the writings, which remain of him, and thoſe which are loſt, or between the works, which have been printed, and thoſe, which were never publiſhed. Father Labbe (13), who complains of this negligence which is too common to Bibliographers, promiſed to repair very amply; but he died without publiſhing that large volume, of which the Diſſertation, which I have quoted, was only a forerunner (14). He obſerves that the *Breviarium Bibliorum* of Aureolus, five *Epitome univerſæ ſacræ ſcripturæ juxta literalem ſenſum*, was printed at Venice in 1571, and at Paris in 1585 (15), by the care of Sthephen Nouellet, Doctor of Sorbonne, and that his *Commentaries upon the four Books of Sentences* were printed at Rome, in *folio* in 1595, and dedicated to Pope Clement VIII, by Cardinal Conſtantius Sarhanus (16). He rejects what Father Maracci tells us in his *Bibliotheca Mariana*, that the treatiſe of Aureolus *de Conceptione immaculata B. Virginis* was printed at Toulouſe in 1314: he ſays, that perhaps this writing was written that year, or printed in 1514.

(13) Labbe, *de Script. Eccleſiaſt.* tom. 2. pag. 184.

(14) In the Preface to his Diſſertation *de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.*

(15) Oldoini in his *Athenæum Romanum*, pag. 532. puts *ann.* 1581.

(16) Oldoini ſays the ſame thing, pag. 533 of his *Athenæum Romanum.*

I ſhall make a few ſhort notes upon all this. I. The Catalogue of the Oxford Library mentions the *Epitome totius S. Scripturæ*, printed at Straſbourg in 1514. Father Labbe did not know that edition; Geſner likewiſe knew nothing of it: the Epitome of Geſner publiſhed in 1583, mentions no book of Aureolus, which had been printed; and we may obſerve, that he very erroneouſly diſtinguiſhes our Peter Aureolus from *Petrus de Verberia dictus Aureoli*. II. It is a miſtake, that the Commentaries upon the four Books of Sentences were printed at Rome in 1595. Bellarmin aſſures us, that he had ſeen only the Commentary upon the firſt of thoſe four Books, and this Commentary was printed at Rome in 1596 (17). The Catalogue of the Oxford Library, and that of the Archbiſhop of Reims's Library, place in that year the edition of Aureolus's Commentary upon the firſt Book of the Sentences, and in the year 1605 the edition of his Commentary upon the three following Books with the *Quodlibeta*. All theſe make two volumes in *folio*, printed at Rome, the former in 1596 at the Vatican; the latter by Lanetti in 1605. I am ſurprized, that Bellarmin knew nothing of the impreſſion of the laſt volume. This is ſomewhat more ſtrange, than to find in Moreri that *we have ſeveral editions* of Aureolus's Commentaries upon the Maſter of the Sentences, but *that of Rome in* 1595 *is the moſt correct*. How could he ſhew us theſe ſeveral editions? Would he have dated that of Rome, as he has done, if he had known what I have remark'd above? III. I muſt obſerve, that Father Labbe has been too civil to Father Maracci, who imagined that there were books printed in 1314. Does not every body know, that it was never in uſe in Europe till about the middle of the fifteenth Century? What then did the Jeſuit Oldoini dream of, when he pretended to have ſeen Aureolus's treatiſe *de Conceptione Virginis Mariæ*, printed at Toulouſe in 1314? *De Conceptione Virginis Mariæ, & Librum, qui habetur MS. Toloſæ in Collegio Fuxenſi, & excuſum vidimus Toloſæ anno* 1314 (18).

(17) Bellarmin. *de Script. Eccleſiaſt.* pag. 365.

(18) Oldoini, *Athen. Romanum*, pag. 533.

AURIEGE, or rather Ariege [*A*], a river of France, has its ſource from the mountains which ſerve as boundaries to the county of Foix towards Rouſſillon. It paſſes by Taraſcon, Foix, Parmies, Barilles, Bonac (*a*), Saverdun, Sainte-Gabelle, Haute-Rive, and falls into the Garonne at Portet about a league above Toulouſe, after it has received on the right the waters of the river Lers, and on the left thoſe of Arget, and of the Leze [*B*]. The Ariege is rapid and full of fiſh, and the water of it very good to drink; but it is not navigable but from Haute-Rive. Du Bartas praiſes it extremely [*C*]. See

(*a*) It is a Lordſhip, which was erected into a Marquiſate for the late Mr. Duſſon, elder brother to Mr. de Bonrepaux, Ambaſſador of France to the Court of Denmark, and afterwards to Holland.

[*A*] *ARIEGE.*] It is called by this name in the country, thro' which it paſſes. It is named *Aregia* in the old Maps, and *Areia* in a manuſcript Martyrology in the Monaſtery of Moiſſac. We find in this manuſcript the Paſſion of St. Antonine, who ſuffered martyrdom at Pamie's, and we are aſſured that the barque, in which his body was laid, entered by this river into the Garonne. *Per fluvium, qui Areia dicitur, ad Garonnam uſque perveniens fluvium navicula* (in qua corpus Antonini Mart. à Gentilibus necati) *inde alium, qui Tarnis dicitur, inveniens fluvium, inde retrogrado curſu per Tarnin intravit in Avarionis alveum* (1). Hadrian Valeſius, from whom I have extracted this, has criticiſed upon thoſe, who call it *Auriege*, and been very ſevere upon Papyrius Maſſo, who called it *Aurigera*. *Fluvius eſt vulgò dictus* Ariege, *quibuſdam corrupte* l'Auriege; *à Maſſono* (2) *priſci ejus fluvii nominis ignaro* Aurigera *novo ac ridiculo nomine nuncupatus* (3). Mr. Baudrand is of opinion, that the true Latin name of this river is *Alburacis* (4). I wiſh he had quoted ſome good author for it. Mr. Sanſon calls it *Lauriegne* in a Map, which he publiſhed in 1675 (5). Moſt of the proper names there are ſo diſguiſed, that it is to be ſuppoſed they were the errors of the Engraver. Moreri imagined very pleaſantly, that the *Auriege* or *Lauriege* are two names, that are uſed. He forgot the true one, and never conſidered that the two names, which he mentioned, are the ſame, the firſt without an article, and the latter with one. His miſtake is juſt ſuch an one, as it would be to ſay of the river, which paſſes thro' Paris, that it is called *Seine* or *La Seine*. I know that a great many Authors laugh at a Writer, who corrects their errors of this kind, and boaſt that they are above ſuch trifles as theſe: but they are a vain ſett of men, who would conceal their ignorance, or indolence, or want of taſte, or inaccuracy, under a ſpecious maſk. If we were to mention a city or river only occaſionally in a work of reaſoning, the faults, which theſe Gentlemen call trifles, would be excuſable. But the caſe is not ſo, when they happen in the principal ſubject of a Book. That, which is only an inconſiderable nicety in the writing of a Divine, would ſometimes be a capital error in a Geographer, or the Author of a Dictionary. I have recollected that Papyrius Maſſo calls it *la Riege*. See the remark [*A*] of the article GARONNE.

(1) Hadrian. Valeſ. *in Notitiâ Galliæ*, pag. 26.

(2) Papyr. Maſſo, *in Deſcript. Fluminum Galliæ* pag. 470.

(3) Valeſii *Notitia Galliæ*, pag. 26.

(4) See his *Geography*, pag. 33, 88, and 128.

(5) That of the Pyrenean Mountains.

[*B*] *After it has received on the right the waters of the river Lers, it receives on the left thoſe of Arget and Leze.*] Moreri deſerves here a ſhort animadverſion: he ſays that the Auriege, *having receiv'd the Lers, the Arget, and the Leze, joins the Garonne*. This plainly ſignifies, that the mouth of the Lers is above the mouth of the Arget, and that the mouth of the Leze is between the other two. Nothing is more falſe than this. The Arget falls into the Ariege near Foix, and there are eight or nine Gaſcogne leagues between Foix and Sainte Gabelle, near which is the mouth of the Lers. *Lertius verò in Aurigeram labitur prope Templum S. Gauvillæ* (6). The Leze has its entrance three or four leagues below that of Lers. Coulon might have informed Moreri concerning the order of theſe mouths. Note, he obſerves, that *the Auriege is called by the Latins* AURIGERA (7), *and Larget* ARGENTIGERA (8), and that *the one carries gold, and the other ſilver* (9). He took this remark perhaps from Olhagarai; for he has told us what follows: *And what ſhall we ſay of the Lers with its flux and reflux* (10)? *And of the Auriege and Arget, rivers with gold and ſilver banks? Does not this make it probable, that there are treaſures hid in the bowels of theſe mountains* (11)?

(6) Papyrii Maſſoni, *Deſcriptio Flum. Galliæ*, pag. 470.

(7) Coulon *Rivieres de France*, tom. 1. p. 483.

(8) He had called it twice before *l'Argot*, which is the true Orthography.

(9) Obſerve that Bertrand Helias, *Hiſtor. Comitum Fuxenſium*, lib. 1. relates ſeveral curious circumſtances concerning this gold. Papyrius Maſſo, *Deſcrip. Flum. Gall.* pag. 412. gives us his words.

(10) See concerning this wonderful Phenomenon the 3d day of the 1ſt week of *du Bartas*, pag. 288.

(11) Pierre Olhagarai, preface to the *Hiſtoire de Foix, Bearn, & Navarre.*

[*C*] *Du Bartas praiſes it extremely.*] Here is the third Sonnet of his nine Pyrenean Muſes, preſented to the King of Navarre (12).

Fleuve d'or & de flot & de nom & de ſable,
Riche in grains, en paſtel, en fruits, en vins, en bois,
Auriege au viſte cours clair ornement de Foix,
Qui rend par ton tribut Garonne navigable,
Fille de ſi grand Mont, qui cache, eſpouvantable,
Son front dedans le ciel, qui chenu tous les Mois.
Depuis le bord du ſu juſq'au bord Eſcoſſois,

(12) Du Bartas, in his *Appendix* to his 1ſt *Week*, pag. 934.

See likewiſe the paſſage of Bertrand Helias, quoted by Papyrius Maſſo (*b*).

(*b*) Papyr. Maſſoni *Deſcript. Flum. Galliæ*, pag. 412.

Ne void autre plus grand à ſa grandeur ſemblable ;
Clair flot, je te ſeroy par un diſcours facond,
Plus riche que Pactol, plus que le Nil fecond :
Plus loin que l'Ocean on orroit tes eaux bruire :
Fier, on t' egaleroit aux fleuves les plus grands ;
On te verroit au ciel comme le Po reluire,
Si je voycy tes bords repurges de brigans (13).

(13) Since Du Bartas's time things have been changed much for the better in that point.

See likewiſe the ſeventh Sonnet, where you'll find this in the beginning :

François, arreſte toy, ne paſſe la campagne,
Que nature mura de Rochers d'un coſté,
Que l'Auriege entrefend d'un cours precipité ;
Campagne qui n'a point en beauté de campagne (14).

(24) Du Bartas, *Appendix de la 1 Semaine*, pag. 936.

AURISPA (JOHN) born at Noto in Sicily (*a*), was one of the moſt learned men of the fifteenth Century. He underſtood the Greek and Latin tongues ; was a good Orator, and wrote finely, conſidering the age, both in proſe and verſe. It is ſaid, that he was honoured with the poetical crown in Italy. He was Secretary to Pope Nicholas V, who gave him conſiderable marks of his favour, by preſenting him with two rich Abbeys [*A*]. He carried on a long correſpondence of letters with Philelphus ; and we find his name mentioned with commendation in Laurentius Valla, Anthony Panormita, and ſeveral other illuſtrious Authors. He retired to Ferrara, and lived there to a great age, honoured with the eſteem of the Lords of that country [*B*] ; I mean with an eſteem which was of advantage to him in every reſpect, for he received from their liberality not only what was ſufficient to ſupport him, but even to raiſe himſelf a conſiderable fortune (*b*). What he wrote is now very difficult to be found [*C*].

(*a*) This city is called *Netum* in Latin.

(*b*) Taken from the *Elogia Siculorum qui Literis floruerunt*, written by the Jeſuit Jerom Raguza, pag. 147, *& ſeq.*

[*A*] *Pope Nicholas V. . . preſented him with two rich Abbeys.*] He gave him that of St. Philip de Grandi (1) the 31ſt of May 1449, and that of St. Mary de la Roccade (2) in 1451. Auriſpa had a law-ſuit for this latter benefice with a man, who had been preſented to it by Alphonſus King of Naples. See Rocchus Pirrus p. 225 of his *Notitia* of the Church of Syracuſe (3).

(1) It is at Meſſina.

(2) It is at Lentini in Sicily.

(3) Taken from Jerom Raguza, pag. 148, 149. *Elogiorum Siculorum.*

[*B*] *He retired to Ferrara, and lived there . . . . . honoured with the eſteem of the Lords of that country.*] I prove all this by a paſſage of Giraldus. *Joannes Auriſpa, Siculus,* ſays he (4), *Orator in aliquo Poetarum ordine reponi poteſt, quippe qui Græcè & Latinè probe doctus eſt ; carmina tamen ejus, quæ ipſe legi, neſcio quid Sicularum gerrarum habere videntur : fuit enim eo tempore, quo nondum exquiſitæ literæ in lucem redierunt. Vixit autem Ferrariæ ad ſummam ſenectutem, in pretio habitus à noſtris principibus, qui & eum locupletem reddiderunt : ab hoc ferunt Ciſtarellam familiam originem duxiſſe.*

(4) Lilius Gregor. Gyrald. *de Poet. ſuorum temporum*, Dial. 1. pag. 531. *See likewiſe* Geſner *in Bibliothec.* fol. 386 *verſo.*

[*C*] *What he wrote is now very difficult to be found.*] Here are the Books which are aſcribed to him : *A Tranſlation of Archimedes, a Verſion of Hierocles's Commentary upon the golden Verſes of Pythagoras,* and *another of Philiſcus's Treatiſe of Conſolation to Cicero.* The Epitome of Geſner mentions theſe three works, without telling us whether they were ever printed. We know, that Auriſpa's *Hierocles* was printed at Baſil by Henry Peter in 8vo 1543 (5). Geſner quotes a paſſage from the Preface, by which it appears, that this Tranſlation was made when the Author was already eighty years old (6). There was in Gabriel Naude's Library a manuſcript intitled, *Comparatio de Præſidentia Hannibalis Carthaginenſis, Alexandri Magni, & Scipionis Majoris Romani, apud Inferos, ex Græco in Latinum converſa ab Auriſpa Oratore ad Baptiſtam Senatorii & Equeſtris Ordinis Civem Romanum* (7).

(5) *See* Geſner, *Biblioth.* fol. 231 *verſo.*

(6) Geſner, *Biblioth.* fol. 231 *verſo.*

(7) Labbe, *Nova Biblioth. MSS. Librorum*, pag. 231. edit. *an.* 1653.

AUROGALLUS (MATTHEW) a learned man of the ſixteenth Century, and Profeſſor of three Languages in the Univerſity of Wittemberg (*a*), was born in Bohemia. He was curious in collecting a great number of good books of the Antients, and he was not contented with valuing them, as a great many others do, who ſeek only to raiſe themſelves a name by their vaſt Libraries, but he was charmed with reading them. I have ſeen an Epiſtle Dedicatory (*b*), in which he was deſired to publiſh Ætius the Phyſician, nineteen books of Natural Hiſtory written by an unknown Author, the Hymns of Callimachus, the Orations of the ten Athenian Orators, and a great many Greek manuſcripts, which were brought from the Eaſt to Bohemia by the Baron Bohuſlas of Haſſenſteyn, and fell into his hands, *Cognationis & ſtudiorum hæreditario jure.* It ſeems that we may infer from theſe Latin words, that he was a relation of that Baron. We have ſome books of his [*A*]. He died in 1543 (*c*), and had been of great ſervice to Luther in his tranſlation of the Bible.

(*a*) See the Epiſtle Dedicatory of Parthenius, *de amatoriis Affectibus*, by Janus Cornarius, *Medicus Zuiccavienſis*, dated the 1ſt of April 1530.

(*b*) That which is mentioned in the preceding quotation.

(*c*) Micrælius, *Syntagm. Hiſtor.* Konig is miſtaken in putting 1533, and quoting Micrælius.

[*A*] *We have ſome Books of him.*] I cannot tell whether we have any others beſides his *Compendium Hebrææ Chaldææque Grammatices*, printed at Wittemberg in 8vo in 1525, and *de Hebræis Urbium, Regionum, Populorum, Fluminum, Montium, & aliorum locorum Nominibus Liber è veteri inſtrumento congeſtus*, printed at Wittemberg in 1526, and at Baſil in 1539, in 8vo (1). This ſecond edition had been enlarged by the Author.

(1) *Epit. Biblioth.* Geſneri.

AUSONIUS, in Latin *Decius*, or rather *Decimus Magnus Auſonius*, one of the moſt excellent Poets of the fourth Century, was of Bourdeaux (*a*), and ſon to a famous Phyſician [*A*]. He was educated with a prodigious deal of care ; the whole family intereſted themſelves,

(*a*) Auſon. *in Præfat. ad Synagrium.*

[*A*] *He was ſon to a famous Phyſician.*] Whoſe name was JULIUS AUSONIUS. He was born at Bazas, and ſettled himſelf at Bourdeaux (1). His wife's name was Æmilia Æonia, the daughter of Cecilius Argicius Arborius, who fled into Aquitain, after a proſcription, which had deprived him of all the eſtate, which he had in his own country (2). This Arborius having fixed in the city *Aquæ Tarbellorum* (3), married there a Lady, who had no fortune, and whoſe name was Æmilia Corinthia Maura. By this marriage he had one ſon and three daughters. The ſon is the ſame Æmilius Magnus Arborius, who taught Rhetoric at Toulouſe, and had a very particular care of the education of our Poet (4). One of the daughters was married to Julius Auſonius, and had four ſons, of whom the Poet Auſonius was the ſecond. The reader will find in his *Parentalia*, or in his *Epicedion in Patrem* the proofs of all theſe particulars, and what follows. This Julius Auſonius was a perſon of great merit, and if he was like the picture, which his ſon has left

(1) Auſon. *in Præfat. ad Synagr. & in Epiced. Parent.*

(2) The Province, which is now called Burgundy.

(3) Scaliger ſays that it is the city of *Acqs* on the *Adour.*

(4) Auſon. *in Profeſſ.* cap. 16. pag. 176.

themſelves in it (*b*), either becauſe his genius was very promiſing, or that the ſcheme of his nativity made them imagine that he would be raiſed to great honours [*B*]. He made a wonderful progreſs in polite Learning, and at the age of thirty years was choſen to teach Grammar at Bourdeaux (*c*). He was promoted ſome time after to the Profeſſorſhip of Rhetoric (*d*). He raiſed himſelf ſo great a reputation in that employment, that he was ſent for to court to be Preceptor of Gratian the ſon of the Emperor Valentinian. He made himſelf very agreeable both to his ſcholar, and his ſcholar's father; and he received ſuch rewards and honours, as ſhew him to be an inſtance of the truth of the maxim, which Juvenal lays down, *that when fortune pleaſes a man may be raiſed from a Rhetorician*

(*b*) See his Poems intitled *Parentalia*.

(*c*) Auſon. *in Præfat. ad Synagrium.*

(*d*) Auſon. *in Profeſſor.* num. 24. pag. 187.

left of him, he was one of the remains of the Golden Age. He maintained in all his conduct the greateſt uniformity imaginable. He offered gratis the aſſiſtance of his art to every one, who aſked it. He endeavoured to anſwer fully the good opinion, which was conceived of him: but never thought favourably of what he did:

Judicium de me ſtudii præſtare bonorum:
Ipſe mihi, nunquam, judice me, placui (5).

(5) Auſon. *in Epiced.* p. 298.

He had an averſion to Law-ſuits; he never encreaſed nor leſſened his eſtate; he was never either a witneſs, or an informer againſt any perſon's life (6); he was without envy or ambition; he conſidered ſwearing and lying as both equally bad; he never engaged in any conſpiracy or plot, or cabal; he religiouſly obſerved the ſacred laws of friendſhip; he placed happineſs not in poſſeſſing what one would have, but in not wiſhing for what fortune had not given him:

(6) *Indice me nullas, ſed neque teſte petit.* Auſon. *in Epiced.* pag. 298.

Felicem ſcivi, non qui, quod vellet, haberet;
Sed qui per fatum non data non cuperet (7).

(7) Auſon. *in Epiced.* pag. 299.

He never endeavoured to penetrate into the ſecrets of another; he never raiſed falſe rumours againſt the reputation of his neighbour; and when he heard any true ſtories to the diſadvantage of others, he concealed them:

Non occurſator, non garrulus, obvia cernens,
Valvis & velo condita non adii.
Famam, quæ poſſet vitam lacerare bonorum,
Non finxi, & veram ſi ſcierim, tacui (8).

(8) Idem, ibid.

He never thought, that to have been abſolutely free from faults was a thing that deſerved praiſe; and he preferred good morals before the laws; that is, I preſume, he did a good action, becauſe it was good, and not merely in obedience to the laws:

Deliquiſſe nihil nunquam laudem eſſe putavi,
Atque bonos mores legibus antetuli (9).

(9) Idem, ibid.

He preſerved inviolably his conjugal faith for forty five years during which he was married (10); and if he had the ſatisfaction of ſeeing what he wiſh'd for accompliſhed, it was not thro' the extraordinary indulgence of fate, but becauſe he had confined his wiſhes within a very narrow compaſs:

(10) Idem, ibid. pag. 300.

Non quia Fatorum nimia indulgentia; ſed quod
Tam moderata illi vota fuere viro (11).

(11) Idem *in Parent.* cap. 1. pag. 110.

He has been compared to the ancient Sages of Greece, and he imitated them in the moſt difficult point of all, which was to practiſe what they taught: he was more ſollicitous to lead the life of a Philoſopher, than to talk like one:

Quem ſua contendit ſeptem ſapientibus ætas:
Quorum doctrinam moribus explicuit:
Viveret ut potius, quam diceret arte Sophorum,
Quanquam & facundo non rudis ingenio (12).

(12) Idem, ibid.

Yet he was eloquent enough in Greek, tho' not in Latin.

Sermone impromptus Latio, verum Attica Lingua
Suffecit culti vocibus eloquii (13).

(13) Idem *in Epiced.* p. 298.

We are not to wonder, that after his death he was honoured with this Elogium: *There was no perſon, who imitated him; nor any one, whom he imitated.*

Inde & perfunctæ manet hæc reverentia vitæ,
Ætas noſtra illi quod dedit hunc titulum:
Ut nullum Auſonius, quem ſectaretur, habebat;
Sic nullum, qui ſe nunc imitetur, habet (14).

(14) Idem *in Parental.* cap. 1. pag. 110.

We may obſerve, that he had the honour of ſeveral eminent offices, without the trouble of exerciſing them; and that he died at the age of ninety years, without having felt any decay. He walk'd without a ſtaff, and had his ſenſes entire.

Curia me duplex, & uterque Senatus habebat
Muneris exſortem, nomine participem (15).
. . . . . .

(15) Idem *in Epiced.* pag. 298.

Ipſe nec affectans, nec detractator honorum,
Præfectus magni nuncupor Illyrici (16).
. . . . . .

(16) Idem, ibid. pag. 302.

Nonaginta annos baculo fine, corpore toto
Exegi, cunctis integer officiis (17).
. . . .

(17) Ibid. pag. 303.

He wrote in Latin ſeveral Books of Phyſic, which are mentioned by Vindicianus (18), and Marcellus (19) with commendation. Scaliger aſſerts that he was Phyſician to the Emperor Valentinian, and even before his ſon was choſen Preceptor to Gratian (20); but I can find no proof of this in Auſonius.

(18) *See* Scaliger *in Vita Auſonii.*

(19) Marcell. *in Epiſt. præfixâ lib. de Medica,* and cap. 25. *juſd. libri.*

(20) Scaliger *in vitâ Auſonii.*

[*B*] *The ſcheme of his nativity made them imagine, that he would be raiſed to great honours.*] Cæcilius Argicius Arborius, his grandfather by his mother's ſide, underſtood Aſtrology, and had caſt this ſcheme of nativity, which he concealed; but it was at laſt diſcovered by his daughter. Auſonius himſelf acquaints us with theſe particulars:

Tu cœli numeros, & conſcia ſidera fati
Callebas, ſtudium diſſimulanter agens.
Non ignota tibi noſtræ quoque formula vitæ;
Signatis quam tu condideras tabulis;
Prodita non unquam, ſed matris cura retexit
Sedula, quam timidi cura tegebat avi (21).

(21) Auſon. *in Parent.* cap. 9. pag. 117.

He adds, that Arborius, tho' he was expoſed from time to time to the preſſures of ill fortune, and afflicted for his ſon, who died at the age of thirty, comforted himſelf under his diſgraces with the hopes, which the ſtars gave him of his grandſon's being raiſed to honour.

Dicebas ſed te ſolatia longa ſovere,
Quod mea præcipuus fata maneret honos.
Et modo conciliis animarum mixte piarum,
Fata tui certe nota nepotis habes.
Sentis quod quæſtor, quod te præfectus, & idem
Conſul, honorifico munere commemoro (22).

(22) Idem, ibid. pag. 118.

We may obſerve, that he ſuppoſes the ſoul of his grandfather was not ignorant in the manſions of the Bleſſed of the accompliſhment of the nativity, and of the ſeveral dignities, which our Poet had obtained at the Emperor's Court. He is leſs orthodox in another place; for he doubts whether any part of us ſurvives after death:

Et nunc, ſive aliquid poſt fata extrema ſuperſit,
Vivis adhuc, ævi quod periit meminens:
Sive nihil ſupereſt, nec habent longa otia ſenſus,
Tu tibi vixiſti; nos tua fama juvat (23).

(23) Idem *in Profeſſor.* cap. 1. *in fine* pag. 148.

I cannot tell, whether thoſe, who aſſert that our Poet was a Pagan, have ever quoted this paſſage, as a proof of their opinion.

cian to the dignity of a Conſul (*e*). He was really made Conſul by the Emperor Gratian in the year 379 (*f*), after he had filled other very conſiderable poſts; for beſides the dignity of Queſtor, which he had been honoured with during the life of the Emperor Valentinian, he had been made Prefect of the Prætorium in Italy and Gaul, after the death of that Prince (*g*). The Oration of Thanks which he ſpoke to the Emperor Gratian, for his promotion to the Conſulſhip, is an excellent piece. We cannot tell certainly the time of his death, but it is undoubted, that he was ſtill living in 388, and even in 392, and that he lived a long time [*C*]. He married a Lady who died young, and who was of a good family (*h*). He had ſeveral children by her, and never married again. He was very much eſteemed by the Emperor Theodoſius, and ſome are of opinion that the latter conferred upon him the quality of a Patrician (*i*). They found this upon a letter, which is to be found at the beginning of Auſonius's works in moſt of the editions. There can be nothing more obliging than that letter. Some Critics think it to be ſuppoſititious; but they cannot deny but this Emperor had a great value for Auſonius's Poems, and adviſed him to publiſh them; for this appears from a Preface which is inconteſtably of that Poet's. There is a prodigious inequality in his works, whether his Muſes were a little uncertain, or whether there are inſerted amongſt his Poems ſome pieces, which he had only given a rough ſketch of, or whether ſome particular reaſons obliged him to publiſh verſes, which he had not time to correct and poliſh. To ſpeak in general, there is ſome harſhneſs both in his manners and his ſtyle; but this is rather the defect of the age than of his genius. The beſt judges eaſily gueſs, that if he had lived in Auguſtus's time, his verſes would have equalled the moſt perfect of that age, ſince there appears ſo much delicacy and ſpirit in ſome of his writings. Though he is generally ſuppoſed to have been a Chriſtian, there are ſome ingenious Authors who believe that he was not ſo [*D*]; they

(*e*) *Si fortuna volet, fies de Rhetore Conſul.* Juvenal. Sat. 7. ver. 197.

(*f*) And not in the year 382, as we are told by Vinetus in his notes upon Auſonius's *Gratiarum Actio*.

(*g*) See remark [*F*].

(*h*) Auſon. *in Parental.* cap. 9.

(*i*) Albertus Petrus Rubenius, *Diſſert. de Vitâ Fl. Mallii Theodori*, pag. 81,

[*C*] *It is undoubted, that he was ſtill living in* 388, *and even in* 392, *and that he lived a long time.*] He ſpeaks (24) of the puniſhment of the Tyrant Maximus, whom Theodoſius put to death in the year 388 (25). Baronius proves that Paulinus dedicated himſelf to a monaſtic life in his retirement at Nola in the year 394 (26). It was but a few years after the devout life, which he had led in Spain, and which Auſonius blamed him for. This is what proves this Poet to have been living in 392, from whence it follows, that he lived a long time, for he was already in years, when he was made Conſul in 379 (27). Add to this, that the difference of age between him and his father was very ſmall (28); now he ſurvived his father, who died at ninety years of age.

(24) *In Claris Urbibus*, cap. 7. pag. 237.

(25) And not in 391, as Vinetus affirms in his notes upon this paſſage of Auſonius. He is more exact in the *Life of Auſonius*, where he puts the year 388.

(26) Baron. *Annal. ad ann.* 394. num. 72. pag. 804.

(27) Auſon. *in Gratiar. Actione*, pag. 709.

(28) Auſon. Epiſt. 1.

[*D*] *There are ſome ingenious Authors, who believe that he was not a Chriſtian.*] Voſſius is of that number. *Poeta fuit gentilis*, ſays he (29), *quemadmodum ex Paulino liquet; ut quæ Chriſtum celebrant perperam illi ſint tributa.* That is: "He was an Heathen Poet, "as appears from Paulinus; ſo that the Poems in "praiſe of Chriſt are falſly aſcribed to him." Father Briet aſſerts the ſame; he only gives a different turn to the expreſſions of Voſſius. *Ex Paulino certum eſt eum Ethnicum fuiſſe, quare opera Chriſtiana huic adjudicari ſolita, ſine dubio alterius ſunt* (30). That is: "It is "plain from Paulinus, that he was a Pagan; and "therefore the Chriſtian pieces, which are com-"monly aſcribed to him, belong undoubtedly to ſome "other Author." Mr. Borrichius goes ſtill further; for he affirms, that Auſonius was frequently cenſured by Paulinus on account of his being a Pagan, *Religione Ethnicus*, EOQUE *à* PAULLINO *amico, ſed Chriſtianis ſacris dedito, identidem objurgatus* . . . . . (31). PAULLINUS *diſcipulus Auſonii, quem colebat ut præceptorem, ſed ut averſum à Chriſtiana religione ſubinde increpabat, quemadmodum ex opere ipſius liquidum eſt* (32). All this ſhews, that even great Authors ſpare themſelves the trouble of conſulting the originals, and ſtop at the teſtimony of the firſt comer. Thoſe, who have recourſe to the works of St. Paulinus, find nothing to induce them to believe, that Auſonius profeſſed Paganiſm; and becauſe they do not read, that he ever uſed any earneſt exhortations to this Poet to be baptized, they conclude that he profeſſed the Chriſtian Religion. But they have ſtronger aſſurance of this from theſe expreſs words, which they meet with there;

(29) Voſſ. *de Poetis Lat.* pag. 55.

(30) Brietius, *de Poet. Latin.* lib. 4. pag. 50.

(31) Borrich. *Diſſertat. de Poetis*, pag. 73.

(32) Idem, ibid. pag. 74.

Non reor hoc SANCTO *ſic diſplicuiſſe* PARENTI (33),
Mentis ut errorem credat, ſic vivere Chriſto (34).

(33) That is to ſay, Auſonius.

(34) Paulinus *in Epiſtola* before *ad Auſonium in fine.*

Thus the reading of St. Paulinus's works proves quite the contrary of what Voſſius and ſome others aſſert; and ſhews, that Auſonius was a Chriſtian, as Lilius Gyraldus very well obſerved. *Chriſtianus quidem Auſonius fuit, ut ex ejus verſibus, & item Paulini ejus diſcipuli facile colligitur* (35). There is no foundation then to take away from this Poet what is found in honour of Jeſus Chriſt in the collection of his Poems. Nay it is certain, that tho' we ſhould give up his *Carmen Paſchale*, and his excellent Poem, which begins with

(35) Gyraldus, *Hiſt. Poet.* Dialog. 10. p. 514.

Omnipotens, ſolo mentis mihi cognite cultu,

as ſome Critics would deprive him of the *Oratio Paſchalis, verſibus Rophalicis*, yet we ſhould find enough in his writings to confute thoſe, who ſay he was a Pagan. We ſee therefore how neceſſary it is to depend upon ſome of the moderns more than others, when we do not care to take the pains of recurring to the originals. If Voſſius had applied himſelf to Baronius, he would have eſcaped the error, which he has committed, and prevented others, who copied him, from falling into it. He could never have imagined, after he had read Baronius, that St. Paullinus gives us the leaſt proof of the pretended Paganiſm of the Poet Auſonius; for that learned Cardinal mentions the reſpectful anſwer of St. Paulinus, and ſhews that Auſonius's thoughts upon his friend's retirement were not different from thoſe, which Chriſtians attach'd to this world entertain every day, when they ſee a young man of quality renounce every earthly gratification and advantage to dedicate himſelf to a monaſtic life (36). He pretends, that Auſonius judged, that the humour of a Miſanthrope, or a diſtemper like Bellerophon's, urged Paulinus to retire from the world, and to renounce the Muſes (37).

(36) Baron. *ad ann.* 394. num. 84.

Triſtis, egens, deſerta colat, tacituſque pererret
Alpini convexa jugi, ceu dicitur olim
Mentis inops, cœtus hominum, & veſtigia vitans,
Avia perluſtraſſe vagus loca Bellerophontis (38).

(37) I expreſs my ſelf thus, becauſe though Paulinus has given this ſenſe to Auſonius's words, there is reaſon to believe that it is not the true one, and that we muſt underſtand here an imprecation againſt him, who adviſed Paulinus not to anſwer Auſonius's Letters.

(38) Auſon. Epiſt. 25. pag. 697, 698.

A thouſand Chriſtians might paſs the ſame judgment; ſo that this is an impertinent proof of Paganiſm. Arniſæus, and the French Author, whom he quotes, without doubt were Chriſtians, and yet they judged juſt as Auſonius did of the love of ſolitude: they plainly intimate, that they thought the retirement of the founders of monaſteries was to be aſcribed to a melancholy humour. *Medici inter ſigna morbi melancholici referunt, ſi quis quærat ſolitudinem, aut ſi quem triſtis agat mœror; torvave ſeverum fronte, vel à lætis ſociorum cœtibus arceat; & Gallicus quidam non inconcinnus ſcriptor ejus ordinis fuiſſe cenſet Franciſcum, Dominicum, aliosque Eremitas, aut Anachoretas, qui contra naturæ præſcriptum politicis ſocietatibus ſe ſubtraxerunt in eremos, inſtar Endymionum, ſeſe abdiderunt, & quo melancholica ingenia maxime afficiebantur, novum vitæ genus, affectatæ religionis pallio veſtitum, condiderunt* (39). Baronius

(39) Arniſæus, *Relectionum Politicar.* pag. 9.

they found this opinion either upon ſome looſe verſes, compoſed by him [*E*], or upon

nius has not forgotten to obſerve that Auſonius was educated by two Nuns, who were his aunts (40). This is a proof that he was of a Chriſtian family. Now at that time Chriſtianity being triumphant, and Paganiſm expoſed to diſgrace and perſecution, it ſcarce ever happened, that a Chriſtian turned Pagan. Since Auſonius therefore was brought up from his infancy in the Chriſtian Religion, we muſt conclude, that he profeſſed it all the reſt of his life; for nothing is more abſurd than the thought of Giſelin. He tells us, that Claudian and Auſonius, being influenced by the authority and eloquence of Symmachus, abjured the Chriſtian Faith, and plunged themſelves into idolatry (41). He pretends to prove this by the teſtimony of St. Auguſtin, and from the ſtrict friendſhip, which Symmachus profeſſed to them in his Letters. The Jeſuit, who confutes this, ſhews that St. Auguſtin, without any mention of Auſonius, ſays only that Claudian was attach'd to Paganiſm (42); which is no manner of intimation that he was ever a Chriſtian, and as for Auſonius, he is juſtified both from the ſilence of the Emperor Gratian and St. Paulinus, and their kindneſs to him. To this we may add, that the reaſon taken from Symmachus's friendſhip with him is the weakeſt imaginable; it was not the conformity of their Religion, which united them, but the love, which they both had for polite Literature.

It muſt be owned, that Mr. Baillet embraces the opinion of thoſe, who pretend that Auſonius was a Pagan, if we thoroughly conſider his words: "Theſe "are faults, which he ought to have atoned for by "ſome good qualities, and by maxims and ſentiments of morality, as the beſt Poets of antiquity "took care to do before him. But as he lived a-"mongſt Chriſtians, he was perhaps apprehenſive of "being confounded with them, if they had found in "him ſentiments, which were too much like theirs "in point of morals (43)." It is certain, that we find in Auſonius's works the fineſt maxims of morality, and particularly the Apothegms of the ancient Wiſe-men of Greece. What can be imagined more moral than his deſcription of a *Good Man, Vir Bonus* (44)?

[*E*] *He compoſed ſeveral looſe verſes.*] Scaliger the Father thought ſome of Auſonius's Epigrams ſo obſcene, that nothing but the fire was capable of purging them. *Nonnulla* (Epigrammata) *adeo fœda atque deteſtanda, ut neque ſcriptore neque auditore digna, non in ſpongiam incumbere merita ſint, ſed ſolis flammis expiari poſſe videantur* (45). I am ſurprized that he ſaid nothing of the obſcenities of the *Cento Nuptialis*, which have moſt provoked the indignation of ſeveral other Authors. Here is a fine paſſage of Mr. Baillet: "It were to be wiſhed at leaſt that they had deſtroyed "the wretched *Cento*, which is a vile piece, which "he patched up out of half verſes from Virgil, upon a ſubject that is purely amorous. It is with a "great deal of juſtice that the Univerſity of Paris complained forty years ago of the abuſe, which this Poet "was guilty of, in making Virgil ſpeak after a ſhameful and indecent manner, who of all the ancient "Poets has been moſt commended for his chaſtity *. "And Father Briet the Jeſuit has carried his zeal "much farther †, when he repreſents to us this action of Auſonius as a crime, that deſerved puniſhment, judging that there was no leſs impudence "and effrontry than impurity and infamy in a man, "who was capable of committing ſuch a piece of infidelity, and that there was ſomething rather diabolical than human in this pernicious art of perverting "things, that is, of changing them from good to "bad, in order to enſnare the innocence and purity "of the youth (46)." As a great many perſons would be glad to read Father Briet's own words, I ſhall copy them as follows: *Centones ejus Virgiliani non tantum impuriſſimi ſunt, ſed & impudentiſſimi, quibus caſtiſſimos verſus libidinoſæ affixit materiæ, opere, quod plus dæmonem quam hominem ſaperet, adoleſcentium pudicitiæ inſidiantem.* Auſonius compoſed this piece at the deſire of the Emperor Valentinian, who had written ſuch an one himſelf. He excuſed himſelf upon that Order, and obſerves, that a Prince can never uſe a more abſolute manner of commanding a thing, than to deſire it. He was very much embarraſſed; for by writing a bad Poem he expoſed himſelf to cenſure for having groſly ſacrificed his reputation to flattery; and by making a better Poem than the Emperor's, he run the riſque of being counted an inſolent perſon, who had the preſumption to attempt to ſhine to more advantage than his maſter. He affirms, I, that he kept ſuch a middle way, that without pretending to excel Valentinian, yet his Poem was not inferior to that Emperor's performance: II, that he had the good fortune to pleaſe him, and having taken care not to ſurpaſs him he did not incur the diſgrace, which his victory might have involved him in. This is the language of a perfect Courtier; but that we may do the Poet all the juſtice, which the delicacy of his wit and expreſſion deſerves, let us hear his own words. *Piget Virgiliani carminis dignitatem tam joculari debonеſtaſſe materiâ; ſed quid facerem? juſſum erat. Quodque eſt* POTENTISSIMUM IMPERANDI GENUS, *rogabat qui jubere poterat, S. imperator Valentinianus, vir meo judicio eruditus; qui nuptias quondam ejuſmodi ludo deſcripſerat, aptis equidem verſibus & compoſitione feſtivâ. Experiri deinde volens, quantum noſtra contentione præcelleret, ſimile nos de eodem concinnare præcepit. Quam ſcrupuloſum hoc mihi fuerit, intellige. Neque anteferri volebam, neque poſthaberi; quum aliorum quoque judicio detegenda eſſet adulatio inepta, ſi cederem; inſolentia, ſi ut æmulus eminerem. Suſcepi igitur ſimilis recuſanti, feliciterque & obnoxius gratiam tenui, nec victor offendi* (47). If it was true, that the *Cento Nuptialis* of the Emperor Valentinian was not inferior to that of Auſonius, it appears that he underſtood Poetry very well, and as he was a man of gravity and exemplary chaſtity in other reſpects, he might ſerve very much to juſtify Auſonius. *Omni pudicitiæ cultu domi caſtus & foris, nullo contagio conſcientiæ violatus obſcenæ, nihil inceſtum; hancque ob cauſam tanquam retinaculis petulantiam frænârat aulæ regalis* (48). Such a great example is a clear proof, that perſons of the greateſt ſtrictneſs and modeſty may ſometimes give way to pieces of wit and invention, wherein the deſcription of the chief ceremonies of a marriage are a little too looſe and obſcene; for there is no doubt that this Poem of the Emperor Valentinian was very luſcious. The ſubject required it; it was an affair of marriage, and he had indulged himſelf in mirth and pleaſantry in writing of it. *Nuptias ejuſmodi ludo deſcripſerat* (Valentianus) *aptis equidem verſibus, & compoſitione feſtivâ* (49). i. e. "The Empe-"ror Valentinian had given a deſcription of marri-"age in ſuch a ludicrous way, in a ſuitable kind of "verſe, and compoſed with a great deal of humour." We may be ſure that this Emperor's verſes were as *erotic* or amorous as thoſe of the Emperor Gallienus (50). We muſt own therefore, that Auſonius had ſome excuſe for compoſing his *Cento Nuptialis*, that he did it only in imitation and at the requeſt of his maſter, who was an Emperor of the greateſt gravity and chaſtity that ever was, and beſides that a follower of the pureſt doctrine of Chriſtianity (51), ſo that if he had not practiſed the doctrine of toleration (52), we might conclude that he wanted no qualification agreeable to the moſt orthodox Monarchs. I remark this only to ſhew, that thoſe who place Auſonius among the Pagan Poets, under pretence that he wrote ſo laſcivious a Poem as the *Cento Nuptialis*, have not examined things with ſufficient care. He is blameable for it without doubt; I do not pretend to excuſe him. I only ſay, that this is not a proof of his being a Pagan, or ſufficient to raiſe any juſt ſuſpicions of his not being a very orthodox Chriſtian; which I prove from the circumſtances, that is from the character of the Emperor, who commanded him to compoſe this piece, and who approved of it. How many Chriſtian Poets are there, whoſe works are more looſe than this *Cento Nuptialis*? We muſt degrade a great many from the character of Chriſtians, if we regulate this affair upon the maxim of Gyraldus. *Chriſtianus quidem Auſonius fuit . . . . ſed petulantior tamen & laſcivior quam ut inter Chriſtianos numerari dignus ſit* (53). i. e. "Auſonius was a Chriſtian indeed . . . . but too "wanton and laſcivious to deſerve to be ranked a-"mongſt Chriſtians." Without going ſo far as Italy, do not we find amongſt the works of a Poet of the Hague an Epithalamium, which with reſpect to

(40) Baron. *ad ann.* 394. num. 85, See Remark [*F*] num. 7.

(41) Victor. Giſelinus *in Scholiis ad 2 Librum Prudentii contra Symmachum, apud* Theophil. Raynaud Hoploth. Sect. 2. Serie 1. cap. 14. pag. 56.

(42) Theophil. Raynaudus, Hoploth Sect. 2. Serie 1. cap. 14. pag. 56.

(43) Baillet, *Jugem. ſur les Poetes*, tom. 2. pag. 470.

(44) Pag. 529.

(45) Jul. Cæſar. Scaliger. *Poet.* lib. 6. cap. 5. pag. 761.

* *Reponſe del' Univerſite a l'Apologie du P. Nic. Cauſin*, p. 358.

† Philip. Briet. *de Poet. Latin.* lib. 4. p. 50.

(46) Baillet, *Jugem. ſur les Poetes*, tom. 2. pag. 470, 471.

(47) Auſon. *in Præfat. Cent. Nupt.* pag. 500, 501.

(48) Amm. Marc. l. 30. c. 9.

(49) Auſon. *in Præfat. Cent. Nuptial.* p. 500, 501.

(50) See above in the article of ARODEN note [*A*] pag. 338.

(51) *See* Monſr. Flechier in his *Life of Theodoſius* pag. 52.

(52) Amm. Marcell. lib. 30. cap. 19. and Valeſius upon the place.

(53) Gyrald. *Hiſt. Poet.* Dialog. 10. p. 514.

on the manner, in which he condemns the ſolitude of Paulinus, or the intimacy which was between the Pagan Symmachus and him, they are greatly miſtaken. And yet theſe are the moſt ſpecious reaſons which have been alledged. Ritterſhuſius conſidered this friendſhip of theirs as a great prodigy (*k*). The errors of Scaliger [*F*], and the chief editions of Auſonius [*G*] will be the ſubject of two remarks below, and I ſhall not

(*k*) Ritterſhuſius, *in Epiſt. ad* Solom. Pantherum.

to obſcenities is not inferior to the *Cento* of Auſonius (34)? I addreſs this chiefly to Ritterſhuſius, who has repreſented Auſonius's conduct in this point as a monſter; I mean, that a Poet, who was a Chriſtian both in profeſſion and manners, ſhould write in a wanton way: *Illud imprimis apud me monſtri inſtar habet, hominem Chriſtianum, &, ut apparet, non nomine tantum, ſed & pectore & moribus, adeo ſæpe laſciva atque improba ſcribere potuiſſe, ut niſi nomen Auſonii eſſet adſcriptum, Bilbilitanum poetam te legere putes* (55). He will not accept of the excuſe of the Author from the purity of his morals, *Laſciva eſt nobis pagina, vita proba eſt*. I ſhall give a particular account of that excuſe in another article (56). We may obſerve, that Auſonius was ſo much perſuaded, that he ſhould be blamed for it, that he endeavours to juſtify himſelf in the beginning, and middle, and end of this little Poem. We have ſeen what he ſays at the beginning, we ſhall ſee in another place (57) what he ſays at the end. We have now only to remark what he ſays in the middle of it. We find then, that after he has deſcribed very handſomly the nuptial feaſt, the bride and bridegroom's walking, the marriage preſents, the wiſhes of the company, and repreſented in very decent terms the firſt diſcourſe of the married couple, he ſtops there, and acquaints his readers, that what remains for him to ſay not being covered with a veil, they have no right to proceed any further. *Hactenus caſtis auribus audiendum myſterium nuptiale, ambitu loquendi, & circumitione velavi. Verum quoniam & feſcenninos amat celebritas nuptialis, verborumque petulantiam notus vetere inſtituto ludus admittit, cætera quoque cubiculi & lectuli operta prodentur, ab eodem auctore collecta, ut bis erubeſcamus, qui & Virgilium faciamus impudentem. Vos, ſi placet, hic jam legendi modum ponite; cætera curioſis relinquite* (58). He had reaſon to ſay, that what he calls *Imminutio* (59) would be deſcribed in very looſe terms. Moreri has been the moſt indulgent to him of all: *There are ſome pieces*, ſays he, *which Auſonius wrote in his youth, wherein he gives way too much to the liberty of the age he lived in.* This cenſure is not the leaſt ſevere, and goes upon a falſe ſuppoſition; for it is certain that Auſonius was not young, when he compoſed the *Cento Nuptialis*. I ſay nothing of the verſes, which he wrote upon a beautiful ſlave named Biſſula, who had been adjudged to him as his part of the booty, after a great victory, which was gained in Germany in 368; for we cannot tell to what degree of licence he carried that ſubject; the verſes are loſt, and we can only conjecture, that they were free, ſince he deſires ſuch readers only, as had drank hard:

. . . . . *Admoneo, ante bibas.*
Jejunis nil ſcribo; meum poſt pocula ſi quis
Legerit, hic ſapiet (60).

This agrees by no means with what remains of that Poem, we ſee nothing immodeſt either in the expreſſion or ſentiments, ſo that we muſt conclude, that moſt of the pieces, which compoſed it, are loſt. A Commentator has proved the ſame thing by another reaſon, without any mention of this. He obſerves, that this Poem is too ſhort at preſent to have the Prefaces before it, which we find there; and conſequently, it was much longer, when the Author finiſhed it, than we have it now. However that be, Auſonius, who at that time was not in the fire of his youth, deſcribed in all probability very freely the charms of his ſlave; who appeared ſo agreeable to him from the firſt day, that he gave her immediately her liberty (62).

[*F*] *Here are ſome errors of Scaliger.*] I. He thought, that Auſonius was raiſed to the poſt of Præfect of the Prætorium during the life of the Emperor Valentinian (63). This is a miſtake; Auſonius declared that he owed this poſt to the Emperor Gratian. *Tot gradus nomine Comitis propter tua incrementa congeſti ex tuo merito, te ac patre principibus, quæſtura communis, & tui tantum præfectura beneficii* (64). II. Scaliger imagined without any ground, that there was an error in the Theodoſian Code in the paſſage, where Auxonius Præfect of the Prætorium is mentioned (65). He would have it read *Auſonius*, and not *Auxonius*. But he would not have propoſed ſuch a correction, if he had obſerved, that the perſon mentioned in that paſſage of the Theodoſian Code, died the year 371, and that Auſonius was Conſul in 379, and lived a great many years after. III. He would have all the laws addreſſed to Antonius the Præfect of the Prætorium corrected, and that we ſhould read *Auſonius* and not *Antonius*. This is a miſtake; for it is certain, that Auſonius was honoured with the poſt of Præfect of the Prætorium of Italy in 376, five months after the death of the Emperor Valentinian, and that his ſon Heſperius was made his collegue (66). We find likewiſe that Antonius was made Præfect of the Prætorium in Gaul about the ſame time. Things continued in the ſame ſituation the year following. Auſonius and his ſon executed that office in Italy, and Antonius in Gaul; but in the year 378 Antonius had the office of Præfect of the Prætorium in Italy, and Auſonius and his ſon executed the ſame office in Gaul, which they did not reſign till 380. We have proofs of all theſe particulars in the Author, which I quote in the margin (67). IV. Scaliger thought that Auſonius ſpoke of himſelf in theſe two verſes:

Aut Italum populos, Aquilonigenaſque Britannos
Præfecturarum titulo, tenuere ſecundo (68).

This is a great error: the Poem, in which theſe two verſes are, was compoſed during the life of the Emperor Valentinian (69): now Auſonius was not Præfect of the Prætorium till after the death of that Emperor (70). V. We are not to believe what Scaliger affirms, that Auſonius, after his Conſulſhip, executed the office of Proconſul of Aſia, and that of Vicar of the Dioceſe of Africa (71). We find indeed one Auxonius, who was Vicar of the Dioceſe of Aſia in the year 365, and another Auxonius, who was Proconſul of Aſia in the year 381 (72); but what does this ſignify to Scaliger's opinion? VI. He miſtakes the uncle for the grandfather in theſe words: *Hoc tanto viro naſcitur Burdegalæ* Decius Magnus Auſonius *nomine avi materni, cognomine patris* (73). Auſonius's grandfather by mother's ſide was named Cæcilius Argicius Arborius; he left one ſon, whoſe name was Æmilius Magnus Arborius. Scaliger's miſtake therefore is very plain. VII. He ſays that Hilaria and Julia Cataphronia, who had made a vow of virginity, were Auſonius's aunts by the mother's ſide (74). This is only true with regard to Æmilia Hilaria; for Julia Cataphronia the Nun was his aunt by the father's ſide (75).

[*G*] . . . . *And the chief editions of Auſonius.*] Geſner and his Abbreviators aſſert, that Aldus was the firſt, who publiſhed this Poet. They do not mention in what year; but if they mean the edition of Venice in 1517, it is plain they are miſtaken; for beſides that Aldus was not then living, Mr. Van Beughem aſſures us, that Auſonius was printed at Milan in 1490 (76), and afterwards at Venice in 1496, with a Preface of George Merula (77). The Baſil Edition of 1523 by Valentin Curio is well known; that of Lewis Mircus at Lyons printed by John de Tournes in 1557 is much better than the former editions: it is mentioned by the Bibliographers; but I do not find that they ſpeak of that, which Ducheri publiſhed, in commendation of which Nicholas Bourbon wrote four verſes, which are printed on the reverſe of the title-page in the Lyons Edition by Sebaſtian Gryphius in 1549.

(54) See the xx *Baſium*, or *Epithalamium* of *Joannes Secundus*, pag. 103.

(55) Conradus Ritterſhuſius, *Epiſt. ad* Solom. Pantherum.

(56) See remark [*D*] of the article VAYER.

(57) See the ſame remark.

(58) Auſon. *in Centone Nupt.* pag. 513, 514.

(59) That is to ſay the deflowering of the Virgin.

(60) Auſon. *in Biſſulâ*, p. 340.

(61) *See* Tollius's *Auſonius*, pag. 342.

(62) Auſon. *in Biſſulâ*, p. 341.

(63) Scaliger. *Auſon. Lection.* lib. 1. cap. 2. *and* lib. 5. cap. 17. *apud* Alb. Petrum Rubenium, *in Vitâ Mallii Theodori*, pag. 16.

(64) Auſon. *Gratiar. Actione*, pag. 702, 703.

(65) Cod. Theodoſ. *Lege* 2 *de Patrociniis Virorum. See* Valeſ. *in Ammian. Marcellin.* lib. 29. cap. 1. pag. 549.

(66) Auſon. *Grat. Act.* pag. 705.

(67) *See* Rubenius *in Vitâ Mallii Theodori*, pag. 17, *& ſeq.*

(68) Auſon. *in Moſellâ*, verſ. 407. pag. 419.

(69) This appears from the 450th verſe.

(70) *See* Rubenius *in Vitâ Mallii Theodori*, p. 23.

(71) Scalig. *in Vitâ Auſonii.*

(72) Ruben. *in Vitâ Mallii Theodori*, pag. 24.

(73) Scaliger. *in Vitâ Auſonii.*

(74) Idem, ibid.

(75) Auſon. *in Parent.* num. 26. pag. 140.

(76) Beughem *in Incunab. Typographiæ, apud* Joh. Albert. Fabricium, *Biblioth. Lat.* pag. 177.

(77) There is a copy of this edition in the Library of Mr. de Thou. It is a folio, and perhaps of Aldus.

not omit the miſtake of Trithemius, who pretended that Auſonius was Biſhop of Bourdeaux [*H*].

1549. I ſay nothing of the edition of Plantin in 1568, with the Notes of Theodorus Pulmannus. That of Joſeph Scaliger at Lyons by Anthony Gryphius in 1575, illuſtrated with a very learned Commentary under the title of *Auſoniarum Lectionum*, eclipſed the former editions. Every body knows, that Elias Vinetus is one of the Commentators, who laboured moſt upon the works of our Poet. He was Profeſſor of polite Learning at Bourdeaux, and being deſired by ſeveral perſons of that city to publiſh an edition of their illuſtrious countryman, he complied with their requeſt; but he found not one manuſcript of Auſonius in the Libraries of Bourdeaux, and all that he could poſſibly do, was to compare the ſeveral editions together. He reſtored and corrected divers paſſages, and while the Commentaries, in which he was to give an account of his criticiſms, were preparing for the preſs, he cauſed the works of Auſonius to be printed, as he had corrected them. James Goupil his friend had the care of this edition, which is that of Paris in 1551. Vinetus ſome years after recovered a manuſcript, which had been found near Lyons, and which furniſhed him with a great deal of light; and as this leſſened his excuſes amongſt thoſe, who preſſed him to publiſh his Notes, he cauſed the Poem *de claris Urbibus* to be printed at Poitiers with his Commentary upon it in 1565. He ſent a perfect copy of the works of Auſonius to Anthony Gryphius, who had deſired it of him, and who promiſed to print it immediately; but this edition not appearing, he was adviſed to make uſe of the printing-houſe, which had been ſet up at Bourdeaux during theſe tranſactions. He gave therefore another copy to Simon Millanges, who began to print it at Bourdeaux in February 1575, and finiſhed it in the beginning of the ſummer of the ſame year. He received at the ſame time the edition of Gryphius; and becauſe Millanges wanted paper, Vinetus's Commentary could not be put to the preſs. It was not printed till four years after the edition, which Millanges had publiſhed of Auſonius's works (78). Upon this account, if we would ſpeak exactly, we ſhould not ſay, that the beſt edition of Auſonius is that publiſhed at Bourdeaux in 1575 with the Commentaries of Elias Vinetus. *Præ reliquis vero laudanda luculenta Auſonii editio cum Commentariis viri docti Eliæ Vineti vulgata Burdigalæ A.* 1575; *& poſt ejus obitum A.* 1590, 4 (79); for once again theſe Commentaries were not publiſhed till 1580. Moreri has been exact in this point: he is only miſtaken in ſaying, that Vinetus was of Xaintes; the word *Santo* ſignifies here nothing but a perſon of *Xaintonge*. The Library of the Archbiſhop of Reims mentions (80) an Auſonius printed by Millanges at Bourdeaux in 1575 with the Commentaries of Elias Vinetus. I imagine that this error ariſes from applying to all the pieces bound together the date 1575, which belongs only to the works of Auſonius, which are at the beginning of the volume. Monſr. Borrichius was miſtaken in ſaying, I, that the edition of Vinetus is one of the beſt: II, that Vinetus wrote a Comment upon Auſonius's Poem *de Urbibus* (81). Does not ſuch a manner of ſpeaking intimate that he did not write a Commentary upon the other Poems of Auſonius? The beſt edition of this Poet is that of Amſterdam in 1671; but I have already obſerved (82), that the title very falſly promiſes, that all the Notes of Mariangelus Accurſius were inſerted in it intire. I ſhall give a Supplement to all this in the article of (HUGOLIN) MARTELLIUS at the end of the remark [*A*]. As I have not the book of Father Lacarry (83), I am obliged to content myſelf with what I find in the *Journal des Savans*. "The double Præfecture of Auſonius, which "gave Scaliger ſo much trouble, is treated of there very "clearly. We find, that in the year 378 Auſonius "was Præfect of the Prætorium in Gaul and Italy "with his ſon Heſperius; but he was not Præfect of "Italy till about the month of July, when one Antonius was made Præfect of the Prætorium in Italy, "as it is mentioned in the Code. Thus the Præfecture "of Auſonius and Heſperius in Italy was interrupted "by Antonius; but he reaſſumed it with his ſon "in 379, and continued in that of Gaul with him "without any interruption during the year 378 and "379 (84)." This Hypotheſis, and this Chronology are by no means agreeable to the opinion of Rubenius, which I have related. If I had Father Lacarry's Book, I might perhaps judge, which of them has explained this matter with moſt exactneſs.

[*H*] *Trithemius pretended that Auſonius was Biſhop of Bourdeaux.*] He aſſures us, that this Biſhop was very learned in the Scriptures, and equally valuable for his piety and learning; and that he flouriſhed under Maximus in the year 310, and exerted himſelf very nobly with St. Martin, St. Ambroſe, and St. Jerom in the Synod, which that Emperor cauſed to be held at Treves. Here is a heap of fables. Vinetus obſerves, that ſome Perſons had aſſerted, that Auſonius was canonized: he tells us likewiſe, that the inhabitants of Angoulême honoured one Auſonius, who, they ſaid, was their firſt Biſhop, as one of their chief ſaints; and he thinks it is not impoſſible, but that the Poet Auſonius having been choſen Biſhop by the people of Angoulême, might accept of that Biſhoprick (85). A manuſcript chronicle of Angoulême tells us, that Auſonius, the diſciple of St. Martial, a Biſhop of Angoulême, ſuffered martyrdom when the Vandals ravaged Gaul (86). Monſ. de Hauteſerre confutes this by reaſon that a diſciple of St. Martial could not poſſibly be living at the beginning of the fourth Century at the time of the irruption of the Vandals (87). However that be, we ſee how very different accounts are given of our Poet Auſonius. Some Authors tell us that he was no Chriſtian, while others place him in the liſt of canonized Saints.

(78) Taken from the Preface of Elias Vinetus.

(79) Joh. Albert. Fabricius, *Bibliothec. Latin.* pag. 177.

(80) Pag. 394.

(81) Auſonii *Editio ſelectior eſt* Joſephi Scaligeri & Eliæ Vineti. Borrichius *de Poet. Lat.* pag. 73.

(82) Below in the quotation (*b*) in the article of (MARIANGELUS) ACCURSIUS.

(83) Intitled, *Hiſtoria Galliarum ſub Præfectis Prætorio Galliarum.*

(84) *Journal des Savans* of the 12th of Auguſt 1675, pag. 225. Holland edit.

(35) Elias Vinetus *in Vitâ Auſonii.*

(86) Alteſerra, *Rerum Aquitanicarum*, lib. 5. cap. 8. p. 339.

(87) Idem, ibid.

AUSTRIA (DON JUAN of) natural ſon to the Emperor Charles V, was born at Ratiſbon the 24th of February 1545. A young Lady of Ratiſbon, whoſe name was BARBARA BLOMBERG (*a*), was willing to paſs for his mother [*A*], to take off from thoſe, who had given life to the child, the ſhame that would have been unavoidable, if the public had known the name of the real mother. The child was carried into Spain before

(*a*) See the Article of her.

[*A*] BARBARA BLOMBERG *was willing to paſs for his mother.*] Famianus Strada tells us, that Cardinal de la Cueva had diſcovered that ſecret to him (1). This Cardinal learned it of the Infanta Clara Eugenia, to whom Philip II, who concealed nothing from her, had intruſted it with. Philip II always teſtified in public that Barbara Blomberg was Don Juan's mother: *Eodemque loco habitam a Philippo Rege ſcenæ pariter inſerviente* (2). The ſacrifice, which this Lady was willing to make of her own reputation to that of a great Princeſs, is not near ſo conſiderable as is imagined; it is eſteemed a ſhame to paſs for the miſtreſs of a private man; but how many Ladies are there, who value themſelves upon being the miſtreſſes of Kings and Emperors? I have obſerved, that ſhe made this ſacrifice in favour of a *great Princeſs*: it is Strada who acquaints me with this particular; *Joannem Auſtriacum, non ex Barbarâ Blombergâ, uti creditum ad eam diem, ſed ex longe illuſtriori ac* PLANE PRINCIPE *fœminâ procreatum; cujus ut famæ parceretur prætentum fuiſſe aliam à Carolo Cæſare.* The ſame Hiſtorian obſerves, that Don Juan, who was twice deceived in his mother, was never undeceived in that point. He thought himſelf at firſt the ſon of Magdalen Ulloa, and afterwards of Barbara Blomberg. However ſucceſsful and vigilant he was in diſcovering the moſt ſecret intrigues of the enemy, he could never unravel this domeſtic myſtery. *Habet profecto*

(1) Strada *de Bello Belgic.* Decad. 1. lib. 10. pag. 626.

(2) Idem, ibid.

before he was a year old [*B*]. The Emperor gave the commiſſion to Lewis Quixada, whom he had found by many proofs to be very capable of retaining a ſecret (*b*). He gave him orders to have the child brought up by Magdalen Ulloa his wife, without any perſons being able to gueſs who was the father. Quixada ſerved his maſter in this affair with all the fidelity imaginable; for he not only concealed the ſecret from every perſon with the utmoſt caution, but he took an extraordinary care of Don Juan's education. Charles, when he was near his death, diſcovered to his ſon Philip, that he was the father of the young Lord, who was brought up by Quixada at Villagarſia, and charged him to acknowledge him as his brother for the future, and to treat him in a manner ſuitable to his quality. Philip did not put this command in execution till about two years after [*C*], but he did it then with a good grace. He had Don Juan educated with Don Carlos and Alexander Farneſe. Theſe three Princes were almoſt of the ſame age, but Don Juan had the greateſt advantage both in perſon and genius. Philip was diſpleaſed to find in him a reluctance to enter into the Eccleſiaſtical ſtate, which his father had deſigned him for. But he was much more ſo at a wild undertaking of this young Lord, who, without the King's leave, had taken a journey to Barcelona, attended with a conſiderable number of Gentlemen, in order to go to the war at Malta. The letters which he received from the King before he had embarked, made him break off this voyage. He obeyed the King's order, and returned with ſuch expedition, that he pacified a little Philip's anger, and he abſolutely regained his favour by being the firſt who diſcovered to him the deſigns of Don Carlos. There had been but very little friendſhip between

(*b*) *Quem expertus erat arcanorum celantiſſimum.* Strada, Dec. 1. lib. 10. pag. 612.

profecto unde minus ſibi de ſuâ ſagacitate placeat humanum ingenium, quando tantus princeps, atque intima quæque vel in hoſte rimari ſolitus, domi ſuæ, ſuorumque ignarus adeò vixerit obieritque, ut bis in matre deceptus, ſemper alienam coluerit, nunquam ſuam (3). I am ſurprized that Father Strada ſays nothing of a third perſon, who paſſed for the mother of Don Juan. The Author of a learned diſſertation, which was printed in 1688 (4), ſpeaks with great commendation of Catherine de Cardonne, born at Naples in 1519. She went to Spain with the Princeſs of Salerno her couſin in 1559, and gained by her virtue and piety ſo much the eſteem of Philip II, that he commanded Ruy Gomez, Prince of Evely, Governor of Don Carlos and Don Juan, to take care of that Lady. Ruy Gomez took her to his houſe, and finding her a perſon of admirable prudence, he deſired her to undertake the government of his family, and to ſhare with him the education of two Princes. She executed this charge with all the care imaginable. Don Juan always honoured her as *his mother*. The Author of the Diſſertation makes a remark upon that word. *We muſt not proceed any further*, ſays he (5), *without juſtifying this Saint from an horrible calumny, which ſome have founded upon the abuſe of this word, and have intimated, that ſhe was the* TRUE MOTHER *of John of Auſtria. Strada of Rosberg ſeems to have occaſion for that ſuppoſition in his genealogy of the Houſe of Auſtria, where he mentions the mother of that Prince under the ſingle name of Catherine. But a life ſo chaſte and ſo mortified, as that which Catherine de Cardonne had led from her very infancy, could not poſſibly admit of ſuch a ſuſpicion concerning her.* There are ſeveral other reaſons added to this, to juſtify Catherine de Cardonne, and the remark is concluded in theſe words. *It was another perſon of much more illuſtrious rank,* (who was mother of John of Auſtria), *and one whom our Saint* (6) *had even known, as the Hiſtorian of her life obſerves, but who, for very conſiderable reaſons, was never diſcovered.* I ſhall add to this a paſſage from Mr. Varillas. *The ſecret of the birth of John of Auſtria,* ſays he (7), *was never abſolutely diſcovered, and whether the high quality of his true mother required all the precautions which were made uſe of, or whether there was more care taken to avoid the ſcandal than the ſin, it is certain that Charles V diſcovered to Quixada only who John of Auſtria was, and ordered him to let him paſs for his ſon, till his Imperial Majeſty told Philip II, when he reſigned up his dominions to him, that he had a natural brother.* This reſerve of Mr. Varillas is more commendable than the liberty which is taken in the ſecond edition of the *Menagiana*, of ſaying in expreſs terms, that Don John of Auſtria was born of his father's own ſiſter. This is told upon occaſion of an excellent ſaying of Charles V. He is reported to have ſaid, upon his tearing an unjuſt privilege which he had ſigned, *I had rather ſpoil my ſignature, than injure my conſcience.* Upon which we have this gloſs in the ſecond edition of the *Menagiana*, pag. 422. *Here is a tender conſcience for a man who had acted the knave all his life long, and who, if we are to credit ſcandal, made no ſcruple of lying with his own ſiſter, while Barbara Blomberg was made uſe of to cover this infamous commerce between them, and called herſelf the mother of Don John of Auſtria.*

(3) Idem, ibid. pag. 627.

(4) *Diſſertation ſur l'Hemine de Vin & ſur la Livre de Pain de St. Benoit.*

(5) Pag. 186.

(6) That is, *Catherine de Cardonne.* Her Hiſtory is in the *Hiſtoire Generale des Carmes dechauſſez* 1 Part, liv. v. See the *Diſſertat. ſur l'Hemine.* p. 182.

(7) Varillas, *Hiſtoire de Francois I*, lib. 13. pag. 589.

[*B*] *He was carried into Spain before he was a year old.*] Brantome tells us another ſtory, which I ſhall relate in the remarks of the article BLOMBERG, and which is not to be believed to the prejudice of Father Strada.

[*C*] *Charles V diſcovered to Philip II, that Don Juan was his ſon, and charged him to acknowledge him as his brother; .... which command he did not put in execution till about two years after.*] The application of an Hiſtorian to the principal point is the occaſion, that he does not always perceive the errors of his calculation. Thus for inſtance here is Strada, who aſſures us, that Don Juan was born the 24th of February 1545; that his father died the 21ſt of September 1558; that Philip acknowledg'd Don Juan two years after his father's death; that he had him brought up with Don Carlos his ſon; and that theſe two Princes had not yet attained the fifteenth year of their age, *annum quartum decimum nondum ſupergreſſi.* If Strada had minded his calculation well, he would have found above fifteen years compleat. It cannot be ſaid that the year 1547 was that of his birth. I confeſs that Moreri aſſerts it; but this cannot be Strada's opinion, ſince he places the death of Don Juan on the 1ſt of October 1578, and tells us that he was then three and thirty years old. So that there is no error of the preſs in the number 1545. The Author of the Diſſertation upon the *Hemina* (8) places the birth of this natural ſon of Charles on the 14th of February 1545, and his death about the firſt of October 1578 *in the army near Namur*; and he criticizes upon the Genealogy of the Houſe of Auſtria, which tells us that he died at Bruges in the 25th year of his age. He finds fault likewiſe with Father Strada for having placed the death of Don Juan in December; but we read expreſly in Strada *Kalendis Octobris* (9), *the Kalends of October*. Mr. Varillas is not to be depended upon, when he tells us, that Philip II ſuffered *eleven years to paſs without executing his father's orders, and that John of Auſtria was twenty years old, when his Catholic Majeſty thought proper to acknowledge him for his brother* (10). He would have been four and twenty years old according to this calculation. Let us recollect that he was ſent Generaliſſimo to the Kingdom of Grenada in the year 1569 (11). It muſt follow then, according to Mr. Varillas, that Philip II began to acknowledge him for the natural ſon of Charles V by conferring upon him that important office. They muſt know little of that King, who can aſcribe to him ſuch a precipitate piece of conduct.

(8) Pag. 187.

(9) Strada, Decad. 1. lib. 10. pag. 611.

(10) Varillas, *Hiſtoire de François I*, lib. 2. pag. 389.

(11) Moreri ſays 1570.

between those two young Princes [*D*]. Don Juan was a little after sent to the Kingdom of Grenada against the Moors, and signalized himself in that war. He was declared Generalissimo of the League against the Turks, in which post he gained the famous battle of Lepanto in the year 1571; after which he took the city of Tunis and that of Biserta, and returned in triumph to Italy, being followed by Amidas King of Tunis, whom he had taken prisoner: he had left a garrison in Tunis contrary to Philip's orders, and by the Pope's interposition there was already a talk of conferring upon him the title of King of Tunis. The King of Spain was by no means pleased with all these successes of his; the idea which he formed of this young Prince's ambition gave him a great deal of uneasiness (*c*). He sent him to command in the Low-Countries, but gave him orders to make peace there; he was displeased to find him at the head of an army. With these prepossessions against him, he easily credited all the rumours which might render his brother's conduct suspected; and some tell us, that to aggravate this division between them, there was means found to acquaint him, that Don Juan was going to marry Queen Elizabeth (*d*). Let us observe, to cut the story short, that Escovedo, Secretary to Don Juan, having been sent to Madrid by his master, to sollicit the succours which he had expected a long while, was killed there [*E*]. Don Juan upon this thought himself in high disgrace; the chagrin of seeing himself sacrificed to the contempt of his enemies, by the impossibility which he was reduced to of supporting himself against them [*F*], occasioned a sickness of which he died the first of October 1578 (*e*). It was even supposed that he was poisoned [*G*]. He recommended to King Philip his pretended mother, and his pretended brother by the mother's side, and his servants; but he durst not order that his two natural daughters (*f*) [*H*] should be mentioned to him.

(*c*) *Quod Philippo suspicionem intendit elatum victoriarum cursu juvenem non diu laturum privatam fortunam, & regna nunc rogare aliquando invasurum.* Strada, *de Bello Belgico*, Decad. 1. lib. 10. pag. 617.

(*d*) See remark [*F*].

(*e*) *Majoribus indies pressus angustiis ac desertus, uti palam querebatur, a Rege, traditusque hostium ludibrio, ingent animi speique princeps.. ex mœrore contabuit.* Strada, Decad. 1. lib. 9. pag. 619.

(*f*) Taken from Strada, lib. 10. Decad. 1.

We

[*D*] *He was the first, who discovered the designs of Don Carlos. There had been but little friendship between those two young Princes.*] I shall relate a story, which we find in Brantome. It is said that Don Carlos "having discovered something of importance "to Don John, he revealed it to the King of Spain, "who always loved him the better for it, tho' he "was afterwards very ill rewarded: upon which "Don Carlos hated him so much, that they ge- "nerally quarrelled together, and he once called him "bastard and son of a whore; to which Don John "replied, *Si yo lo soy; mas yo tengo padre mejor que "vos: Yes, it is true I am so, but my father was "much superior to yours*; and thus they were ready to "come to blows about it (12)."

(12) Brantome, *Vies des Capitaines étrangers*, tom. 2. p. 117, 118.

[*E*] *Escovedo, his Secretary, having been sent to Madrid . . . . was killed there.*] Mr. le Laboureur says, that he had read some Memoirs written by Mr. de Peiresc, which affirm that *Escovedo was killed after his master's death*; and that Mr. Du Vair, who was acquainted with this particular *in a familiar conversation with Antonio Perez*, told it to Mr. de Peiresc (13). This deserves to be examined. We shall perhaps give an article of Escovedo, in which we shall treat of this more largely, whether it was before or after Don Juan's death, that the designs, which he and the Duke of Guise were concerting, were discovered to the Court of Spain. Philip II was not so much in the wrong as is imagined, and Don Juan was capable in time of giving him much more trouble, than the Dutch. He was no better man with regard to his King, than the Duke of Guise. But it is true, the jealous humour of Philip, and his mysterious politics, very frequently inspired those of his family with these rebellious thoughts. *Multi fallere docuerunt, dum timent falli, & aliis jus peccandi suspicando fecerunt* (14). That is: "Many persons have taught others to de- "ceive them, while they have been apprehensive of "being deceived; and have given them a right to "injure them by their own suspicions."

(13) *Additions aux Memoires de Castelnau*, tom. 2. pag. 889.

(14) Seneca, Epist. 3.

[*F*] *He saw himself sacrificed to the contempt of his enemies, by the impossibility which he was reduced to of supporting himself against them.*] We see by this, that the King of Spain, as great a Politician as he was, chose rather to lose the Low-Countries, than not to gratify his jealousy and the other secret passions which tormented his soul. It is to this that the Dutch owe their liberty as much or more, than to their own excellent and wise conduct. There are few grand affairs, which do not succeed as much at least by the faults of one party, as by the prudence of the other. It was by no means difficult to draw Philip II into the snare, when his jealousies were discovered. Strada imagines, that the Prince of Orange wrote to one of his friends at Paris concerning the marriage of Don Juan with the Queen of England, and the promise, which the bridegroom had made of granting liberty of conscience to those of the new Religion; and all this, with a direct design to inflame the suspicions of King Philip: he thought, that such a piece of news would immediately be known to the Spanish Embassador. *Quin ad hanc quoque suspicionem Regi confirmandam haud sanè dubitaverim aspexisse Orangium, scriptis ad amicum literis in Galliam, quibus Joan. Austriaci atque Angliæ Reginæ conjugium significabat, addebatque pro suâ in eam rem operâ, spem sibi ab Austriaco factam liberæ per Belgium Religionis. Id, quod à Varga, Hispano apud Gallum oratore in arcana quæque intento, sollicite admonitum ferunt Philippum Regem* (15).

(15) Strada, *de Bello Belgic.* Dec. 1. l. 10. p. 618.

[*G*] *It was believed . . . . that he was poisoned.*] You will find here the words of Strada, and of Brantome, *Ex mœrore contabuit*, says Strada (16): *An verò ad hoc quo satis extingui potuit, venenum aliua cujusquam dolo subjectum fuerit (namque in defuncti corpore extitisse non obscura veneni vestigia affirmant qui viderunt) equidem nihil ipse statuerim.* This poor Prince, says Brantome (17), *did not long enjoy this great glory and praise, for he, who had so much sought to die in the rude field of Mars, went to die in a soft and easy bed, as if he had been some minion of Venus, and not a son of Mars. He died of a contagious distemper, which it is said he catched of the Marchioness of Avré, whom he was in love with; but every body did not agree to this story, even in Spain; for it is reported, that he was poisoned with perfumed buskins.*

(16) Idem, ibid. pag. 619.

(17) Brantome, *Vies des Capit. étrangers*, pag. 140.

[*H*] *He durst not recommend his two natural daughters to Philip.*] Don Juan, who was the finest Prince of his time, was likewise a person of great gallantry and civility. Judge whether he was not a man of success in his intrigues. He had a daughter at Madrid, and another at Naples. That at Madrid was named Anne; and her mother was a Lady of the first quality and a perfect beauty. *Ex Mariâ Mendoziâ splendidissimi generis formæque elegantissimæ puellâ* (18). The same Lady, who had nursed Don Juan (19), brought up this child till she was seven years of age; and then put her into a Nunnery. Philip II took her from thence, and sent her to Burgos, where she was made perpetual Superior of the Benedictine Nuns. The other daughter of Don Juan was named Joan; her mother was a young Lady of Sorrento, whose name was Diana Phalanga; and after the child had been brought up till she was seven years old by Margaret Duchess of Parma her father's sister, she was placed amongst the Nuns of St. Claire at Naples, and having continued twenty years there she was married at last to the Prince of Butero. These two daughters of Don Juan died almost on the same day, in February 1630. He had them brought up so privately, that he did not doubt but that the King was ignorant of the whole

(18) Strada, Decad. 1. lib. 10. pag. 624.

(19) Catherine Ulloa, wife to Don Lewis Quixada.

We find his Elogium amongſt thoſe of ſeveral other warriors, in a book written by Primo Damaſchino, and printed at Rome in the year 1680, under the title of *La Spadà d'Orione ſtellata nel Cielo di Marte.* But if the reader would ſee a detail of the complaints which were made againſt his conduct, with ſeveral of his letters which were intercepted, he may read the *Summary Diſcourſe of the juſt cauſes and reaſons, which have obliged the States-General of the Low-Countries to provide for their defence againſt Don John of Auſtria.* This is a very curious manifeſto. It was printed at Antwerp by William Sylvius, printer to the King in the year 1577. See likewiſe the manifeſto which Prince John Caſimire, Count Palatin of the Rhine, publiſhed the year following to juſtify his expedition. He had it printed at Neuſtad in High-Dutch and Latin. There was in the ſeventeenth Century another DON JOHN OF AUSTRIA [*I*], who appeared in the world with great applauſe. He was ſon to Philip IV by an Actreſs [*K*].

ſecret; and he had never intruſted it with his great friend the Prince of Parma, who knew nothing of theſe natural daughters of his, but from his mother the Ducheſs, a little before Don Juan's death. *Eas Regi incompertas crederet; quippe occultè adeò cautèque educatas, ut Alexander ipſe ſecretorum ejus plane omnium particeps filiarum alteram ignoraret; alteram non ab Auſtriaco, ſed à Margaritâ matre haud pridem nôſſet* (20). The Author of the Life of this Prince, printed at Amſterdam in 1690, will have it, that *Don John entruſted his dear nephew Prince Alexander Farneſe with the ſecret of his intrigue with the beautiful Mendoza, and of his daughter Anne, becauſe as they lived then in the ſame Court of Spain they obſerved each other's conduct, and becauſe they were too intimate friends, to conceal their affairs from each other. But as he was well perſuaded, that the diſcovery of a fault is a fault, he had kept*, ſays the Author, *his amour with Diana ſecret* (21). This is contradicting Strada without any reaſon or proof; and alledging a reaſon of his ſilence, which proves too much.

(20) Strada, Dec. 1. lib. 10. pag. 624.

(21) *Vie de Dom Juan d'Autriche*, pag. 146.

[*I*] *There was in the 17th Century another* DON JOHN OF AUSTRIA.] He was natural ſon to Philip IV King of Spain, and was born in the year 1629 (22). He was legitimated in 1642; and there was no perſon, who paid his compliments of congratulation to Philip IV upon that occaſion with ſo much zeal, as the Apoſtolical Nuncio James Panzirollus (23). The King's affection for this child was the moſt tender imaginable. He declared him his Generaliſſimo both at ſea and land in the war againſt Portugal in 1642; and ſome years after he ſent him into Italy againſt the rebels at Naples (24). This laſt expedition proving very ſucceſsful, induced the King to give Don Juan a commiſſion to reduce the revolted Catalans to their duty. He ſent him afterwards to command in the Low-Countries. This employment did not contribute much to Don Juan's glory. The honour, which he had gained by raiſing the ſiege of Valenciennes, was deſtroyed by the ill ſucceſs, which attended him in other places, and eſpecially by the loſs of the battle of the Downs, which was ſoon followed by the loſs of Dunkirk. He was no leſs unfortunate in the war in Portugal after the peace made at the Pyrenees; for the army, which he commanded, was entirely defeated; upon which he fell into diſgrace, and received an order from the King his father to retire to Conſuegra (25). He had no ſhare in the Government after the death of that Prince; the whole authority was in the hands of the Queen Mother and the Jeſuit Nidhard. They wanted to remove him under the ſpecious pretence of ſending him into the Low-Countries in order to oppoſe the arms of France; but he diſcovered the contrivance, and would not go, pretending himſelf ſick. The Court being diſpleaſed at this conduct of his obliged him to retire to Conſuegra (26). He was not unmindful of his intereſts in that retirement, and managed the diſpoſitions of thoſe, to whom Father Nidhard's credit was odious, in ſo effectual a manner, that this Jeſuit was forced at laſt to give way. He left Spain to go to Rome, and from that time the affairs of Don John went on much better, till at laſt he was ſent for again to Court (27), and obtained the chief direction of the Government. He died the 17th of September 1679 after a ſickneſs of three and twenty days (28). There were ſome perſons, who ſaid, that he was poiſoned. *Vi ſono perſone, che aſſicurano che foſſe un colpo uſcito dalla mano della* Reg. Mad. *e del Cardinal Nitardi, coll. aſſiſtenza de' ſuoi Partigiani* (29). Others ſaid, that he conceived ſo much chagrin at the King's marriage with the Duke of Orlean's daughter, that he died of it; and yet, according to the opinion of the Public, he had been the chief promoter of that marriage (30). I remember to have read in a Gazette of the year 1678, that the Marquis of Agropoli, who was ſuſpected of having written a Comedy againſt Don Juan, was baniſhed to Oran.

(22) *Vita di Don Giovanni d'Auſtria*, p. 4. Geneva edit. in 1686.

(23) Ibid. p. 7.

(24) Ibid. p. 37.

(25) Ibid. pag. 284.

(26) Ibid. pag. 288.

(27) About the end of the year 1676.

(28) *Vita di Don Giovanni d'Auſtria*, pag. 628.

(29) Ibid. pag. 629.

(30) See *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for July 1686, pag. 827.

[*K*] . . . . *Son to Philip IV, by an Actreſs.*] Every body knows that Philip IV was extremely given to women. He ſhewed this inclination very early, and he had a Governor, who was ſo far from ſupporting him in ſuch a ſlippery path, that he contributed to his fall. It was the Conde Olivarez, who was likewiſe ſubject to this paſſion; and upon that account, as well as the better to ſecure to himſelf the adminiſtration of affairs, he fomented the looſe temper of this young Prince; he hoped, that under the reign of his pupil, he ſhould have the greateſt poſts in the Kingdom, and he foreſaw that he might exerciſe them with the moſt abſolute authority, if the King ſhould indulge himſelf in a voluptuous and effeminate manner of life; and beſides that his own irregularities would have a more free courſe under a maſter, whom he ſhould only imitate. This management had the ſucceſs he wiſh'd for. Philip IV, at the age of ſixteen years, aſcended the Throne in 1621, and left the care of affairs to the Conde Olivarez, who omitted nothing to encourage the King in his indolence. He invented new pleaſures; he ſent for to Madrid the beſt company of Actors, which Spain could furniſh. They performed before the King in 1627. There was one of the Actreſſes, whoſe name was Calderona, who pleaſed him exceedingly. She was not very handſome, but ſhe had a great many charms, and an extremely ſweet voice. The King had no ſooner ſeen her upon the ſtage, but he was ſtruck with her, and ordered her to be brought into his chamber; he only wanted, he ſaid, to hear her ſpeak nearer him. As ſoon as the Conde Duke heard of this, he managed the interview, and had the Actreſs introduced into his Majeſty's chamber in the night. She did not go away till the next morning, and left the King ſo charmed with her, that he declared her his favourite. She was then but ſixteen years of age. After that time their meetings were very frequent; ſhe proved with child, and was brought to bed of our Don Juan. But after her delivery ſhe broke off this commerce (31), and ſhut herſelf up in a Convent, where ſhe took the habit of a Nun, with the benediction of the Pope's Nuncio (32).

(31) *Non volle poi la Calderona accopiarſi piu col Rè. Vita di Don Giovanni d'Auſtria*, p. 5.

(32) John Baptiſta Pamphilio, who was afterwards Pope Innocent X. *Vita di Don Giovanni d'Auſtria*, p. 2, *& ſeq.*

AUTON (JOHN D') Gentleman of Xaintonge (*a*), Abbot of Angle (*b*), of the Order of St. Auguſtin, lived in the Reign of Lewis XII. He *was retained in the ſervice of the court*, and had a particular order to write the Hiſtory of that King (*c*), which he executed, and it was publiſhed at Paris in the year 1615 in 4to, by Theodore Godefroi. It extends only from the year 1506 to 1508 (*d*). We find there *even the verſes which the Author dedicated to that King* (*e*).

(*a*) Baudier, *Hiſtoire du Cardinal d'Amboiſe*, pag. 44.

(*b*) Du Cheſne, *Bibliotheque des Hiſtoriens de France*, pag. 65.

(*c*) Baudier, *Hiſtoire du Cardinal d'Amboiſe*, pag. 44.

(*d*) Du Cheſne, *Biblioth.* pag. 65.

(*e*) Sorel, *Biblioth. Franç.* pag. 329.

AYLMER

☞ AYLMER [*A*] (JOHN), Biſhop of London in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, was born of a good family [*B*] at Aylmer-Hall in the pariſh of Tilney in Norfolk, about the year 1521 (*a*). Tho' he took his degrees of Divinity in Oxford, yet he had his firſt education at Cambridge, but in what College, is uncertain (*b*). Grey, Marquis of Dorſet, and afterwards Duke of Suffolk, conceived a good opinion of him, when he was very young, and entertained him as his ſcholar, and gave him an Exhibition at the Univerſity. Mr. Wood (*c*) ſuppoſes, that he took his degrees in Arts at Cambridge; after which the Marquis took him into his family, and made him tutor to his children, among whom was the Lady Jane Gray, who was afterwards made Queen. She made a prodigious progreſs in the Greek language and all parts of polite literature under Mr. Aylmer's inſtruction [*C*], who diſtinguiſhed himſelf very early among the beſt and politeſt Writers of that age [*D*]. Nor did he confine his ſtudies to ſecular learning only, but applied himſelf likewiſe to Divinity; and having the Duke of Suffolk and the Earl of Huntingdon for his patrons in the reign of King Edward VI, he was the only Preacher in Leiceſterſhire for ſome time, and had a great ſhare in bringing over the people of that county to the Proteſtant Religion (*d*). In the beginning of the year 1553 he was made Archdeacon of Stow in the Dioceſe in Lincoln, in the room of Chriſtopher Maſſingberd, who died on the 8th of March that year, as Wood informs us (*e*), or of Dr. Draicot, according to Mr. Strype (*f*). This dignity qualified him to ſit in the Convocation in the firſt year of Queen Mary, where he diſputed in defence of the Proteſtant Religion [*E*]. But he was ſoon after obliged to retire beyond ſea, where he employed himſelf in the inſtruction of

(*a*) Strype's *Life of Biſhop Aylmer*, pag. 2, 3. edit. London in 8vo 1701.

(*b*) Idem, p. 3.

(*c*) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. pag. 712. edit. 2. London 1721.

(*d*) Strype, pag. 8, 9.

(*e*) *Ubi ſupra.*

(*f*) Pag. 9.

[*A*] *Aylmer.*] This name is variouſly written, *Ailmar*, *Ailemare*, *Elmer*, and *Ælmer*, with the Saxon Diphthong, (and ſo he wrote it himſelf,) contracted from the Saxon name *Adelmar* or *Ethelmar*; for the name is undoubtedly Saxon; and in the Catalogue of the Biſhops of Sherbern in the Saxon times about the year 1009, we have one of the ſame name (1).

(1) Strype's *Life of Biſhop Aylmer*, p. 1, 2.

[*B*] *Born of a good family.*] This family was very ancient, and ſettled in Norfolk and Suffolk (2). Mr. Strype tells us (3), that he finds ſeveral perſons of that family in the city of Norwich about the year 1500. His elder brother was Sir Robert Aylmer of Aylmer-Hall, whoſe Anceſtor was High-Sheriff of the county of Norfolk in the time of King Edward II (4).

(2) Idem, p. 2.
(3) Pag. 192.
(4) Idem, p. 3.

[*C*] *She made a prodigious progreſs . . . . . under Mr. Aylmer's inſtruction.*] She gained ſuch a knowledge of the Greek tongue, that ſhe read Plato and Demoſthenes with the greateſt eaſe and pleaſure, and we are informed by Mr. Aſcham in his *Schoolmaſter* (5), that he viſited her at Broadgate in Leiceſterſhire, her father's ſeat, where he found her reading Plato's *Phædon* in Greek, while the reſt of the family were hunting in the park. Upon his aſking her how ſhe came to have ſuch an exquiſite reliſh and pleaſure in learning, contrary to the uſual cuſtom of her ſex, ſhe replied in this manner: *One of the greateſt benefits, that ever God gave me is, that he ſent me ſo ſharp and ſevere parents, and ſo gentle a ſchoolmaſter. For when I am in preſence either of father or mother, whether I ſpeak, keep ſilence, ſit, ſtand, or go, eat, drink, be merry or ſad, be ſewing, playing, dancing, or doing any thing elſe, I muſt do it as it were in ſuch weight, meaſure, and number, even ſo perfectly as God made the world, or elſe I am ſo ſharply taunted, ſo cruelly threatned, yea preſently ſometimes with pinches, nipps, and bobbs, and other ways, (which I will not name for the honour I bear them,) ſo without meaſure miſordered, that I think myſelf in hell, till time cometh that I muſt go to Mr. Aylmer, who teacheth me ſo gently, ſo pleaſantly, with ſuch fair allurements to learning, that I think all the time nothing whiles I am with him. And when I am called from him, I fall on weeping; becauſe whatſoever I do elſe but learning, is full of grief, trouble, fear, and wholly miſliking to me. And thus my book hath been ſo much my pleaſure, and bringeth daily to me more pleaſure and more, that in reſpect of it all other pleaſures in very deed be but trifles and troubles unto me.* Mr. Aylmer inſtructed this Lady likewiſe in piety, and made her firm in the profeſſion of the Proteſtant Religion (6).

(5) Edit. 1571. pag. 11.

(6) Strype, p. 4.

[*D*] *Diſtinguiſhed him very early among the beſt and politeſt Writers of that Age.*] We have ſome account of his reſidence in the noble family abovementioned in an old Book intitled *The Jewel of Joy*, written by Thomas Becon in the reign of King Edward VI. This Author being in danger on account of his Religion in the latter end of Henry VIII's reign, was obliged to conceal himſelf by travelling Northwards; and coming into Leiceſterſhire, where the Marquis of Dorſet's ſeat was, he met with Mr. Aylmer, who received him with great civility, and of whom he gives this character, that *he was excellently well learned both in Latin and Greek*; and added, that *with him alone in that county he had familiarity.* Mr. Strype likewiſe obſerves (7), that he was ranked among the beſt ſcholars and greateſt genius's of thoſe times; ſuch as Sir John Cheke, Haddon, Smith, and Aſcham; the laſt of whom being Tutor to the Lady Elizabeth, afterwards Queen, and therefore often at Court, Mr. Aylmer and he contracted a very intimate acquaintance. And in a letter which Mr. Aſcham wrote in the ſtrongeſt terms of friendſhip from Augſburgh, when he was Secretary to Sir Richard Moriſon Embaſſador in Germany, he deſires two things of his friend Aylmer; one of which was, that he would engage the Lady Jane Grey to write him a Greek letter, as ſhe had promiſed, and another to the famous John Sturmius of Straſburgh; the other requeſt, or rather exhortation, was, that they both ſhould continue their preſent courſe of life of reading and ſtudy; for then, ſaid he, *how free, how agreeable, how like Philoſophers ſhould we live? What ſhould prevent us from enjoying all thoſe advantages, which Cicero in the concluſion of his third book* De Finibus *aſcribes to this manner of life? Nothing could occur to us in both the languages, nor in all the records of time paſt and preſent, but we ſhould collect thence matter to render life the moſt delightful imaginable.*

(7) Pag. 7.

[*E*] *He diſputed in defence of the Proteſtant Religion.*] He ſhewed upon this occaſion his ſkill in the Greek language to great advantage. For when Cheny, another of the Proteſtant Diſputants, had quoted a paſſage out of Theodoret, to prove that the ſubſtance of bread remained after the conſecration, that the elements were the ſame after the bleſſing of them as they were before, and that they did not loſe their former ſubſtance and form; where that Writer uſes the word οὐσία *ſubſtance*; Dr. Moreman, a Member of that Synod, to evade this allegation, affirmed that οὐσία was a word that implied accident as well as ſubſtance, and *Accidental Subſtance*, as he called it. But Mr. Aylmer ſhewed with great ſtrength, that οὐσία could not poſſibly ſignify *accidens* in the paſſage, which had been quoted; which was very evident from the other two words uſed by Theodoret in the ſame place, εἶδος and χῆμα, which ſignify *ſhape* and *form*. He proved likewiſe out of the ſame Author, that οὐσία in Greek could not be taken in ſo general a ſenſe, as Dr. Moreman would inſinuate. This he demonſtrated in the Acts of the ſecond Seſſion of the Convocation. And two days after, when Dr. Moreman had endeavoured to refute what he had urged, he confirmed his aſſertion by proofs from the Greek language; which confounded his antagoniſt in ſuch a manner, that he deſired a day to conſider them (8). There happened another remarkable paſſage in this Convocation, which was, that when Dr. Pern had declared his opinion againſt Tranſubſtantiation, and confirmed the arguments and authorities of Mr. Aylmer, Dr. Weſton the Prolocutor expreſſed his

(8) Idem, pag. 221, 222. Collier's *Eccleſ. Hiſt.* vol. 2. B. 5.

of youth, and aſſiſting in and compoſing works of Learning and Religion [*F*]. Upon his return in the beginning of Queen Elizabeth's reign, he diſtinguiſhed himſelf as one of the eight managers of the diſputation held at Weſtminſter againſt an equal number of Popiſh Biſhops (*g*). In 1562 he was made Archdeacon of Lincoln, and was preſent at the famous Synod held the ſame year, when the doctrine and diſcipline of the Church, and the reformation from Popery were eſtabliſhed (*b*). He continued a long while without any other conſiderable preferment, though he was often nominated by the Archbiſhop of Canterbury to ſome vacant Biſhoprick [*G*]. However he was appointed one of the Queen's Juſtices of the Peace for the County, and one of her Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſioners (*i*). October the 10th 1573 he was made Bachelor and Doctor of Divinity the ſame day in the Univerſity of Oxford (*k*). The year following he was choſen by the Archbiſhop of Canterbury to write an anſwer to a Latin book written againſt the government of the Church of England [*H*]. In 1576 he was preferred to the Biſhoprick of

(*g*) Idem, pag. 17.

(*b*) Idem, pag. 18.

(*i*) Idem. pag. 21.

(*k*) Wood, *Faſti*, pag. 109.

his ſurprize that he ſhould urge that, becauſe he had ſubſcribed to the contrary but the Friday before. Upon this Mr. Aylmer told the Prolocutor, that he had no right to reprove any man, ſince the Houſe was free, and every perſon had a liberty of ſpeaking his conſcience; and he himſelf had promiſed the day before, that notwithſtanding the ſubſcription of any man, he ſhould have the liberty of delaring his opinion (9).

(9) Strype, pag. 222, 223.

[*F*] *Obliged to retire beyond Sea, where he employed himſelf in the inſtruction of youth, and aſſiſting in and compoſing works of learning and religion.*] Dr. Fuller tells us (10), that when he fled from perſecution in this reign, he was wonderfully ſaved from the ſearchers of the ſhip by a Merchant, who put him into a great wine-but, which had a partition in the middle, ſo that Mr. Aylmer ſat in the hinder part, whilſt the ſearchers drank wine, which they ſaw drawn out of the head or other end of it. He reſided firſt at Straſburgh, and afterwards at Zurich in Helvetia; where he proſecuted his ſtudies and heard the Lectures of Dr. Peter Martyr, who had been not long before the King's Profeſſor of Divinity at Oxford. While Mr. Aylmer continued here, he undertook the inſtruction of ſeveral young Gentlemen in learning and religion. Mr. Strype (11) is of opinion, that it was he who publiſhed at Straſburgh the Lady Jane Grey's Letter to Harding, her father's chaplain; and when Mr. John Fox, who was now collecting materials for his *Martyrology*, enquired of him what he had to communicate of that excellent Lady, he mentioned this Letter to him, which he told Mr. Fox he would find *to be pionſly, and prudently, and perhaps learnedly written. Nam & pie & prudenter, fortaſſe etiam docte ſcriptam dices*. He was greatly aſſiſtant to that writer in two of the works, which he was engaged in, the former of which was his Hiſtory of the Engliſh Martyrs in Latin, and the latter his Latin Tranſlation of Archbiſhop Cranmer's Vindication of his Book of the Sacrament againſt Dr. Gardiner Biſhop of Wincheſter. But this Tranſlation was never printed. We muſt not omit to mention the good ſervice, which Mr. Aylmer intended for the Engliſh at Francfort. For obſerving a conſiderable number of Scholars and Students there, he thought it would be of great uſe to have ſome learned Profeſſor of Divinity among them; and determined upon Peter Martyr, who was then at Straſburgh. Upon this he engaged Mr. Fox and ſeveral other men of eminence to write a letter to him with the propoſal of a very honourable ſtipend. But this did not take effect (12). During his exile Mr. Aylmer took the opportunity of viſiting the Univerſities of Italy and Germany, and conferring with many of the moſt learned men there. At Jena, an Univerſity erected by the Duke of Saxony, he was offered the Hebrew Profeſſorſhip (13).

(10) *Worthies*, in *Norfolk*.

(11) Pag. 11.

(12) Pag. 15.

(13) Pag. 16.

[*G*] *He continued a long while without any other conſiderable preferment, tho' he was often nominated by the Archbiſhop of Canterbury to ſome vacant Biſhoprick.*] Mr. Strype obſerves (14), that the Archbiſhop had enemies at Court, who generally oppoſed what he recommended and adviſed. But there were many conjectures, why our Divine continued without higher preferment. The party, who were averſe to the Biſhops, and diſliked the form of worſhip eſtabliſhed by Law, made his Book againſt Knox, which we ſhall mention below, one of the cauſes of the neglect of him; becauſe perhaps they imagined that he had in that treatiſe too much advanced the power and authority of Princes, which Knox had too much depreſſed. To this purpoſe we may underſtand that expreſſion of one Norton a Miniſter in a letter to Dr. Whitgift written in the year 1572; in which adviſing the latter to forbear anſwering Mr. Cartwright the Puritan's Book, that Proteſtants might not give an opportunity to the enemies of Religion by falling into controverſies among themſelves; and inſinuating that his ſecret intention in writing in this conteſt was the view of preferment, he obſerves to him, that *Mr. Aylmer's unſeaſonable paradox in truth hath hurt the Church, and yet not advanced his preferment ſo much as he hoped.* But Dr. Whitgift, in his Anſwer to Norton's Letter, gave a better interpretation both of himſelf and Mr. Aylmer, and their intentions in writing, and ſays, that *Mr. Elmer's doctrine was neither unſeaſonable, nor yet a paradox, but a common true received opinion, grounded on the expreſs words of the Scripture, and received without doubt of all learned Writers, both old and new, and in moſt ſeaſonable time taught, mens minds and hearts being ſo far from due obedience, and ſo inclinable to the contrary. And I am ſo fully ſatisfied concerning our Divine, that he had all the advancement, that he look'd for. And that it was great lack of charity to judge men to do that for advancement; which they did of conſcience and duty* (15). Mr. Strype tells us afterwards (16), that one of the reaſons of his being neglected ſo long, was that in his *Harborough of Princes* above-mentioned, he declaimed againſt the ſplendor and wealth of the Church, and ſpoke with ſome ſeeming ſeverity of the civil authority of Biſhops. This made many perſons conclude, that he was not well affected to that Order itſelf. But in reality he was no enemy to the function, but only to the tyranny, which had been exerciſed by the Biſhops under the Papal Uſurpation. In 1569, when Grindal Biſhop of London was to be removed to York, the Archbiſhop endeavoured to procure our Divine to ſucceed him, and recommended him on that account to the Earl of Leiceſter, the favourite of the Queen. But he imagined, that the Queen would object againſt this preferment, as too great a ſtep from an Archdeacon to one of the moſt conſiderable Biſhopricks in England. However when Mr. Aylmer's name was mentioned at Court, the Archbiſhop took occaſion to give the Secretary his judgment of him, that he was a very proper perſon to ſucceed in London, which was a See extremely troubled with Papiſts, and therefore required a man of his activity, ſpirit and reſolution. But all this did not take effect, and Dr. Sandys Biſhop of Worceſter was tranſlated to London.

(14) Pag, 19.

(15) Pag. 20, 21.

(16) Pag. 24, 25.

[*H*] *Choſen by the Archbiſhop of Canterbury to write an Anſwer to a Latin Book, written againſt the Government of the Church of England.*] This Latin piece was intitled *de Diſciplina*, and was ſent by the Archbiſhop to Mr. Aylmer, in order that he might write a confutation of it. But tho' he kept the book a long time, yet he refuſed to do it, and wrote to the Archbiſhop, that he could not undertake that deſign. This perhaps may be aſcribed to his diſcontent. However the Archbiſhop procured it to be anſwered by another hand. Dr. Grindal likewiſe, who was then Archbiſhop of York, conſider'd our Divine as the fitteſt perſon for ſuch a work, but concluded, that he would not take pains, which was probably occaſioned by his other employments (17).

(17) Pag. 22.

of London [*I*] in the room of Dr. Sandys, tranſlated to the Archbiſhoprick of York, with whom he had ſoon after a warm conteſt [*K*]. He was conſecrated on the 24th of March (*l*), and began his primary Viſitation the 17th of December 1577, and urged the ſubſcription, which was refuſed by ſome of the Miniſters, who treated the Subſcribers with very reproachful language, and called them diſſemblers, and compared them to Arians, Priſcillians, and Anabaptiſts (*m*). He was very aſſiduous in preaching [*L*]; and careful in his Ordination of Miniſters [*M*]; and in his endeavours to reſtrain both the Papiſts and Puritans, with regard to the former of whom he wrote his advice to the Lord Treaſurer Burleigh [*N*]. He took great care with regard to the plague, which

(*l*) Strype, pag. 28.

(*m*) Idem, pag. 29.

[*I*] *In* 1576 *he was preferred to the Biſhopric of London.*] Dr. Sandys his predeceſſor, in his farewel-Sermon at St. Paul's-Croſs, gave him the following character: *My hope is, that the Lord hath provided one of choice to be placed over you, a man to undertake this great charge ſo well enabled for ſtrength, courage, great wiſdom, skill in government, knowledge, as in many other things, ſo eſpecially in the heavenly myſteries of God, that I doubt not but my departure ſhall turn very much to your advantage* (17).

(17) Pag. 25.

[*K*] *With whom he ſoon after had a warm conteſt.*] They had formerly been very intimate friends and fellow-exiles. But Dr. Aylmer, who ſucceeded Dr. Sandys in the See of London, required as his due the whole revenue and benefits of the Biſhopric for the laſt half year, from Michaelmas to Lady-day, though the latter had continued Biſhop of London the greateſt part of that time before his removal to York. Both of them appealed to the Lord Treaſurer (18). Archbiſhop Sandys charged Dr. Aylmer with ingratitude, and with *coloured covetouſneſs and an envious heart covered with the coat of diſſimulation*; which, as Mr. Strype obſerves (19), were words, in which the Archbiſhop was too much led by his paſſion. However it is certain, that he had been inſtrumental in the advancement of Dr. Aylmer, recommending him to the Queen as a perſon well qualified for that See (20).

(18) Pag. 25, 26.

(19) Pag. 27.

(20) Pag. 28.

[*L*] *He was very aſſiduous in preaching.*] He preached very frequently in his Cathedral, and was maſter of an admirable talent of captivating the attention of his audience. But once perceiving thoſe about him not ſo attentive as they ought to have been to what he was teaching, he begun to read out of the Hebrew Bible. This immediately awakened his hearers, who looked up at him, as amazed, that he ſhould entertain them to ſo little purpoſe in an unknown language. But when he perceived them all thoroughly awake and attentive, he proceeded in his Sermon, after he had admoniſhed them how much it reflected on their good ſenſe, that in matters of mere novelty, and when they underſtood not a word, they ſhould ſo carefully attend, and yet be ſo very negligent in regarding thoſe points, which were of the moſt real importance to them imaginable. At another ſolemn audience in the Parliament time at St. Paul's-Croſs, where a great number of the Nobility and Perſons of Quality were preſent, in order to excite them to a proper regard for piety and religion, he propoſed to them the example of Sir Thomas More, *a man for his zeal to be honoured*, ſaid the Biſhop, *though for his religion to be abhorred*. He obſerved to them, that this great man would often put on a ſurplice, and aſſiſt the Prieſt in performing divine ſervice. But one day the Duke of Norfolk came to him at Chelſey, while Sir Thomas was Lord Chancellor, about ſome particular affairs, and being informed that he was at Church, went thither. In the end of the ſervice the Duke and he met, and after ſaluting each other, the Duke ſaid, *What? my Lord Chancellor become a Pariſh Clark? What will the King's Majeſty ſay to this Geere, when he ſhall underſtand that his Lord Chancellor of England, a ſpecial perſon in the Realm, and in the higheſt room of honour in the land next the Prince, is become a Pariſh Clark?* Sir Thomas replied, that he believed that his Highneſs would be ſo far from being diſpleaſed with him upon that account, that on the contrary, *when he ſhall hear*, ſaid he, *of the care which I had to ſerve both his maſter and mine, he will the rather take me for a faithful ſervant*. This paſſage the Biſhop applied to the preſent occaſion, that when the Parliament was ſitting and conſulting about the affairs of the Nation, their firſt care ſhould be to ſerve God themſelves, and ſhew a due regard to his honour (21).

(21) Pag. 30, 31, 32.

[*M*] *Careful in his Ordination of his Miniſters.*] He was very ſollicitous to ſupply the church with Miniſters, who were perſons of learning and character, and who being diſperſed about the Nation might preach and inſtruct the ignorant people. But there was great want of ſuch men. For many of the old Incumbents and Curates were perſons *fitter to ſport with the timbrel and pipe, than to take in their hands the Book of the Lord*, as the Preacher at the Biſhop's firſt Ordination expreſſed it. A great number of theſe men were deprived, and conſequently many churches left deſtitute. Therefore on Aſcenſion Day, May 16th 1577 there was a great Ordination of Miniſters at Fulham by this Biſhop, and this was his firſt Ordination. He appointed Mr. Keltridge, formerly of Trinity College in Cambridge, an eminent Preacher, to make a ſermon upon the occaſion. His text was from 1 Tim. iii. 1, 2, 3. *It is a true ſaying, if a man deſire the office of a Biſhop, he deſireth a good work. A Biſhop therefore muſt be unreprovable &c.* He afterwards publiſhed this Sermon, and dedicated it to the Biſhop. He addreſſed himſelf to his Lordſhip againſt the vicious old Popiſh Clergy, who were yet in the Church, but undermining it, *humbly craving of his honour, whom God in his eternal counſel had placed over them, the Levites, to rub and raze out all the ſtock of Jezebel, to pluck up and deface them, who had no title to the true Prieſthood, to rid the Kingdom of thoſe headleſs fellows, who having of a long time ſerved Peor, and offered up the firſt-fruits of their youth to Acheron, were then compelled to lie grovelling in the Church of God and in the darkneſs wherein they had loitered, and choak'd up the people with chaff and ſuperſtition, &c.* He exhorted thoſe, who were then ordained, that *for ſupply of preaching in the Kingdom, they would ſcatter themſelves thro' every angle and quarter of this realm in ſeveral congregations, that all Countries might hear their voice, and every part thereof might glorify the Lord.* He deſired them likewiſe, *nay charged them in the Lord Chriſt, that they would not be of divers minds, but that they would teach one God, and one Chriſt, whom he had ſent; ſowing abroad no new and fantaſtical opinions, nor ſcattering deviliſh and old hereſies, nor inventing ſtrange and fond novelties, thruſting upon the ſilly ſouls innovations and fables, which appertained not to edification, brought in at that time by the ſchiſmatics of the times, and then troubling the Commonwealth.* At this Ordination ſixteen were made Deacons, and ten Prieſts, after due examination of them by William Lane and William Cotton his Chaplains (22).

(22) Pag. 32, 33, 34.

[*N*] *With regard to the former of whom* [*the Papiſts*] *he wrote his Advice to the Lord Treaſurer Burleigh.*] He had diſcovered in 1577 a Popiſh Prieſt, whoſe name was Meredith, who had endeavoured to draw off the Queen's ſubjects from their allegiance to her. He found likewiſe that there were attempts made by the Prieſts to reconcile the Engliſh Papiſts to the King of Spain's deſigns againſt England, and to induce them to aſſiſt him whenever he ſhould invade the Kingdom. He informed therefore the Lord Treaſurer, that it appeared from ſome perſons, who were brought before him and the Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſioners, that ſeveral conſpiracies and dangerous attempts were in agitation; and ſuggeſted to him what meaſures he thought were proper to be taken. *I ſpeak to your Lordſhip*, ſaid he, *as one chiefly careful for the State, or to uſe more ſeverity than hitherto hath been uſed; or elſe we ſhall ſmart for it. For as ſure as God liveth, they look for an invaſion, or elſe they would not fall away as they do.* For the Papiſts, who

which raged at London in 1578 [O]. Upon the publication of the Jeſuit Campian's *Ten Reaſons*, he conſulted upon the proper meaſures of obviating the effects of it [P]. He met likewiſe with no ſmall difficulty with regard to the Puritans [Q], and was particularly alarmed by Stubb's *Diſcovery of a Gaping Gulph*, written againſt the Queen's marriage

before outwardly complied with the laws, began now to withdraw themſelves from the Church, and refuſe the Oaths of Supremacy; and others, who were not well ſettled in their opinions, upon the ſuggeſtions of the Papiſts abandoned the Proteſtant Religion. Our Biſhop likewiſe adviſed the ſame Lord, that under ſuch dangerous circumſtances the Heads of the Papiſts, whom he called their *chief Captains*, ſhould be cloſely confined in priſon, as Sir Thomas Fitz-Hubert, Townley, and others, who were now at liberty, or only under ſome eaſy reſtraint. He obſerved alſo, that it was improper, that Fecknam, late Abbot of Weſtminſter, Watſon, late Biſhop of Lincoln, and Young, another active Popiſh Dignitary under Queen Mary, ſhould continue in the Fleet and Marſhalſea, where they might by their converſation and advice engage others in ill deſigns. He adviſed therefore, that they ſhould be placed again, as they had been before, with three of the Biſhops, as Winchester, Lincoln, Chicheſter, or Ely; and obſerved, that for his own part, if he were out of his firſt-fruits, he would readily take one of them (23).

(23) Pag. 34-38.

[O] *He took great care with regard to the plague, which raged at London in* 1578.] His principal attention was directed to two things, to preſerve the lives of his Clergy, and yet to make proviſion, that the infected might be viſited, and have the proper aſſiſtances with reſpect to Religion. He ſummoned therefore the London Clergy before him, in the preſence of Dr. Nowel Dean of St. Paul's, Mullins and Walker Archdeacons, and Stanhope Chancellor, in order to elect and appoint out of the Clergy viſitors of the ſick; and all the reſt were to be ſpared by reaſon of the danger of the infection. Mr. Strype tells us (24), that the forwardneſs of many Miniſters to undertake this office was remarkable; ſome for covetouſneſs, and others for vain-glory, others to ſupply their wants, ſuch as were in debt, and others becauſe they were without employment. But the Miniſters generally diſlik'd this motion, thinking it a part of their duty to ſuffer with their flock, and to ſubmit to God's will in the diſcharge of their function. The Biſhop likewiſe ordered books containing Directions for preventing the rage of the peſtilence to be printed and diſpers'd.

(24) Pag. 44.

[P] *He conſulted upon the proper meaſures of obviating the effects of it.*] Campian's Book was written in a very elegant ſtyle, and dedicated to the ſcholars of both Univerſities, in vindication of what he had done in returning to the Romiſh Religion, and caſting the vileſt imputations upon the Proteſtant Faith. It was privately diſperſed in the Univerſities; which gave great diſturbance to the Government. The Lord Treaſurer Burleigh thought it neceſſary to have a good Anſwer to it publiſhed, and eſteemed our Biſhop a very proper perſon for ſuch a deſign, upon one conſideration particularly, which was on account of the reproaches, which the Jeſuit caſt upon the firſt Reformers, in whoſe times the Biſhop had lived, and with ſome of whom, as well as their conduct, he was well acquainted. The Biſhop had heard of the Book, and ſent to Oxford and other places for it, but could not procure it. And this was partly his excuſe for not anſwering it, beſides the indiſpoſition, under which he laboured at that time. However he let the Lord Treaſurer know, that if he could get the Book, he would do what his health would permit; adding, that with regard to what Campian had written concerning thoſe great men, who diſtinguiſhed themſelves by introducing the Reformation, he preſumed that his reproaches upon them were only collected from the apoſtate Staphilus, and were for the moſt part not to be found in their writings. However he acknowledged, that there were ſome leſſer errors in their works, which is a common caſe of all Writers. Some things were ſpoken by Luther and Calvin in too ſtrong and hyperbolical a manner, particularly with regard to the Sacrament and Predeſtination. He obſerved then, that this Jeſuit and Staphilus might ſoon be anſwered in this point, if they would but look in the end of *the Maſter of the Sentences*, where they might find under the title of *Errorum Pariſiis condemnatorum*, that their Peter Lombard, Thomas Aquinas, and Gratian among the ſchoolmen, and Tertullian, Cyprian, Auguſtin, Jerom, and others among the Fathers, were condemned, and even ſaid *errâſſe contra fidem*, to have erred againſt the faith. And yet the reſt of their doctrine was conſidered as Catholic, and not the whole condemned for a few of their errors. He then adviſed the Treaſurer, that a Letter ſhould be ſent from the Lords of the Council to the Archbiſhop of Canterbury or himſelf to enjoin the Deans, Archdeacons, and Doctors, to make ſome collections for that purpoſe; ſince thoſe, who had no great employment in the affairs of the Church, had leiſure ſufficient for ſuch a deſign. *Wherefore elſe*, added he, *have they their livings?* He gave the Lord Treaſurer a liſt of thoſe perſons, who were proper for that work; ſome of whom were to collect materials, and others to compile the book from thoſe collections. Mr. Strype obſerves (25), that it is to be regretted, that this deſign was not purſued and brought to perfection. For by this means a good Hiſtory of the Reformation of Religion and of the Doctrines of it, might have been publiſhed by thoſe, who lived in or near thoſe times. But perhaps it was not thought convenient, that Campian's Book ſhould have ſo much honour done to it, as to be anſwered in ſuch a ſolemn manner. However Dr. Whitaker, Profeſſor of Divinity at Cambridge, and others, wrote a confutation of it. But when the Treaſurer had ſoon after ſent to the Biſhop Campian's Book, and deſired him again, as his health would permit, to conſider it, and to engage ſome perſons in an anſwer to it; he gave that Nobleman his ſentiments of it to this purpoſe: that with regard to his collections of ſtrange opinions and expreſſions from ſome of the Reformers, in his chapter intitled *Paradoxa*, he thought that, upon the ſuppoſition of the Author's having truly repreſented them, none of our Church deſigned to defend Luther's *Hyperbola*, or every thing, which was written by Calvin or Beza; for *quiſque ſuo ſenſu abundet*. That we read them as St. Auſtin read Cyprian, and as he would be read himſelf, that where he differed from the canonical Scripture, he ſhould not be allowed. He obſerved likewiſe, that if we ſhould make a collection of the Popiſh Writers and Schoolmen, we ſhould find many things equally exceptionable in them. *Sed in nullius juramus verba magiſtri.* we have learned to ſwear to the dictates of no maſter, but Chriſt. Then he ſhewed what little regard was to be paid to Campian's quotations from Scripture, ſince in the very firſt text that he cited he uſed the Septuagint Tranſlation, which was entirely different from the original. He remark'd farther, that a favourable interpretation was due to Writers and Speakers; otherwiſe what ſhould we ſay of Gregory Nazianzen, who expreſſes himſelf thus; *Ita nos Deos fecit Chriſtus, ut ille factus homo eſt*; with many other paſſages of that kind in Lactantius and others? He aſſures his Lordſhip that he would find Campian's writings to be *the arrogant vanities* of a Porphyrius or a Julian, who were baſe apoſtates from Chriſtianity. In ſhort, that if it were not for the toil of his eccleſiaſtical commiſſion, he could readily have employed himſelf in the confutation of that Jeſuit's Book; but according as his health would permit, he would examine it, and engage ſome others in an anſwer (26).

(25) Pag. 51.

(26) Pag. 52, 53.

[Q] *He met likewiſe with no ſmall difficulty with regard to the Puritans.*] Theſe perſons, as Mr. Strype obſerves (27), were enemies to the Church on account of the Eccleſiaſtical Government of it, which they thought to be antichriſtian, becauſe uſed in the Popiſh Church. *Theſe*, ſays that Author, *were now commonly known by the name of* Puritans *and* Preciſians; *whom the Biſhop had indeed little kindneſs for, and they as little for him.* "In the year 1577, *continues Mr. Strype*, "he met with ſeveral perſons of a contrary way to "the Papiſts; of whom he informed the Lord Trea- "ſurer, that in reſpect of their hindering unity and "quietneſs, they were not much leſs harmleſs than "they;

(27) Pag. 55.

marriage with the Duke of Anjou, brother to the King of France. This occaſioned him to ſummon the London Clergy, and to urge a ſtrict conformity to the orders of the Church [*R*]. He gave his advice alſo to the Lord Burleigh, Chancellor of the Univerſity of Cambridge, concerning the juſt methods of preventing the growth of Puritaniſm there (*n*). In May 1579 he was brought before the Council, and openly reproved by the Lord Treaſurer for felling his woods (*o*); which obliged him to write a paper in defence of himſelf (*p*). However he was prohibited to ſell any more of them (*q*). He was engaged at the ſame time in a ſuit againſt Archbiſhop Sandys for dilapidations, and at laſt obtained a ſentence in his favour in 1584 (*r*). An earthquake, which happened at London the 6th of April 1580, occaſioned him to compoſe a form of prayers for his Dioceſe.

(*n*) Idem, pag. 68.
(*o*) Idem, pag. 71.
(*p*) Idem, pag. 72, 73.
(*q*) Idem, pag. 74.
(*r*) Idem, pag. 75, 76, 77.

" they; namely Chark, Chapman, Field and Wil-
" cox. Theſe he had before him; but the two latter
" ſhewed themſelves obſtinate, and eſpecially Field;
" who notwithſtanding the Archbiſhop's Inhibition
" had entred into houſes, and taught, as he ſaid, God
" knows what." *His advice concerning thoſe men was, that they might be profitably employed in Lancaſhire, Staffordſhire, Shropſhire, and ſuch other barbarous countries, to draw the people from Papiſm and groſs ignorance. And that tho' they went a little too far, yet he ſuppoſed it would be leſs labour to draw them back, than now it was to hale them forward. And that ſome letters of friendly requeſt might be ſent thither for ſome contribution to be made by the Towns and Gentlemen for ſome competent ſtipend to relieve them. And he thought this might grow greatly to the profit of the Church. And therefore communicated this counſel to the Lord Treaſurer, and prayed him at his leiſure to think on it. Yet he declared, that he ſaid all this, not becauſe he lik'd them, but becauſe he would have his cure rid of them* (28). Some years before a Book had been publiſhed under the title of *An Admonition to the Parliament*, the main deſign of which was to deſtroy the Church, as it was then eſtabliſhed in the public worſhip by the Book of Common-Prayer, and in the government of it by Biſhops and other eccleſiaſtical Officers. To give the reader an idea of it we ſhall give a few paſſages extracted from it, as we find them in a late Book intitled, *A Vindication of the Government, Doctrine, and Worſhip of the Church of England eſtabliſhed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth againſt the injurious reflection of Mr. Neale in his Hiſtory of the Puritans* (29).

(28) Pag. 56.
(29) See pag. iii, & ſeq.

" Let us all, *ſays the Preface to the Admonition*, with
" more earneſt prayer than we are wont, earneſtly re-
" commend it to God his bleſſing; and namely, that it
" will pleaſe him by his Spirit, to enlighten the heart
" of our moſt gracious Sovereign, and the reſt in au-
" thority, to the benefit of his *ſmall flock*, and the
" *overthrow of their proud enemies*, that Godlineſs may
" by them proceed in peace." And that we might not be at a loſs, as the Author of the *Vindication* obſerves, to know who theſe proud enemies are, that they deſire to be overthrown, they deſcribe them very diſtinctly; " Certain men, whoſe credit is great, and
" whoſe friends are many, we mean the Lordly Lords,
" *Archbiſhops, Biſhops, Suffragans, Deans, Univerſity-*
" *Doctors*, and *Batchelors of Divinity, Archdeacons,*
" *Chancellors*, and the reſt of that proud generation,
" *whoſe Kingdom muſt go down*, hold they never ſo
" hard; becauſe their tyrannous Lordſhip *cannot ſtand*
" *with Chriſt's Kingdom.*" In the *Admonition* itſelf they addreſſed the Parliament in the following manner: *Now, becauſe many men ſee not all things, and the world in this reſpect is marvelouſly blinded; it has been thought good to prefer to your godly conſiderations* a true Platform *of a Church reformed, to the end that it being laid before your eyes, to behold* the great unlikeneſs *betwixt it and this our Engliſh Church, you may learn either with* perfect hatred *to deteſt the one, or elſe to be without excuſe before the Majeſty of our God.* " You muſt, *ſay they to the Parliament*, diſ-
" place thoſe ignorant and unable Miniſters already
" plac'd, and in their rooms appoint ſuch as both can
" and will by God's aſſiſtance feed the flock. . . . .
" *Overthrow* without hope of reſtitution the Court of
" Faculties . . . remove *Homilies, Articles, Injunctions,*
" *and that preſcript Order of ſervice made out of the*
" *Maſs-Book.*" And that none might preſume to violate their Injunctions, they deſired them to have them enforced by *wholeſome ſeverities. To redreſs theſe, your Wiſdoms have to remove, as before, ignorant Miniſters . . . to enjoin Deacons and Midwives not to meddle in Miniſters matters; if they do, to ſee them ſharply puniſhed.* This *Admonition* therefore gave great offence to the Queen; and Anſwers were written to it by ſeveral perſons, eſpecially by Dr. Whitgift, afterwards Archbiſhop of Canterbury. A ſevere Proclamation was iſſued out in 1573 for the better obſervation of the Common-Prayer and Orders of the Church, and for the ſuppreſſing of that Book. However one Thomas Woodcock a young Stationer in 1578 ventured to ſell ſeveral of them; upon which Biſhop Aylmer committed him to Newgate. But being ſollicited to diſcharge him, he anſwered, that he neither could nor would do any thing without the Lord Treaſurer's conſent, or by his Letters or Warrant. This was thought a little rigorous in him; whereas, as Mr. Strype obſerves (30), he could not of his own authority diſcharge a criminal, whom he had committed, without inflicting due puniſhment, unleſs it were by an order from above; eſpecially in the caſe of ſuch as diſperſed or ſold this *Admonition*, which tended to excite the moſt dangerous diſorders.

(30) Pag. 57.

[*R*] *To ſummon the London Clergy, and to urge a ſtrict conformity to the Orders of the Canon.*] They were called to the Biſhop's Palace; where forty of them appeared. The Biſhop then in the preſence of the Dean of St. Paul's, who aſſiſted him, told them that the occaſion of his ſudden calling for them was to admoniſh them of two things chiefly. The former was of one Andreas Jacobus a Dutchman, and, as it ſeems, a Miniſter of the Foreigners Church at London, who was a Lutheran or *Ubiquitary*, and maintained the real Preſence, and had raiſed great conteſts among the foreign Preachers. He warned the Clergy to be cautious of paying any regard to his doctrines, ſince he had excited prodigious differences among the Proteſtants in Germany. He proceeded then to the other reaſon, which indeed was the principal one, why he called them together at that time, which was upon the account of Stubbs's Book, and of the Animoſities, which it had occaſioned. For people were highly offended at the Duke of Anjou's being at Court, and perhaps uſing his Religion there. And many of the Preachers themſelves had treated upon that ſubject and other matters of State in their pulpits. He then aſſured them of the Queen's firmneſs to the Proteſtant Religion; and adviſed the Miniſters not to interpoſe in the affairs of State, but to ſtudy peace, and promote it in their ſeveral charges. Theſe diſturbances about the Queen's marriage being chiefly moved by thoſe, who were enemies to the Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitutions, a ſtricter hand was held over them and the City-Miniſters. For beſides this Summons, they were four times more called together by order from the Court to the Biſhop, that a diligent inſpection might be made into their behaviour, and ſeveral rules might be preſcribed them in their miniſtry. The next citation therefore of the London Miniſters was November 10th following at St. Sepulchre's Church; where a great many perſons were ſworn to make enquiry upon theſe articles: 1. For the true and faithful obſervation of the Book of public Prayers, 2. If any Preachers meddled with matters of State in their public or private doctrine; or intermeddled with alterations of States and Kingdoms. 3. If any uſed to preach who were not licenſed thereunto. For that ſuch who had not Licences, were to preach. 4. To enquire after private Conventicles, Preachers, and Faſts. 5. If there were any alterations from the Book of Common Prayer, and to enquire, who and how many gathered to private preaching. 6. To make diligent ſearch after vagrant Preachers and Popiſh Prieſts (31). In January 1579 ſeveral other articles were ordered to be enquired of by the Parſons, Vicars and Curates,

(31) Strype, pag. 63, 64, 65.

Dioceſe (*s*). Auguſt the 16th following, he began the viſitation of his Dioceſe, and in November following divers articles were exhibited by the Archdeacon to be enquired of within the Archdeaconry of London [*S*]. In January 1581 he cited the Miniſters of London twice before him [*T*]. He had a warm conteſt with the Lord Rich a Puritan, who ſupported one Mr. Wright as his Preacher. This cauſe was brought before the Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſion, upon which the Lord Rich was committed to the Marſhalſea, and Mr. Wright to the Fleet; who at laſt offered a ſubſcription to his allowance of the Miniſtry and Liturgy of the Church of England. The ſame year he propoſed a very uſeful ſcheme in London, that a number of learned Preachers ſhould be appointed to preach on ſet times before great Aſſemblies, particularly at St. Paul's Croſs; for the encouragement of which certain contributions were to be made and ſettled on them by the City (*t*). He made uſe of his power likewiſe to promote conformity to the Church [*U*], which expoſed him to ſevere reproaches. He began now to be uneaſy in his Dioceſe of London, and uſed all his endeavours to obtain a removal to the Biſhoprick of Ely or Winchеſter, but without ſucceſs [*W*]. He was again diſturbed by falſe informations againſt him

(*s*) Idem, pag. 78, 79, 80.

(*t*) Idem, pag. 87.

Miniſters and Church Wardens of every Pariſh within the Archdeaconry of London, according to a commandment ſent from the Lords of the Privy Council. Mr. Strype is of opinion (32), that theſe articles were of the Biſhop's compoſing, but that he procured the Privy Council to own them and ſend them as theirs, in order to give them the greater ſtrength and authority. For the better execution of the Council's Letters, it was ordered the Clergy at this meeting after this manner, *that from henceforth you do not admit any man to preach or to read any Lectures in any of your churches, but ſuch as you do know; that do alſo in their own perſons miniſter the Sacraments of Baptiſm and of the holy Communion, according to the order preſcribed in the book of Common Prayer*. In purſuance of theſe articles, February 6th following there was another call of the London Clergy by virtue of the Council's Letters; and on the firſt of March they were ſummoned again. (33) "Thus cloſe, *ſays Mr. Strype*, was the matter of "conformity this year purſued; and that becauſe of "the dangerous ſchiſm that was now a breeding; "and the apprehenſion of the great evils, that muſt "needs enſue upon that; while the Common Prayer "was by ſome in part, and by others wholly laid "aſide, and the Sacraments of the Church diſuſed, or "ſhifted off to be performed by others, that were "hired or procured. All which conſiderations made "both the Biſhop and the Queen herſelf ſomewhat "vigorous in the ſuppreſſing theſe men."

(32) Pag. 66.

(33) Pag. 67, 68.

[*S*] *Divers articles were exhibited by the Archdeacon to be enquired of within the Archdeaconry of London.*] Theſe articles chiefly related to the Laity, Sectaries, and Papiſts; and were as follow (34): 1. Whether there be any in your Pariſh, that do refuſe to conform themſelves in matters of Religion, and to come to their Pariſh-Church, and refuſe the Communion. And what be their names, and of what condition and eſtate. 2. How long they have refuſed ſo to do. 3. How many of their wives, children, ſervants, or others, ſojourning or abiding in their houſes, do likewiſe refuſe ſo to do. And what be their names and ſurnames. And how long they have ſo done. 4. For what cauſe they have refuſed ſo to do. 5. Of what yearly living in England, or other value of ſubſtance in goods are theſe principal perſons thought to be in truth and indeed, and not as they be ſtinted in the Subſidy-Book. 6. Whether any one or more of them have been now already committed to any priſon for ſuch recuſancy. *Memorandum*, This inquiſition not to extend to any other than ſuch as do obſtinately refuſe to come to their Pariſh-Church, and there to receive the Communion. Mr. Strype obſerves (35), that this enquiry ſeems to have been appointed upon the intelligence of the encreaſe of the Papiſts; *for theſe crafty Emiſſaries of Rome took this opportunity* to reconcile as many *as they could to the pretended unity of the Church, while the eyes of the State were chiefly upon the diſſenting brethren, of whom it had a great jealouſy about this time.*

(34) Idem, pag. 81.

(35) Pag. 81.

[*T*] *In January* 1581 *he cited the Miniſters of London twice before him.*] The firſt citation was to enquire what ſons of Engliſh Gentlemen and others, or what ſervants were then beyond ſea, and for what purpoſe they went, whether as ſcholars, or factors, or otherwiſe. And the 29th of the ſame month there was another citation of them into the Conſiſtory by the Biſhop and the Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſion; and theſe injunctions and enquiries were given them. I. No invectives to be uſed of or againſt eſtates. This related to the foreign Kingdoms as well as our own, becauſe ſeveral Preachers took great freedom in ſpeaking of France and Spain. II. None to refuſe the wearing the ſurplice. III. That there be no diminiſhing or altering the ſervice. IV. Enquiry to be made, who did not celebrate the ſacraments together with their preaching, doing the one, but wholly omitting the other. V. Alſo who made alteration in the rites required to be uſed in baptiſm. VI. Who did not catechiſe the youth. VII. The ſeventh article related to contentious Preachers, who ſcandalouſly gave others the name of *Dumb Dogs*. VIII. The laſt related to ſuch as utterly refuſed to read the Homilies. The Biſhop at this Aſſembly ſhewed himſelf warm and reſolute, and ſaid that he would ſeverely puniſh the offenders in theſe points, or he would *lie in the duſt for it* (36).

(36) Pag. 83.

[*U*] *He made uſe of his power likewiſe to promote conformity to the Church.*] He complained that ſeveral of the Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſioners abſented themſelves, whenever any affair of importance, but of an invidious nature, was enquired into; which was a great diſcouragement to thoſe few, who were preſent. He therefore informed the Lord Treaſurer of it, and adviſed that Dr. Clerke Dean of the Arches, who was very active, might be encouraged by his Lordſhip or the Queen, eſpecially ſince he had but little favour from the Court; and that others might be admoniſhed by his letters on account of their abſence. He propoſed likewiſe, that ſeveral other men of abilities and reſolution might be added to them. The Commiſſioners at their laſt ſitting had made an order, that the Archdeacons, Commiſſaries, and Officials, ſhould ſend their Apparitors from place to place every Sunday to ſee what conformity was uſed in every pariſh, and give an account of it. Theſe proceedings the Biſhop deſired the Lord Treaſurer to impart to the Queen for her ſatisfaction, and to know further her pleaſure in that point. In December 1581 the Treaſurer ſent Dr. Lewis Maſter of the Requeſts to the Biſhop to adviſe him not to meddle with a great many matters by virtue of the Commiſſion, but ſuch only as related to religion. This prudent direction was kindly received by the Biſhop, who immediately returned his thanks to his Lordſhip. He was the great ſupport of the Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſion. *And indeed*, ſays Mr. Strype (37), *by his diligence and patience he was a great inſtrument, in obedience to the Queen, to quell and take down thoſe men, who ſet themſelves againſt the Eccleſiaſtical order, notwithſtanding all their endeavours and intereſt at Court againſt him. Which he remembred to the Lord Treaſurer as a good office that he had done, for which the Queen he reckoned ought to favour him, and not to give ear to every information given againſt him and the Commiſſioners; but to conſider into what peaceable tranquillity God by his poor ſervice, as he ſaid, had brought not only London and the whole Dioceſs, but alſo the moſt part of England, ſince he came to that place. Whereby he had, as he thought in his conſcience, rather deſerved her gracious favour than diſcouragement. For on the other ſide he expreſſed how he was hated like a dog, and was called the* Oppreſſor of the Children of God.

(37) Pag. 95, 96.

[*W*] *Endeavoured to the utmoſt to obtain a removal to the Biſhoprick of Ely or Winchеſter; but without ſucceſs.*]

him for felling of his woods, but eſcaped the force of them [*X*]. In 1583 he performed his triennial Viſitation, in which he diſcovered a frequent and ſcandalous practice in his Dioceſe of commutation of penance, which he endeavoured to reform [*Y*]. His committing of Mr. Thomas Cartwright, the great Leader of the Puritans at that time, to priſon, expoſed him to the diſpleaſure of the Queen [*Z*], with whom he had likewiſe a diſpute concerning a Vicarage (*u*). In 1585 he compoſed a prayer on account of the unſeaſonable wet weather, which he recommended to be uſed in private families, as well as in public (*w*). In ſummer 1586 he performed his next triennial Viſitation; but at Malden in Eſſex a public inſult was intended to be offered him [*AA*]. In January following his

(*u*) Pag. 119, 120.

(*w*) Pag. 123.

ceſs.] He ſaw evidently how many troubles he muſt continually be expoſed to, while he remained in the See of London, and how obnoxious he was to the inconvenience of ſlanderous tongues and malicious informations, which meet with too much regard at Court. The labour and attendance likewiſe of the Commiſſion was too great a burden for him in his old age. He had been endeavouring to procure a removal to another Dioceſe ever ſince the year 1579, for then he very earneſtly ſollicited the Lord Treaſurer to obtain a tranſlation for him to Ely or Wincheſter. He obtained the grant of the former from the Queen at the Lord Treaſurer's requeſt: and therefore upon the death of Dr. Cox the late Biſhop of that See in 1581, he wrote a letter to the Treaſurer to promote his removal, in which he told him, *that he would not ſeek the place as he did, but that he found in himſelf ſome imperfection of body and mind, being then* Homo Sexagenarius, *and that within a ſhort time he ſhould never anſwer her Majeſty's expectation nor his own conſcience in that place of ſervice, which hitherto had been ſo tedious, that he hoped her Majeſty even of juſtice would recompenſe him, though not with gain, yet with eaſe in theſe his crooked years.* About this time the Queen was inclined to remove him to Worceſter, and in his room to have preferred Dr. Richard Bancroft, Archbiſhop Whitgift's Chaplain, an active man, and of great ſervice in the Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſion. But this deſign was laid aſide, and our Biſhop continued in vain to ſollicit a removal in the years 1582, 1583, and 1585 (39).

(39) Strype, p. 97--101.

[*X*] *Diſturbed by falſe informations againſt him for felling his woods; but eſcaped the force of them.*] Theſe informations were made to the Council or the Star-Chamber againſt him. But he was diſcharged from them, and the Lord Treaſurer ſupported his cauſe in the ſtrongeſt manner. The Biſhop was ſo confident of his own innocence in this affair, that he deſired the Treaſurer that he might have the liberty of anſwering any perſon who ſhould appear againſt him, and he did not doubt of clearing himſelf to the general ſatisfaction (40). There was likewiſe a report ſpread abroad of his cutting down the elms about his palace at Fulham. But how falſe this was all the Court knew, and the Queen herſelf could witneſs, who had lately lodged at the palace there, and diſliked nothing but that the proſpect from her lodgings was intercepted by the thickneſs of the trees. Dr. Pern, Dean of Ely, being at a great man's table, and hearing the Biſhop ſeverely reproached for felling his elms at Fulham, aſked an antient Lawyer of the company how long they had been cut down, who replied, about half a year ago; upon which the Dean obſerved that they muſt have grown in a ſurprizing manner, ſince he had been there within four days paſt, and they ſeemed then to be two hundred years old. He took occaſion upon this to mention what the Queen had complained of, that the proſpect was hindered by the trees. It appears from hence that the common ſtory related by Martin Mar-Prelate and Sir John Harington is falſe; that one Madox ſhould tell the Biſhop that his name was *Elmar*, but it might properly be *Mar-Elm*, ſince he had *marred* all the *Elms* in Fulham (41).

(40) Pag. 101.

(41) Idem, pag. 103, 104.

[*Y*] *Diſcovered a frequent and ſcandalous practice in his Dioceſe of commutation of penance, which he endeavoured to reform.*] This was practiſed by Chancellors, Commiſſaries, Officials, Regiſters, and even the Apparitors. Theſe commutations were ſo numerous, and ſometimes ſo ſtrange, that the Biſhop apprehended it would open a paſſage to a general inundation of vice, eſpecially with regard to the rich, who might be as criminal as they pleaſed when they might ſave themſelves from puniſhment by money. And this was done, notwithſtanding a late Convocation had expreſly ordered, that no commutation of penance ſhould be allowed without the knowledge of the Biſhop of the Dioceſe. The higheſt Eccleſiaſtical Courts were not free from ſcandal in that point. The Biſhop, who was then at Hadham in Hertfordſhire upon his viſitation, informed the Lord Treaſurer of this, and in order to rectify this abuſe, deſired him, together with the Council, to direct their letters to the High Commiſſioners Eccleſiaſtical; that whereas in the Convocation at the laſt Parliament order had been taken by the Biſhops, that no commutation of penance ſhould be made without the Biſhop's knowledge, their Lordſhips pleaſure was, that the Commiſſioners ſhould examine all manner of Eccleſiaſtical offences, what and how many penances they had commuted and changed within ſix or ſeven years paſt. The profits ariſing from the refunding of ſuch ſums as had been given, the Biſhop propoſed ſhould be applied to the reparation of St. Paul's Cathedral, *which would help to make good a good piece of it. And beſides by this means all Eccleſiaſtical officers would be more preciſe in bargaining for ſin, and all ſinners would be more afraid of puniſhment, God's name would be leſs diſhonoured, and the chief of the Clergy, which were therein moſt blamed, ſhould be hoped ſhew themſelves of all others to have leaſt gain, or elſe let them bear the burthen of their deſerts.* Thus honeſtly and diſcreetly, ſays Mr. Strype (42), did our Biſhop adviſe for the cure of this corruption of diſcipline. But it is not known what effect this ſcheme had.

(42) Pag. 108.

[*Z*] *His committing of Mr. Thomas Cartwright ... to priſon, expoſed him to the diſpleaſure of the Queen.*] Mr. Cartwright, according to Mr. Strype (43), *was a man of a bold ſpirit and a running pen. He had writ ſome books againſt the Hierarchy eſtabliſhed by law in the Engliſh Church, whereby he had given great offence, and made himſelf obnoxious to the Laws.* Our Biſhop had lately ſeized and committed him to priſon, which, according to his cuſtom, he acquainted the Lords with by the Clark of the Council. He had made uſe of the Queen's warrant, who was incenſed againſt Mr. Cartwright, in ſeizing him, in order to ſecure himſelf and the Commiſſion from any imputation; and he informed the Lords, that he had done it by her Majeſty's order. But the Queen was extremely offended that he had made uſe of her name to the Lords. The Biſhop was prodigiouſly ſurprized and uneaſy at this, and expoſtulated with the Lord Treaſurer in the following manner: *I underſtand myſelf to be in ſome diſpleaſure with her Majeſty about Mr. Cartwright, becauſe I ſent word to your Lordſhip by the Clark of the Council, that I committed him by her Majeſty's commandment. Alas! my Lord, in what a dilemma ſtood I, that if I had not ſhowed that warrant, I ſhould have had all your diſpleaſures, which I was not able to bear; and uſing it for my ſhield (being not forbidden by her Majeſty) I am blamed for not taking upon me a matter, wherein ſhe herſelf would not be ſeen? Well, I leave it to God and to your wiſdom to conſider in what a dangerous place of ſervice I am. But God whom I ſerve, and in whoſe hands the hearts of Princes are as the rivers of water, can and will turn all to the beſt, and ſtir up ſuch honourable friends as you are to appeaſe her Highneſs's indignation.*

(43) Pag. 116.

(45) Strype 127, 128.

[*AA*] *A public inſult was intended to be offered him.*] He obſerved in a Letter to a great friend of his at Court, that at Malden *he had like to have taſted of the four fruits of the new Reformers, and eſpecially of ſuch as were mercenary*; by which he means thoſe, who were retained to preach in divers places, beſides the ordinary Miniſters. Mr. Strype tells us (44), that "a certain

(46) Idem 158.

(44) Pag. 125, 126.

his ſon Dr. Theophilus Aylmer, whom he had made Archdeacon of London, cited the Clergy before him, to whom he enjoined ſeveral particulars [*BB*]. In 1587 our Biſhop ſate in the Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſion upon the caſe of Mr. Robert Cawdry, who had been preſented by the Lord Burleigh to the living of South Loughnam or Luffenham in Rutlandſhire, and diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his oppoſition to the Church of England; ſo that he was at laſt degraded and depoſed from the Miniſtry; however he was offered to be reſtored upon ſubſcription, but refuſed it (*x*). In 1588 he ſuſpended Mr. Henry Smith, Lecturer of St. Clement's, for preaching againſt the Common Prayer and refuſing to ſubſcribe (*y*). The year following he viſited his Dioceſe [*CC*]. In 1591 he ſent for Mr. Cartwright from the Fleet, and expoſtulated with him in a very ſtrong manner [*DD*]. His care of the Church, and his regard for thoſe of his friends, who were men of diſtinguiſhed merit, obliged him ſometimes to recommend them to vacant Biſhoprics. And therefore in the year 1592, upon the vacancy of the See of Oxford, he wrote to the Lord Treaſurer in favour of Dr. John Bullingham, Biſhop of Gloceſter, and Dr. Cole, who had been his fellow-

(*x*) Pag. 129-148.

(*y*) Pag. 154.

" certain fellow, to be hired by ſome young heads of " the town, Tradeſmen there, was to have come in- " to the Church, beſmeared like a fool, and to have " taken the Biſhop's cap off from his head, and hav- " ing twirled it about his finger, to have caſt and toſ- " ſed it to and fro among them in the midſt of the " people. By ſome means this came to his knowledge, " and was ſeaſonably prevented. Which if it had " not, there was no doubt but a dangerous tumult " would have riſen, and as the Biſhop feared, not " without blood. The Biſhop examined the matter, " and having found out the chief deviſers of it com- " mitted them to priſon. The Bailiff and the reſt " were much diſmayed at it. The Biſhop did adviſe " hereupon, that her Majeſty, or ſome of the Lords " of the Council, would ſhew ſome countenance of " miſliking of ſo dangerous a device, as the fruits " of thoſe mens preachings, who diſobeyed the Book " and other Orders. Whereby, as by the Biſhop's " preſent proceedings they began to yield, ſo the Bi- " ſhop doubted not then to find them and all others " in that corner very tractable."

[*BB*] *His ſon Dr. Theophilus Aylmer . . cited the Clergy before him, to whom he enjoined ſeverat particulars.*] He intended this meeting chiefly for thoſe Miniſters who were not Preachers, but of the inferior rank; and therefore they were enjoyned; I. that every perſon ſhould have a Bible in Engliſh and Latin. II. That every perſon ſhould have Bullinger's Decads. III. That each perſon ſhould have his paper book, and write in it the quantity of one ſermon every week. IV. This book to be ſhewn quarterly unto a certain grave man appointed to examine how they had profited; and he to deliver them to the Archdeacon. V. The examinants to uſe theſe beginners with favour. VI. Every non-preaching Miniſter to be taxed at four purchaſed ſermons every year; that is, to procure at his own coſt a Preacher to preach a ſermon in his Church once a quarter. VII. A licenſed Preacher to preach ſixteen times in the year. In March following, the Archdeacon ſummoned the Clergy again, that is, the Preachers and more learned of them, enjoining them, I. To obſerve carefully the Book of Common Prayer. II. To catechiſe youth on Sundays and Holydays. And this was now allowed to Curates to do, in certain queſtions and anſwers ſet forth by the Biſhop. III. Every man to ſhew his Letters of Orders and Licence to preach immediately. IV. Several, who had taken the Degrees of Maſters of Art or Bachelors of Art, were enjoined to procure the Biſhop's Licence to preach. This and the former citation of the Clergy were in order to encreaſe the number of Preachers, according to a Mandate from the Archbiſhop to the Biſhops (45).

(45) Strype, p. 127, 128.

[*CC*] *The year following he viſited his Dioceſe.*] This viſitation was held by him at London Auguſt 30th 1589. Among other Injunctions the Clergy were required, I. To give God public thanks for the French King's victory. II. That they be ready with furniture according to the proportion aſſigned them: that is, with arms for the Queen's defence, who was now in daily apprehenſion of the Spaniards ſince their defeat the laſt Summer (46).

(46) Idem, pag. 158.

[*DD*] *He ſent for Mr. Cartwright from the Fleet, and expoſtulated with him in a very ſtrong manner.*] Mr. Cartwright had been ſummoned up in 1590 from Warwick into the Star-chamber, together with Edmund Snape and ſeveral other Puritan Miniſters, for ſetting up a new diſcipline and a new form of worſhip, and ſubſcribing their hands to ſupport it. This therefore was interpreted an oppoſition and diſobedience to the eſtabliſhed laws. In May 1591 he was ſent for by the Biſhop to appear before him and ſome others of the Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſion, and brought into the chamber of the Biſhop's houſe, who in a long ſpeech directed himſelf to him, and charged him firſt with abuſing the Privy Council by informing them of diſeaſes, which he was not troubled with. For Cartwright had lately ſollicited them for his liberty from the Fleet on account of his gout and ſciatica; which it ſeems was more in pretence than truth. Secondly, that as he had abuſed the Council, ſo he with others had abuſed her Majeſty in a ſupplication, by ſuggeſting that the oath, which was tendered to them, was not according to law, and that it was given generally without limitation; by which he meant the oath, which the Eccleſiaſtical Commiſſioners offered to thoſe, who came before them. That he had confeſſed twice or thrice before that time, that a man might be ſaved in obſerving the orders of the Church eſtabliſhed by the laws of the Land; and in conſequence of this he charged him with the vanity and fruitleſneſs of a further reformation. He added likewiſe that in the greateſt matters, which he and others contended for, they were of the ſame opinion, that the Papiſts were; as he ſaid appeared partly from the anſwers of ſome of his party, who were a few days before at Lambeth before the Archbiſhop and the Commiſſioners there. Whereas the agreement, which there was between the Papiſts and the Biſhops, which the Puritans were ſo ready to lay to their charge, was at moſt but in ſome ſmall ceremonies, and theſe but indifferent till eſtabliſhed by law (47). Mr. Strype in his *Appendix* (48) mentions ſeveral other particulars of the conference between the Biſhop with the other Commiſſioners and Mr. Cartwright, who refuſing to take the oath, the Biſhop commanded an Act of it to be entered. The principal articles charged againſt Mr. Cartwright and the other Puritan Miniſters in the Bill of Complaint againſt them, were as follow (49): *That there had been of late ſet forth by ſome ſeditious people a Government of the Church by Doctors, Paſtors, Elders, and Deacons, and ſuch like; with a new Form of Common-Prayer and Adminiſtration of the Sacraments and Diſcipline of the Church, compriſed in a book intitled,* Diſciplina Eccleſiæ ſacro Dei verbo deſcripta, *and other books and pamphlets of like nature. That the defendants had unlawfully and ſeditiouſly aſſembled themſelves together concerning the premiſes; and had in thoſe* [*Aſſemblies*] *treated of and concluded upon ſundry ſeditious articles, in allowance of the ſame books and of the matters therein contained. Unto which articles the defendants had in ſome of thoſe Aſſemblies ſubmitted themſelves and ſubſcribed and put part in execution. For which miſdemeanors they had been called in queſtion before the High-Commiſſioners; where they refuſed to take the oath miniſtred to them, to anſwer to ſuch articles as they were to be examined of on her Majeſty's behalf concerning the ſame. Of all which a Bill had been exhibited by direction from the Lords into the Star-chamber againſt the defendants. In which Bill was alſo contained, that they under colour and pretence of diſcipline and charity did derive to themſelves power to deal in all manner of cauſes whatſoever; and had moved and perſuaded ſundry of her Majeſty's ſubjects, to refuſe to take any oath to anſwer to any matter, that might concern any the unlawful doings and proceedings of them, their brethren and teachers.*

(47) Idem, pag. 160, 161.

(48) Pag. 310, *& ſeq.*

(49) Idem, pag. 319, 320.

fellow-exile in the reign of Queen Mary (z). Being now broken with age he was desirous to resign his Bishopric to Dr. Bancroft, a man in high esteem with the Queen [*EE*]; but the latter refused it. In 1592 March the 18th he was present at his son's Visitation of his Archdeaconry, in order to assist him with his advice; and the next year was his own last Visitation of his Diocese (*aa*). He died at Fulham the 3d of June 1594, being 73 years of age, and was buried in St. Paul's Cathedral before the Chapel of St. George, and had a Monument with an Inscription [*FF*] erected to him. He married Judith Bures or Buers, of a good family in Suffolk (*bb*), by whom he had several children [*GG*]. He kept a very noble house, having eighty servants in his family (*cc*). Several imputations were cast upon him; but Mr. Strype has shewn that they were the mere effects of malice (*dd*). He was particularly charged with a breach of the Sabbath and Swearing (*HH*). But in the midst of all his enemies, he had many friends of the highest Quality and Character, and among the rest the great Lord Treasurer Burleigh (*ee*). His abilities in Learning appeared from the share which he had in the debates in Queen Mary's Convocation, and his book intitled *The Harborough* [*II*]. He was an excellent Logician and Historian, and well skilled in the Hebrew Tongue. He understood the Civil Law, Divinity, and the antient Writers, and was

(z) Pag. 167, 168.

(aa) Pag. 170.

(bb) Pag. 174.

(cc) Pag. 193.

(dd) Pag. 196--206.

(ee) Pag. 219, 220.

[*EE*] *He was desirous to resign his Bishoprick to Dr. Bancroft, a man in high esteem with the Queen.*] He offered him three times this year a resignation upon certain conditions; *perhaps*, says Mr. Strype (50), *in respect of the dilapidations, to allow him such a sum in satisfaction. For the Bishop seemed to foresee a considerable burthen like to fall upon his estate on that account; and so thought it his best way to compound it in his life time. But Bancroft refused.* "But questionless Bishop Aylmer's main inducement in labouring Bancroft's succession to the See of London, was, that "he knew him to be a person long used in the Ecclesiastical Commission, and strait for the observation of the rites and prescriptions of the Church established against such as would have trampled upon "them. Therefore it was but the day before our "Bishop died, that he signified how sorry he was, "that he had not written to the Queen, and commended his last suit unto her Highness, viz. to have "Bancroft his successor."

(50) Pag. 169.

[*FF*] *A monument with an inscription.*] It was as follows: *Hic jacet certissimam expectans Resurrectionem suæ carnis D.* Johannes Aylmer *D. Episcopus Londini. Qui obiit diem suum An. Dom.* 1594. *Ætat. suæ* 73.

Ter senos annos præsul; semel exul, & idem
Bis pugil in causâ Religionis erat.

That is: "Here lies the Body of Dr. JOHN AYLMER "Lord Bishop of London, in expectation of a sure "Resurrection. He died in the year of our Lord "1594 in the 73d year of his age. He was eighteen "years Bishop, once an Exile, and twice a Champion "in the cause of Religion."

[*GG*] *By whom he had several children.*] He had seven sons: Samuel, who was High-Sheriff of Suffolk in the reign of King Charles I (51); Theophilus, who was Archdeacon of London, and Rector of Much-Hadham in Hertfordshire, and died in January 1625 (52); John, who was knighted, and stiled Sir John Aylmer of Rigby in the county of Lincoln Knight (53); Zachary, Nathaniel; Tobel, who was godson to Archbishop Whitgift, and Edmund (54). His daughters were Judith, who married William Linch of Kent; Elizabeth, who married Sir John Foliot of Pirton in Worcestershire Knight. He had a third daughter (or one of the former by a second marriage), who married Dr. Squire, who had good preferments in the Church, but was a man of a very indifferent character (55).

(51) Idem, pag. 174, 175.

(52) Idem, pag. 176-184.

(53) Idem, pag. 184.

(54) Idem, pag. 185.

(55) Idem, pag. 280, *& seq.*

[*HH*] *He was particularly charged with breach of the Sabbath and Swearing.*] The former charge was founded upon his playing at bowls on Sunday; and the latter, because he used to say sometimes *By my faith.* With regard to the former, Mr. Strype tells us (56), *that this was a recreation, which he delighted in, and used for the diversion of his cares, and preservation of his health at Fulham, according as he had leisure. This exercise he used on Sundays in the afternoon after evening-prayer. And herein he would be so eager, that he sometimes had such expressions in his game, as exposed him to the censure of many, especially of his enemies.* "But the Bishop, *continues the Historian*, thus either "justified or accused himself; that he never with-"drew himself from service or sermon on the Lord's "Days. That Christ the best Expositor of the Sab-"bath said, that *the Sabbath was made for man, and "not man for the Sabbath.* That man might have "his meat dressed for his health upon the Sabbath; "and why might he not have some convenient exercise "of his body for the health thereof on that day? "Indeed it was the general custom in those days, "both in Geneva and in all other places, where Protestants inhabited, after the service of the Lord's "Day was over, to refresh themselves with bowling, "walking abroad, and other innocent recreations; "and the Bishop followed that, which in his travels "abroad he had seen ordinarily practised among "them." And with respect to his using the word *By my faith* sometimes in his asseverations, the Bishop pleaded, that if it were an oath, he would amend it; but he was apprehensive of no more in that phrase of speech *By my faith*, than *In very truth, Bona fide, assuredly*, or as *Amen* imports (57).

(56) Pag. 294.

(57) Pag. 215, 216.

[*II*] *His book intitled* The Harborough.] The whole title of it is as follows: *An* HARBOROWE *for faithfull and trewe subjects, against the late blowne Blaste, concerning the Government of Women. Wherein be confuted all such reasons, as a stranger of late made in that Behalfe: With a brief Exhortation to Obedience.* He wrote this while he was in exile, and just before he returned to England. It was printed at Strasburg in 1559, soon after Queen Elizabeth came to the crown. It was composed in the name and for the vindication of the English Protestants against a Book written by John Knox the Scot, intitled *A Blast against the Government of Women*; wherein he insisted strongly upon the unlawfulness of women's government, and urged the right of fighting against and dethroning of Princes, if they opposed and persecuted Religion. Mr. Aylmer endeavours in this book to remove the imputation of such principles from the Protestants to the Papists; and from hence took occasion to declaim against the Popish Bishops in these words: *Come off, ye Bishops; away with your superfluities; yield up your thousands; be content with hundreds, as they be in other Reformed Churches, where be as great learned men as you are. Let your portion be Priest-like, not Prince-like. Let the Queen have the rest of your temporalities and other lands to maintain these wars* [against the French,] *which you procured* [meaning the Popish Clergy in compliance with King Philip] *and your Mistress* [Queen Mary] *left her embroiled in. And with the rest to build and found schools throughout the realm. That every Parish-Church may have his Preacher; every City his Superintendent, to live honestly and not pompously. Which will never be unless your lands be dispersed and bestowed upon many, which now feed and fat but one. Remember that Abimelech, (when David in his banishment would have dined with him,) kept such hospitality, that he had no bread in his house to give him but the shew-bread. Where was all his superfluity to keep your pretended hospitality? For that is the cause that you alledge, why you must have thousands, as tho' you were commanded to keep hospitality rather with a thousand than with an hundred.* It appears from hence that our Divine was no friend to the wealth and grandeur of the Popish Bishops, who were then in power, and had opposed the Reformation. But his expressions were so general against all Bishops, that they were afterwards objected to him and the rest of the Protestant Bishops by the enemies of Episcopacy; and he himself was obliged to make an apology for them.

was an admirable Preacher [*KK*]. He was very curious with regard to the collecting of books. We ſhall mention ſome of his ſentiments upon different ſubjects [*LL*]. He had a ſtrong averſion to Popery; and was from the beginning an hearty embracer of the Proteſtant Religion (*ff*). He was very exact in the diſcharge of his Epiſcopal Function, and inflexible to any ſollicitations or bribes (*gg*). He was regular in his devotions (*hh*); and punctual in his Triennial Viſitations of his Clergy. And becauſe his preſence might be of advantage to the promoting of ſobriety of manners, and obedience to the Eccleſiaſtical Conſtitution, he would often make a longer ſtay in ſeveral parts of his Dioceſe, to ſee abuſes rectified, to hear complaints, to give his counſel and advice, to obſerve the behaviour of his Clergy, to preach himſelf, and to keep hoſpitality (*ii*). In the Ordination of Miniſters he was extremely careful to admit none to Orders, but thoſe, whom he had examined

(*ff*) Pag. 277.
(*gg*) Pag. 280.
(*hh*) Pag. 281.
(*ii*) Ibid. and pag. 282.

them. Martin Mar-prelate deſired Biſhop Aylmer to reſolve him, that in caſe his Prophecy of Mr. Aylmer came to paſs in his days, who then ſhould be Biſhop of London (58). Mr. Aylmer dedicated his Book to the Earl of Bedford and the Lord Dudley. Mr. Strype tells us (59), that *it was written with as cloſe and logical reaſoning and good arguing, as I have met with compoſed in that Age, and void of that manner of abuſive treating of the adverſary too common in controverſial Writers, (eſpecially of that time,) dealing in gentle and humane words with the perſon he undertook to confute. And his expoſitions of Scripture throughout the Book, which are divers and ſundry, are very ſound and learned; a piece of learning more rare among Divines then, when the original languages and the Jewiſh hiſtory were leſs known.* He reduces the arguments of Knox's Book into theſe ſix ſyllogiſms: 1. That whatſoever is againſt nature, the ſame in a Commonwealth is not tolerable. But the government of women is againſt nature. *Ergo* it is not tolerable. 2. Whatſoever is forbidden by Scripture is not lawful. But a woman to rule is forbidden by Scripture. *Ergo* it is not lawful. 3. If a woman may not ſpeak in a congregation, much leſs may ſhe rule. But ſhe may not ſpeak in the congregation, *Ergo* ſhe may not rule. 4. What the civil law forbiddeth, that is not lawful. But the rule of a woman the civil law forbiddeth. *Ergo* it is not lawful. 5. Seeing there followeth more inconvenience of the rule of women than of men's government, therefore it is not to be born in a Commonwealth. 6. The Doctors and Canoniſts forbid it. *Ergo* it cannot be good. Theſe arguments our Author confuted, and in the concluſion of his Book treated of three things with a peculiar regard to the new Queen: I. Of the duty of ſubjects to her. II. Of the good hope that her people might conceive of her. III. Of the fruit of doing or balking their duty to her. He publiſhed this Book without his name, that he might write with the greater freedom, and appear to ſay of the Queen what he thought and knew, without ſuſpicion of flattery or hope of reward (60).

(58) Idem, pag. 226, 227, 228.
(59) Pag. 231.
(60) Idem, pag. 224-240.

[*KK*] *An admirable Preacher.*] He preached very frequently and ſucceſsfully both in Leiceſterſhire, where in King Edward's time he was the only Preacher, and in Lincolnſhire, where he was Archdeacon, and afterwards in London and at Court, eſpecially when invaſions and wars were apprehended, for he had a manner of preaching, which inſpired his hearers with ſpirit and reſolution (61). He could not ſuffer flattery in a Preacher, and eſteemed learning, integrity, zeal and wiſdom to be neceſſary in his character. He ſaid, that *thoſe that were Preachers muſt be no milkſops, no white livered Gentlemen, that for the frowning and cloudy countenance of every man in authority will leave his tackle, and cry* peccavi. *They muſt be of ſuch a nature as the Poet Terence ſaid of Crito*; In vultu gravitas, in verbis fides, *to have gravity in his countenance, and faithfulneſs in his ſpeech. That they ſhould not be afraid to rebuke the proudeſt, no, not Kings and Queens, ſo far forth as the two tables reach. That they ſtoop not to every man's beck, nor ſtudy to pleaſe men more than God. If hereſies ariſe, they muſt have their tools ready to meet with the adverſary and to overthrow him. Which he could never have, unleſs he had travailed in many Sciences, heard, and read much, &c... And again, in ſuch as are occupied in the Pulpit are required theſe things, that they be meet to teach, to reprove, and convince. In teaching is required gravity, learning and eloquence; in reproving carriage and ſound judgment; and in convincing arts, memory, and much ſcience* (62).

(61) Pag. 263.
(62) Idem, pag. 264, 265.

[*LL*] *Some of his ſentiments upon different ſubjects.*] We have mentioned in note [*II*] his opinion concerning the Biſhops lands and revenues, and the uſes, which they ought to be applied to. This was a principle maintained by many perſons, who favoured the Reformation from the times that Henry VIII ſeized the lands of the Abbies, when the pretence was, that thoſe revenues would be employed in the beſt manner, and particularly in maintaining the expence of wars without taxing the ſubject, in promoting learning by eſtabliſhing a great many ſchools, and erecting new Biſhopricks. But the Courtiers ſoon diverted the King from theſe good deſigns, and procured thoſe eſtates to themſelves. Our Biſhop therefore changed his opinion, and thought the Biſhops had as much right to retain their antient revenues, as the Laity had to conſume them in the gratification of their own pleaſures. And when that paſſage of his *Harborough* was objected to him, he replied as St. Paul did in another caſe, *Cum eſſem parvulus, loquebar cum parvulis, ſapiebam ut parvulus*; i. e. "When I was a child, I "ſpake as a child, I thought as a child (63)." His opinion of the proper government of England was as follows: *The Regiment of England is not a mere* Monarchy, *as ſome for lack of conſideration think; nor a mere* Oligarchy, *nor* Democratie; *but a mixt rule of all theſe; wherein each of theſe have or ſhould have like authority. The image whereof, and not the image but the thing indeed, is to be ſeen in the Parliament Houſe, wherein you ſhall find theſe three eſtates, the King or Queen, which repreſenteth the* Monarchy; *the Noblemen, which be the* Ariſtocratie; *and the Burgeſſes and Knights the* Democratie. *The very ſame had Lacedæmonia, the nobleſt and beſt governed city that ever was. They had their Kings, their Senate, and* Hippagretes, *which were for the people. As in Lacedæmonia none of theſe could make or break laws, orders for war or peace, or do any thing without the other; the King nothing without the Senate and Commons; nor either of them or both without the King; albeit the Senate and* Ephori *had greater authority than the King had. In like manner, if the Parliament uſe their privileges, the King can ordain nothing without them. If he do, it is his fault in uſurping it, and their folly in permitting it. Wherefore thoſe, that in King Henry's days would not grant him, that Proclamations ſhould have the force of a Statute, were good Fathers of the Country, and worthy commendation in defending their liberty* (64). He expreſſed his judgment concerning the Queen's marriage, whether it was more proper to marry one within her own Kingdom, or ſome foreign Prince, in this manner: "That if all things anſwered, it was "better joyning at home than chooſing abroad. As "if he be no baſe or mean perſon, if he love and "fear God, if he be of the ſame Religion, endued "with good and commendable qualities of wiſdom, "juſtice, manhood, temperance, gifts of languages, "knowledge of countries, pitiful, merciful, conſtant, "ſober, no hearer of flatterers, continent, not prodigal but liberal, no extorter, &c. ſuch an one, if "God ſhould allot any Queen, were to be preferred "to any abroad. Unleſs all theſe might be found in "a ſtranger, and thereto joined Nobility, and Anti-"entneſs of Lineage, and the Nation being ſuch as "uſed not to rule cruelly, but rather fatherly than "lordly." It is eaſy to perceive what foreign Prince he excluded by theſe words, namely King Philip of Spain, who had already made his addreſſes to Queen Elizabeth, which ſhe had prudently declined (65). He uſed to ſay, that *as an eye full of tears is the more unable to ſee, ſo the mind full of ſorrow is leſs able to*

(63) Idem, pag. 268, 269.
(64) *See* Strype, pag. 269, 270.
(65) Idem, pag. 272.

examined in various points of Divinity, in Latin, and before ſeveral perſons (*kk*). His natural temper was very quick and warm; and his converſation lively and facetious [*MM*], and very free. He was a man of great reſolution and courage [*NN*]. His ſtature was low. To conclude his character, he had all the advantages, which both proſperity and adverſity can contribute to render a man wiſe and good. After the eaſe and reputation which he had enjoyed at Court and in the family of a great Nobleman, he was caſt into exile; and afterwards, when he was reſtored to wealth and honour, it was ſo deeply mixed with care and ſorrow, that he could readily have reſigned them for the tranquillity of a private life (*ll*).

(*kk*) Ibid.

(*ll*) Pag. 296, 297.

to judge; that *good example is often much better than a great deal of preaching* (66); and that *miracles are not the work but the impediment of nature* (67). He divided women into two ſorts; *ſome of them wiſer, better learned, diſcreeter, more conſtant, than a number of men*; but the other he deſcribed in theſe words; *fond, fooliſh, wanton, flibbergibbs, tatlers, triflers, wavering, witleſs, without counſel, feeble, careleſs, raſh, proud, dainty, nice, tale-bearers, eves-droppers, rumour-raiſers, evil-tongued, worſe-minded, and in every wiſe doltified with the dregs of the Devil's dunghill* (68).

(66) Idem, pag. 274.

(67) Idem, pag. 275.

(68) Idem, pag. 276.

[*MM*] *Facetious.*] He frequently enlivened his diſcourſes with an agreeable turn of wit and humour. When Knox endeavoured to prove the unlawfulneſs of women's government from this paſſage of Iſaiah, *I will take from you your honourable Senators and your wiſe Counſellors, and I will give you boys and women to reign over you*; he confuted it by obſerving, that it was not meant of boys in age, but in manners, not of women in ſex, but in weakneſs of underſtanding; and then added that this argument was drawn from a miſunderſtanding of the word: As the Vicar of Trumpington, ſaid he, underſtood *Eli, Eli, Lamaſabacthani*, when he read the Paſſion upon Palm-Sunday. For when he came to this place he ſtopped, and called upon the Church-Wardens, and ſaid; *Neighbours, this Gear muſt be amended. Here is* Eli *twice in the book. I aſſure you, if my Lord of* Eli *come this way and ſee it, he will have the book. Therefore by mine advice we ſhall ſcrape it out, and put in our own Town's name, viz.* Trumpington, Trumpington, Lamaſabacthani. They conſented, and he did ſo. So they, ſays Mr. Aylmer, *who uſe this place for a weapon againſt this matter, do fault in* Homonymia, *not conſidering that words have proper ſignifications and tranſlations* (69).

(69) Idem, pag. 288, 289.

[*NN*] *Of great reſolution and courage.*] He gave an odd inſtance of his courage before the Queen. In December 1578 her Majeſty had been extremely afflicted with the tooth-ach, ſo that ſhe had no intermiſſion day or night, and could not poſſibly take any reſt. She was adviſed to have the tooth drawn, but was very averſe to it, being apprehenſive of the acute pain that would attend it. Biſhop Aylmer being preſent endeavoured to perſuade her, that it was not ſo exquiſite as ſhe imagined, and to convince her of it, told her that ſhe ſhould have a ſenſible experiment of it in himſelf, though he was an old man, and had not many teeth to ſpare; and immediately deſired the Surgeon to draw one of his teeth (perhaps, ſays Mr. Strype (70), a decayed one) in her Majeſty's preſence. This encouraged her to ſubmit to the operation. T.

(70) Pag. 294.

AYRAULT (PETER), in Latin *Ærodius*, Lieutenant-Criminel in the Preſidial of Angers, was born there in the year 1536. He performed his Humanity Studies, and his courſe of Philoſophy at Paris: after which he went to ſtudy Law at Toulouſe; from thence he went to Bourges for the advantage of the public Lectures of Duarenus, Cujas, and Doneau, three of the moſt excellent Civilians of that age. Having taken the Degree of Bachelor at Bourges, he returned to his own country, where he read public Lectures upon the Civil Law, and pleaded ſeveral cauſes. He was then 22 years of age. He returned to Paris ſome time after, and became one of the moſt famous Advocates in the Parliament [*A*]. He publiſhed there in 1563 *the Declamations of Quintilian*, which he corrected in a variety of places, and illuſtrated with notes. The year following he publiſhed in the ſame city a treatiſe *concerning the power of Redemption*, written by Francis Grimaudet, the King's Advocate at Angers, and wrote a preface to it concerning *the nature, variety, and change of Laws*. In 1567 he publiſhed a book intitled, *Decretorum Rerumve apud diverſos populos & omni antiquitate judicatarum libri duo. . . . . Accedit Tractatus de origine & auctoritate rerum judicatarum.* That is, "An account of Decrees and Caſes, which have been judg-" ed amongſt divers Nations from all antiquity, in two books. . . . . To which is added, " A Diſcourſe concerning the origin and authority of Caſes which have been judged." He made great additions to it in the other editions [*B*]. He left Paris the year following in order

[*A*] *He became one of the moſt celebrated Advocates in Parliament.*] Anthony Loiſel in his Dialogue upon the Advocates in the Parliament of Paris, places our Ayrault amongſt the moſt famous of that profeſſion, and even gives him the preference of Bodin. It is true, he obſerves that Bodin had no ſucceſs at the Bar. His words are theſe: *Mr. Peter Ayrault had likewiſe the poſt given him of Lieutenant-Criminel at Angers, where he was born, and retired thither at the end of the General Seſſions of Poictiers in the year* 1567, *tho' he was an excellent and learned Pleader, and was much ſuperior in that point to Mr. John Bodin of Angers, how great ſoever the learning of the latter was; for he never ſucceeded in pleading at the Bar* (1). There were ſome of the Pleadings of Peter Ayrault printed at Paris in 1568 (2). They were printed at Roan in 1614 with Notes and Additions by a young Lawyer. Mr. Menage, who acquaints us with this (3), might have added, that they were printed at Paris in 1598 in 8vo, with ſeveral other little pieces of Ayrault. The Curates of Paris choſe him in 1564 to plead their cauſe againſt the Jeſuits; however he did not plead it; and this was probably occaſioned by this, that it was not found proper to ſeparate the intereſts of the Curates from thoſe of the Biſhop of Paris. This is the conjecture of the Sieur de Boulai (4). However that be, his pleading was publiſhed, as I have obſerved in the marginal note (2).

(1) Loiſel *apud* Menag. *in Teſtim. de* P. Ærodio, *ejus Vitæ præfixis*, pag. 26.

(2) There are 22 pleadings. The 20th is that which he drew up for the Curates of Paris againſt the Jeſuits in 1564.

(3) *In Vita Petri Ærodii*, pag. 26.

(4) *In Hiſtoria Academ. Pariſienſ.* tom. 6. pag. 966. *apud* Menag. *in Teſtim. de* P. Ærodio, pag. 17.

[*B*] *He made great additions to his Book in the other editions.*] The ſecond edition was printed at Paris in 1573 in 8vo, and contains ſix Books. The third is in *folio*, and is entitled, *Rerum ab omni antiquitate judicatarum Pandectæ*, i. e. "Pandects of caſes, which " have been judged from all antiquity." This was printed likewiſe at Paris in 1588. After the Author's death the ſame Pandects were printed at Paris in 1615 with a little tract *de Patrio Jure*. He had revis'd and corrected them. Mr. Menage promiſed (5) a new edition of them, which was to be illuſtrated with little marginal notes, to ſhew from whence Ayrault took his examples. That work is a very learned one; *Continet enim res ab omni antiquitate apud Indos, Græcos, Romanos, Francos, alios judicatas* (6); "for it con-" tains caſes, which have been judged from all anti-" quity amongſt the Indians, Greeks, Romans, French, " and other Nations." His piece in French, *de l'Ordre*

(5) *In Vita Petri Ærodii*, p. 28.

(6) Ibid. p. 27.

der to take upon him the office of Lieutenant-Criminel in his own country. And he executed it with ſuch exactneſs, that like a new Caſſius he was called *the Rock of the Accuſed*. During the confuſion occaſioned by the League, he executed in the interim [C] the office of Preſident in the ſame Court, and diſcharged it with the ſame integrity, as he had done the other. The city of Angers teſtified their eſteem of him ſeveral ways, and eſpecially by conferring upon him the office of Perpetual Echevin. He had a great diſpute with *Philip Gourreau*, Maſter of the Requeſts, his countryman; and he publiſhed *an apologetical Letter* againſt him in 1577 (a). He was firm to the right party in oppoſition to the League; and he was obliged to be ſo, not only by the place, that he held at the Preſidial, but likewiſe by his poſt of Maſter of Requeſts to the Duke of Anjou, which he held in conjunction with Baudouin the Civilian, before that Prince came to the Crown. The ſpeech, which he made to that Prince upon his entrance into Angers the 7th of January 1570 was printed with a Diſcourſe [D] addreſſed to him, in which he compliments him upon his victories, and the reſtoration of the Univerſity of Angers. This Diſcourſe turns chiefly upon Baudouin's having dedicated to that Prince two antient Panegyrics, that of Eumenius to Conſtantius, and that of Pacatus to Theodoſius. The Diſcourſe, which he publiſhed in the year 1589 upon the death of Henry III, and the ſcandal, which the Church received from it, ſhews his attachment to the party of that Monarch. He did not put his own name to it, nor that of the Printer's. Thuanus ſpeaks of it with great commendation (b). There was found amongſt the Author's papers a Latin Verſion, which he had made of it. He wrote at the ſame time a *Diſcourſe*, in which he exhorted Henry IV to turn Catholic; but of all his Works, that which made him moſt known amongſt foreigners, eſpecially Proteſtants, was his *Treatiſe upon the power of Fathers* [E]. He wrote it during the proceſs, which he carried on againſt the Jeſuits, on account of his eldeſt ſon, who had taken upon him the habit of their Order (c). He had ſent him to their College at Paris, in order to qualify him for ſucceeding himſelf ſome time or other; but he ſoon had the melancholy news, that they had perſuaded him to enter into their Society. He complained of this to the Parliament of Paris (d); and when he found that they had ſent him away privately, he preſented a Petition to the Pope, and procured Letters from Henry III to the Cardinal d'Eſt, Protector of the affairs of France, and to the Marquis of Piſani, Ambaſſador from that Kingdom (e); in which Letters the King demanded very poſitively, that they ſhould follicit an order

(a) There were two editions of it in the ſame year at Angers, the ſecond much larger than the firſt. This piece is in Latin.

(b) Thuani, *Hiſtor.* lib. 95.

(c) See the following Article.

(d) On the 19th of May 1586.

(e) They are dated the 18th of June 1586.

& Inſtruction judiciaire dont les anciens Grecs & Romains ont uſé en accuſations publiques, conferé à l'uſage de noſtre France; i. e. "Of the judicial Manner and "Forms, which the ancient Greeks and Romans "uſed in their public accuſations, compared to the "preſent uſage of France," is a very fine and curious work. It was firſt printed at Paris in 1575 in 8vo. The ſecond edition, which was likewiſe printed at Paris in 1588 in 4to, was enlarged with two Books. The third had the addition of another Book, at Paris 1598 in 4to (7). So that this work contained four Books. The fourth Book, which treats of *their proceedings with regard to dead bodies, and their aſhes, and memory, and with regard to beaſts, inanimate things, and contumax*, was printed ſeparately at Paris in 1591 in 8vo. I have omitted to mention, that his treatiſe *de Decretis Rebuſve apud diverſos populos ab omni antiquitate judicatis*, was printed at Francfort in 1580, after the firſt edition. The Authors of the Abridgment of Geſner knew nothing of this Peter Ayrault but from this edition of Germany. They were miſtaken in ſuppoſing his name was *Paul*.

(7) It is thus we muſt render theſe words of Mr. Menage. *Quem poſtea anno* 1588, *duobus libris, & anno* 1589 *tribus auctiorem in eadem urbe publicavit. Vita Petri Ærodii*, pag. 17.

[C] *During that interval.*] Mr. Menage extends this interval to two years: *Et præturæ munere per biennium functus Ærodius eſt* (8); and yet he tells us, that he was not named to that office till the eleventh of May 1589; and that Henry the Great ſubſtituted another at the beginning of the year 1590, *ineunte anno* 1590 (9).

(8) Ibid. pag. 24.

(9) Ibid. pag. 23.

[D] *His Speech was printed with the* Diſcourſe &c.] Mr. Menage is not right in the time, when theſe two pieces were printed: he tells us it was in the year 1577, and that the Prince, whom he commends, was then King of Poland and Duke of Anjou. That intimates very clearly, that he was not then King of France; whereas the Duke of Anjou was crowned at Rheims in February 1575, and was conſidered as King of France, from the very day that Charles IX died (10). We may be aſſured, that the Speech and Diſcourſe in queſtion were publiſhed in 1570, and conſequently, that the Prince, who is commended in them, was not at that time King of Poland.

(10) On the 30th of May 1574.

[E] *The treatiſe of* the Power of Fathers.] The Author wrote this in French and Latin. One of his countrymen, named Jacob Frubert, tranſlated it into Italian (11). Let us ſee what Mr. Menage ſays.

(11) Menag. *Vita P. Ærodii*, pag. 28.

Egit cum fugitivo filio tanquam cum abſente reo, hoc eſt annotatione & programmate:

Qualis populeâ mœrens philomela ſub umbra
Amiſſos queritur fœtus (12),

(12) Virgil. *Georg.* lib. 4. ver. 511.

Et quæ ſequuntur; notum enim tibi carmen eſt; talis Petrus Ærodius amiſſum filium inſolabiliter in ſcriptis ſuis queritur. Vide quæſo . . . . quos ipſe queſtus fundat in libro tertio Ordinis Judiciarii, modo fratrem Johannem Ærodium, modo Renatum filium compellans. Quis verò tam ferus ac ferreus eſt, qui cum querelas ejus legat in libello ejus illo aureo, & tot laudibus à Stephano Paſcaſio celebrato (13), *quem de Patrio Jure ad fugitivum filium contra Jeſuitas ſcripſit, à gemitu & lacrimis temperare poſſit? . . . At non ſolus Ærodius fatum ſuum gemuit, ingemuere & alii: lege Stephani Paſcaſii & Johannis Bodini* (14) *ea de re ad Petrum Ærodium Epiſtolas. Lege Antonii Arnaldi Advocati Pariſienſis. . . . Orationem pulcherrimam, habitam in Senatu Pariſienſi contra Jeſuitas, anno MDLXXXXIV* (15). That is, "He treated his ſon as a guilty perſon, who is abſent, that is, in a judicial way;

(13) See the 10th Letter of the 11th book of *Paſquier's Letters.*

(14) Mr. Menage produces the Letter of Bodin, pag. 242.

(15) Menag. *Vita Ærodii*, pag. 37.

"So, cloſe in poplar ſhades, her children gone,
"The Mother Nightingale laments alone.

"And what follows, for you know the Poem; in "ſuch a melancholy manner does he bewail the loſs "of his ſon in his writings. See how he complains "in his third Book of *the Forms and Judiciary Methods &c.* where he ſometimes addreſſes himſelf to "his brother John Ayrault, and ſometimes to his ſon "René. Who is there of ſo inſenſible a temper, that "upon reading his complaints in his excellent work "*de Patrio Jure* addreſſed to his fugitive ſon againſt "the Jeſuits, and ſo highly extolled by Stephen Pâquier, can refrain from tears? . . . . Nor did he "complain alone; for others were ſharers with him "in the ſame diſtreſs. Read the Letters of Stephen "Pâquier and John Bodin to him upon this ſubject. "Read the fine Oration of Anthony Arnaud, an Advocate of Paris, pronounced in the Parliament of "Paris againſt the Jeſuits, in the year 1594." Mr. Menage in his Remarks has given an account of what Anthony

order from the Pope, for the liberty of that young Gentleman, but all this was to no purpoſe. The *Treatiſe of the power of Fathers*, which he addreſſed three years after to this diſobedient ſon, was likewiſe ineffectual. Tho' Ayrault had other ſons, yet he was extremely chagrin'd for the loſs of this. He married at Paris in 1564 Anne des Jardins, daughter of John des Jardins, Phyſician to Francis I, by whom he had fifteen children [*F*], ten of whom were living when he died at Angers the 21ſt of July 1601, aged 65 years (*f*). I have taken this Article from Mr. Menage (*g*).

(*f*) Sammarthanus is miſtaken in his *Elogium* upon Peter Ayrault, when he tells us, that he was but ſixty three years old.

(*g*) *Ex Vita Petri Ærodii ab Ægidio ejus ex filiâ nepote ſcripta, & typis Pariſiis, anno* 1675, in 4to.

Anthony Arnaud ſpoke upon this ſubject, and what was anſwered by Peter Barni, Attorney of the Jeſuits in the College of Clermont. The anſwer comes to this purpoſe, that the Jeſuits would not receive René Ayrault in France, tho' he was then at leaſt eighteen years old; ſo that *he went without their knowledge into* GERMANY, *where he was admitted into their Society* (16). See the remark [*A*] of the following article.

(16) Ibid. pag. 251.

[*F*] *He had fifteen children.*] We deſign a particular article for his eldeſt ſon. PETER AYRAULT, his ſecond ſon, ſucceeded his father in his virtues and in his poſt, and was Preſident in the Seneſchal's Juriſdiction of Angers, Counſellor of the City, and Mayor. He procured in 1603 a Profeſſorſhip in Law in the Univerſity of Angers for William Barclay. The *Speech*, which he made to Mary de Medicis, mother of Lewis XIII, at Angers, the 16th of October 1619, may be ſeen in the ſixth tome of the *Mercure François*. He was deputed to the Aſſembly *des Notables*, which was appointed at Roan in 1617. He left iſſue behind him JOHN AYRAULT, his brother, was an Advocate in the Parliament of Paris. WILLIAM AYRAULT, their brother, a Monk of the Order of St. Benedict, and a Doctor of Sorbonne, had a great friendſhip and intimacy with Lewis Servin, Advocate-General of the Parliament of Paris. GUYONNE AYRAULT one of their ſiſters, married William Menage, the King's Advocate in the Preſidial of Angers. From this marriage was born the late Mr. Menage, one of the moſt learned men in France (17).

(17) *Ex Vitâ P. Ærodii.* See the quotation (*g*) of this Article.

AYRAULT (RENE), eldeſt ſon of the preceding Author, was the occaſion of great trouble to his father. He was born at Paris the eleventh of November 1567, and was placed under the care and inſtruction of the Jeſuits (*a*). Peter Ayrault at that time had a great affection and eſteem for that ſociety (*b*), and would then have refuſed to plead the cauſe of the Curates of Paris againſt them, tho' he had undertaken it in the year 1564. He, perceiving in his eldeſt ſon a very lively genius, a ſtrong memory, and other excellent qualifications, deſired very earneſtly the Provincial of the Jeſuits, and the Rector of the College of Clermont, when he put his ſon into their hands, that they would by no means ſollicit him to enter into their Society. He told them, that he had other ſons to devote to the Church; but that he deſigned this to ſucceed him in his own poſt, and to be the ſupport of the family. They promiſed him every thing that he deſired. However the great abilities of this young Gentleman made the Jeſuits wiſh to have a perſon of his importance in their Society; ſo that after he had ſtudied two years in Rhetoric under Father James Sirmond, they gave him the habit of their Order in 1586. His father, without whoſe advice all this was tranſacted, made a great noiſe upon it. He accuſed them of ſtealing his ſon, and called upon them to reſtore him. They anſwered, that they knew nothing of him. Ayrault procured an Order, and obtained a Decree from the Parliament, which commanded the Jeſuits of the College of Clermont not to admit René Ayrault into their Order, and to notify to the other Colleges that prohibition. They paid no regard to this Decree; they conveyed the youth from one place to another; they changed his name, and ſent him into Lorrain, Germany, and Italy [*A*]. Henry III applied to the Pope by his Ambaſſador and the Protector of his intereſts; Ayrault wrote to his Holineſs; who ordered the liſt of all the Jeſuits in the world to be ſhewn to him; but René Ayrault, being veiled under a fictitious name, did not appear in that liſt (*c*). Three years being ſpent in vain in this ſearch, the father had recourſe to his pen, and wrote a book *concerning the power of Fathers*, which he addreſſed to his ſon René (*d*). René wrote an anſwer to it, but his Superiors thought it not proper to publiſh it. They choſe rather, that Richeome, the Provincial of the Jeſuits at Paris, ſhould confute the book of Peter Ayrault [*B*]. The adventures of René were as follow. He entered into their Society at Treves the twelfth of June 1586; he went from thence to Fulde, where he renewed his Studies in Rhetoric. He paſſed over Germany, and was there taken priſoner by the Proteſtants. Thence he went to Rome, and ſtudied Philoſophy one Year under Mutius Vitelleſchi (*e*). He continued the ſame Studies the year following at Milan, and compleated them at Dijon (*f*). Having taught the Claſſes in the ſame city for four years with a great deal of ſucceſs, he left it in 1594, when the Jeſuits were baniſhed from ſeveral cities of the Kingdom, and went to Piedmont, where he taught for two years. After this he came to Avignon, where

(*a*) Menag. *Vita P. Ærodii*, pag. 245.

(*b*) *Quos tum ipſe & amabat, & magni faciebat: quin & eos vocari Andegavum, & ibi ſedem habere aliquando voluit.* i. e. "He loved "and eſteemed "them at that "time; nay he "was once de-"ſirous to have "them ſent for "and fixed at "Angers. *Vita Ærodii*, pag. 35. See likewiſe p. 245, where he quotes Ayrault in his 3d book of his *Ordre Judiciaire*.

(*c*) See the text of the preceding Article towards the end.

(*d*) See the remark [*E*] of the preceding Article.

(*e*) He was General of the Jeſuits.

(*f*) At that time the courſe of Philoſophy continued three years.

[*A*] *Into Lorrain, Germany, and Italy.*] Anthony Arnaud in his Pleading in the year 1594, declares, that *the Jeſuits having drawn aſide René Ayrault, when he was but fourteen years old, kept him in Italy and Spain.* It does not appear that he was ever in Spain (1); and he was almoſt nineteen years of age, when he took the habit of the Order.

(1) *Hiſpaniam quoque petiiſſe falſo creditum eſt.* Menag. *Vita P. Ærodii*, pag. 37.

[*B*] *They choſe rather, that Richeome . . . . ſhould confute the work of Peter Ayrault.*] His Anſwer was not printed, no more than that of René Ayrault. *Quia indecorum viſum eſt adverſus parentes ſcribere filios, prohibitus eſt à Rectoribus ſuis Reſponſionem vulgare. Igitur id aggreſſus eſt Ludovicus Richeomus . . . quod me docuit privata ipſius Renati Ærodii ad ipſum Richeomum Epiſtola, cujus exemplar, quæ ſua eſt humanitas, miſit ad me Roma Petrus Poſſinus Preſbyter Societatis Jeſu doctiſſimus, idemque Jeſuiticæ Hiſtoriæ Scriptor celeberrimus. Sed neque Reſponſionem ſuam vulgavit Richeomus; qua de cauſa neſcio* (2). i. e. "Becauſe it "ſeemed indecent that a ſon ſhould write againſt his "father, he was forbidden by his Superiors to pub-"liſh his Anſwer. Upon which Lewis Richeome un-"dertook to write a Reply; as I underſtand from a "private Letter of René Ayrault himſelf to Richeome, "a copy of which was ſent me from Rome by Peter "Poſſinus, a very learned Prieſt of the Society of Je-"ſus, and the famous Writer of the Hiſtory of that "Order. But Richeome likewiſe never publiſhed his "Anſwer, for what reaſon, I cannot tell."

(2) Menag. *Vita P. Ærodii*, pag. 39.

where he ſtudied two years. Then he returned to Rome, and from thence was ſent to Milan to teach Rhetoric; which he did for ſeveral years, and then came back into France; where he paſſed through the moſt illuſtrious employments of his Order. He taught Philoſophy; he preach'd, and was Preſident of the College. He was Rector at Rheims, Dijon, Sens, Dole, and Bezançon; Aſſiſtant of the Provincial, and Procurator of the Province of Champagne, and afterwards of that of Lyons at Reme. He died at laſt at la Fleche the 18th of December 1644 (*g*). His father by a ſolemn writing paſſed before a Notary and witneſſes deprived him of his paternal Bleſſing in the year 1593; but he did not continue his reſentment to his death, for there was found among his papers a writing, in which he gave him his Bleſſing [*C*].

(*g*) *Ex Vitâ Ærodii.* See the quotation of the preceding Article.

[*C*] *His father left a writing, in which he gave him his bleſſing.*] It was ſigned by his own hand, and contained what follows: *God grant his peace, his love, and his grace to my ſon René Ayrault. I give him my bleſſing, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt. And I pardon him every thing, in which he has offended me. And I pray God to aſſiſt him with his bleſſed holy Spirit, whatever ſtate of life or vocation he ſhall undertake* (3).

(3) Menag. *Vita Ærodii*, p. 257.

AZOTUS, a city of Paleſtine, near the Sea, one of the five Lordſhips of the Philiſtins (*a*). It was there that they kept the chief of their idols, which they called Dagon, and which fell down and was broken before the Ark, that had been taken by them from the Jews, and placed in the Temple of this Idol (*b*). It does not appear that the Jews ever ſubdued this place till the reign of Uzziah King of Judah (*c*) [*A*]. It was taken from them by Tartan, General of the Army of Sargon King of Aſſyria, as we learn from Iſaiah (*d*), who lived at that time. It was beſieged ſome time after by Pſammitichus King of Egypt, and it was one of the longeſt ſieges, which was ever heard of; for it was nine and twenty years before the city was taken (*e*). It is probable that it was deſtroyed by the Egyptians, ſince the Prophet Jeremiah ſpeaks of it only as the remains of a city (*f*). It was of conſiderable importance during the war of the Maccabees; and the taking of this city was not one of the leaſt exploits of Jonathan. The enemies, whom he had defeated, fled, and ſhut themſelves up in the Temple of Dagon. He ordered it to be ſet on fire, ſo that they were deſtroyed in the ſame flames, which conſumed the temple and the city (*g*). We read in the Acts of the Apoſtles, that St. Philip, after he had baptized the Eunuch of Queen Candace was *caught by the Spirit of the Lord, and found at Azotus* [*B*]. Profane Authors ſpeak of this place as of the Mart of the Arabians (*h*); and it is certain that the inhabitants muſt have made a conſiderable figure, ſince Strabo has ranked them among the four Nations, who were mixed with the Celoſyrians and with the Phœnicians, the two principal people, according to him, who poſſeſſed Syria (*i*). Stephanus Byzantinus aſſerts, that Azotus was founded by one of theſe fugitives, who removed from the Red-Sea to Paleſtine, and gave his wife's name to the city, which he built. This name ſignifies a She-Goat. Mr. Bochart rejects this whole account (*k*). St. Jerom tells us, that in his time Azotus was ſtill a conſiderable city [*C*].

(*a*) Joſhua xiii. 3. where the Geneva tranſlation calls it *Aſdod.*

(*b*) 1ſt Book of Samuel, ch. v.

(*c*) 2d Book of Chronicles, ch. xxvi. ver. 6.

(*d*) Chap. xx. ver. 1.

(*e*) Herodot. lib. 2. cap. 157.

(*f*) Jerem. xxv. 20.

(*g*) 1ſt Book of Maccabees, ch. x. ver. 83, & *ſeq.*

(*h*) Pompon. Mela. lib. 1. cap. 10.

(*i*) Strabo, lib. 16. pag. 515. *See likewiſe*, pag. 522.

(*k*) Bochart, *Geograph. Sacra*, lib. 2. cap. 12.

[*A*] *It does not appear that the Jews ſubdued it before the reign of Uzziah.*] If you examine ever ſo much the 11th and 15th chapters of the Book of Joſua, which Moreri refers you to, you will not find that Joſua ever ſubdued the city of Azotus. It is not more true that the Tribe of Judah conquered it in the time of the Judges: the Author who aſſerts this, and quotes the firſt chapter of the Book of Judges (1), was abſolutely miſtaken. What deceived him, or Moreri, or the Author, whom he followed, is, that in the 15th chapter of Joſua we find this city in the Diviſion of the Tribe of Juda. But we muſt obſerve, that they placed among theſe Diviſions what had been already ſubdu'd, and what would be ſo ſome time or other. It appears plainly from the third chapter of Judges, that the five Governments of the Philiſtins, and conſequently of Azotus, were not ſubdued by Joſua. God himſelf, when he repreſents, that this Conqueror was too old to finiſh that war, places amongſt the countries which remained to be conquered theſe five Governments (2). This ſhews us another error of Moreri. *Joſua*, ſays he, *ſubdued it firſt to the Hebrews about the year of the World* 2586, *and it was afterwards one of the five Lordſhips of the Philiſtins.* Was it not ſo before Joſua's time, by the teſtimony of God himſelf?

(1) Chriſtoph. Heidmannus, *in Palæſtinâ*, pag. 90.

(2) Joſua xiii. 3.

[*B*] *Was found at Azotus* (3).] Moreri aſſerts, that St. Philip was caught up in this city. If he had read the 8th chapter of the Acts, which he quotes, he would not have ventured to affirm ſuch a thing.

(3) Acts viii. 40.

[*C*] *St. Jerom tells us, that in his time Azotus was ſtill a conſiderable city* (4).] His words are as follow: *Uſque hodie inſigne oppidum Palæſtinæ.* Mr. Baudrand affirms, that tho' it had been anciently an Epiſcopal city under the Archbiſhoprick of Ceſarea, yet it became afterwards a ſimple *municipium* in St. Jerom's time. *Olim Epiſcopalis ſub Archiepiſcopo Cæſarienſi, poſtea municipium tempore S. Hieronymi* (5). That Gentleman will give me leave to tell him, that he ſeems to have reverſed the true order of things in this point. For what ſhould occaſion the ruin of the Biſhoprick of Azotus between the time of the erection of it, and that, in which St. Jerom lived?

(4) Hieronym. *de Locis Hebraic.*

(5) Baudrand. *Lexicon. Geographicum.*

SUPPLEMENT

SUPPLEMENT to the Letter (A).

AGAMEDES ſon of Ergenus King of the Orchomenians (*a*), and brother of the celebrated Trophonius [*A*], was with his brother famous for the building of Temples and ſtately Palaces (*b*). Cicero (*c*) and Plutarch (*d*) tell us, that when the two brothers had finiſhed the Temple of Apollo, which they built at Delphi, they went and worſhipped the God in it, and requeſted of him that he would grant them whatever was beſt for men. Apollo anſwered that within three days (*e*) he would grant their requeſt, and in the mean time he commanded them to be merry. When the three days were paſt they were both found dead; Apollo the wiſeſt of the Gods intimating thereby, that death was the beſt preſent he could make to man [*B*]. It is pity that a ſtory, which may furniſh Orators and Preachers with very fine reflections, ſhould be contradicted

(*a*) *Orchomenus mons* is a mountain in Theſſaly, whence a town which lies in or near Theſſaly is called *Orchomenum*. There is alſo a town of that name in Bæotia, of which I think Erginus was King.

(*b*) Pauſanias *in Bæoticis*, p. m. 599.

(*c*) *In Tuſcul. Quæſt. lib.* 1. *verſus finem.*

(*d*) *In Conſol. ad Apoll. in oper.* tom. 2. pag. 109. ed. Pariſ. 1624.

(*e*) According to Tully, or within ſeven days, according to Plutarch.

[*A*] *Brother to the celebrated Trophonius.*] This is what moſt writers aſſert, and even Pauſanias himſelf; tho' he adds that ſome think that Trophonius was the ſon of Apollo; and he takes this opinion to be the moſt probable, becauſe Trophonius gave oracles like Apollo himſelf (1).

(1) *See* Pauſanias *in Bæoticis*, pag. 599.

[*B*] *Death was the beſt preſent he could make to man.*] This has been the opinion of ſeveral wiſe men among the Heathens and among the Chriſtians. And indeed if we conſider to how many evils and miſeries men are ſubject from the moment they are born to the end of their life, we ſhall conclude that the ſooner they die, and are delivered out of this vale of anguiſh, the better it is for them; for, as has been very truly ſaid by the Author of the book of Job (2), *Man that is born of a woman has but a ſhort time to live and is full of miſery*, or, as the words may be tranſlated, *becauſe he is full of miſery*; ſo that it is the effect of a wiſe Providence that man, miſerable as he is, ſhould not live long. Death indeed may ſeem an evil to thoſe who are happy in this world. But theſe are very few if compared to thoſe who are miſerable. It is true, ſome perſons think that there is leſs evil than good in this world, and this they pretend to prove by obſerving that there is no man upon earth, tho' ever ſo miſerable, but ſtill deſires to live (3). But here I beg leave to aſk, do they mean, that taking all together, the happineſs of thoſe that are happy, and the miſery of thoſe that are unhappy, the ſcale will turn on the ſide of happineſs? Or do they mean that in the ſame perſon all things conſidered and compared happineſs ſurpaſſes miſery? In the firſt caſe, what comfort is it to me, that there are more happy than unhappy perſons, if I am among the latter? or what is to me, that there is upon the whole more happineſs than miſery in the world, if I have nothing but misfortunes for my ſhare? As to the ſecond propoſition, that upon the whole every perſon enjoys more happineſs than he ſuffers miſery, I doubt very much whether experience will confirm it, I don't ſay in every particular perſon, but even in any conſiderable number of men? As for the fear of death and the great love all men have for this life, it does not follow from thence that they find by experience this life to be attended with more good than evil: For the beſt Chriſtians, who are perſuaded that after death they ſhall enjoy an inexpreſſible bliſs, are yet as weak as other people with regard to death; they would put it off, if they could, even when a decrepit old age, and a complication of evils have tied them down to their beds. Shall we ſay of them that they thus fear death, becauſe they know this world affords more pleaſure and happineſs than heaven can do? If they judged thus, they would be worſe than Heathens and Infidels. We muſt ſay therefore, that tho' they are perſuaded there is infinitely more happineſs in heaven than upon earth, yet they are afraid of death, and have a great love for this life. Hence we muſt conclude that the fear, which the generality of mankind have for death, and their love for this life, does not prove that they have found by experience, there is more good than evil in this world. How ſhall we then ſolve this queſtion? Indeed I think it cannot be ſolved, becauſe every perſon judges according as he is happy or unhappy, or at leaſt as he thinks himſelf ſo. A man who has every thing at command, and can ſatisfy his paſſions at his pleaſure, and who beſides is of a ſtrong conſtitution and enjoys a good health, will be apt to judge, that there is more good than evil in this world. On the contrary, a man who muſt toil for his ſupport, who can never enjoy his wiſhes, who by his continual labours impairs his health and ruins his conſtitution, will be apt to ſay that there is more miſery than happineſs upon earth. Further, we are not proper judges of other people's happineſs or miſery; this depends very much upon the ſituation of their mind, and the circumſtances they are in. The ſame thing may be accounted a good by one perſon, and an evil by another; nay to the ſame perſon it may appear good at one time and bad at another, according as that perſon is differently diſpoſed, or as his circumſtances are altered. Since then the fear of death and the love of life are no proofs that men enjoy more happineſs than miſery; and ſince we are not proper judges of what is good or evil for other people, it is impoſſible for us to determine whether there be more good than evil in this world; nor conſequently whether death be always the beſt thing that can befal a man. Only thus much we may venture to ſay; When a man is more miſerable than happy, death is good for him; and let him be ever ſo happy, death cannot be an evil for him, abſtractedly from the conſideration of the other life; ſince it puts him in a ſtate of inſenſibility, in which he cannot be conſcious of what he has loſt. And ſuppoſing another life, death muſt ſtill be for the virtuous the moſt happy event, which they can wiſh for, ſince it makes them enjoy a perfect bliſs. Why then are all or moſt men afraid to die? It is becauſe they don't conſider what death is, and becauſe all their thoughts are bent towards the pleaſures of this world. Hence this unconquerable fear of death, which is ſtill encreas'd by education and by the examples we have continually before our eyes. " Death, *ſays Montagne*, " is repreſented to men in a frightful manner, they " ſhun it like a bug-bear; and becauſe it is mentioned in laſt Wills and Teſtaments, do not expect " they will make their Will, till the Phyſician has " pronounced their ſentence. And God knows with " how much judgment they can go about it, filled as " they then are with grief and terror. Becauſe that " little word *death* was too harſh for the Romans ears, " and ſeemed of an ill omen, they attempted to ſoften it, and turn it into periphraſes; and inſtead of " ſaying of a man, he is dead, they uſed to ſay, he " left off living, he has lived. If they did but mention leſs, tho' paſt, they were ſatisfied. It is from " them we have borrowed this way of ſpeaking, *the* " *late Sir John D****." The reader will perhaps be pleaſed to find here Montagne's own words, of which it is not an eaſy matter to preſerve the ſpirit in a tranſlation. *On fait peur a nos gens de nommer la mort, & la pluſpart s'en ſeignent comme du nom du diable. Et parce qu'il s'en fait mention aux teſtamens, ne vous attendez pas qu'ils y mettent la main, que le medecin ne leur ait donné l'extreme ſentence. Et Dieu ſait lors entre la douleur & la frayeur, de quel bon jugement il vous le partiſſent. Parceque cette ſyllable frappoient trop rudement leurs oreilles, & que cette voix leur ſembloit malencontreuſe, les Romains avoient appris de l'amolir, on l'étendre en periphraſes; au lieu de dire il eſt mort;*

(2) Chap. xiv. ver. 1.

(3) See *Nouvell. de la Rep. Lettres*, for May 1703. pag. 563, 564.

contradicted by one of the beſt Writers of Antiquity, I mean Pauſanias, who gives us a quite different account of Agamedes's and Trophonius's death. He tells us (*f*), that they built a Treaſury for Hyrieus a King of Thebes [*C*], and left in the wall of it a ſtone looſe in ſuch a manner that it could eaſily be taken down; Agamedes and Trophonius uſed in the night time to take down the looſe ſtone, and ſo to get into the Treaſury, where they took as much money as they pleaſed. Hyrieus finding continually ſome money wanting, tho' it was well locked up, and he alone had the keys, was amazed at it; ſo that to find out the thieves, he made a kind of a trap or net in the bags or veſſels in which his money was, in ſuch a manner, that as ſoon as any one attempted to take the money, his hand was ſo well faſtened that it could not get free. Agamedes according to cuſtom coming one day to take money was catched in the net. Trophonius fearing leſt Agamedes being put to the rack ſhould diſcover the whole myſtery, immediately cut off his head. He was himſelf ſome time after ſwallowed up by an earthquake. This account is very different from that, which we have given from Tully and Plutarch; and yet Moreri, tho' he quotes Pauſanias, does not ſay a word of what we have juſt now related [*D*]. He is alſo guilty in this place of another miſtake [*E*]. Agamedes and Trophonius made a very ſumptuous bed for Amphytrio and Alcmena, which was ſhewn at Thebes, as a great curioſity (*g*). They were both prayed to and worſhipped with ſacrifices (*h*).

(*f*) *In Bœoticis*, pag. 599.

(*g*) Pauſanias, ibid. pag. 558.

(*h*) Idem, ibid. pag. 603.

mort; il a ceſſé de vivre, diſent ils, il a vécu. Pourveu que a ſort vie, ſoit elle paſſée, ils ſe conſolent. Nous en avons emprunte nôtre feu Maître Jean (4). Now ſince death is no evil, and for the beſt part of mankind is the greateſt good they could wiſh for, it may be aſked what kind of death is the moſt deſirable? We may anſwer with Cæſar, the moſt unexpected and moſt ſudden (5). A ſudden death prevents thoſe fears and terrors, which uſually ſeize us at the approach of our laſt hour, and which are always encreaſed by the lamentations and tears of our friends and relations, who ſurrounding our death-bed ſeem to contend how to make us more ſenſible of what we are going to loſe by leaving this world; not to mention the pains and agonies, which always accompany a lingering death. A ſudden exit delivers us from all theſe dreadful circumſtances, which make death be really a King of Terrors. It may be objected that a ſudden death may be dangerous to our ſalvation, ſince it prevents that repentance, which is neceſſary to obtain God's mercy and pardon for our ſins. But they, who make that objection, ſhew, they are but very little acquainted with the genius of the Chriſtian Religion; ſince according to the Goſpel we ſhall not be judged by the manner, in which we die, but by that in which we have lived. A virtuous man has no need for a death-bed repentance; and the deepeſt ſorrow in the laſt moments of life will never atone for the crimes of a wicked life. If to obtain eternal ſalvation it was ſufficient to repent at the approach of death, no man, tho' ever ſo wicked, could be damned; ſince it is impoſſible for the moſt profligate perſon, not to repent, when he conſiders, that his crimes will make him miſerable for ever.

(4) *Eſſays de Montagne*, liv. 1. chap. 19. p. m. 52.

(5) *Apud eund.* ibid. lib. 2. cap. 13. p. m. 580.

[*C*] *Hyrieus King of Thebes.*] Moreri (6) and Geſner (7) ſay he was a countryman of Bœotia, and that having received Jupiter, Mercury, and Neptunus hoſpitably in his houſe, they promiſed him for a reward that whatever he would aſk ſhould be granted to him. He anſwered that he deſired nothing more than to have a ſon, though he did not care to marry. The three Gods to grant his requeſt, made water in the hide of a bull, which Hyrieus had ſacrificed to Jupiter, and ten months after a ſon was procreated out of it, and was called Urion, from οὖρος, which ſignifies *urine*; and that name was afterwards changed into Orion. But Hyginus, from whom this ſtory is borrowed, ſays Hyrieus was a King of Thebes (8).

(6) *In* HYRIEE.

(7) *In Onomaſtico*, where he calls him HYREUS.

(8) Hyginus, *Fabul.* cxcv. *& Ejuſdem Poeticon Aſtronomicon*, lib. ii. Conſtel. xxxiv. *& in utrumque locum vide Notas Thomæ Munkeri, in Mythographis Latinis*, tom. i.

[*D*] *Moreri, tho' he quotes Pauſanias, does not ſay a word of what we have juſt related.*] This is a great omiſſion; but the manner in which Moreri expreſſes himſelf is ſtill more inaccurate. Having related the ſudden death of Agamedes and Trophonius, he ſays, Pauſanias adds that they built in Arcadia the famous temple dedicated to Neptunus. This way of ſpeaking miſleads the reader, and makes him believe that Pauſanias alſo relates the ſudden death of theſe two perſons; tho' he relates their death in a quite different manner, as we have obſerved.

[*E*] *He* (*Moreri*) *is alſo guilty in this place of another miſtake.*] I. He tells us that any perſon, who was ſo bold as to enter into Neptune's temple without the God's expreſs command, met with certain death; and he quotes Pauſanias for this, tho' that Author only tells us, that the builders of that temple had ſhut the entrance of it only with a woollen net (μίτῳ διατείνασιν ἱρεοῦν) becauſe the fear of the Deity was then ſtrong enough to keep men in awe, or perhaps becauſe there was in this net a ſecret power to prevent people from entring into the temple. II. He ſays that Pauſanias ſpeaks of the miraculous birth of theſe two perſons, tho' that Author does not mention any miracle on this occaſion. III. He declares that Pauſanias thinks they were brothers, tho' he expreſly tells us he is inclined to believe Trophonius was the ſon of Apollo (9).

(9) *See* Pauſanias *in Bœoticis*, p. m. 599.

☞ ALLIX (PETER), a famous French Divine, was born in the year 1641 at Alençon in Normandy, where his Father was a Miniſter of great reputation. Mr. Allix firſt ſtudied under his father, and went afterwards to the Univerſities of Saumur and Sedan. He was ordained a Miniſter at St. Agobille in Champaign, the Proteſtants of that town having deſired him for their Paſtor. A year or two after he was choſen one of the Miniſters of the Church of Paris (*a*) which met at Charenton, a village about ſix miles diſtant from that capital. Though we are not able to determine preciſely the time, when Mr. Allix was made a Miniſter of Charenton, yet we may affirm that he was not then much above thirty years of age; for we find that he preached a ſermon there December the 2d 1675, which being a faſt day (*b*), a ſtranger would not have been admitted to preach on ſo ſolemn an occaſion; and therefore Mr. Allix muſt have been then a Miniſter of that place. His being choſen ſo young by the largeſt and moſt conſiderable congregation of the Proteſtants in France, ſhews in how much eſteem he was already amongſt them; for they would never have choſen a young man, if he had not been able to maintain the Proteſtant Religion againſt the perpetual cavils of the Papiſts, and to ſecure thoſe, committed to his care, from being inſnared by them, at a time when the Popiſh Clergy uſed all poſſible arts and policy, to draw the Proteſtants over to their Religion. It was neceſſary therefore, that there ſhould be learned and prudent Paſtors in every Proteſtant Congregation, and eſpecially in that, which being near the Court was for that very reaſon the moſt expoſed to the various attacks of the enemy. Mr. Allix had given very early proofs of his learning and abilities; for in the

(*a*) From the MS. Memoirs communicated to us by the Doctor's family.

(*b*) 12 *Sermons de P. A. Miniſtre du St. Evangile*, 2d ed. Rotterd. 1685, 12°, in the Index.

the year 1660 (being then but nineteen years old) he publiſhed his *Theſes Theologicæ de ultimo Judicio.* He publiſhed afterwards, even during his ſtay at Paris, ſeveral other books, which we ſhall mention hereunder [*A*]. When he was a Miniſter of Charenton he undertook in conjunction with the celebrated Mr. Claude a new tranſlation of the Bible into French, which gave his enemies a pretence to aſperſe his character, as tho' he had been a Socinian (*c*); but he has fully proved by his latter works how little ground there was for ſuch a charge, as will appear by the account we ſhall give of them hereafter. In the year 1682 the Roman Catholick Clergy of France publiſhed a *Paſtoral Advice* (*d*), directed to the Proteſtants of that Kingdom [*B*], entreating them to declare the reaſons for which they had ſeparated from the Church of Rome. Mr. Allix thought it his duty on this occaſion to exhort his flock in an excellent Sermon (*e*) to ſtudy the grounds of their Religion, that they might be able to give an account of their faith. He likewiſe laid before them the reaſons for which their Anceſtors thought they were obliged to ſeparate from the Church of Rome. I believe he was ſtill in France when he publiſhed *Reflexions Critiques & Théologiques ſur la Controverſe de l'Egliſe:* i. e. "Critical and Theological Reflections on the Controverſy concern-"ing the Church." There is an edition of this work printed in 1686, but I believe it is not the firſt. Mr. Bayle has quoted a paſſage out of it, and made ſome obſervations upon it, which deſerve to be communicated to the reader [*C*]; becauſe he corrects a miſtake, which is common to a great many Proteſtants, who believe that the Doctrine of the Merit of Good Works is conſtantly received in the Church of Rome, and has received the ſanction of the Council of Trent. When the learned Emeric Bigot publiſhed at Paris in 1680 Palladius's

(c) Luicius's *Hiſtor. Diction.* in Dutch, Hague 1724, fol. Art. ALLIX.

(d) Advertiſement Paſtoral.

(e) It is the firſt in the vol. quoted above, and was delivered at Charenton Octob. the 11th, 1682, ſoon after the *Paſtoral Advice* had been publiſhed.

[*A*] *Several other books which we ſhall mention hereunder.*] *Diſſertatio de Sanguine Domini noſtri Jeſu Chriſti, ad Epiſtolam* 146 *S. Auguſtini, quâ num adhuc exiſtat, inquiritur*; i. e. "A Diſſertation concerning "the Blood of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, upon the 146th "Epiſtle of St. Auguſtin, &c." *Diſſertatio de Tertulliani vita & Scriptis*; i. e. "A Diſſertation concern-"ing the Life and Writings of Tertullian." *Réponſe à la Diſſertation, qui eſt à la fin du Livre de Mr. Arnaud, touchant le Livre du Corps & du Sang du Seigneur, publiée ſous le nom de Bertram, & touchant l'Autorité de Jean Scot, ou Erigéne, avec quelques argumentations* * *importantes, faites à la Réponſe au livre de Mr. Arnaud, par L'Auteur même.* i. e. "An An-"ſwer to the Diſſertation, which is at the end of "Mr. Arnaud's book, concerning the treatiſe of the "Body and Blood of our Saviour, publiſhed under the "name of John Scotus, or Erigenes; with ſome con-"ſiderable additions made to the anſwer to Mr. Ar-"naud's book, by the Author himſelf;" printed in France, in 4to, 1671. As we have not ſeen theſe pieces, we cannot give a more particular account of them; nor can we ſay whether theſe, with the other pieces mentioned in the text of this Article, to the quotation (*f*), be all that Dr. Allix publiſhed during his ſtay in France. We imagine that he wrote ſome other, to which he did not put his name, which is the reaſon why we are not able to give the titles of them. We have been informed, that upon the ſhutting up of the Church of Charenton, Mr. Allix preached there the laſt Sermon, which was printed by itſelf, and in which were ſome very remarkable paſſages concerning the neceſſity of publick worſhip; but after all our endeavours to procure that Sermon, we have not been able to obtain it.

* Thus it is written in the Manuſcript communicated to us; perhaps it ſhould be *augmentations.*

[*B*] *A Paſtoral advice directed to the Proteſtants of France.*] This *Paſtoral Advice* was only deſigned to enſnare the Proteſtants. They were aſked to give an account of the reaſons for which they had ſeparated from the Church, but the intent of this queſtion was, that they ſhould acknowledge their ſeparation to be ill-grounded. It was therefore neceſſary that the Proteſtants ſhould be armed againſt the cavils of their adverſaries; and this Dr. Allix intended in the Sermon we have mentioned. As we could not procure the *Paſtoral Advice* itſelf, we hope the readers will be pleaſed to find here what Mr. Bayle has ſaid of it. It will give them ſome notion of the craft and policy of the French Roman Catholick Clergy. *I own,* ſays Mr. Bayle (1), *that the* Paſtoral Advice *which the Clergy has directed to their erring brethren, is written in ſuch a manner, that it ſeems to breathe nothing but love and charity; it is mild, compaſſionate, pacifick, and flattering. They even promiſe us that the execution of their deſign* (2) *will be attended with moderation and juſtice. The event will ſhew us the intent of this new attack. If we may judge of it, by the Spirit that ran thro' their former advices, it is a device, a ſnare intended to deſtroy us. Theſe fine diſcourſes, ſo meek, ſo charitable, ſo civil, are deſigned only to impoſe on future Ages, when theſe publick writings will be read, and the particular actions that followed them remain unknown. The Clergy alſo think that ſuch an advice will give them room to boaſt, that they have employed the moſt proper methods to conquer our obſtinacy; and if we are not prevailed upon to renounce our pretended errors, they may juſtly pronounce us obſtinate hereticks, and conſequently unworthy the toleration, which the King has granted us till this time: for the ſtubbornneſs of the hereticks is ſtill more puniſhable than their very hereſies. This is not much unlike the ſpirit, by which Pliny the younger acted, when he put the Chriſtians to death, without knowing what it was to be a Chriſtian, thinking they were ſufficiently guilty, ſince they were obſtinate* (3). *Some Proteſtants found fault with Mr. Bayle, for having ſaid, that the Paſtoral Advice was mild and compaſſionate; where were his eyes, ſaid they, when he wrote thoſe words? How came he not to ſee in the Paſtoral Advice the dreadful misfortunes, with which we are threatned in the concluſion of it* (4)? The words alluded to here are theſe, *Et quemadmodum hic error veſter noviſſimus erit pejor priore, ſic erunt noviſſima veſtra pejora prioribus*; which the French Clergy tranſlated in the following manner, *Et parceque cette derniere erreur ſera plus criminelle en vous, que toutes les autres, vous devez vous attendre à des malheurs incomparablement plus epouvantables, & plus funeſtes que tous ceux que vous ont attirez juſqu'à preſent vôtre revolte & vôtre ſchiſme.* That is, "And "as this laſt error will be more criminal in you, "than all your former errors, ſo you muſt expect that "your future miſeries will be incomparably more dread-"ful and fatal to you, than all the misfortunes, which "your revolt and your ſchiſm have already drawn upon "you (5)." The obvious ſenſe of theſe words is, that if the Proteſtants would not yield to the Advice of the Clergy, and return into the pale of the Church, they were to expect a much heavier perſecution, than that which they had already ſuffered. But as theſe words might alſo be underſtood of puniſhments in another life, Mr. Bayle ſays, he thought it was more agreeable to Chriſtian civility, and alſo more prudent in him to take them in this latter ſenſe, that the Authors of this piece might not complain, he had miſrepreſented the meaning of their Advice (6). However as the event has made it appear, that the obvious ſenſe of the words was that of the Author's, it was abſolutely neceſſary that able and pious Miniſters, ſuch as Dr. Allix, ſhould not only arm their flocks againſt the cavils and fallacious arguments of the Popiſh Clergy, but alſo inſpire them with courage and patience to undergo the evils, with which they were threatned.

(1) *Critique Generale de l'Hiſtoire du Calviniſme*, Lect. 8. § 6. tom. 1. pag. 136. 4th edit. 1714, 12°.

(2) Of reuniting the Proteſtants to the Church.

(3) *Neque enim dubitabam, qualecunque eſſet, quod faterentur, pervicaciam certe, & obſtinationem debere puniri.* Plin. lib. 10. Epiſt. 97.

(4) Bayle, *Nouvel. Lett. de l'Auteur de la Critique Let.* 12. § 2. tom. 3. pag. 369.

(5) Idem, ibid.

(6) Idem, ibid. pag. 371, &c.

[*C*] *Mr. Bayle has quoted a paſſage out of this Book, and made ſome obſervations upon it.*] Here follow Dr. Allix's words; "It is certain, *ſays he* (7), that there "are ſome errors in the Church of Rome, which the "members of that Church did before the Reformation, "and do ſtill renounce, when they are upon the point "of death. For inſtance, they taught and do ſtill "teach

(7) Allix, *Reflexions Critiques & Theologiques ſur la Controverſe de l'Egliſe*, pag. 230, 231. edit. 1686.

ladius's Life of St. Chryſoſtom, in Greek and Latin, he was reſolved to add to it that Father's Letter to the Monk Cæſarius; and accordingly it was printed, but he was obliged to ſuppreſs it [D], in order to obtain a licence for the publication of his book; ſo that there are but a very few copies of Palladius's Life of Chryſoſtom, in which that Letter is found. The Proteſtants hearing of this did not fail to boaſt of it, as tho' this Letter had been ſuppreſſed only becauſe it contained ſome paſſages againſt Tranſubſtantiation. One of them printed in England a book intitled, *S. Anaſtaſii Sinaïtæ Anagogicarum contemplationum in Hexameron liber XII. hactenus deſideratus; cui præmiſſa eſt expoſtulatio de S. Johannis Chryſoſtomi Epiſtola ad Cæſarium Monachum adverſus Apollinarii Hæreſin, a Pariſienſibus aliquot Theologis non ita pridem ſuppreſſa. Londini* 1682, 4to. That is, "The twelfth book of "Anaſtaſius the Sinaite's Contemplations on the ſix days Creation, not publiſhed before; to "which is prefixed a complaint concerning Chryſoſtom's Letter to Cæſarius having lately "been ſuppreſſed by ſome of the Paris Divines." Some perſons thought at firſt that this complaint was written by Mr. Juſtel, but it is certain that Mr. Allix was the author of it (*f*). Upon the repeal of the Edict of Nantes, on the 22d of October 1685, all the Miniſters of Charenton were obliged to leave Paris in four and twenty hours, and the Kingdom in a fortnight. Mr. Allix retired immediately to St. Denys, where he found much difficulty to obtain a paſs in order to go out of France with his wife (*g*) and three children. Very advantageous terms were propoſed to him, in order to draw him to the Roman Catholic Religion, but he refuſed them all, and retired into England, where he arrived that ſame year, and obtained from King James II a Patent for eſtabliſhing in the City of London a French Church conformable to that of England. This was the only preferment he obtained before the Revolution. In the year 1686 he publiſhed *Determinatio Fr. Joannis Pariſienſis Prædicatoris de modo exiſtendi Corporis Chriſti in Sacramento Altaris alio quam ſit ille, quem tenet Eccleſia; nunc primum edita ex MS. Codice S. Victoris Pariſ. Cui præfixa eſt Præfatio Hiſtorica de dogmate Tranſubſtantiationis.* i. e. "Friar John of Paris the Dominican's "Determination of the manner in which the body of Chriſt is preſent at the Sacrament "of the Altar, different from that held by the Church. To which is prefixed an Hiſ-"torical Preface concerning Tranſubſtantiation." London, printed for Cailloüe, 1686, in 8vo. This Treatiſe of John of Paris had never been printed before; a French Roman Catholick Gentleman had it copied from the manuſcript, which is repoſited in the Abbey of St. Victor at Paris, and ſent it to Mr. Allix, who publiſhed it with an Hiſtorical

(f) Bayle, *Nouv. de la Rep. des Lett.* 1686. Juin, p. 686.

(g) Her name was Margaret, ſhe was the daughter of John Roger, an eminent Merchant at Paris, and had been married to our Author in 1678.

"teach the doctrine of *the merit of good works*, and "of *human ſatisfactions*: but theſe doctrines are ab-"jured by dying perſons in the following profeſſion. "The Prieſt. *Do you believe that you cannot obtain the "heavenly glory, by your own merit, but only by the "power and merit of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt's Paſſion?* "The ſick perſon's anſwer. *I do believe it.* The Prieſt. "*Do you believe that our Lord Jeſus Chriſt died for "our ſalvation, and that no one can be ſaved by his own "merit, nor by any other means, but by the merit of "Chriſt's Paſſion?* The ſick perſon. *I do believe "it.* The Prieſt. *If God ſhould judge you according "to your ſins, you muſt tell him; O Lord God, I put "the Death of Jeſus Chriſt my Lord between me and thy "judgment; and tho' I deſerve everlaſting death becauſe "of my ſins, yet I have recourſe to the merit of Jeſus "Chriſt's Paſſion, inſtead of the merit, which I miſerable "wretch ought to have, and which I want.*" Mr. Bayle's obſervations on this paſſage are as follow: "You "will no doubt wonder, *ſays he* (8), that the Miniſter "of Charenton quotes no *ritual*, nor any other book, "which contains what he relates, and you deſire me "to ſupply this defect, if I can. Being willing to "comply with your requeſt, I refer you to Cardinal "Hoſius, who will tell you (9), that Anſelm Archbi-"ſhop of Canterbury is ſaid to have preſcribed a "form of queſtions and anſwers for dying perſons, "which does not much differ from that, quoted by "Dr. Allix. Hoſius adds (10), that this form has "been inſerted in a book intitled, *Hortulus animæ*, "and he quotes the queſtions and anſwers, which he "has read in the *Sacerdotale Romanum*; they are ex-"actly the ſame with theſe mentioned above. This "paſſage of Cardinal Hoſius excited Dr. Calixtus's "curioſity, and engaged him to ſearch old books, in "hopes of finding ſuch kind of forms in them.—If "you read the collections he made on this ſubject, "you will find there (11) the Form of Anſelm, that "of the *Formula Raymundi*, a work printed at Co-"logne in 1498. Calixtus will alſo inform you, that "the *Agenda Eccleſiaſtica* printed at Paris in 1512, to "be diſtributed to the inhabitants of the Dioceſe of "Sleſwic, and the *Agenda Moguntina*, printed the next "year, contain the ſame queſtions and anſwers, as "the *Sacerdotale Romanum*, and that they are alſo "found (12) in a book printed A. 1627, and intitled, "*Rituale Monaſticum, Juſtorumque infirmantibus, moribundis, nec non vitæ functis perſolvendorum ratio, ex optimis quibuſque Romano præcipue, & antiquiori Benedictino depromptum*; and in (13) the *Ordo baptiſandi cum modo viſitandi juxta ritum ſanctæ Romanæ Eccleſiæ*, reprinted at Venice in 1575. I do not "know, whether the learned Author, who would not "take the trouble of quoting any of thoſe *rituals*, "pretended, that the doctrine of the Merit of good "Works has been and is ſtill taught in the Church "of Rome as an article, which every body is obliged "to believe. If this was his meaning, he will give "me leave to ſay that he is very much miſtaken. "The doctrine of the Merit of good Works, is a ſub-"ject, which belongs to the ſchool, and is a diſputa-"ble point; it has been denied by very famous Doc-"tors (14); and the Fathers of the Council of "Trent finding the Schoolmen were divided on this "ſubject, expreſſed their decree concerning it with ſo "much caution, that it condemns neither party (15).

(8) *Reponſe aux Queſtions d'un Provincial*, tom. 2. ch. 122. p. m. 576, &c.

(9) Hoſius, *Confeſſ. Fidei.* cap. 73. pag. 291.

(10) Idem, ibid. pag. 292.

(11) Calixtus *de Arte nova*, pag. 423, & *ſeq.*

(12) Ib. p. 435. See alſo the laſt part of the *Epitome Conf. Cathol.* of John Gherard. pag. 771.

(13) Calixt. ibid. pag. 427.

(14) This has been fully proved by George Calixtus, *ubi ſupra*, p. 290, &c. and in the *Epitome Confeſſ.* of John Gherard. *ubi ſupra*, pag. 766, & *ſeq.*

(15) *See* Calixtus, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 419, 420.

[D] *It (Chryſoſtom's Letter) was printed, but Mr. Bigot was obliged to ſuppreſs it.*] Here follow ſome reflections of Mr. Bayle upon this fact, which the reader will not be diſpleaſed to find. He informs us (16), that Dr. Boileau, brother to the famous Poet of that name, publiſhed a new edition of Ratramnus, or Bertram's treatiſe concerning the Body and Blood of our Saviour, and added ſome remarks to it, in order to ſhew that this Author was orthodox, that is, held no other opinions than thoſe of the Church of Rome. Now ſince our Author like Ratramnus may be explained in ſuch a manner, as to make him favour Tranſubſtantiation, the policy of the Paris Divines, who obliged Mr. Bigot to ſuppreſs St. Chryſoſtom's Letter, appears unintelligible; for it had been much better for them, to oblige Mr. Boileau, who diſcovers Tranſubſtantiation in Ratramnus, to find it alſo in that famous letter, rather than to diſcover in ſo public a manner, how much they dreaded the publication of that Letter.—Mr. Baillet intimates to us, that there are a great many Roman Catholicks, who think that *it would have been much better to publiſh that Letter fairly, with an explication of the ſtumbling-block, I mean, the difficult paſſage it contains, than to ſuppreſs it;*

(16) *Repub. des Lett.* 1686. Juin, pag. 682.

rical Preface (*b*), in which he proves with the clearest evidence, that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is so far from having been constantly believed in the Church, that it was not so much as an article of faith before the Council of Trent [*E*]. The same Gentleman, who sent Mr. Allix a copy of John of Paris's work, wrote a book, in which he proved, that the Roman Catholicks ought not to require of the Protestants a belief of Transubstantiation, as of an article of faith, and sent it to Mr. Allix, desiring him to have it printed in England, which was done accordingly (*i*). That work deserves that we should give a short account of it [*F*], though it was only published by our Author. In the year 1687 he published *Reflexions sur les cinq Livres de Moyse pour établir la Vérité de*

(*b*) Bayle, *Nouv. de la Rep. les Lett.* 1686. Oct. pag. 1226.

(*i*) Idem, ibid.

it; since that suppression is in a manner impossible, the passage in question having been published above a Century ago. He also observes, that *the Protestants exclaim against such a conduct, calling it a cheat and an imposture, and have even printed a Complaint in England, which some persons ascribe to Mr. Justel* (17). Here Mr. Baillet is mistaken, that Complaint, as we have said above, being written by Mr. Allix.

(17) Ibid. pag. 685, 686.

[*E*] *Transubstantiation . . . . was not so much as an article of faith, before the Council of Trent.*] This, says Mr. Bayle in the account he gives of Dr. Allix's Preface (18), is perhaps the greatest of all the absurdities, with which the doctrine of Transubstantiation abounds; for how can it be conceived, that a society, which boasts of having no other ground for her belief, but an uninterrupted series of doctrine drawn from the time of the Apostles down to the present, and which looks upon as a way that leads to error, whatever in the least deviates from this continued tradition, should yet have resolved towards the middle of the sixteenth Century, to propose a new article of faith? And if it be conceivable, that an assembly of grave Prelates should be bold enough to take such a resolution, how could they execute it? How could the whole body of the Church submit blindly to such an imposition, without perceiving, that the Council acted against their own principles? But after all, this will not appear very extraordinary to those, who have some knowledge of mankind. It would be a flat contradiction to affirm that man is a mere machine; yet it is certain that upon a thousand occasions, especially in matters of faith, men suffer themselves to be led as though they were mere mechanism. However that be, let us see what Mr. Allix offers in the Preface we have mentioned. He is so fully persuaded that every body will allow, that the ancient Church did not believe the whole substance of the bread and the wine in the Lord's Supper to be annihilated, that he contents himself with alledging the Letter of St. Chrysostom to Cæsarius, the first Dialogue of Theodoretus, and the book of Pope Gelasius *De duabus Naturis*. He afterwards treats of the three following points: 1. The success which attended the first Councils of Rome, in which Decrees were made concerning Transubstantiation under the Popes Nicholas II and Gregory VII. 2. The authority which Pope Innocent III had in this affair. 3. What had been taught by the Doctors of the Church since the affair of John of Paris. With regard to the first point, he examines the Formulary which the Popes Nicholas II and Gregory VII proposed to Berengarius in two Councils held at Rome, one in 1059, the other in 1078. Some persons have said, that Pope Gregory did not believe himself what he required of Berengarius. Mr. Allix does not insist upon this; but he quotes a manuscript in the Library of Lambeth; in which that Pope, after he had related several different opinions concerning the change of the bread and wine into the Body and Blood of our Saviour, leaves them all undetermined, and says expressly, that we have nothing clear and express concerning that substantial change or conversion. Yet he condemned Berengarius, who held it. Notwithstanding this decision of the Pope with regard to Berengarius, yet Mr. Allix shews by some direct passages from the famous Rupertus, who flourished a little after Pope Gregory VII, that at that time it was sufficient for a man to believe that the Body and Blood of Christ were in some manner present at the Altar, without being obliged to hold that the substance of the bread and wine were annihilated after consecration. With regard to the second point, Mr. Allix says, that Pope Innocent III being resolved to cut off the liberty which people took of explaining differently the *corporal* Presence of Jesus Christ, decreed in the Council of Lateran, held in 1215, that the bread was *transubstantiated* into the Body of our Lord. But as the Pope did not observe the ordinary forms, the Church did not receive his determination with the same submission, which she had for the Decrees of Councils. For even after his determination, several Divines maintained, that if an animal swallowed a consecrated host, it did not swallow the Body of Christ. Mr. Allix also shews, that the disputes which had risen concerning Christ's Presence at the sacrifice of the Altar, did still subsist even after Pope Innocent III's decision; whence it follows that his decision was not universally received. It is surprizing, says Mr. Bayle (19) that Mr. Allix, who knows so many other things, should have been able to gain such a prodigious knowledge of the Schoolmen. With regard to the third point, the Author quotes a great many passages, by which it appears, that the opinion of the *annihilation* of the bread and the wine in the Lord's Supper has been confuted or maintained, according as it was the fashion amongst the learned to do either. He also shews that neither the decisions of the Council of Constance against Wicliff, nor those of the Council of Florence did settle people's minds on this subject, nor were they able to do it, because their authority was reciprocally called in question by the Italians and the French; the latter refusing to acknowledge the Council of Florence for a general one, and the former scornfully stiling the Councils of Constance and Basil mere *Conciliabula*. Besides, it is not true that the Council of Florence determined the doctrine of Transubstantiation; it was Pope Eugenius, who decreed it in his Instruction to the Armenians dated November the 21st, 1438, four months after the breaking up of the Council. Hence it is, that the Schoolmen, who wrote since that time, establish Transubstantiation only upon Tradition, or upon the Decrees of the Council of Lateran. One would think, that at least since the Council of Trent the Roman Catholick Doctors ought to know where to fix; and yet even since that Council there have been some who maintained opinions very different from Transubstantiation: Mr. Allix refers us on this occasion to Forbes, who has quoted those Authors; and adds that F. Barnes has maintained in his books, that even at this time Transubstantiation was not an article of faith.

(18) *Rep. des Let.* Dec. 1686. p. 1417, &c.

(19) Ibid. pag. 1423.

[*F*] *That work deserves that we give a short account of it.*] The Author of that book was a very eminent man, but more illustrious still by his great learning, than by his rank: this is all we know of him, because, if he had been more particularly described, it would have served only to expose him to the fury of those, who employ all possible means to destroy such persons of their own party, as dare to acknowledge truth. He begins his book with observing, that the Assembly of the French Clergy held at Paris in 1682, having directed a pastoral Letter to the Protestants, desiring them to return into the pale of the Church, laid it down as a maxim, that *the true method to know, whether any doctrine belonged to the faith or not, was to examine, whether such a doctrine had constantly been believed as an article of faith.* He adds, that this maxim has been delivered to us by Vincentius Lirinensis above eleven hundred years ago, and had been inserted as a fundamental principle by Pope Pius IV in the profession of faith, which he caused to be added to the Council of Trent, and in which he requires every Doctor to swear, *that he will explain the holy Scripture only according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. This maxim*, continues the Author, *has been received as a rule of faith by the reformed Church of England*, and by several Protestants, whom he names, and whose authorities Gesselius has quoted

de la Religion Chrêtienne; that is, "Reflections upon the five Books of Moſes, to eſtabliſh "the truth of the Chriſtian Religion." London 1687, 8vo. Two years after he publiſhed the ſecond volume with this title: *Reflexions ſur les Livres de l'Ecriture ſainte, pour établir la verité de la Religion Chrêtienne*; that is, "Reflections upon the Books of the ho- "ly Scripture, to eſtabliſh the truth of the Chriſtian Religion." Tom. II. Amſterdam, 1689, 8vo. We ſhall give ſome account of this Work in the note [G]. After the Revolution his merit began to be rewarded; for through the intereſt of Biſhop Burnet Mr. Allix was in the year 1690 choſen Canon and Treaſurer of Saliſbury, whither he went then to reſide. About that time the two Univerſities conferred upon him the Degree of Doctor of Divinity *ad honores*, and the whole Clergy of England entreated him to write a general Hiſtory of the Councils. The Parliament was likewiſe ſo well perſuaded of his abilities for ſuch a taſk, that this auguſt Aſſembly voted, that all the papers neceſſary for the printing of that Hiſtory might be brought over from Holland free from all duty. Yet this great undertaking

in the Preface to his Hiſtory of the memorable things which happened from the creation of the world to the year 1125. From all this the Author concludes, that the true way to know, whether Tranſubſtantiation be an article of faith, is not to ſhew, that the Council of Trent decided it, and that of Lateran ſuppoſed it; but that it is *contained in the Scriptures, and underſtood in that ſenſe by the unanimous conſent of all the Doctors and Councils that went before us*. He then tells us his only deſign is, 1. To enquire who are thoſe Catholick Doctors, who believed that the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is not ancient. 2. To examine whether what theſe Doctors have written be true, and whether we can really produce ſufficient authorities for this aſſertion, viz. *that the Ancients did not believe Tranſubſtantiation*. With regard to the firſt of theſe heads, he proves by the confeſſion of Suarez, Peter Lombard, Scotus, the Cardinals d'Ailli, and Cuſanus, of Eraſmus, Alfonſus de Caſtro, Tonſtal Biſhop of Durham, Caſſander, Charles du Moulin, John Vribarne, and Mr. de Marca, that the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation has been neither univerſally nor conſtantly received in the Church. But leſt people ſhould think that all theſe great men were miſtaken in what they confeſſed, the Author proceeds to the ſecond head of his diviſion; and obſerves firſt, that there are ſeveral Doctors of his Communion, who are agreed that the holy Scripture does not contain clearly that doctrine; ſecondly, that neither the Jews nor the Heathens, who made ſo many objections againſt the Chriſtian Myſteries, ever made any againſt the ſhocking difficulties, with which the doctrine of Tranſubſtantiation is ſurrounded. He then examines what has been the opinion of every Century upon this ſubject, and he finds every where very ſtrong proofs againſt Tranſubſtantiation. It was not difficult for him to collect paſſages upon this ſubject; he found the taſk already performed by the Proteſtant writers; but he does not employ theſe paſſages exactly to the ſame purpoſe as they do; he contents himſelf with ſhewing, by ſhort obſervations, that the bread ſtill ſubſiſts after conſecration. He does not attack the doctrine of Chriſt's real preſence in the Sacrament, nor does he entangle himſelf in the wild labyrinths of this intricate diſpute. He concludes his book by an humble addreſs to the Biſhops, *not to tire to the utmoſt the patience of the poor Proteſtants, who in order to obey the King's commands have already yielded beyond what their conſcience could allow, but will by no means reſolve to make a particular profeſſion of Tranſubſtantiation, ſince it appears they oppoſe it conſcientiouſly, as being contrary to the very rule, which has been propoſed to them by the Biſhops*. Some perſons, who will hardly believe this to be the language of a Roman Catholick, will be apt to think, that the manuſcript has been altered before it was ſent to the preſs. But the Editors aſſure us in the Preface, that they have exactly followed the Author's manuſcript, as they can prove it not only by his letters which they have, but alſo by the original itſelf, which he ſent to one of his friends to have it printed (20). The title of the book is as follows. *Traité d'un Auteur de la Communion Romaine, touchant la Tranſubſtantiation, ou il fait voir, que ſelon les Principes de ſon Egliſe, ce dogme ne peut être un Article de Foy*. That is, "A Treatiſe written by the Author of "the Roman Catholick Religion, wherein he ſhews, "that according to the principles of his Church, that "doctrine cannot be an Article of Faith." London, 1686, in 12mo.

(20) Bayle, *Repub. des Lett.* 1687. Fevrier, pag. 121, &c.

[G] *Some account of his reflections &c.*] It would be too prolix to give a juſt abſtract of theſe two volumes; and therefore we ſhall only mention a few obſervations, which will render the reader capable of judging of Dr. Allix's performance. He undertakes firſt to prove the truth of the facts related in the five Books of Moſes, for which purpoſe he makes ſeveral very good obſervations upon the character of Moſes, to ſhew that he deſerves to be credited. And as it may be aſked, how Moſes came to know theſe facts, which happened long before he was born, the Author has not recourſe to an immediate revelation, but ſhews that the memory of thoſe facts may very well have been preſerved by an unqueſtionable tradition; I ſay unqueſtionable, becauſe it had paſſed through ſo few hands that it could not have been altered nor corrupted. And indeed, we find that the Books of Geneſis and Exodus are written in a very different manner. In the latter Moſes often uſes this expreſſion, *the Lord ſaid to me*, and he mentions the time when, and place where, God ſpoke to him; but he uſes no ſuch phraſes in Geneſis: and beſides, he is very ſhort upon what paſſed long before his time, the Hiſtory of 156 years taking up only eight chapters; whereas he is more prolix, when he ſpeaks of later events, and for that reaſon better known; which ſhews that he followed tradition, tho' under the direction of the Holy Ghoſt (21). Another deſign of Dr. Allix in his Reflections, is to ſhew that the Meſſiah was known and promiſed in all the ages of the Church. To prove this, he obſerves, that moſt of the actions mentioned in the Scriptures relate to the Meſſiah. It was with a view to the Meſſiah, that Eve ſaid, when ſhe brought forth Cain, *I have gotten a man from the Lord* (22), and Cain thinking the promiſe of the bleſſed ſeed muſt relate to him, and ſeeing that his brother Abel was a Prieſt of the Lord, killed him, becauſe he could not bear that another ſhould come and trouble him in the poſſeſſion he enjoyed, as applying to himſelf the firſt oracle and promiſe of God. Lamech indulged himſelf in polygamy for the ſame reaſon, thinking that by multiplying his poſterity he ſhould ſooner ſee the Meſſiah born. Ham laughed at his father, becauſe he ſaw that the good old man not being able to beget any more children, was thereby uncapable of contributing towards the accompliſhment of the Prophecy, and the coming of the Meſſiah; and Noah curſed him in ſo terrible a manner, only becauſe his raillery was an impiety againſt God himſelf. Eſau's crime conſiſted in this, that by ſelling his birth-right, he thereby deprived himſelf of the right he had, of ſeeing the Meſſiah ariſe from his poſterity; &c. If this manner of reaſoning, ſays the Author of the *Repub. des Lettres* (23), ſurprizes the reader, he muſt ſuſpend his judgment till he has read the Book itſelf, in which it is found; and indeed Dr. Allix places his proofs in ſuch a light, that if he does not convince his reader of the truth of his obſervations, yet he gives him a ſtrong idea of his ability, ſkill and learning. The ſecond volume of theſe Reflections, which is upon the reſt of the books of the Old Teſtament, and thoſe of the New, is written with as much if not more judgment and ſtrength of reaſoning. We ſhall only obſerve, that it were to be wiſhed, it had been printed under the Author's eye, who would certainly have corrected a few inadvertencies, which dropt from his pen, and ſometimes weaken the force of his arguments, and leſſen the beauty of his Reflections (24).

(21) *Rep. des Lett.* 1687. Avril, 415, 416.

(22) Gen. iv. 1.

(23) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 427.

(24) De Beauval, *Hiſt. des Ouv. des Savans*, 1688, Decemb. p. 372.

undertaking proved abortive [*H*]. Dr. Allix was beloved and eſteemed by all the learned men of his time. He had a great many friends, with ſome of whom he kept a conſtant correſpondence. He was extremely zealous for the intereſt of the Proteſtant Religion, and always ready to maintain its cauſe againſt the attacks of the Roman Catholicks. He had a ſtrong deſire to unite all the Proteſtants, and eſpecially the Lutherans with the Calviniſts, and frequently conſulted upon that ſubject with the Miniſters of Geneva, Holland, and Berlin. He was deeply ſkilled in almoſt every ſcience; his ſermons were very rational, and for that reaſon he had always a numerous audience. He underſtood very well the Hebrew, Syriac and Chaldaic Tongues; and being a man of extenſive reading and an excellent memory, he was in a manner a living library, and his converſation was as agreeable as inſtructive. This great man died after a lingring illneſs in Charter-houſe Square February the

[*H*] *This great undertaking miſcarried.*] The Hiſtory was to contain ſeven volumes in *folio*, but the Bookſeller would not undertake the printing of them, till there were eight hundred books ſubſcribed for; and his not being able to procure ſo many ſubſcriptions, was the reaſon why the work was dropt. We do not hear, whether Dr. Allix left any manuſcripts or any materials for that work behind him, tho' in all probability he muſt have had a great many ready, before he could take upon him ſo arduous a work.

[*I*] *A catalogue of his works ſince the Revolution with ſome remarks upon them.*] We ſhall obſerve firſt, that immediately before the Revolution he wrote ſome pieces againſt Popery, as, *A Diſcourſe concerning Penance; ſhewing how the doctrine of it in the Church of Rome makes void true repentance*, 4to, 1688. *An hiſtorical Diſcourſe concerning the neceſſity of the Miniſter's intention in adminiſtring the Sacraments*, London, 4to, 1688. *A Preparation for the Lord's Supper*, 1688. He wrote alſo ſome other pieces, but what they were we could not be informed of. After the Revolution he publiſhed ſome treatiſes in defence of the titles of King William and Queen Mary, and alſo to induce the people to take the oaths; as for inſtance, *An examination of the ſcruples of thoſe, who refuſe to take the oath of allegiance*, London, 4to, 1689, and ſome others, the titles whereof we could not learn. In 1690 he publiſhed *Some Remarks upon the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the ancient Churches of Piedmont*, London, 4to. The occaſion of his writing theſe Remarks was as follows: Biſhop Boſſuet in his *Hiſtory of the Variations of the Proteſtant Churches*, had employed the eleventh book of that Hiſtory in diſgracing the character of the Albigenſes and Valdenſes, by accuſing them of having been Manichees, in order to deprive the Proteſtants of the uſe they make of theſe people's teſtimony againſt the Roman Catholicks. Dr. Allix thought it his duty to call that celebrated Author to an account, and to lay his diſingenuity and inſincerity open to the Publick. He does not undertake to write a compleat Hiſtory of the Churches of Piedmont, this having already been abundantly done by ſeveral learned men; but he undertakes to ſhew that theſe Churches are really ancient, and that they have kept themſelves free from all ſubjection to the See of Rome even from their firſt eſtabliſhment, which they carry as high as the time of the Apoſtles. Dr. Allix therefore ſhews that there was a conſtant ſucceſſion not only of the true Chriſtian doctrines, but alſo of the miniſtry in theſe Churches from the time of the Apoſtles to the thirteenth Century, when they became ſo famous by oppoſing bravely the errors and corruptions of the Church of Rome. By this means he thinks he is able to anſwer the queſtion of thoſe, who require the Proteſtants to ſhew them a Church, in which their opinions were held before Luther, or at leaſt before the twelfth Century. The anſwer will be eaſy, that there was ſuch a Church in Piedmont, as Dr. Allix ſhews at large in this book, a curious account of which may be read in the work referred to in the margin (25). Two years after he publiſhed *Remarks upon the Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the ancient Churches of the Albigenſes*, London, 1692, 4to. This book he wrote firſt in French, and had it afterwards tranſlated into Engliſh. The Albigenſes were ſituated in *Gallia Narbonenſi*, and in *Aquitania*, and Dr. Allix defends theſe Churches with as much zeal, judgment, and ſtrength of reaſon as he has done thoſe of Piedmont. This book as well as the laſt mentioned is full of curious hiſtorical facts, the choice of which ſhews the Author's good ſenſe, as the copiouſneſs of them is a proof of his extenſive reading; ſee the book mentioned in the margin (26). In 1695 he publiſhed *Animadverſions on Mr. Hill's Book, entitled, A Vindication of the primitive Fathers againſt the Imputations of Gilbert, Lord Biſhop of Sarum.* And ſome time after appeared in print another book of his, intitled, *A Vindication of the Fathers &c. being an Anſwer to a Book intitled, The Judgment of the Fathers concerning the Doctrine of the Trinity, oppoſed to Dr. G. Bull's Defence of the Nicene Faith.* The Author of the Book, which Dr. Allix undertook to anſwer, maintained that Juſtin the Martyr, who lived but an hundred and forty years after Chriſt, is the firſt Author of the opinion of our Saviour's Divinity, and conſequently of the doctrine of the Trinity. To ſupport this notion, he aſſerted, 1. That ſince the Jews have maintained that the Meſſiah was to be but a mere man, as appears by Juſtin's Dialogue againſt the Jew Tryphon, it follows neceſſarily from thence, that the Jewiſh Authors, quoted by Dr. Bull againſt the opinion of the Socinians, muſt have lived after the Goſpel was publiſhed. 2. That the Books of the Jews quoted againſt the Socinians, are nothing but pious frauds of ſome diſguiſed Chriſtians, who lived after Juſtin the Martyr, and this he believes is particularly true with regard to the Books of Philo Judæus, and the Book of Wiſdom. 3. That ſince the Jews could not ſpeak of the doctrine of the Trinity, nor of the Divinity of the Meſſiah, of which they had not the leaſt notion, it follows that whatever ſeems to favour theſe doctrines in their Books, muſt have been inſerted therein by ſome Chriſtians, who lived after Juſtin Martyr. 4. Laſtly, that if there be found either in the Scripture or in the writings of the ancient Jews, ſomething which favours thoſe doctrines, it comes probably from the Platoniſts, from whom the Jews and the Chriſtians have borrowed many ideas, which they have mingled with the Chriſtian doctrines, in order to draw the Heathens more eaſily to embrace the Goſpel (27). Theſe were the opinions, which Dr. Allix undertook to confute in his *Vindication of the Fathers*, and more fully ſtill, in his *Judgment of the ancient Jewiſh Church, againſt the Unitarians, in the controverſy upon the Holy Trinity, and the Divinity of our Bleſſed Saviour*, London, 8vo, 1699. In this treatiſe he endeavours to prove, that the ancient Jewiſh Church had in the main the ſame notions of the Trinity, and the Divinity of our Saviour, with the Chriſtian Church; tho' the notions of the former were leſs clear and diſtinct, than thoſe of the latter. The reader will expect perhaps, that this ſhould be proved by expreſs paſſages from the Old Teſtament; but this is not the method our Author choſe to follow. He ſays, that the notions of the ancient Jewiſh Church are to be look'd for in thoſe books, which are called Apocryphal, in the works of Philo, and in the Chaldaic Paraphraſes of the Old Teſtament. Theſe are the oldeſt and moſt certain Records of the ancient Traditions of the Jews. And if they be as old and as genuine as Dr. Allix pretends, it cannot be doubted, but they will be of great uſe to acquaint us with the opinions of the ancient Synagogue. Our Author therefore firſt endeavours to prove the antiquity and genuineneſs of theſe Books, and then to give us the ſenſe contained in them concerning the matter in diſpute (28). This work was ſoon after violently attacked in a Book intitled, *The Doctrine of the Holy Trinity, and the manner of our Saviour's Divinity, as they are held in the Catholick Church, and the Church of England; with a diſcuſſion of two late famous Books on thoſe ſubjects*, the Judgment of the Jewiſh Church, *by Dr. P. A. and* Bilibra, *by Guil. Vorſtius. To which is added, an account of the Opinions and Books of Philo Judæus: more eſpecially concerning the Λογος or Word. In ſeveral letters to a Peer. By Stephen Nye,*

(25) *Acta Eruditor. anni* 1691. *Menſ. Junii*, p. 254, &c.

(26) Ibid. *ann.* 1693, *Menſ. April.* pag. 169, &c.

(27) *Nouvell. de la Rep. des Lett.* 1699, Nov. pag. 519, 520.

(28) Ibid. pag. 520, &c. and Decemb. 693, &c.

the 20th 1717, being then about 76 years old, and was buried in St. Sepulchre's Church near Newgate. We ſhall give hereunder a catalogue of his Works ſince the Revolution, with ſome remarks upon them [*I*]. He left behind him a widow and five children, three ſons and two daughters. His eldeſt ſon is the preſent worthy Dean of Ely, Dr. Peter Allix, who having firſt been educated in the Charter-houſe, went to ſtudy at Cambridge, where he took the degree of Doctor of Divinity. He was afterwards one of the King's Chaplains in ordinary, and married Mrs. Parker ſiſter to the Honourable Sir Charles Wager. The materials for the greateſt part of this article have been communicated to us, which is the reaſon that we do not quote any printed book, for the facts we mention, except when we relate any thing that is not in the memoirs, which have been ſent to us.

(29) *Hiſtoire des Ouv. des Savans*, 1699, Avril, p. 147, &c. *Repub. des Lettr.* 1701, Decemb. p. 625, &c.

Rector of Hormead. London, 1701, 8vo. Mr. Nye treats Dr. Allix in a very ſevere manner, but ſays in his defence, that the Doctor had attack'd him firſt, and had aſcribed to him ſome books, which he did not write, and which contain opinions very different from his own. He charges Dr. Allix with being a Tritheiſt, becauſe he ſometimes ſpeaks of God in the plural number, and ſays, that the three Divine Perſons are three Beings, three uncreated Spirits. But if Dr. Allix's notion be Tritheiſtical, I do not know what to make of Mr. Nye's notions, except they be Sabellian. For if the three Perſons be but three diſtinctions, an eternal Spirit, a divine Self-knowledge begotten by that Spirit, and a divine Self-complacence, which neceſſarily proceeds from both, and not three Beings, it muſt be the ſame Being conſidered under different names, and in different circumſtances, which I think, is mere Sabellianiſm. How to find a medium between one Being only and three Beings, is a very difficult point; *hic labor hoc opus eſt.* Mr. Nye afterwards endeavours to ſhew that the Jews had not theſe notions, which Dr. Allix aſcribes to them, and that the authorities he quotes, are for the moſt part of no weight at all. Thoſe who are inclined to know more of that diſpute, may conſult their Books or the Authors we refer to in the margin (29). In 1701 Dr. Allix publiſhed *The Book of Pſalms, with the Argument of each Pſalm, and a Preface giving ſome general rules for the interpretation of this ſacred Book*, London, 1701. The Author gives to moſt of the Pſalms a ſenſe very different from that, which had been put upon them before; he finds prophecies every where, and exclaims againſt thoſe, who are for admitting a double ſenſe, that is, a literal and a myſtical one (30). The ſame year he publiſhed his treatiſe *De Meſſiæ duplici Adventu Diſſertationes duæ adverſus Judæos.* That is, "Of "the twofold Coming of Chriſt in two Diſſertations "againſt the Jews." It was the reſult of a diſpute he had with a learned Rabbi (31). The next year he printed with his Annotations, *Nectarii Patriarchæ Hieroſolymitani Confutatio Imperii Papæ in Eccleſiam.* That is, "A Refutation of the Pope's Empire over the "Church, by Nectarius, Patriarch of Conſtantino-"ple." Tranſlated out of Greek into Latin by Dr. Allix. In 1707 he publiſhed *Diſſertatio de Jeſu Chriſti Domini noſtri anno & menſe natali*, Lond. That is, "A Diſſertation concerning the month and year in "which our Lord Jeſus Chriſt was born." The ſame year he wrote two treatiſes, the firſt, *A Confutation of the hopes of the Jews concerning the laſt Redemption*; the ſecond, *An Anſwer to Mr. Whiſton's late treatiſe on the Revelations, being an examination of the ſeveral Scripture Prophecies, which he has applied to the times after the coming of the Meſſiah.* London, 1707. He alſo wrote ſeveral ſmall pieces againſt Mr. Whiſton's Arian Notions, and ſomething alſo againſt Mr. Dodwell, but we do not know the titles of theſe pieces. Perhaps he publiſhed ſome others, to which he did not put his name; which is the reaſon why we cannot at preſent give any account of them. P.

(30) *Rep. des Let.* 1701. Decemb. p. 688.

(31) Ibid. Sept. pag. 348.

☞AREUS ſon of Acrotatus, and grandſon of Cleomenes, ſucceeded the latter [*A*] in the Kingdom of Lacedæmon about the fourth year of the 117th Olympiad (*a*). His uncle Cleonymus diſputed the crown with him, but the Elders of the people, who, according to Polybius (*b*), had a great ſhare in the Government, preferred Areus before his uncle, at which the latter was ſo exaſperated, that notwithſtanding all the honours conferred upon him by his countrymen [*B*], he kept his reſentment, and was reſolved to be revenged. However, a great many years paſſed before he could accompliſh his deſign. At laſt the ſame year that Pyrrhus had made himſelf maſter of Macedonia, Cleonymus prevail'd with him to attack the Lacedæmonians [*C*]; and accordingly the next year, which was the 481ſt from the building of Rome (*c*), Pyrrhus marched againſt Lacedæmon (*d*). Areus was then abſent, being gone into the Iſland of Crete to the aſſiſtance of the Gortynians.

(*a*) According to Petav. *Rat. Temp.* tom. 1. pag. 1. lib. 4. cap. 3. pag. 127. The 4th year of the 117th Olympiad, is the 308th before Chriſt.

(*b*) *Hiſt.* lib. 6. cap. 43. p. 681, edit. Gronovii.

(*c*) 272 before Chriſt.

(*d*) Pauſan. *in Att.* pag. 23, 24. and *in Lacon.* p. 168, 169.

[*A*] *Areus ſucceeded his grandfather.*] Cleomenes had two ſons, Acrotatus, who was the eldeſt, and Cleonymus. Acrotatus dying before his father, there happened upon Cleomenes's death a conteſt between Areus the ſon of Acrotatus, and Cleonymus, both pretending to the Crown (1). Cleonymus was of a very proud and haughty temper, which rendered him very odious and ſuſpected to his fellow-citizens (2); this was probably the reaſon why the Lacedæmonians preferred his nephew before him.

(1) Pauſanias, *in Lacon.* p. m. 168.

(2) Plutarch. *in Pyrrho, Oper.* tom. 1. p. m. 400.

[*B*] *The honours conferred upon him by his countrymen.*] The Lacedæmonians to pacify him decreed ſeveral honours to him, and made him General of their Armies (3). He was ſent into Italy to aſſiſt the people of Tarentum againſt the Romans and the Lucani (4); and gained a victory over the latter. Thoſe of Tarentum having afterwards revolted againſt the Lacedæmonians, Cleonymus took their city in the ſecond year of the 119th Olympiad, the 451ſt of the building of Rome (5). The next year he came again into Italy with a fleet, and took the city of Thuriæ belonging to the Salentines, a people inhabiting part of Calabria: but he was ſoon obliged to leave it, and to retire to his veſſels, having been vanquiſhed by the Conſul C. Æmilius Paulus, whom the Romans ſent againſt him. Livy, who tells us this (6), adds, that he found in ſome Annals, that Junius Bubulcus the Dictator was ſent to aſſiſt the Salentines, and that Cleonymus had left Italy, before he could be obliged to fight againſt the Romans. However that be, the ſame Author tells us, that Cleonymus, whom he erroneouſly calls King, having for ſome time infeſted the Coaſt of Italy, was at laſt obliged to retire after a great loſs, having ſcarce the fifth part of his fleet left, and meeting with ill ſucceſs in all his undertakings on the coaſt of the Hadriatick Sea.

(3) Pauſanias, *ubi ſupra.*

(4) A people that inhabited part of Italy between the rivers Laus and Sybaris, now called *Laino* and *Cochilo*, in Calabria, a Province of the Kingdom of Naples.

(5) Diodor. Sic. lib. 20. *apud* Petav. *Rat. Temp.* tom. 1. pag. 1. lib. 4. cap. 3. p. m. 127.

(6) Lib. x. cap. 2. p. m. 234, 235.

[*C*] *Cleonymus prevailed with him* [*Pyrrhus*] *to attack the Lacedæmonians.*] The raiſing Areus to the throne was not the only cauſe of Cleonymus's reſentment; there was another cauſe, which exaſperated him ſtill more, particularly againſt the family of the King. The caſe, as related by Plutarch (7), is as follows. Cleonymus being already pretty much advanced in years, had married Chelidonis, a young and beautiful Lady, of Royal Blood. She fell in love with Acrotatus Areus's ſon, a very handſome youth, who was not ſo inſenſible, as to reject the Lady's addreſſes. Cleonymus was ſo much the more grieved at his wife's infidelity, as he had a very great love for her. It was this domeſtick ſorrow, together with the injury he thought was done him, when Areus was preferred before him, that at laſt obliged him to raiſe a powerful army againſt his own country.

(7) *In Pyrrho, Oper.* tom. 1. p. m. 401.

Gortynians (*e*). His abſence did in a manner ſave the city, becauſe Pyrrhus, thinking he ſhould not meet with much reſiſtance, did not at firſt attack it very briſkly, nor immediately upon his arrival, for fear that if he ſhould take it by ſtorm, his ſoldiers would entirely plunder and deſtroy it; upon which account he contented himſelf with pitching his camp round it. Cleonymus's friends at Lacedæmon did ſo little doubt of his ſucceſs, that they adorned his houſe, expecting that Pyrrhus would ſup there that very night. But they were extremely diſappointed in their hopes, when they ſaw the preparations made for a vigorous defence, the very women exerting themſelves to defend the city [*D*]. Acrotatus, Areus's ſon, gained a great reputation by his bravery and conduct on this occaſion [*E*]; and Areus arriving ſoon after from Crete with two thouſand men, Pyrrhus was at laſt obliged to raiſe the ſiege (*f*). Some time after [*F*] Areus accompanied with a body of volunteers went to aſſiſt the Athenians, who were warmly beſieged by Antigonus Gonatas King of Macedonia. Patroclus was alſo arrived from Egypt with a fleet to force Antigonus to raiſe the ſiege; but that King had ſo cloſely beſieged the city, and was ſo well fortified, that it was impoſſible for Areus and Patroclus to enter Athens, or to drive the Macedonians away. Patroclus adviſed Areus to engage in battle againſt the enemy, whilſt he ſhould attack them from another quarter; the Lacedæmonians were very ready to fight, not only on account of their ancient friendſhip and alliance with the Athenians, but alſo becauſe they flattered themſelves that they ſhould gain a great reputation and glory by that action, tho' they were to periſh in the attempt. But Areus finding that their ammunition was almoſt ſpent, declin'd the engagement, and return'd home with his troops, juſtly thinking it was more prudent to keep them for the defence of their own country, than to hazard their lives for the relief of their allies, when there was but little hopes of ſucceſs; for he could not much depend upon the troops which Patroclus had brought with him, becauſe they being for the moſt part ſeamen and Egyptians were not very proper for a land-fight (*g*). Areus having reigned about forty four years (*h*), was killed in an engagement near Corinth. His ſon Acrotatus ſucceeded him, who having been vanquiſhed in a battle by Ariſtodemus near Megalopolis, died there, leaving his wife pregnant. She was ſoon after delivered of a ſon, who was called Areus, as well as his grandfather, and choſen King under the guardianſhip of Leonidas, the ſon of Cleonymus. This young King dying of ſickneſs when he was but eight years old, Leonidas his guardian ſucceeded him (*i*). We muſt not omit to obſerve, that according to Joſephus, Areus the elder wrote a letter to Onias the High-Prieſt of the Jews [*G*].

AUDLEY

(*e*) Gortyna was an ancient city in the Iſland of Crete, but now entirely ruined.

(*f*) Plutarch. *in Pyrrho, Oper.* tom. 1. p. 401--403.

(*g*) Pauſan. *in Lacon.* p. m. 169.

(*h*) Petav. *Rat. Temp.* tom. 3. p m. 37.

(*i*) Plutarch. *in Agide & Cleom. Oper.* tom. 1. p. m. 796, 797.

[*D*] *The very women exerted themſelves in defence of the city.*] The Lacedæmonians reſolved at firſt, to ſend all the women into the Iſland of Crete; but they themſelves bravely oppoſed it. Archidamia, the grandmother of the famous King Agis, went into the Senate with a drawn ſword in her hand; and there, in the name of all the women, ſeverely upbraided the Senators with the ill opinion they had of them, becauſe they imagin'd, that they could enjoy any ſatisfaction from life after the overthrow of their country. This courage and bravery of the Ladies, made the Senators alter their intention; they reſolved to ſtand the ſiege; and in the night-time, the matrons and the virgins of the city, together with the old men, went to work, and made a ditch of ſix cubits in breadth, four in depth, and of about 1440 feet in length. The women themſelves made about the third part of that ditch. Whilſt they were thus labouring to put the city in a condition to be defended, they ordered the young men, and all thoſe that were able to bear arms, to go to reſt, that they might be capable to fight the next day. At break of day, they furniſhed the young men with arms, and exhorted them to exert themſelves with reſolution. In the mean time Chelidonis, the wife of Cleonymus, retired to a private place, and put a rope round her neck in order to ſtrangle herſelf in caſe the city was taken, rather than to fall into the hands of her huſband (8).

(8) Plutarch. ib. pag. 401, 402.

[*E*] *Acrotatus acquired a great reputation by his bravery and conduct on this occaſion.*] Ptolemy, Pyrrhus's ſon, had found means to approach the city with about two thouſand men, nay even to enter it, according to Juſtin (9); which Acrotatus perceiving, he went directly with three hundred men, who being encouraged by the cries of the old men and of the women, who were ſpectators of the battle, fought with ſo much courage, that they drove the enemy back, Ptolemy having been killed in the fight. Acrotatus, now victorious and triumphant, ſeemed, tho' covered with blood and duſt, more beautiful ſtill to the Lacedæmonians, who extolled Chelidonis's happineſs, for having ſuch a lover. A numerous troop of old men followed him, crying, "Go, Acrotatus, run into the arms of Chelido-"nis; nothing but a brave iſſue can ariſe from thy em-"braces for the ſervice of Sparta." The Greek paſſage in Plutarch is as follows, Ὦχται, Ἀκρότατε, καὶ δίφρε τὴν Χελιδόνιδα; μόνον παῖδας ἀγαθὰς τὰ Σπάρτα ποίει (10). The love of Chelidonis for Acrotatus would afford a man of Mr. Bayle's genius, a variety of entertaining reflections. We ſhall only obſerve two things: 1. It is not only in this Age that cowards are deſpiſed, and brave and valiant men eſteemed by the Ladies; Chelidonis's love for Acrotatus is a very ancient inſtance of that diſpoſition in the fair ſex. 2. Gallantry even in a married woman, however criminal it may be in itſelf, yet it did not appear ſo to the ancient Lacedæmonians, ſince they did not condemn Chelidonis's love for Acrotatus, but even encouraged him to the moſt familiar converſation with his dear miſtreſs, who did not ſeem to be aſhamed of her intrigues with him, imagining perhaps, that the old age and coldneſs of her huſband was a ſufficient excuſe for her conduct. Whether this polite and refined Age affords any women of her taſte and temper, is not proper for us to determine.

(10) Plutarch. *ubi ſupra*, pag. 402.

[*F*] *Some time after &c.*] It appears from Juſtin (11), that Antigonus did not beſiege Athens till after the death of Pyrrhus, that is, according to Archbiſhop Uſher (12), between the years of the Julian Period 4442, and 4450, that is, between the years 272 and 264 before the Chriſtian Æra. Thoſe therefore, who think that the naval victory, which Joſephus ſays (13) Demetrius gained over Antigonus, was won when the latter beſieged Athens, muſt be miſtaken, according to Uſher (14), who perhaps is himſelf miſtaken in taking for granted, what Joſephus relates concerning the ſeventy two Tranſlators of the Bible.

(11) Lib. 26. cap. 1, 2.

(12) *Annal. ad Ann. Per. Jul.* 4437, p. m. 268.

(13) *Antiquit.* lib. 12. cap. 2.

(14) *Ubi ſupra.*

[*G*] *Areus wrote a letter to Onias, the High-Prieſt of the Jews.*] Moreri ſays quite the contrary. "Onias, "the High-Prieſt of the Jews, *ſays he*, wrote a letter "to Areus;" and yet he quotes *Joſephus, Ant. Lib. xii* (15), where we find that letter, which is as follows. "Areus King of Lacedæmon, to Onias, greet-"ing. We have found by certain Regiſters, that the "Jews and the Lacedæmonians have the ſame origin, "being all deſcended from Abraham. Since there-"fore we are all brethren, and ought to have the ſame "intereſt, it is reaſonable, that you ſhould freely "make us know, what you deſire of us, and that we "ſhould

(15) Cap. 5.

☞AUDLEY (Sir THOMAS), deſcended from an ancient and illuſtrious family [*A*], applied himſelf to the Law, in which he made a conſiderable progreſs, and was made Serjeant at Law in the twelfth year of King Henry VIII's reign (*a*). "His reading upon the Statute "of Privileges commended him to the King's ſervice; his ſpeaking for the Prerogative in "Parliament brought him to the King's favour..... His Stewardſhip to the Duchy of "Suffolk raiſed him to the Attorneyſhip of that of Lancaſter (*b*). . . . In the black Parliament he was a Member by his own intereſt, and Speaker by the King's choice. Sir "Thomas Moor was to ſerve the Crown in the Lord's Houſe, and Sir Thomas Audley "was to ſucceed him in the Houſe of Commons. When the Abbey Lands were beſtowed "upon the King in groſs, and returned by him to the leading Lords and Commons in "retail, moſt of that Parliament looked for ſhares," and Sir Thomas's was none of the leaſt (*c*). When Sir Thomas Moor reſigned the Seals, May the 16th 1532, the King gave them to Audley, with the title only of Lord Keeper, till he was made Lord Chancellor the 26th of September following, according to Mr. de Rapin (*d*), who having conſulted Rymer's Fœdera, which he quotes *, is more to be depended upon than the Author of the Lives of the Lords Chancellors, who ſays (*e*), that the Seals were delivered to Audley the 6th of September in the 24th year of Henry VIII's reign; that is, in 1533, and that the 26th of January following he was made Lord Chancellor of England. David Lloyd muſt alſo be miſtaken, when he ſays (*f*), that Audley was not made Chancellor till after the death of Sir Thomas Moor. When that great man was called to an account and tried for his life, Sir Thomas Audley was one of thoſe commiſſioned to try him, and pronounced ſentence of death upon him (*g*). He was actually Speaker of the Houſe of Commons when the Great Seal was firſt delivered into his cuſtody; and while he was in that ſtation in the Seſſion of Parliament held in 1529, the Commons being very intent upon reforming divers abuſes in the Church, the Biſhops were much concerned at their proceedings, and eſpecially Fiſher Biſhop of Rocheſter, who ſaid in the Houſe of Lords, *You ſee what Bills come daily from the Commons, all tending to the deſtruction of the Church. For God's ſake conſider what the Realm of Bohemia was, that the glory of it fell with the Church; the Commons cried nothing now, but down with the Church, and all this ſeemed to come to paſs for want of faith.* The Commons were exaſperated at this, and deputed Audley their Speaker, with thirty of their Members, to wait on the King, complaining, "What a diſhonour "it was to his Majeſty, and the whole Kingdom, that they, who were choſen for the wiſeſt "men of all the Counties of England, ſhould be charged with want of faith; and that it "implied as much as if they were Infidels and no Chriſtians; and therefore they entreated "the King by the mouth of the Speaker, to call the Biſhop of Rocheſter to an account, "for what he had ſaid." The Biſhop excuſed himſelf as well as he could, by urging, that he meant that what the Bohemians did was done for want of faith; with which the Commons were not ſatisfied, and perhaps this had an influence afterwards upon that learned Prelate's fate (*b*). When Audley was made Lord Keeper the King knighted him, and afterwards created him Baron Audley, of Audley in Eſſex (*i*). "The King, ſays Mr. "Lloyd (*k*), might very well truſt him (Audley) with his conſcience, when he truſted "the King with his, owning no Doctrine but what was eſtabliſhed, ever judging the "Church and State wiſer than himſelf." He was one of the Lords who conducted Queen Anne Bullen to the Tower, "but he would not condemn her, rather eſcaping than refuſing "unwelcome employments, wherein he muſt either diſpleaſe his Maſter or himſelf. He "was *tender* but not *wilful*, waving ſuch ſervices dexterouſly, wherein he muſt oppoſe "his Maſter dangerouſly." Yet he, with Archbiſhop Cranmer, and ſome other Members of the Privy Council, were the firſt who acquainted the King with Queen Catherine Howard's amorous intrigues, tho' they were not ignorant of the danger to which they expoſed themſelves, if the charge had not been proved; but on the other hand it was no leſs dangerous to be ſilent (*l*). Audley was a ſecret favourer of the Reformation [*B*], and if "Cromwell

(*a*) *The Lives of the Lords Chancellors*, vol. 1. pag. 76.

(*b*) *State Worthies, or the Statesmen and Favourites of England ſince the Reformation during the reigns of Henry VIII, and five of his Succeſſors*, by David Lloyd, 2d edit. Lond. 8vo, pag. 72.

(*c*) Ibid. pag. 73.

(*d*) *Hiſt. d'Angl.* tom. 5. p. 307.

* *Acta Publ.* tom. 14. pag. 433, 446.

(*e*) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 75.

(*f*) *State Worthies*, pag. 74.

(*g*) *Lives of the Chancell.* pag. 76.

(*b*) Ibid. pag. 75, 76.

(*i*) Ibid. and pag. 77.

(*k*) *State Worthies*, pag. 75.

(*l*) Rapin, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 411.

"ſhould do the like with regard to you. Demoteles "will deliver you this letter, which is written on a "ſquare ſheet, and ſealed with a ſeal, on which is en-"graved the figure of an eagle holding a ſnake be-"tween its pounces." How this kindred of the Lacedæmonians and the Jews can be proved, is not eaſy to gueſs. But the learned knew, that Joſephus himſelf is not much to be credited, when he does not follow the Old Teſtament; if he had told us where he found that letter of Areus, we might know, whether it is to be look'd upon as genuine or ſpurious; but it would be very imprudently done, to lay any ſtreſs upon a bare quotation of Joſephus.

P.

[*A*] *Of an ancient and illuſtrious family.*] This, I think, we may conclude from Mr. Lloyd's words (1), which are as follow: "Sir Thomas Audley's birth "was generous, his education more: Eſſex bred him "to that honour, which his anceſtors loſt." This ſeems to inſinuate, that he was originally from the county of Eſſex, and that his family had anciently enjoyed the ſame honours, to which Audley arrived. Tho' we ſhould be careful, how we draw inferences from Lloyd's affected ſtyle, which for that very reaſon is ſometimes dark and intricate. However Dr. Fuller in his *Worthies* expreſly tells us, that he was born in Eſſex.

(1) *State Worthies*, pag. 72.

[*B*] *He was a ſecret favourer of the Reformation.*] This appears by ſeveral facts. Firſt by the petition of the rebels in the North of England (2). One of the pretences of their rebellion was, that the King had renounced the Pope's authority; for they were very zealous for the Roman Catholick Religion. Now amongſt the conditions on which they propoſed to lay down their arms, one was that Cromwell and the Lord Chancellor ſhould be removed from the Council-Table, and not be admitted into the Parliament, that was ſhortly to meet (3). By which it appears that they look'd upon Audley and Cromwell as two perſons, who favoured the Proteſtants. Rapin mentions another fact. He tells us (4), that above five hundred perſons

(2) In 1536.

(3) Rapin, *Hiſt. d'Anglet.* tom. 5. pag. 369.

(4) Ibid. p. 388.

" Cromwell pulled down Popery with his power, Audley kept it down with his policy, " enjoining the preachers to detect the follies of that way, which is reckoned the wiſdom " of the world. He had a moderate way to ſecure the Privileges of Parliament, by free- " dom from arreſts; and the good-will of the citizens, by an order about debts (*m*)." He obtained the grant of the Priory of the Trinity, now called *Duke's Place*, in Aldgate Ward in London, which was the firſt that was diſſolved †. And Lord Herbert tells us in his Hiſtory of the Life and Reign of King Henry VIII *, that when the King ſuppreſſed the Priory of Chriſt-Church in London, he beſtowed the Church-plate and lands on Sir Thomas Audley, newly made Lord Keeper of the Great Seal. He founded Magdalen College in Cambridge, and died poſſeſſed of the Great Seal on the 30th of April 1544, and was buried in the Church of Saffron-Walden in Eſſex, leaving a great eſtate to his daughter Margaret, afterwards married to Thomas Duke of Norfolk, from whom is lineally deſcended the preſent Earl of Suffolk (*n*). He was ſucceeded in the high poſt of Chancellor by Sir Thomas Wriotheſley, a man very zealous for the ancient, that is, for the Popiſh Religion. " Audley died as much in the King's favour as he lived: Patience " can weather out the moſt turbulent age, and a ſolid judgment the moſt intricate times. " The reſerved and quiet man is the moſt ſecure; activity may raiſe a man; warineſs keep " him up. If he had done nothing, he had not been ſeen; if he had done much, he had " not been ſuffered: between the two extremes Audley could do well (*o*)." We ſhall give hereunder a more particular account of his character [*C*], and his epitaph [*D*].

(*m*) *State Worthies*, pag. 75.

† See *Fuller's Worthies*, in Eſſex.

* See the *Complete Hiſt. of England*, vol. 2. pag. 162. edit. 1706.

(*n*) *Lives of the Chancellors*, pag. 77.

(*o*) *State Worthies*, pag. 75.

perſons having been impriſoned in the city of London in a few days, on account of Religion, Audley, who was no enemy to the Reformation, obtained their pardon from the King, by repreſenting to him, that againſt his intentions the Commiſſioners had laid ſnares before a great many of theſe perſons, to oblige them to diſcover their opinions, which in obedience to the laws, they were reſolved to keep ſecret. And beſides, ſince in the city of London only, they had found in a little time ſo many hereticks, it was eaſy to gueſs, what a vaſt number there would be found in the other parts of the Kingdom; and how dreadful muſt the conſequences be of ſo ſevere a perſecution, by which an infinite number of perſons of all ages and ſexes, would ſuffer death! Audley repreſented this to the King in the moſt lively and moving manner, ſo that all thoſe, who had been put into priſon, were pardoned. Another inſtance of his ſecret inclination for a Reformation is, in the words of Mr. Lloyd, that " he " at once gratified the preſent humour of the King, " and the conſtant temper of the people, in ſix Bills " againſt the Clergy. 1. Againſt the extortions of " their Courts. 2. The exactions of their corps and " mortuaries. 3. Their worldly occupations, as graz- " ing, tanning, &c. 4. Merchandize. 5. Their " non-reſidencies. 6. The pluralities of the ignorant, " and the mean ſalaries of the learned (5)." A man, who ſo openly declared againſt the Clergy, could not but favour thoſe, who laboured for a Reformation.

(5) *State Worthies*, pag. 74.

[*C*] *We ſhall give his character hereunder.*] " Chan- " cellor Audley, *ſays Mr. Rapin* (6), was a man of " ſound judgment. He was ſerviceable to the Re- " formers, whenever he could be ſo without any ha- " zard or danger to himſelf. But he was too much a " Courtier, to inſiſt upon what he judged reaſonable, " if the King did not approve it." This agrees well enough with what Lloyd ſays of him. " His ſoul, " *ſays he*, ennobled his body, and his body graced " his ſoul. The one quick, ſolid, apprehenſive, and " judicious; the other tall and majeſtick. King Henry " loved a man; and here was one, whoſe auſterity " was allayed with Debonairneſs, whoſe gravity was " ſweetened with pleaſantneſs, whoſe knowledge " was as large as his authority, whoſe wit was e- " qual with his wiſdom, whoſe memory was ſtrong, " and judgment ſolid (7). . . . He was always in fa- " vour with the Queens, who had no leſs intereſt in " the King's heart, than the Kingdom had in his " head. The age was uncertain, intereſt not ſo. Sir Tho- " mas was fixed on the one, above the alterations of the " other; underſtanding what was moſt convenient, at " a time, when there was nothing lawful. He was " well ſeen in the flexures and windings of affairs, at " the depth whereof other heads, not ſo ſteady, turn- " ed giddy. He had the arts of a Stateſman, and " the cloſeneſs of a Politician. Reſerved he was, but " no diſſembler. For if a man have that penetration " of judgment, as he can diſcern what things are " to be laid open, and what to be kept ſecret, and " what to be ſhewed with half-ſights, and to whom " and when, (which indeed are arts of ſtate, and arts " of life) to him an habit of diſſimulation is a hin- " derance, and a poorneſs. Audley, as an able man, " was always frank and open, but wary; knowing " how to ſtop and turn, within the compaſs of equity " and honeſty. He underſtood buſineſs well, and men " better, and knew King Henry's temper better than " himſelf, whom he ſurprized always to his own bent, " never moving any of his ſuits to him, but when " in haſte, and moſt commonly amuſing him with " other matter, untill he paſſed his requeſt. His ac- " tions were managed for applauſe, as well as ſervice: " for when made Sergeant, he was the firſt of eleven; " his entertaining day was the laſt of ſix; the King, " who paid for his dinner, was invited to it. He " watched the circumſtances of his actions, that they " might be taking, as well as their iſſue, that they " might be uſeful; and contrived that the beſt of his " publick actions ſhould come off with reputation. " He followed the moſt paſſable rather than the moſt " able men living, in a time, when active men were " more uſeful, than the virtuous (8)." Here follow a few verſes, in which his character ſeems to be pretty well deſcribed.

(6) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 405, 406.

(7) *State Worthies*, p. 72.

(8) Ibid. p. 72, 73, 74.

Treaſure of arms and arts, in whom were ſet
The mace and books, the Court and College met;
Yet both ſo wove that in that mingled throng
They both comply, and neither neither wrong;
But pois'd and temper'd, each reſerv'd its ſeat;
Nor did the learning quench, but guide the heat.
The Courtier was not of the furious ſtrain,
The hand that acts, doth firſt conſult the brain.
Hence grew commerce betwixt advice and might,
The Scholar did direct the Courtier right.
And as our perfumes mixt do all conſpire,
And twiſt their curles above the hallowed fire,
Till in that harmony of ſweets combin'd,
We can nor muſk, nor ſingle amber finde;
But gums meet gums, and their delights ſo crowd
That they create one undiſtinguiſh'd cloud:
So to thy minde theſe rich ingredients preſt,
And were the mould and fabrick of thy breſt.
Learning and courage mixt, and temper'd ſo,
The ſtream could not decay nor overflow.
And in that equal tide thou didſt not bear
From courage raſhneſs; nor from learning, fear (9).

(9) Ibid. pag. 75, 76.

[*D*] *His Epitaph.*] It is engraven upon a braſs-plate over his tomb, and ſhews, that the Engliſh Poetry and Verſification at that time had not gained any degree of elegance; and is as follows;

The ſtroke of Deathes inevitable dart. Hath
now alas of lyfe beraft the hart of Syr
Thomas Audely of the Garter Knight, late
Chauncellour of Englond under our Prince of
might. Henry the ight worthy high renown. And
made by him Lord Audely of thys town.
the 6 April 1544.

P.

B.

BABELOT, Almoner to the Duke of Mompenſier, during the civil wars of France under Charles IX, diſtinguiſhed himſelf ſo much by his cruelty, that he has gained a very eminent place in Hiſtory. It will not therefore be accounted ſtrange, that we give an Article of him here. He was a Franciſcan Friar, who had quitted the monaſtery to follow "the army, from the implacable hatred with "which he was animated againſt the Calviniſts (*a*). His averſion to them made him act "ſo inconſiſtently with his character and profeſſion, that ſo far from ſaving the lives of "thoſe who were reduced by the fortune of arms to the mercy of Mompenſier, he "importuned him ſtrongly to have them put to death, and could not bear that any one "of them ſhould be pardoned [*A*]. This thirſt after the blood of the Calviniſts, which "could not be abated by the two firſt wars, encreaſed in the third, when the ſoldiers "of the Prince (*b*) being informed that Babelot had imprudently ſhut himſelf up in "Champigni (*c*), gave ſuch a vigorous aſſault, that they carried the place (*d*). The ſa- "tisfaction to find themſelves maſters of the perſon of him, whom they conſidered as "their executioner, induced them to be more favourable to the inhabitants of Champigni. "They pardoned them, and diſcharged all their reſentments upon Babelot. They hang'd "him upon a gibbet of an extraordinary height (*e*) [*B*]; and though they gave him "time to prepare himſelf for death, it was only that they might have leiſure to reproach "him for his cruelty. The revenge which the Duke of Mompenſier, who had an af- "fection for him, took upon the Calviniſts on account of his death, whenever chance or "weakneſs put any of them in his power, occaſioned for ſeveral weeks an *unfair war* (*f*) "between the two parties. The ſoldiers of Briſſac cut the throats of the garriſon of "Mirebeau, though it had capitulated in form, and Andelot treated that of St. Florent "in the ſame manner." Here is a man deſtin'd to be fatal to the Hugenots, ſince he was the cauſe even after his death that many of them were cut to pieces. Brantôme believed him capable of another ſort of crime, that is, that he inſpired his maſter with the brutal reſolution of cauſing the women to be raviſhed [*C*].

(*a*) I only copy Mr. Varillas's *Hiſtoire de Charles IX*, tom. 2. pag. 147.

(*b*) He means the Prince of Condé, the Head of the Proteſtants.

(*c*) A City of Poitou; it belonged to the Duke of Mompenſier.

(*d*) In 1568.

(*e*) It is a great chance if his brethren have not ranked him amongſt their Martyrs.

(*f*) That is, there was no quarter given.

BABYLAS,

[*A*] *He importuned him ſtrongly to put the Calviniſts to death, and could not bear that any one of them ſhould be pardoned.*] Brantôme deſerves to be heard on this point. *When they brought to him*, ſays he (1), ſpeaking of the Duke of Montpenſier, *any priſoners, if there was a man amongſt them, he ſaid to him at firſt ſight only this*; You are an Hugenot, friend; I recommend you to Monſr. Babelot. *This Monſr. Babelot was a Franciſcan, a man of learning, who governed him very eaſily, and never ſtirr'd from him; the priſoner was immediately brought to him, and after Babelot had aſked him a few queſtions, he was preſently condemned to death and executed.*

(1) Brant. *Memoires*, tom. 3. pag. 281.

[*B*] *He was hang'd upon a gibbet of an extraordinary height.*] This puts me in mind of Galba's uſage of a man, who endeavoured to evade the puniſhment of death by pleading his right as a Roman Citizen; upon which he ordered him to be fixed to a croſs, which was painted white, and much higher than the reſt. This was doing honour to the quality of the criminal, and furniſhing him with ſome little conſolation; but all this was only mockery. *Tutorem, quod pupillum, cui ſubſtitutus hæres erat, veneno necâſſet, cruce affecit, implorantique leges & civem Romanum ſe teſtificanti, quaſi ſolatio & honore aliquo pœnam levaturus, mutari, multoque præter cæteras altiorem & dealbatam ſtatui crucem juſſit* (2). I cannot tell what was the motive of thoſe, who choſe a more elevated gibbet for the Monk Babelot; perhaps they deſigned merely to excite the greater attention to the fantaſtic characters of that man, without any alluſion or reference to the cuſtom of antiquity. See Juſtin (3) concerning Maleus, a diſgrac'd General of the Carthaginians, *qui filium cum ornatu ſuo in altiſſimam crucem in conſpectu urbis ſuffigi juſſit*, that is, "who ordered his ſon to be faſten- "ed to a very high croſs with all his ornaments in "ſight of the whole city;" and Silius Italicus (4) concerning Regulus;

(2) Sueton. *in Galbâ*, cap. 9.

(3) Juſtin, lib. 18. cap. 7.

(4) Lib. 2. verſ. 343.

——— *Vidi cum robore pendens*
Italiam cruce ſublimis ſpectaret ab altâ.

Haman, in the Book of Eſther, had prepared for Mordecai a gibbet of fifty cubits high. Sometimes they erected their gibbets of a prodigious height, that the guilty perſon might be expoſed to the ſight of more people. See the Remark [*C*] of the article OTHO III. I ſhall only obſerve by the way, that thoſe, who compare this croſs of Galba with that, which Verres made uſe of againſt Gavius (5), are guilty of great inaccuracy; for all that there was remarkable in the latter, was that it was fixed, not in the place, where the inhabitants of Meſſina uſed to crucify their criminals, but on that ſide, which look'd towards Italy. It was in this manner that Verres inſulted over the perſon, who pleaded that he was a Roman Citizen: "*he* "*ſhall look*, ſays he, *upon Italy and his own houſe from* "*the top of his croſs.*" *Quid attinuit cum Mamertini more atque inſtituto ſuo crucem fixiſſent poſt urbem in viâ Pompejâ, te jubere in eâ parte figere, quæ ad fretum ſpectaret, & hoc addere, quod negare nullo modo potes, quod omnibus audientibus dixiſti palam, te idcirco illum locum deligere, ut ille, qui ſe civem Romanum eſſe diceret, ex cruce Italiam cernere ac domum ſuam proſpicere poſſet.* It is this laſt circumſtance which Cicero chiefly urges (6), tho' Lactantius, who had no occaſion to make uſe of that for the deſign of his diſcourſe, only conſiders the indignity of the puniſhment in general (7).

(5) Torrentius has done ſo: ſee his *Comment. in Suet. Galb.* cap. 9. TORRENTIUS is miſtaken upon a paſſage of Cicero.

(6) Cicero *in Verr.* 7.

(7) Lactant. *Inſtit. Divin.* lib. 4. cap. 18.

[*C*] *Brantôme believed him capable . . . of cauſing the women to be raviſhed.*] The Duke of Mompenſier uſed to recommend his women priſoners to his Guidon, *Viro benè vaſato & benè mutoniato*, that is, *a man of great proweſs in affairs of love*. Brantôme gives a very free deſcription of this affair, and adds what follows: "This was the puniſhment of thoſe poor Hugenot La- "dies, invented by the Duke of Montpenſier, which "makes me think it was perhaps taken from Nice- "phorus (8) by Monſr. Babelot, where he tells us, that "the Emperor Theodoſius removed and aboliſhed a "cuſtom, which had long continued at Rome; and "which was this: If any woman was ſeized in adul- "tery, the Romans puniſhed her, not by reſtraining "of the crime, which ſhe had committed, but by "inflaming ſtill more her laſcivious temper: for "they ſhut her up in a narrow lodge, and then gave "her leave to gratify her wanton humour to the full "with every one that would come, and that was moſt "eminent

(8) He might better have quoted Socrates, lib. 5. cap. 18.

BABYLAS, one of the moſt celebrated Martyrs of the primitive Church, was made Biſhop of Antioch in the third Century under Gordian the Emperor (*a*). He governed his Church like a good and holy Prelate, and after he had worthily executed his function for about thirteen years, he obtained the crown of martyrdom about the year 251, during the perſecution of Decius. Some Authors tell us, that he was actually put to death for the Chriſtian faith (*b*); others, that he died in priſon (*c*). It is generally agreed that he deſired to be buried with his chains (*d*). It is reported that his relicks ſilenced an Oracle of Apollo. St. Chryſoſtom employed more than once all the force of his eloquence in celebrating the memory of St. Babylas; it is a pity he was not better informed concerning the facts which he advanced. He ſuppoſes, that this Martyr was put to death for having ſtopt a guilty Emperor from entering into the Church [*A*], and he ſpeaks of the crime of that Emperor as a man who had not at all conſulted Hiſtory [*B*]. He knew not even what is reported of the deference which that Emperor paid to the ſevere diſcipline of St. Babylas.

(a) Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 6. cap. 29.

(b) Chryſoſtom. tom. 1. pag. 641, 669.

(c) *Martyrolog. Romanum, ad diem* 24 *Januar.* Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 6. cap. 39.

(d) Chryſoſtom. tom. 1. p. 669. and *Martyrolog. Romanum, ad diem* 24 *Januar.*

" eminent for his debauchery and lewdneſs. Theſe abandoned whoring fellows furniſh'd themſelves with ſeveral little bells, when they went in to the Lady, that at every motion they might make a ringing, and not only give notice to thoſe, who paſſed by and liſten'd, what they were doing there; but likewiſe by this means and by the ſound of theſe bells ſhew that this puniſhment was attended with all the circumſtances of diſgrace and injury. What an infamy was this? and how much the women valued it? Indeed this was a terrible cuſtom, which that wiſe Emperor aboliſhed, as we are told by Nicephorus the Hiſtorian, from whom Mr. Babelot very probably took it, and had it put in practice by this brave Guidon (9)."

(9) Brant. *Memoires*, tom. 3. pag. 282, 283.

[*A*] *St. Chryſoſtom . . . . ſuppoſed that this martyr was put to death for having ſtopt a guilty Emperor from entering into the Church.*] There is no doubt but that Babylas died under the Emperor Decius. It muſt then be Decius, who was prevented from entring into the Church, if the ſtory of St. Chryſoſtom be true; but it does not appear that Decius ever was at Antioch during his whole reign. Baronius affirms without proof that Decius went into Syria in the year 253, to make war againſt the Perſians; and that it was then that Babylas would not ſuffer his Church to be profaned by the preſence of ſuch an Emperor (1). This does not agree either with chronology, or hiſtory, or the prudence of the Biſhop of Antioch. The beſt Chronologers place Decius's death in the year 251 (2). No good Hiſtorian tells us, that Decius was ever in the Eaſt to make war againſt the Perſians. It is true, the Acts of St. Laurence (3) aſſure us, that this Emperor went to make war againſt the Perſians, and that he took from them the country of Babylon, Aſſyria, all Perſia, Hyrcania, and even Bactriana, and that he died at Rome, poſſeſſed by the Devil, a little after the martyrdom of St. Laurence (4); but theſe Acts are *without any authority and full of errors* (5). Father Noris does not ſtick to ſay, that all this Perſian War *is a mere fable* (6). With regard to the prudence of St. Babylas we may ſay, that it would never have allowed him to reſiſt a Pagan Emperor. *It was inconſiſtent with the conduct of the Church, that St. Babylas ſhould attempt to hinder him from entring, if he had come, tho' a Pagan, to do ſome act of violence there; for the Church had no power, and exerciſed her own authority only upon thoſe, who were her children, and ſhe ſuffered quietly the inſults of her perſecutors.* In this manner ſpeaks the Author of the Life of Tertullian and Origen (7). Mr. de Tillemont confirms this remark. *The Church upon theſe occaſions defends herſelf*, ſays he (8), *only by her prayers, and by an humble and peaceable patience, with which ſhe bears the injuries of her perſecutors. But if we find in an Oration aſcribed to St. Chryſoſtom *, that St. Roman of Antioch hindered a Pagan Governor from coming into the Church, this is a very extraordinary piece of conduct, and the fact itſelf is by no means well atteſted.* He obſerves likewiſe, that all the expreſſions of St. Chryſoſtome ſhew, that the Emperor, who was oppoſed by St. Babylas, was a Chriſtian. It is not true therefore, that this holy man reſiſted Decius; and yet he died under that Emperor: ſo that we muſt ſay that St. Chryſoſtome was miſtaken, when he tells us, that St. Babylas ſuffered death for having oppoſed an Emperor's entrance into the Church.

(1) Baron. *Annal. ad ann.* 253. num. 128.

(2) Calviſius, Petavius, Pagi, &c.

(3) *See* Tillemont, tom. 3. pag. 600.

(4) This Saint did not die till 258. Tillemont, ibid.

(5) Ibid.

(6) Noris, *Epocbæ Syro-Maced.* pag. 293, quoted by Tillemont, ibid.

(7) Printed at Paris in 1675. See pag. 642.

(8) Tillemont, tom. 3. p. 821.

* Chryſoſt. tom. 1. Oration 48. pag. 547, a; 549, e; 550, e.

[*B*] . . . . *And he ſpeaks of that Emperor like a man, who had not at all conſulted Hiſtory.*] He relates, that a certain Nation, which was at war with that Emperor, deſired to put an end to it, and to eſtabliſh peace *by the ſtrongeſt and moſt inviolable obligations, which are amongſt men*; that this agreement was *made and confirmed by an oath on both ſides*; that this Nation being deſirous to ſhew their enemies that they acted with ſincerity, perſuaded their King to give his own ſon as an hoſtage to the Prince, with whom they had concluded peace; that the ſequel of this affair proved, that they had put into the lion's mouth him, *whom they thought they had intruſted to the protection of a friend, for that Prince, having no regard to the youth of his Ally's ſon, nor to the inviolable ſanctity of the oath, which he had ſworn, nor to the eye of Divine Juſtice, which is always open for the puniſhment of crimes . . . . . with his own hand cut the throat of him, whom he ought to have cheriſhed as a ſacred pledge and inviolable bond of the alliance* (9). This according to St. Chryſoſtom is the crime of the Emperor, whom St. Babylas treated in the manner, which we are going to relate. This great Prelate *exactly imitated upon that occaſion the zeal of Elias and St. John; for he did not conſider, that he was to oppoſe not only a Prince, an ordinary King, but even one, who was Lord of a great part of the earth, who had a very ſtrong army, and one, whom all things ſeemed to conſpire to render formidable to him. He was not touched by all this external ſplendor . . . . . and even this ſplendor ſerving only to repreſent to him at that moment the Majeſty of the ſupreme King, whoſe Miniſter he was . . . . . he advanced boldly towards* THIS CRIMINAL PRINCE *in the midſt of his guards, ſtop'd him with his hand againſt his breaſt, repreſented his crime to him, and forbad him in God's name to enter into the aſſembly of the faithful* (10). It is not neceſſary to obſerve, that St. Chryſoſtom adds to the ralation of theſe facts the moſt lively and pathetic figures of Rhetoric (11). We may imagine the reſt, when we know (and who does not know it?) that he was a great Preacher, and that he ſpoke to a people full of reverence and zeal for the name of St. Babylas (12). But have not we reaſon to pity him for having employed ſo many ornaments, and ſuch force of imagination and eloquence upon mere falſities? For what can be more chimerical, than the ſtory of the people, who were enemies to the Romans, and yet perſuaded the King to give his ſon as an hoſtage into the hands of the Emperor? If any Nation did this, it was without doubt the Perſians. Now it is very certain, that they did nothing like this while Babylas was Biſhop. I doubt very much that any Roman Emperor ever killed with his own hand a young Prince, who had been given him as an hoſtage after the concluſion of a peace; but it is very falſe, that ſuch a perfidious barbarity was committed under the Emperors, in whoſe reign St. Babylas enjoyed the Biſhoprick of Antioch. I have no manner of doubt but that St. Chryſoſtom was ſincere in this error; for he not only relates theſe falſities in the pulpit, but likewiſe in a Book, which he wrote againſt the Gentiles (13). If he could have promiſed himſelf, that his auditors ſhould have given him quarter upon his amuſing them with a fictitious and pious tradition, he could never expect the ſame favour from the enemies of the Chriſtian name. So that he muſt certainly think, that what he ſaid was true.

(9) See *Vie de Tertullien & d'Origene*, pag. 632.

(10) Ibid. pag. 636.

(11) Eraſmus adviſed to read this Homily in the Colleges of Louvain, as a model, which ſcholars ought to prefer to Lyſias, Libanius, &c. See the Letter, which he wrote to the Head of a College of Louvain. It is the 24th of the 28th book, pag. 1705.

(12) To the people of Antioch. St. Babylas had been Biſhop of that city.

(13) S. Chryſoſtom. *Homil. de S. Babyl.* p. 641. vol. 1; item *Contra Gentes, & de S. Babyl.* p. 647, 655, &c. quoted by the Author of *Vie de Tertullien & d'Origine*, pag. 632.

Babylas [C]. We may discover the general foundation of some of his mistakes [D]. We shall speak of all this in the remarks, as likewise of the request, which it is pretended Apollo

[C] *St. Chrysostom knew nothing of what is related concerning the Deference, which that Emperor paid to the severe discipline of St. Babylas.*] St. Chrysostom supposed that St. Babylas had to deal with a Monarch, which punish'd him with death for his pious boldness in refusing him entrance into the church. The falsity of that fact has been already shewn by reason that St. Babylas died under the Emperor Decius, and that Decius met with no resistance at the entrance of the Church of Antioch. We have now another means of proving this to be an error. The Predecessor of Decius was named Philip; it is to him, that it is said St. Babylas refused entrance into his Church, not regarding him as an Emperor, but as a Christian, who was obliged to submit to the laws of penance and the Canons of discipline. Now it is pretended that this Emperor submitted himself and behaved very near in the same manner towards the Bishop of Antioch, as Theodosius did afterwards towards St. Ambrose at Milan. Eusebius tells us, that the Emperor Philip would have assisted at the public prayers on Easter-Eve; but that the Bishop would not suffer him to come into the Church till he had obliged him to confess his sins, and place himself among the penitents; which conditions the Emperor submitted to with all the sincere marks of piety and the fear of God (14). Eusebius relates this only upon hear-say; and mentions neither the place of this great event, nor the Bishop, who did so brave an action. It is very strange, that such facts should be so confusedly known. Besides, we have several very learned men, who maintain, that the Emperor Philip was no Christian. But, however that be, we must not separate the firmness of Babylas, and the submission of Philip, as St. Chrysostom has done; we must either admit or reject them both together. There are some Historians, who speak in a less vague and uncertain manner than Eusebius. The Chronicle of Alexandria mentions, that the Empress was no less condemned to penitence than the Emperor her husband; and it adds, that St. Babylas used this rigour, because Philip had killed the son of the Emperor Gordian (15). We may observe, that Erasmus, deceived by St. Chrysostom, found a great difference with regard to the success between the firmness of St. Babylas, and that of St. Ambrose. *Babylæ*, says he (16), *parum feliciter cessit quod Imperatorem impiâ cæde funestatum templo prohibuit; imò feliciter cessit ipsi, qui præsidis autoritatem suâ morte confirmavit. At Ambrosio cessit felicius, qui summâ constantiâ suam tuens autoritatem, ipsum etiam Cæsarem Christo lucri fecit.* That is: "Babylas succeeded very ill, in forbidding an Emperor, "who was defiled with an impious murder, to enter "into the Church; nay rather he succeeded very well, "since he confirmed the authority of a Bishop by "his death. But Ambrose had better success, who "by defending his authority with the greatest constancy, gained even the Emperor himself over to "Christ." We have another passage to the same purpose: *Ambrosius Episcopus Mediolanensis ausus est Theodosium Cæsarem, ob crudelem & præcipitatam in Thessalonicenses sententiam à templi limine secludere, postque sævas objurgationes, post indictam satisfactionem, in pœnitentium classem relegare.... Tentavit idem Babylas Antiochenus Episcopus adversus Regem innocentis homicidio pollutum, & interfectus est* (17). That is: "St. "Ambrose, Bishop of Milan, had the courage to hinder the Emperor Theodosius from entering into the "Church, because of the cruel and precipitate sentence, which he had passed upon the Thessalonians; "and obliged him, after several severe reproofs, and "commanding him to make satisfaction, to place "himself amongst the penitents..... Babylas Bishop "of Antioch attempted the same against an Empe"peror, who had been polluted with the murder of "an innocent person, and was slain.

(14) Euseb. *Hist. Ecclesiast.* lib. 6. cap. 34.

(15) *Chron. Alexand.* pag. 630. quoted by Tillemont, tom. 3. pag. 822.

(16) Erasm. Epist. 3. lib. 28. pag. 1586.

(17) Idem, Epist. 69. lib. 29. pag. 1033.

[D] *....We may discover the general foundation of some of his mistakes.*] We have seen above that it is reported, that St. Babylas founded his behaviour to Philip upon that Emperor's bloody disloyalty. The Emperor Gordian, under whom Philip was Prefect of the Pretorium, had committed his son to his care; after Gordian was dead, Philip being ambitious to reign in his room killed the young Prince, who had been entrusted with him. St. Babylas, knowing that he had been defiled with so execrable a murder, refused to admit him into the Church. Decius revenged this affront offered to Philip; for he put Babylas to death on that account. This we find in the Chronicle of Alexandria; and it was Leontius, Bishop of Antioch in the year 348, who reported all this. He did not well understand the conduct of Philip; but he has departed much less from the truth of the story than St. Chrysostom. The Emperor Gordian, under whom Philip was Prefect of the Pretorium, had no children to entrust with any person; for he never had any at all. So that it was not with a design to succeed this Emperor, who was then dead, that Philip killed his son; and therefore Leontius has been extremely mistaken in his account. Philip taking advantage of the youth of the Emperor Gordian, caballed in such a manner, that he procured himself to be declared his collegue and tutor. The factions were begun again; that of Gordian was obliged to give way; Philip had him deposed and afterwards killed (18). This is the true state of the fact. Different representations of this fact took place and encreased in process of time. Leontius said, that Philip killed his Emperor's son, the same son, whom that Emperor had entrusted to his care. This now is one alteration; but it has some resemblance to the truth. St. Chrysostom assures us, that Philip killed the son of a Prince, with whom he had concluded a treaty of peace, the same son, whom that Prince had left with him as a pledge of his friendship, and of his sincere desire to live in terms of good understanding with him; this is a second alteration; this is to approach too near to the erroneous account of Leontius. This last Author asserts that Decius put Babylas to death to punish him for his insolence towards Philip. Those, who have known the aversion of Decius to Philip, an aversion, which is supposed to have been the cause of Decius's persecuting the Christians, have considered what Leontius says as very absurd. They have corrected him therefore, by supposing that Philip himself put St. Babylas to death (19); they have corrected one error by another, and so unluckily deceived St. Chrysostom. They have made him lose his reflections, which he had graced with all the ornaments of his eloquence, in order to repel the insults of the Pagans, and to give an advantage to the Gospel Ministry. The humiliation of an Emperor at the word of a Bishop would have suggested a great many fine thoughts to St. Chrysostom; it is a pity, that he knew nothing of it. Let us see a little in what manner he improves upon the resistance of St. Babylas; "Whereas, *says he* (20), the "Priests of the false Gods are more the slaves of the "Emperors than of their Gods, and shew themselves "constant in their worship only out of fear of those "Princes, to whom the Demons are thus obliged for the "worship and reverence paid them by men; this great "Bishop of Antioch shewed, by punishing the Emperor "himself with a chastisement very sensible to a rea"sonable mind, and as far as he was permitted to "do it according to the measure of the power of the "Church, that the Priests of the Religion of Jesus "Christ are not slaves to any person whatever upon "earth, and that they ought to be so jealous of that "holy elevation, which God has given them by lot, as "the true character of their dignity, that they ought "rather to be disposed to give up their lives in a "pious manner, than to lose this privilege. This "same example, *continues he*, by confounding the "pride of the Pagans, encreased the piety of the "faithful, who learned from the behaviour of their "Pastor to fear God more than all mankind; and "entirely stop'd the mouths of those, who durst "maintain with an excessive impudence, that there "was no courage amongst the Christians, but that "every thing was false and spurious among them, be"ing only covered with a specious appearance."

(18) Capitol. *in Vita Gordiani.*

(19) *See* Tillemont, tom. 3. pag. 822.

(20) *Contra Gentil. de S. Babyl. Oper.* tom. 1. pag. 664, 665, quoted in *Vie de Tertullien & d'Origene*, pag. 639.

Apollo made to Julian the Emperor with regard to the relicks of St. Babylas [E]. There are aſcribed to this Martyr three eminent triumphs over the Pagan Emperors, two during his life, and one after his death (e). The firſt is the advantage, which he gained over Philip by obliging him to continue without the Church in the condition of a Penitent; the ſecond is that, which he had over the perſecutor Decius, when he choſe rather to prepare himſelf to ſuffer every thing for the faith, than to do any thing, which was unworthy of a good Prelate. The third is that, which his aſhes obtained over the Oracle of Apollo near Antioch (f). Mr. Chevreau has ſpoken with very little exactneſs of the Martyrdom of St. Babylas [F]. This is what I ſhall examine more fully below.

(e) *Vie de Tertullien & d'Origene*, pag. 757.

(f) See the Remark [E].

BABYLON.

[E] *It is pretended that Apollo made a requeſt to Julian the Emperor with regard to the relicks of St. Babylas.*] There was near Antioch a Temple and Oracle of Apollo in a place called Daphne. Superſtition and debauchery endeavoured as it were to exceed each other in diſtinguiſhing that place; it was the reſort of lovers and their miſtreſſes. Others went thither to perform their devotions; and it is probable a great many went with both views at the ſame time. Gallus brother to Julian the Apoſtate, was no ſooner declared Cæſar, but in order to put an end to this double diſorder, he built a Church in that place, and commanded the Sepulchre of Babylas to be removed thither. It is ſaid, that when this was done, Apollo gave no more anſwers. The tomb of that Martyr was the cauſe of this, and not the interruption of the ſacrifices; for the ſacrifices having been reſtored under the Emperor Julian, the Oracle ſtill continued ſilent; and when Julian conſulted it in perſon, he underſtood, that the dead bodies, which that place was full of, had rendered the Oracle dumb. The Emperor applied this only to the tomb of St. Babylas; and for that reaſon he ordered it to be removed. The Chriſtians of Antioch carried away this into the City. It was a proceſſion of perſons of both ſexes and of every age, who ſung all the way (21) a ſong of triumph; for the burthen related to the confuſion of thoſe, who worſhip Idols, and was taken out of the 97th Pſalm. Ἐξῆρχεν δὲ τῶν ψαλμῶν τοῖς ἄλλοις, οἱ τέκνες ἀκριβοῦσιν, καὶ ἐνισχύει τὸ πλῆθος ἐν συμφωνίᾳ καὶ ταύτην τὴν φωνὴν ἐπῆσαν· ἠχύθησαν πάλιν οἱ προσκυνοῦντες τοῖς γλυπτοῖς οἱ ἰσχυχώμενοι τοῖς εἰδώλοις (22). By the argument *à majori ad minus*, we might conclude from this Hiſtory, that the Birth of Jeſus Chriſt put the Heathen Oracles to ſilence, if we did not find otherwiſe from the confeſſion of Sozomen, that this Oracle of Apollo gave anſwers till the reign of Conſtantius, under whom Gallus had the dignity of Cæſar. The objection appears ſtronger againſt thoſe, who acknowledge no diabolical operation in the Pagan Oracles. But let us ſee what Mr. Van Dale anſwers to this. He ſuppoſes that the Prieſts of Apollo, not being willing to be obſerved ſo nearly by the Chriſtians, who came in vaſt numbers to viſit the tomb of Babylas, invented an anſwer, which might oblige the Emperor to remove that Martyr's tomb from that place. Theſe Prieſts were fearful of nothing ſo much as of the eyes of unbelievers, and had no hopes of being able to conceal their artful practices from perſons ſo very curious to detect them as the Chriſtians were. Perhaps too the blind ſuperſtition of theſe Prieſts perſuaded them that they ſhould do a great act of Religion, if they ſhould procure the tomb of a Chriſtian Martyr, reverenced by the enemies of their Gods, to be removed from the neighbourhood of their temple. *Chriſtiani, quibus repleta erat Antiochia, aliique ejuſdem religionis aliunde advenientes, viſitabant quotidie ſepulchra martyrum, atque inprimis quidem Babylæ. Sub quo prætextu dum loca illa ita frequentarent, cum ſubreperent etiam huic Oraculo, oculiſque emiſſitiis omnia perluſtrarent, ut ſic detegerent impoſturas ac præſtigias ibi exercitas, neque id ferrent ea tempora, ut vi expellere eos inde poſſent Antiſtites; illi ſub prætextu à mortuis purgandi locum Diis ſacratum, cum Babila aliiſque, Chriſtianos inde removere nitebantur. Nihil enim magis aut citius detegere valebat Antiſtitum ejuſmodi impoſturas, quam continuus concurſus publicæque panegyres, ob ludos aut feſta publica ibi celebranda, ſi quarumcunque ſectarum Philoſophi, eorumve ſequacibus ad illa pateret acceſſus* (23).

(21) It was about 40 ſtadia, that is 5000 paces.

(22) Sozomeni, *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 5. cap. 20.

(23) Van Dale *de Oracul.* p. 442. See *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for March 1684, p. 15, 16.

[F] *Mr. Chevreau has ſpoken with very little exactneſs of the martyrdom of St. Babylas.*] This is what he ſays: "Babylas, Biſhop of Antioch, ſuffered "martyrdom with his three children, on account of "his not permitting Numerianus to ſee the ceremonies of the Chriſtians, adding, *That a man defiled "with blood and the ſacrifice of idols could not enter into "the church*; or, as Suidas tells us, *That he would not "ſuffer a wolf to enter into the ſheepfold of the Lord* "(24)." I. Babylas had no children; he ſhould have ſaid, that he had three brothers, who were then but children, or very young, who ſuffered martyrdom with him (25). II. There was above thirty years between the death of Babylas and the reign of Numerianus. III. The antient Authors do not attribute to the martyr the expreſſions, which Mr. Chevreau relates. We muſt confeſs that an Univerſal Hiſtory is a very arduous undertaking. Mr. Chevreau was a very ingenious man; he knew the defects of thoſe who went before him in that deſign; he has employed a long time in his work; and yet..... As he is a Gentleman ſtill living (26), and notwithſtanding his age, enjoys a perfect vigour of body and mind, I do not doubt but he will publiſh a new edition, which will be ſtill more beautiful than the former (27).

(24) Chevreau, *Hiſt. du Monde*, lib. 4. ch. 4. pag. 400. tom. 2. Holland edit.

(25) *Vie de Tertullien & d'Origene*, pag. 758.

(26) I write this in 1694.

(27) He has publiſhed an edition at the Hague in 1698, with ſeveral additions and corrections; but he has not at all altered the paſſage relating to Babylas.

I was in hopes that Mr. Chevreau would not take amiſs the ſhort critical notes, which I have given above; and as I had all the value for him which was due to his great merit, I ſhould have ſuppreſſed them, if I could have foreſeen that they would have diſpleaſed him; but I thought him ſuperior to any concern for ſuch a trifle. I imagined that he would have applied to himſelf what I had ſaid in my firſt preface; and he was unqueſtionably one of thoſe Authors, who had no reaſon to fear a ſmall loſs (28). So that I was ſurprized at his unexpected ſenſibility upon this occaſion, and extremely ſorry that he was angry. There are ſeveral illuſtrious perſons, who can teſtify, that in wiſhing him a longer life, than his proved to be (29), I grounded my wiſh not only upon his being an ornament of the age, but likewiſe upon my deſire, that he might read in this ſecond edition the proof of my regard for him, and the explanation of a thing, which had been expreſſed in an ambiguous manner. I preſume that this equivocal expreſſion was the chief occaſion of his diſpleaſure. He thought that the line which was pointed, *and yet*.... had a great deal of latent poiſon in it. It was a void, which his imagination filled up with very diſobliging ideas; and I was willing that he ſhould know, that according to my real ſentiments, this chaſm was only to ſuggeſt a general repreſentation of the impoſſibility of avoiding errors, how able ſoever the Author be, who undertakes a work, which contains a variety of particulars.

(28) See the *Plan of this Dictionary* towards the end of the ſixth paragraph.

(29) He died the 15th of February 1701, aged 87 years and ſome months. See the *Journal de Trevoux*, for March and April 1701, pag. 241. Dutch edition.

But to come to the point: Mr. Chevreau acknowledges himſelf the juſtice of my firſt remark; ſince he owns (30) *that it would have been more right to have put* THREE BROTHERS WHO WERE AS YET CHILDREN, *in order to avoid all ambiguity, and that he ſhould have explained himſelf more clearly, than many Authors, who wrote upon the ſame ſubject before him.* With regard to the expreſſions, which I ſaid the antient Authors have not aſcribed to St. Babylas, Mr. Chevreau quotes Georgius Syncellus, and Paulus Diaconus (31); but can we call theſe Authors antient, with reſpect to the age of the martyr whom we are ſpeaking of? Did not they live about the end of the eighth Century? In ſhort, he quotes ſeveral Writers, for the moſt part moderns, who have aſſerted, that St. Babylas was put to death by Numerianus; and he gives us (32) theſe words of Mr. de Tillemont; *It muſt be confeſſed that the Hiſtory of St. Babylas is embarraſſed with ſeveral difficulties, which are unſurmountable by our weakneſs.* I agree that all this may ſerve for an excuſe to thoſe, *who ſpeak with very little exactneſs of the martyrdom of St. Babylas*; but it will ſtill be allowed me to remark, that they did not take proper care to chooſe what was the leaſt erroneous and unexact upon that point.

(30) *Chevræana*, Part 2. Dutch edition.

(31) Ibid. pag. 321.

(32) Ibid. pag. 329, 330.

I am

BABYLON. Moreri and his continuators have collected ſo many particulars relating to this City, that if I were to give this Article a reaſonable length, I ſhould be obliged to repeat the greateſt part of their collections. So that, to ſave the public the tedioufneſs of meeting with the ſame things in different Dictionaries, I ſhall inſiſt only upon a fact, which they have not touch'd upon. I ſhall not examine whether what they have related is done with all the exactneſs neceſſary. The inhabitants of Babylon pretended that this City was very ancient; they reckon 473 thouſand years from the firſt obſervations of their Aſtrologers till the coming of Alexander. This we are told by Diodorus Siculus (*a*). Others, confining themſelves to a round number, inform us, that the Babylonians boaſted of having kept in their Archives obſervations made by their Aſtrologers upon nativities for 470 thouſand years [*A*]. We muſt correct by this a paſſage in Pliny [*B*], which ſome authors have made uſe of improperly, either to refute the antiquity of Babylon, or for other purpoſes. A learned Profeſſor of Leyden has obſerved this lately (*b*), and it is ſtrange, that it was

(*a*) Lib. 11. pag. 118. edit. Rhodomanni.

(*b*) Mr. Perizonius. See remark [*B*], quotation (8) and (9).

I am very well perſuaded, that Mr. Chevreau has found ſeveral faults in my work. It is poſſible to diſcover a great many without having a fourth part of the abilities of ſo great a man as he was. If he had given inſtances of what he has ſaid in general concerning thoſe *eſſential faults againſt our language, and thoſe low, burleſque, obſcure, and embarraſſed expreſſions* (33), I ſhould have thought my ſelf obliged either to have debated about them, or to have condemned them; and I ſhould have ſubmitted to the latter without any reluctance, as ſoon as ever I ſaw that it was reaſonable: but ſince nothing has been particularly mentioned, I preſume it will not be thought unreaſonable, that I ſhould conſider that part of his book (34) as general and uncertain reproaches. He has objected in particular to me a kind of contradiction, with relation to a perſon, who, he ſays, *had been a long while my idol* (35). I am certain he would have omitted that, if he had ſeen how I have vindicated my ſelf in that point in my *Reflections upon a Pamphlet called the Judgment of the Public, &c.* And with regard to *the words*, which he aſſerts that *nice ears cannot bear* (36), the reader may ſee what I have to anſwer to that objection in an explication at the end of this work. I wiſh that I deſerved all that he has obſerved in his retorſion of the period, which ends with *And yet . . . .* (37); and I ſhould think my ſelf very happy, if the world would excuſe me upon this account, that it is abſolutely impoſſible, or almoſt ſo, not to commit a great many errors in ſuch a work as this. I think that I ſhould never have attempted this Dictionary, if I had foreſeen, that all my care to avoid miſtakes, would not have prevented me from falling into very frequent and groſs errors. To conclude, it is proper to deſire my readers to conſult the learned work publiſhed by Monſr. de Larroque (38) at Leyden in 1688, under the title of *Matthæi Larroquani Adverſariorum Sacrorum Libri tres.* See pag. 79 and the following.

(33) Ibid. pag. 320.

(34) Compare this with the end of the remark [*C*] of the article REGIUS.

(35) *Chevræana*, Part 2. p. 320.

(36) Ibid.

(37) Ibid. pag. 330, 331.

(38) Daniel Larroquanus, *Matthæi Filius.*

[*A*] *The Babylonians boaſted of having kept the obſervations made by their Aſtrologers . . . . for four hundred and ſeventy thouſand years.*] I ſhall quote only two paſſages of Cicero. *Contemnamus etiam Babylonios, & eos, qui è Caucaſo cæli ſigna ſervantes, numeris & motibus ſtellarum curſus perſequuntur. Condemnemus, inquam, hos aut ſtultitiæ aut vanitatis, aut imprudentiæ, qui CCCCLXX millia annorum, ut ipſi dicunt, monumentis comprehenſa continent* (1). Let us ſee how he ridicules them in another place. *Quod ajunt* 470 *millia annorum in periclitandis experiundiſque pueris quicunque eſſent nati, Babylonios poſuiſſe, fallunt. Si enim eſſet factitatum, non eſſet deſitum. Neminem autem habemus autorem, qui id aut fieri dicat, aut factum ſciat* (2). That is: "They ſay, that the Babylonians "have calculated the nativities of all the children who "were born for 470,000 years; but they deceive "us. For if this had been done, it would not ceaſe to be "done now. But we have no Author, who aſſerts "that it is done, or knows that it ever was done."

(1) Cicero, *de Divin.* lib. 1. cap. 19.

(2) Ibid. lib. 2. cap. 46.

[*B*] *We muſt correct, on occaſion of the aſtronomical obſervations of the Babylonians, a paſſage in Pliny.*] His words are theſe: *Epigenes apud Babylonios* 720 *annorum obſervationes ſyderum coctilibus lateritiis inſcriptis docet, gravis auctor imprimis; qui minimum Beroſus & Critodemus* 480 *annorum. Ex quo apparet æternus literarum uſus* (3). He had juſt before ſaid, that he believed that the Aſſyrian Letters had always exiſted, or that the Aſſyrians had always the uſe of writing; *Literas ſemper arbitror Aſſyrias fuiſſe* (4). So that he muſt take for the proof of his opinion the teſtimonies of Epigenes and Beroſus relating to the Aſtronomical Obſervations, which the Babylonians had cauſed to be engraved; for the concluſion, which he infers from theſe teſtimonies is the ſame with the opinion, which he had repreſented a little before; *ex quo apparet*, ſays he, *æternus literarum uſus*; that is, "from hence it appears, that the uſe of letters was "eternal." Now there is nothing more abſurd than his manner of reaſoning, if we ſuppoſe, that he wrote as it is repreſented in the manuſcripts and editions of his book. Epigenes, a grave Author, aſſures us, that the obſervations of the Babylonian Aſtrologers contain 720 years. Thoſe, who give them the ſhorteſt extent, as Beroſus and Critodemus, aſſign to them 480 years. And therefore the uſe of Letters is eternal, and I think upon good grounds that it always exiſted amongſt the Aſſyrians. In this manner Pliny reaſons, as his Natural Hiſtory ſtands now; in this manner, I ſay, he reaſons, after he had obſerved, that Cadmus brought the uſe of Letters into Europe, and that it was ſaid, that the invention of them in Egypt was prior to the reign of Phoroneus. Could any man in his ſenſes, a drunkard, or a dotard, have been guilty of a more extravagant rhapſody? We muſt therefore neceſſarily ſuppoſe, that this paſſage is not in its proper ſtate; and it is very ſurprizing, that ſo many learned Critics ſhould have examined theſe expreſſions, and yet not have perceived the falſe and impertinent reaſoning, which might render them ſuſpected. The Scaligers, the Voſſius's, the Marſhams, the Dodwells, have ſo little miſtruſted this paſſage, that they have taken it as a foundation of the concluſions, which they would form concerning the age of Beroſus (5), or againſt the antiquity of Babylon (6), or for other purpoſes (7). Father Hardouin has corrected part of this paſſage; but this was not chiefly with a deſign to adjuſt Pliny's reaſoning; for if that had been his principal motive, he would have corrected the whole. But Mr. Perizonius (8) is the Gentleman, who has fully diſcovered the cauſes of this error, and the proofs of the corruption of the text (9). He has ſhewed that we muſt add the number of a thouſand both to the account of Epigenes, and that of Beroſus; and thus Pliny will be found to ſay, that according to the teſtimony of Epigenes, the obſervations of the Aſtrologers of Babylon contained 720 thouſand years; and according to the teſtimony of thoſe, who like Beroſus and Critodemus give them the leaſt extent, 480 thouſand years. Pliny was right, if we ſuppoſe as he does that theſe Writers are credible witneſſes, in concluding that we cannot aſſign any time, when the Aſſyrian Letters were firſt invented. Now when a thing is ſo ancient that we cannot fix the beginning of it, we make no ſcruple in writing after Pliny's manner, of calling it eternal. But would any perſon venture to call it ſo, when the proofs from antiquity, which are given, leave it of a later date than a thing whoſe beginning is known? This would be exactly the caſe of Pliny, if he had ſaid what we find at preſent in his writings. Conſider well what he ſaid with relation to Cadmus and Phoroneus.

(3) Plin. lib. 7. cap. 56.

(4) Mr. Perizonius thinks that we ought to read *Aſſyriis*. See his *Diſſertatio Philologica de Originibus Babylonicis*: they are Theſes maintained in April 1694.

(5) Scaliger *ad Græca Euſebii*, pag. 407. Voſſius *de Hiſtoricis Græcis, apud* Perizonium *in Origin. Babylon.* (6) Marſhamus, *Secul.* 17. pag. 474. edit. Anglic. *apud eundem.* (7) *See* Dodwell, *Obſervat.* Cyprian. *in Append.* pag. 36, 37. (8) Formerly Profeſſor at Franeker; but now Profeſſor of Greek, Hiſtory, and Eloquence at Leyden ſince the laſt year 1693. (9) See his *Diſſertatio* 1 *de Originibus Babylonicis.*

I shall explain Father Hardouin's correction ſeparately. He reſtores the text of Pliny thus. *E diverſo Epigenes apud Babylonios* CCCCLXX *annorum* M. *Obſervationes ſiderum coctilibus laterculis inſcriptas docet . . . . qui minimum, Beroſus & Critodemus* CCCCXC *annorum*

was so long before it was taken notice of. Aristotle knew without doubt that the Babylonians boasted of having a series of Astronomical Observations for a prodigious number of ages. Being desirous to inform himself of it by means of Callisthenes, who was in the retinue of Alexander, he found there was a great error in the account; for it is said that Callisthenes acquainted him, that he had seen at Babylon Astronomical Observations but for 1903 years only. Simplicius relates this, and borrowed it from Porphyrius (*c*). If Callisthenes calculated right, it must be owned that after the flood men made prodigious haste to become Astrologers; for, according to the Hebrew Bible, we find but two thousand years from the Deluge to the death of Alexander. There is some reason to doubt what is related by Simplicius; and it is remarkable that all the ancient authors, who have ascribed to Semiramis the founding of Babylon, had no other authority for it than that of Ctesias, whose Histories were full of Fables (*d*). Besides we find that Berosus blames the Greek Writers extremely, for having reported that Semiramis built Babylon, and adorned it with admirable buildings (*e*). The Supplement to Moreri quotes Quintus Curtius concerning the lasciviousness of the women of Babylon. We may add to this account, that this disorder was very ancient. The letter of Jeremiah, inserted in the book of Baruch, touches a little upon this, but in an obscure manner, and which wants a Commentary taken from Herodotus [*C*].

(c) *In Lib.* 2. DE CŒLO, Com. xlvi. pag. 123.

(d) Marshamus, *in Chronic.* pag. 507. edit. *ann.* 1676, in 4to.

(e) Berosus, *Chaldaicorum*, lib. 3. *apud* Josephum, lib. 1. *contra* Apion. pag. 1045.

BACHOVIUS

annorum. On the one side he puts 470 thousand, instead of 720, and on the other he puts 490 instead of 480. He depends upon the authority of manuscripts, with regard to the latter correction, and upon that of Cicero, with respect to the former (10). It is true he observes by the way, that the passage of Pliny itself seems to require the former correction. *Certe annorum millia locus iste postulare videtur, non annos* (11). This is a sign that he was sensible of the false reasoning, which the common reading makes Pliny guilty of. But if we add a thousand to the 480 in the common reading, we fall into another difficulty. It is affirmed, that Berosus allows 480 thousand years to the Observations of the Babylonian Astrologers; and yet we find that he spoke but of 150 thousand years, when he mentioned the care, with which the Babylonians preserved the memory of a great many things in nature and history. Βηρωσσὸς ἐν τῇ πρώτῃ τῶν Βαβυλωνιακῶν φησὶ γενέσθαι αὐτὸν κατ' Ἀλέξανδρον τὸν Φιλίππου τὴν ἡλικίαν, ἀναγραφὰς δὲ πολλῶν ἐν Βαβυλῶνι φυλάσσεσθαι μετὰ πολλῆς ἐπιμελείας ἀπὸ ἐτῶν πλειόνων μυριάδων ἱ περιέχουσας χρόνον, περιέχειν δὲ τὰς ἀναγραφὰς ἱστορίας περὶ τῆς ὑφανοῦ, καὶ θαλάσσης, καὶ πρωτογονίας, καὶ βασιλέων, καὶ τῶν κατ' αὐτὰς πράξεων (12). That is: "Berosus in his first book of the Babylonics tells us, that "he was born in the time of Alexander the son of "Philip; and that a great many writings are pre"served at Babylon with great care, which include "a series of time for above fifteen myriads of years; "and that these writings contain histories relating to "the heavens, the sea, the origin of things, and of "Kings and their actions." It must be owned, that this passage equally proves these two things; first, that we must remove from the text of Pliny the number 480 or 490; and then, that we are not to substitute in the room of it 480 thousand but rather 150 thousand. Not but that we may still dispute about it; and conjecture, that Berosus, when he was better informed about this point, found it to be 480 thousand years, which calculation he published in a work, which Pliny took his account from. It may be objected likewise, that the numbers might be falsified in the passage quoted by Eusebius. However that be, I had rather retain Father Hardouin's correction, and add to it with respect to Berosus and Critodemus the alteration of 490 to 150 thousand.

(10) That is, upon the two passages of his book, *de Divinatione*, quoted above num. (1) and (2).

(11) Harduin. *in Plinium*, tom. 2. pag. 134. num. 157.

(12) Berosus, *apud* Alexandrum Polyhistorem, quoted by Eusebius in his *Chronicon*, pag. 5 and 6. edit. Scaliger. *an.* 1658.

I shall observe by the bye, that Vossius has not reported as he ought what concerns Berosus in the passage of Pliny, which has been the subject of this remark. He pretends, that Pliny says, that Berosus wrote an History of what passed for the course of 480 years. I shall give the words of Vossius. *Plinius, Lib.* VI. *Hist. Nat. Cap.* LV. (he should have said *Lib.* VII. *Cap.* LVI.) *refert Berosum tradere memoriam quadringentorum annorum & octoginta* (13). Compare this with the passage of Pliny, and you will find it to be a very great error. Whom can we possibly depend upon?

(13) Vossius, *de Histor. Græc.* pag. 86.

[*C*] *The Letter of Jeremiah . . . . . relating to the lasciviousness of the women of Babylon, wants a Commentary taken from Herodotus.*] The text of Jeremiah is as follows: *The women also with cords about them sit in the ways . . . . . and if any of them drawn by some that passeth by, lie with him, she reproacheth her fellow, that she was not thought as worthy as herself, nor her cord broken* (14). To understand this thoroughly, we must have recourse to Herodotus, who tells us that there was a law at Babylon, which obliged all the women of the country to go and sit down near the temple of Venus, in order to wait an opportunity of lying with a stranger (15). It was necessary for them once in their life to pass thro' this. The richer part of them kept themselves in their coaches, and carried a great many servants with them; the rest had only an inclosure of cords, that is, they formed themselves into certain ranks, which were divided from each other by cords (16); but in such a manner, that they had a liberty to go in and out, that the strangers might walk freely between them, and choose such an one, as was most agreeable to them. When they had chosen, they threw money into her lap, and carried her aside to enjoy her. They put up a prayer for her to the Goddess of the Temple (17). It was not permitted to these women to refuse any stranger, nor reject the money offered her, how small soever the sum was. They were obliged to the first stranger, who threw the money to them. We may observe that this money was designed for religious uses. Γίνεται γὰρ ἱερὸν τοῦτο τὸ ἀργύριον (18). After the consummation of the Act, they might return to their lodging; the devotion, or expiation, which the Goddess required, was finished. Those, who were beautiful and handsome, were soon dispatched, and relieved from the watch; but the ugly waited a long while for the propitious hour to satisfy the law. There were some so unhappy, that three or four years waiting would not finish their novitiate. Καὶ γὰρ τριέτεα καὶ τετραέτεα μετεξέτεραι χρόνον μένουσι (19). Thus all the obscurity of Jeremiah's expressions is now entirely removed. Every one of these women sat in a little cell surrounded with cords, and did not go out but by breaking the cord; after which she insulted those, who were still in the inclosure. We may apply to those, who went out late, these verses:

(14) Book of *Baruch*, in the *Apocrypha*, ch. 6. ver. 42 and 43.

(15) Herod. lib. 1. cap. 199.

(16) I have added something to the exact Letter of the Author, in order to explain by a paraphrase what Herodotus has not represented particularly enough.

(17) It was Venus; the Babylonians called her Mylitta. Herodot. lib. 1. cap. 199.

(18) Ibid.

(19) Herod. lib. 1. cap. 199.

Tam gratum mihi quam ferunt puellæ
Pernici aureolum fuisse malum,
Quod zonam solvit diu ligatam (20).

(20) Catulli, Epigram 2.

——— —— "As pleasing
"As the bright golden apple was of old
"To Atalanta, which unloos'd her zone
"Long bound."

Who can sufficiently lament the monstrous alliance, which was formed amongst the Heathens between the worship of the Gods, and the most shameful passions? This is what might be justly called *Easy Devotion*, if the Comedy had contained more Acts and Scenes, and if there had not been a disagreeable circumstance for the ugly: for this patience of three or four years at once was too harsh a penance. Martin del Rio retracted what he had said upon the words, which I have quoted from the Book of Baruch. He imagined before,

BACHOVIUS (REINIER) was born at Cologne in the year 1544. His Life is publiſhed amongſt thoſe of the Civilians of Germany in Melchior Adam. I ſhall not repeat what Moreri has extracted from thence, but only give an account of the perſecutions which Bachovius ſuffered at Leipſic, becauſe of his being a Calviniſt. At firſt there were nothing but ſuſpicions againſt him, and they were ſatisfied with removing him from his public employments; but the times changing, he obtained the office of Senator, and afterwards in the year 1585 that of Echevin, and about three years after that of Conſul. The Elector Chriſtian I dying in 1591, Bachovius was importuned to profeſs Lutheraniſm, which he refuſing to do, they obliged him to quit his poſts. He had no regard to the advice which was given him to retire, though they repreſented to him the danger of a priſon; he thought that this flight would give occaſion to his enemies to tell the world, that he was not conſcious of his innocence; but in the year 1593 he was forced to give way to the popular commotions, and to depart from Leipſic. He went firſt to Serveſte (*a*), and the year following to the Palatinate, not without the loſs of almoſt all his effects. He found a kind protector in the Elector Palatine, and he executed ſeveral Offices of profit and honour at Heidelberg till his death, which happened the 27th of February 1614 (*a*). He publiſhed a book, which ſhews more of the Divine than the Lawyer [*A*]. He left among other children REINIER or REINHARD BACHOVIUS, whom he ſaw raiſed from the Profeſſorſhip of Politics to that of Civil Law in the Univerſity of Heidelberg. This ſon had a conſiderable character among the Civilians of the ſeventeenth Century [*B*]. He was in a very eminent manner maſter of the art of confuting with great ſubtilty whatever he engaged to attack (*b*): he was uncertain with reſpect to religion; for he ſaid in confidence to a Lutheran Profeſſor (*c*), that if they would permit him to read private Lectures in Civil Law at Straſbourg, he would quit his Profeſſorſhip at Heidelberg, and go to Straſbourg. He declared that he abhorred the doctrine of abſolute Predeſtination, and that he believed the corporal preſence of Jeſus Chriſt in the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, though he did not underſtand the manner of it. The perſon to whom he diſcovered his mind in theſe points, communicated it to the Magiſtrates of Straſbourg, who deſired him to acquaint Bachovius that he ſhould be welcome there. Upon this he removed thither with his Library, but not finding any method to ſupport himſelf there (*d*) he returned to Heidelberg, where the friend, whom he had confided in, found him chagrin'd and ſick in the year 1629 (*e*).

(*a*) Taken from Melchior Adam. *in Vitis Jurisconſultorum.*

(*b*) See the remark [*B*].

(*c*) His name was Tabor, and he was eſteemed a great Civilian.

(*d*) *Vtæ præſidiis deſtitutus religionem omiſit.* Praſchius *in Mauſoleo Taberi.*

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

that they meant certain ligatures, which were practiſed to make a perſon loved. See his Magical Diſquiſitions (21).

(24) Lib. 3. Part 1. Quæſt. 3. pag. 13.

(*a*) *Zerbſt*, the German name of this city, is likewiſe the French name, both in the *Index Thuani*, and in Baudrand, in the word *Zerveſta*. [CRIT. REM.]

[*A*] *He publiſhed a Book, which ſhewed more of the Divine, than of the Lawyer.*] It was a kind of Commentary upon the famous Catechiſm of the Palatinate. Melchior Adam tells us this: *Propagandæ Veritatis Evangelicæ ſtudio edidit Catecheſin Palatinatus, teſtimoniis ſacræ Scripturæ ac ſententiis Patrum, qui primis quingentis à Chriſto nato annis in Eccleſiâ Dei claruerunt, exornatam & illuſtratam, cum Epitome vitæ eorundem Patrum, & methodicâ narratione de Conciliis; quorum Canones in illo catechetico libro citantur* (1). That is: "With a deſign to propagate the truth of the "Goſpel, he publiſhed the Catechiſm of the Palatinate, "adorned and illuſtrated with the teſtimonies of the "holy Scripture and the opinions of the Fathers, who "flouriſhed in the Church of God for the firſt five "hundred years from our Saviour's Nativity, with an "Epitome of the Lives of thoſe Fathers, and a me"thodical Account of the Councils, whoſe Canons "are quoted in that catechetical work."

(1) Melchior Adam. *in Vitis Jurisconſult.* pag. 472, 473.

[*B*] REINIER, *or* REINHARD BACHOVIUS ..... *had a conſiderable character among the Civilians.*] Conringius ſtiles him *diſciplinæ juridicæ æternum decus* (2); that is, "the eternal Honour of the Civil Law." According to Vinnius he was *ſubtiliſſimus Juriſconſultorum, non tam ſuæ ſententiæ adſtructor, quam deſtructor alienæ* (3); that is, "the moſt ſubtil of all the Civi"lians, and one, who did not ſo much inſiſt upon "his own opinion, as deſtroy that of others." Another ſays, *Eo, in his quæ ad ſolidam noſtri juris interpretationem faciunt, acutiorem vix tradit prior ætas* (4); that is, "The former Age ſcarce produced "any one, who was more acute in thoſe things, "which are neceſſary to the ſolid interpretation of "our law." In ſhort, the epithets of *accuratiſſimus, ſubtiliſſimus, acutiſſimus, inexorabilis cenſor* (5); that is, "moſt exact, moſt ſubtle, moſt acute, and the "inexorable Cenſor," were never wanting to him. The commendation, which Vinnius gave him, may be applied to a great many people: we find a vaſt number of ſubtle writers, and great reaſoners, who prove their own doctrine but very weakly; and yet have the talent of entirely overturning that of others. A man is generally much ſtronger in an offenſive than in a defenſive diſpute. See what an Elector of Cologne ſaid with reſpect to the diſputes between the Franciſcans and Dominicans. It is mentioned by Father Paul. See the fourth Book of his Hiſtory of the Council of Trent p. 309 of the verſion of Mr. Amelot de la Houſſaie.

(2) Conringius, *de Autoritate Juris publ. Juſtin. in Germaniâ*, *apud* Magirum, *Eponym.* pag. 99.

(3) Vinnius, cap. 11. *de Pact.* num. 9. *apud* Magirum, *Eponym.* pag. 99.

(4) Hahn. *in Dedic. Obſervat. ad Weſenbec. ap. eundem.*

(5) Schutz, *apud eundem.*

BACON (ROGER) an Engliſh Franciſcan Friar, lived in the thirteenth Century. He was a great Aſtronomer, a great Chymiſt, and a great Mathematician. This without doubt is what made him ſuſpected of Magic. There is a tradition amongſt the Engliſh that this Friar made a brazen head, which anſwered the queſtions which he propoſed [*A*]. Selden rejects this as a mere childiſh Fable [*B*], and obſerves, that no Hiſtorian

[*A*] *It is ſaid .... that he made a brazen head, which anſwered the queſtions, which he propoſed to it.*] Maier obſerves, that it was uſual to introduce Roger Bacon in Comedies as a great Magician, and *that the common tradition is that he and his Fellow-Monk Thomas Bungey were ſeven years in making this head, in order to know of it if there was any method diſcoverable of ſurrounding all England with a thick wall and rampart; upon which the brazen head gave them an anſwer, which they could not well underſtand, becauſe as they did not expect to receive it ſo ſoon, they were employed in ſomething elſe inſtead of hearkening to this Oracle* (1). Theſe are mere popular tales, which deſerve no ſerious confutation. Such kind of ſtories have been told of Albertus Magnus (2).

(1) Maierus, *Symbol. aureæ Menſæ*, lib. 10. pag. 453. quoted by Naudé, *Apolog. des grans Hommes*, p. 491.

(2) See above remark [*F*], num. 2. of the article of ALBERTUS MAGNUS.

[*B*] .... *Selden rejects this as a mere childiſh fable.*] I ſhall

torian mentions it, and that Baleus, who had defamed Roger Bacon, retracted his calumnies, and repaired that injury very honourably. Franciſcus Picus ſays, that he had read in a book of Bacon's, "that a man might become a Prophet, and foretel things to come, "by means of the looking-glaſs Almuchefi formed after the rules of perſpective, provi- "ded that he did but uſe it under a proper conſtellation, and had before reduced his body "to an even temperature by Chymiſtry (*a*)." This is not contrary to what John Picus Mirandula ſays, who aſſerted that Bacon amuſed himſelf only with natural Magic (*b*). This Friar ſent divers inſtruments of his invention to Pope Clement IV (*c*). Several of his books have been publiſhed: *Specula Mathematica & perſpectiva*, *Speculum Alchemiæ*, *de mirabili poteſtate Artis & Naturæ*, *Epiſtolæ cum Notis*, *&c.* It is very probable that he performed nothing by means of a compact with the Devil; but notwithſtanding he might aſcribe ſurprizing effects to things, which had not naturally ſuch a virtue in them. So that there is ſome reaſon for ſaying, that his Writings contain a great deal of ſuperſtition [*C*]. He was extremely infatuated with judiciary Aſtrology [*D*].

(*a*) Franc. Picus, lib. 2. *de Prænotione*, cap. 1. and lib. 7. cap. 7. quoted by Naudé, *Apolog. des grans Hommes*, pag. 490.

(*b*) Jo. Picus in *Præfat. Apolog.* quoted by Naudé ibid.

(*c*) Naudé, ibid. pag. 493.

The Letter which he wrote to Pope Clement IV, and which is ſtill in the Library at Lambeth, contains with the commendations of the holy Scripture a very ſtrange deſign; for he deſires that Pope to confirm by the Apoſtolical Authority, and to recommend to the whole Church, the method which he had invented of teaching any perſon Hebrew, Latin, Greek and Arabic, in a very few days. He aſſerted that Laymen ought not only to read the Scripture, but even to underſtand the Originals [*E*]; and he affirmed that his Univerſal Grammar was earneſtly deſired, and that ſeveral Prophecies confirmed it.

I ſhall give his own words: *Iſtiuſmodi caput ex ære conflatum ab eruditiſſimo Rogero Bacon eſt in ore noſtratis vulgi, ſed non ſine injuriâ in illius Matheſin, quam ſummam & à dæmonum præſtigiis puram monſtrant ſatis illius opera quotquot nos legiſſe contigit, & quicquid adverſus eum uti magum ſeu νικυόμαντιν J. Balæus inſcitia dicam, an in optimas artes malitiâ, editione centuriarum prima ſatis incogitanter effutierat, id benè monitus omne non modò retractavit, verum in ea quæ tali & tanto viro digna ſunt poſtremâ recognitione etiam prudenter commutavit. Nec quod banc vulgi famam adſtruat, habent Annales noſtri* (3). John Dee, an Engliſh Philoſopher and Mathematician, wrote an Apology for Roger Bacon. He mentions in the Epiſtle Dedicatory his *Propædeumata Apoſtolica de præſtantioribus quibuſdam naturæ virtutibus.* See Naudé pag. 488 of his *Apology for great men.*

(3) Selden. *de Diis Syris, Syntagma* 1. cap. 2. pag. 38.

[*C*] *His writings contain a great deal of ſuperſtition.*] Martin del Rio, an Author, who in theſe points is the leaſt free to acquit ſuſpected perſons, has yet cleared our Roger Bacon from being a Magician, and contents himſelf with repreſenting him only as a ſuperſtitious Author. *Alchindus*, ſays he (4), *Rogerius Bachonus, & Geber Arabs multis ſcatent ſuperſtitioſis; ideò vetitæ lectionis etiam hos putârim:* that is, "Alchin- "dus, Roger Bacon, and Geber the Arabian are full "of ſuperſtitious obſervations, and therefore I think "the reading of them ought to be prohibited." John Wierus is not ſo indulgent; for he ranks in the ſame claſs Roger Bacon, Petrus Aponenſis, Anſelmus Parmenſis, Cicchus of Aſculum, and ſeveral others, whereas Martin del Rio repreſents the three laſt as real Magicians, and only places Bacon among the ſuperſtitious. *Ab hoc numero removeo, ut dæmoniacos magos Picatricem Hiſpanum, Anſelmum Parmenſem, Cicchum Eſculanium, Petrum de Abono, & Cornel. Agrippam, & Paracelſum . . . . . homines partim atheos, partim hæreticos* (5). Wierus agrees exactly with him in relation to the reſt, that is, he conſidered Petrus Aponenſis, Anſelmus Parmenſis, &c, as men, who were guilty of magic. *Superiorum magorum nugamenta itidem inſulsè ſequuti ſunt Appion Grammaticus, Julianus Apoſtata, Robertus Anglicus apud Helvetios miſerè mortuus,* Rogerius Bachon, *Petrus Aponenſis Conciliator dictus, Albertus Teutonicus, Arnoldus de Villa-nova, Anſelmus Parmenſis, Picatrix Hiſpanus, vel author Libri ad Alfonſum ſub Picatricis nomine, Cicchus Aſculus Florentinus, & plerique alii obſcurioris nominis ſcriptores, deplorati certè ingenii homines. Qui quum ſe magiam tradere pollicentur, non niſi aut deliramenta quædam nulla ratione ſubnixa, aut ſuperſtitiones piis omnibus indignas congeſſerunt* (6).

(4) *Diſquiſit. Magicar.* lib. 1. cap. 3. pag. 22.

(5) Ibid.

(6) Wier. *de Præſtigiis*, lib. 2. cap. 4. He remarks that John Franciſcus Picus, lib. 7. cap. 7. confutes Bacon.

[*D*] *He was extremely infatuated with judiciary Aſtrology.*] John Picus aſſerts, that the Book intitled *Speculum Aſtrologiæ*, which treats of the lawful and unlawful Authors, who wrote upon Aſtrology, is the work of Roger Bacon (7). This Book was condemned by Gerſon (8) and by Agrippa, *as ſuperſtitious to the laſt degree* (9): Franciſcus Picus (10) and many others condemned it, becauſe it is maintained there, *with ſubmiſſion to better judgments*, that the Books of Magic ought to be carefully preſerved, becauſe the time draws on, when, for certain reaſons, which are not ſpecified, there will be a neceſſity of *peruſing them, and making uſe of them upon ſome occaſions.* Naudé adds that *Roger Bacon was ſo much addicted to Judiciary Aſtrology, that Henry de Haſſia, William of Paris, and Nicholas Oreſme . . . . were obliged to declaim ſeverely againſt his writings, and againſt all the vanities of the Aſtrologers* (11).

(7) Jo. Picus, lib. 1. *adverſus Aſtrolog.* quoted by Naudé, pag. 526.

(8) *Lib. de Libris Aſtrolog. non tolerandis*, Propoſ. 3. quoted by Naudé, p. 525.

(9) Agrippa *in Epiſt.* quoted by the ſame Author, ibid.

(10) Lib. 7. *de Prænotione*, cap. 2. quoted by the ſame Author, ibid.

(11) Naudé, *Apolog. pour les grans Hommes*, pag. 526.

[*E*] *He aſſerted, that laymen ought not only to read the Scripture, but even to underſtand the Originals.*] As I have not read the Letter, I cannot ſay whether he proceeds upon this argument, that a private perſon, who does not underſtand Greek or Hebrew, is obliged to depend upon the fidelity and capacity of the Tranſlators; which it may be ſaid is a very precarious foundation, and ſuch as it would be hard to truſt our ſalvation upon. However that be, his pretenſion is not far from being extravagant, and is involved in impoſſibilities. This is the opinion of the Author, who mentions that Letter, *Inter Scriptores 13 ſeculi, qui à Whartono pro ſcripturis & ſacris vernaculis adducuntur, comparet* Rogerus Bacon, *cujus Epiſtolam de laudibus S. Scripturæ ad Clementem IV Bibliotheca Lambethana tenet. Obſervat autem, Autorem illum portentoſa quædam & impoſſibilia in prolixâ illâ Epiſtolâ comminiſci. Non enim tantum neceſſarium eſſe docet, ut omnes Chriſtiani ſacram Scripturam tanquam fidei ſuæ fontem & regulam perfectè ſciant, ſed etiam fontes Hebraicos & Græcos ab omnibus conſulendos aſſerit. Et quamvis incredibile videatur, ut ſinguli Chriſtiani linguarum iſtarum notitiam ſibi comparere poſſint, id tamen Baconus factu perquam facile eſſe perſuadere ſuis Lectoribus cupit, imprimis cum ſe Grammaticam quandam univerſalem invenisse glorietur, cujus ope intra pauciſſimos dies quilibet linguam Hebraicam, Græcam, Latinam, & Arabicam addiſcere queat; & ut omnes, quod legunt, etiam intelligant, ſe opus quoddam manuductorium ſeu præliminare ad promovendam S. Scripturæ intelligentiam editurum ſpondet, enixè Pontificem orans, ut artificium ſuum ſummis omnium votis expetitum, & frequentibus vaticiniis confirmatum, apoſtolicâ autoritate confirmet, & univerſæ eccleſiæ commendet, unde innumera in Eccleſiam beneficia redundatura minimè dubitat* (12).

(12) *Acta Eruditor. Lipſ. menſis Junii* 1691. pag. 279. in an Extract from Uſſerius *de Hiſtoriâ dogmaticâ Controverſiæ de Scripturis & ſacris vernaculis.*

☞BACON (ROGER), The great merit of this Writer will juſtify us for enlarging Mr. Bayle's Article concerning him. He was deſcended from a good family, and born in 1214 (*a*) at Ilcheſter (*b*) in Somerſetſhire. He was diſtinguiſhed by the title of *Doctor Mirabilis* on account

(*a*) Dr. Freind's *Hiſtory of Phyſic*, Part 2. pag. 235.

(*b*) Mr. du Pin calls it erroneouſly *Iccheſter*, *Bibliotb. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* tom. 10. pag. 77. edit. de Pariſ. 1702.

count of the extent of his learning and the penetration of his genius. He ſtudied at Oxford under Edmund Rich, afterwards Archbiſhop of Canterbury, and Richard Fitzacre (*c*), where he made a prodigious progreſs in all parts of polite Learning, and from thence removed to the Univerſity of Paris, which was greatly frequented by the Engliſh at that time (*d*). After he had taken his degree of Doctor of Divinity there, he is ſaid (*e*) to have returned to his own country, and by the advice of Robert Groſtete or Groſthead the learned Biſhop of Lincoln, who was always a kind Patron to him, entered himſelf among the Franciſcan Monks at Oxford. But others are of opinion, that he engaged in that Order at Paris (*f*). Caſimir Oudin in his *Commentar. de Scriptor. & ſcriptis Eccleſ.* (*g*) places this fact about the year 1240. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf, as well as his brother Robert Bacon, by a Sermon which he preached at Oxford before King Henry III, wherein he remonſtrated againſt his conduct for paying too great a regard to the advice of Peter Biſhop of Wincheſter, and giving the moſt conſiderable Poſts of the Kingdom to Foreigners (*h*). Dr. Cave and Oudin fix this under the year 1259. Dr. Plot in his *Natural Hiſtory of Oxfordſhire* (*i*) tells us, that he was *ſome time Fellow of Merton-College in Oxford*; but Mr. Wood in his *Hiſtoria & Antiquitates Univerſitatis Oxonienſis* (*k*), repreſents this as very doubtful. His ſtrong inclination to the purſuits of knowledge engaged him in the moſt intenſe application to it imaginable; but his chief ſtudy was that of Philoſophy [*A*], in which he made ſo great a progreſs, that Leland tells us, that he left no part of it unexplored (*l*). In order to open the way to his improvement in the Sciences, he endeavoured to make himſelf maſter of the Latin, Hebrew, Greek, and Arabic Languages; for which purpoſe he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Grammar, which was at that time ſo greatly neglected, that there were ſcarce four perſons among the Latins who underſtood Grammar, though there were many who could ſpeak Greek, Arabic, and Hebrew.

(*c*) Cave, *Hiſt. Literar. in Sæc. Scholaſt. ad ann.* 1278. pag. 648. edit. Coloniæ Allobrog. 1720. in fol.

(*d*) *See* Dr. Jebb in his Preface to his edition of *Bacon's Opus Majus*, publiſhed at London 1733. in fol.

(*e*) *Hiſt. & Antiq. Acad. Oxon. &c.* pag. 136. and Cave, *ubi ſupra.*

(*f*) *See* Dr. Jebb in his marginal note (*i*).

(*g*) Tom. 3. Sæc. 13. col. 191. ed. Lipſiæ 1722. in fol.

(*h*) Pitſeus, *Relat. Hiſt. de Rebus Anglic.* tom. 1. pag. 366. edit. Paris 1619.

(*i*) Cap. 9. pag. 214. edit. 1677.

(*k*) Lib. 2. pag. 88. edit. 1674.

(*l*) *Ingreſſam ita totam penetraverit & circuiverit, ut nullum locum jam non excuſſum reliquerit.* Comment. de Scr. Brit. pag. 257.

[*A*] *His chief ſtudy was that of Philoſophy.*] Philoſophy, as Dr. Jebb obſerves in the Preface to his edition of the *Opus Magnum* of our Author, was at that time abſolutely neglected, and almoſt extinguiſhed in our own country, as well as in other parts of Europe. Some of the ancient Fathers having expreſſed themſelves with ſeverity againſt the Philoſophers in the heat of their controverſies, this gave occaſion to the later Divines to reject all Philoſophy with the utmoſt indignation; particularly Gratian (1), who collected the Canon-Law into one body. He having compiled his work from the ſentences of the Fathers, the Decrees of the Councils, the Decretals of the Popes, and a great many ſuppoſititious writings, publiſhed it in the year 1151; and it was immediately confirmed by Pope Eugenius III, and ordered to be read publickly in the Univerſities (2). In this compilation there are many paſſages, which repreſent the ſtudy of Philoſophy as uſeleſs and unworthy of the application of a Chriſtian. The Divines of Paris therefore being induced by this authority, in the beginning of the thirteenth Century, condemned Ariſtotle's philoſophical writings, and excommunicated thoſe, who ſhould preſume to read them (3). *Scimus enim quod temporibus noſtris Pariſiis diu fuit contradictum naturali philoſophiæ & metaphyſicæ Ariſtotelis per Avicennæ & Averrois expoſitores; & ob denſam ignorantiam fuerunt libri eorum excommunicati, & utentes eis per tempora ſatis longa.* But perhaps this cenſure will appear leſs obnoxious, if we conſider, that the Divines of Paris had not the works of Ariſtotle in the original, and in the ſame degree of purity, as we have them now, but tranſlated very imperfectly from the Arabic Verſions of them, and extremely diſguiſed and corrupted. And Father Rapin obſerves (4), that this condemnation was particularly occaſioned by a man of a violent factious ſpirit, whoſe name was *Amaury*, who endeavoured to juſtify his extravagant opinions by the principles of Ariſtotle, which were then begun to be taught, and whoſe Phyſics he had read; and aſſerted, that God ſerved for form to the matter of all natural beings; and that this matter being uncreated was divine. Theſe errors of Amaury's were imputed to Ariſtotle, from whom he pretended to have taken them. But the Divines did not continue long in this opinion; for ſoon after the year 1230, when Michael Scotus publiſhed a Latin Verſion of ſome parts of Ariſtotle relating to Natural Philoſophy and Mathematics (5), that Philoſopher ſeems to have recovered his reputation among the Students. The new Orders of the Dominicans and Franciſcans, which were inſtituted about the ſame time, favouring likewiſe the doctrine of that Philoſopher, and defending it in their publick Lectures, Ariſtotle's character was raiſed ſo high, that the title of Philoſopher was ſolely appropriated to him (6). By this means ſeveral others beſides Michael Scotus laboured in explaining his works, and ſoon after divers verſions of them, which were ſaid to have been made by Gerard of Cremona, Alured Anglicus, Herman Alemannus, and Willielmus Flemingus. However Philoſophy was ſtill in a very rude and uncultivated ſtate. And Bacon himſelf tells us (7), that tho' there never was ſo great an *Appearance* of knowledge, nor ſo great an application to ſo many ſciences in ſeveral countries, as there had been for forty years paſt; yet there never was ſo great ignorance and ſuch a variety of errors as then. *Nunquam fuit tanta apparentia ſapientiæ, nec tantum exercitium ſtudii in tot facultatibus, in tot regionibus, ſicut jam à quadraginta annis; ubique enim Doctores ſunt diſperſi . . . in omni civitate, & in omni caſtro, & in omni burgo, præcipuè per duos ordines ſtudentes, quod non accidit niſi à quadraginta annis vel circiter, cum tamen nunquam fuit tanta ignorantia, tantus error.* Thoſe who had undertaken to publiſh new verſions of Ariſtotle's works, were not ſufficiently converſant in the languages, or in the ſciences of which they treated. Herman confeſſed to Bacon, that he was rather an aſſiſtant in the tranſlations than a tranſlator himſelf, ſince he employed Saracens in Spain, who had the chief hand in his verſions (8). Michael Scotus borrowed all that he publiſhed in his own name from one Andrew a Jew. And *Willielmus Flemingus*, ſays Bacon, *as every body knows at Paris, has no ſkill in the Greek language; tho' he pretends to it, and therefore he tranſlates every thing falſly, and corrupts the learning of the Latins.* Tho' Bacon therefore eſteemed Ariſtotle's works *as the foundation of all knowledge*, yet he thought it would have been of advantage to learning, if all the copies of them, which were then in uſe amongſt the Latins, were deſtroyed; and he declares, that if it had been in his power, he would have burnt them all; for the ſtudy of them was mere loſs of time, and the occaſion of error, and the multiplying of ignorance, beyond what could be expreſſed. *Si haberem poteſtatem ſuper libros Ariſtotelis, ego facerem omnes cremari; quia non eſt niſi temporis amiſſio ſtudere in illis, & cauſa erroris, & multiplicatio ignorantiæ, ultra id quod valeat explicari* (9). He tells us afterwards, that the herd of Students with their Teachers had no valuable knowledge as the object of their purſuits, and therefore they languiſhed in a ſtupid application to bad tranſlations, and loſt both their time and expence. In ſhort, that they were amuſed with a mere appearance or ſhadow of knowledge, and did not value what they really knew, but what they were thought to know by the ignorant multitude. *Vulgus ſtudentium cum capitibus ſuis non habet unde excitetur ad aliquid dignum, & ideo languet & aſininat circa malè tranſlata, & tempus & ſtudium amittit in omnibus & expenſas. Apparentia quidem ſola tenet eos,* &c.

(1) Baconi, *Opus Maj.* lib. 1. cap. 15.

(2) Cave, *Hiſt. Litter. Sæc. Waldenſe, ad ann.* 1131. pag. 578. edit. Coloniæ Allobrogum, 1720. *and* Jebb, *ubi ſupra.*

(3) Baconi, *Opus Maj.* lib. 1. cap. 9. pag. 14. edit. Jebb. *See likewiſe* Father Rapin's *Compariſon between Plato and Ariſtotle*, ch. 5.

(4) *Ubi ſupra.*

(5) Baconi, *Opus Majus*, lib. 2. cap. 8. pag. 36, 37.

(6) Idem, lib. 2. cap. 8.

(7) *MS. Cot. Tib.* C. 5. f. 121, *apud* Jebb.

(8) Ib. fol. 138. c. 8.

(9) Ibid.

Hebrew (*l*). He then turned his thoughts to the Mathematics, which he eſteemed *the chief of all the Sciences, and that, which ſhould precede and qualify us for the reſt* (*m*). He took a great deal of pains in ſearching out the Works of the Antients, and he procured at a large expence rare copies from different parts of the world (*n*). He tells us likewiſe himſelf (*o*), that after he had ſtudied the Languages and Sciences from his youth, yet he at laſt found that he was deficient in many points of knowledge, ſo that after the example of Biſhop Groſtete, he laid aſide Ariſtotle, and reſolved to penetrate into the receſſes of Nature by experiments. He contracted a friendſhip with all the learned men of his time, and procured ſeveral young men to be inſtructed in the Languages, and other things neceſſary, in order to aſſiſt him in his experiments. In theſe deſigns he ſpared no coſt, but within the ſpace of twenty years, according to his own account (*p*), he ſpent above two thouſand pounds (*q*). It is not at all ſurprizing therefore, that a man of his genius and induſtry ſhould make ſo many noble diſcoveries in Aſtronomy, Perſpective, Chymiſtry, Phyſic, and the mechanical Sciences [*B*]. His uncommon and extenſive Learning

(*l*) *Opus Tert. ad Clem. IV. MS. Cot. Tib.* c. 5. f. 6. *apud* Jebb, *ubi ſupra.*

(*m*) *Prima erit inter ſcientias, & præcedens alias, & diſponens ad eas.* Opus Majus, Part 4. pag. 64.

(*n*) *MS. Cot. Tib.* C. 5. fol. 10. *apud* Jebb.

(*o*) Ib. fol. 138.

(*p*) Ibid. fol. 19.

(*q*) Dr. Jebb, ſays, that they were of Paris Pounds or Livres.

& non curant quid ſciant, ſed quid videantur ſcire coram multitudine inſenſatâ (10). With regard to Mathematics in general, he owns, that Robert Groſtete, Biſhop of Lincoln, and his brother Fryer Adam de Mariſco were eminent in this way (11); and indeed they were not only ſo in this, but in other parts of learning; but they died when Bacon was in the flouriſhing part of his life. So that in his later years, giving an account of what ſteps were taken in this branch of knowledge, he acquaints us, that there were but four in Europe (of whom his pupil Johannes Londinenſis was one,) who had made any progreſs in that ſcience. The reſt, he tells us, ſtuck in the firſt elements at the fifth propoſition of Euclid, which afterwards went by the name of *Pons Aſinimus* (12). In an age of ſuch profound ignorance, and amidſt all theſe prodigious diſadvantages our Author appeared, and by the uncommon force of his genius and intenſe application made great advances in the ſeveral arts and ſciences, as we ſhall ſee in the following notes.

(10) Ibid.

(11) *Specul. Mathemat.* pag. 12. *apud* Freind, *Hiſt. of Phyſick*, Part 2. pag. 242, 2d edit. London 1727.

(12) *See* Freind, ibid. p. 242, 243.

[*B*] *Should make ſo many noble diſcoveries in Aſtronomy, Perſpective, Chymiſtry, Phyſic, and the mechanical Sciences.*] Dr. Freind obſerves (13), that he was almoſt the only Aſtronomer of his age; he accordingly took notice of an error in the *Calendar*, with regard to the quantity of the *ſolar* year, which had been encreaſing ever ſince the time of Julius Cæſar; and propoſed in 1267 a Plan for the correction of it to Pope Clement IV, who was a man of ſome learning himſelf, and an encourager of it in others. He treats of this at large in the fourth Book of his *Opus Majus*. And Dr. Jebb (14) ſtiles this one of the nobleſt inventions, which were ever diſcovered by the human mind and induſtry. *Et primo Calendarii emendandi ratio, quam fuſius tractat in majoris hujuſce operis libro quarto, inter pulchriora jure recenſenda eſt, quæ humana unquam excogitaverat induſtria.* And the ſame Gentleman obſerves, that in this point he ſurpaſſed not only Bede and other Engliſh Writers, who endeavoured to reform the errors of the *Calendar*, but likewiſe Theophilus, Euſebius, Victorius, Cyrill, and all the other foreigners. And that when the queſtion was diſcuſſed concerning the ſame ſubject in the Lateran Council under Pope Leo X, tho' it remained undetermined, becauſe the *quantity of the years and months, and the motions of the Sun and Moon, were not yet ſufficiently adjuſted* (15), yet Paul Biſhop of Foſſombrone, who was at the head of that affair, borrowed a great part of his Book, *concerning the right celebration of Eaſter*, from Bacon; tho' he concealed his name, and in ſome places diſapproved of his opinion. But when the celebrated Nicholas Copernicus at the advice of the ſame Biſhop had applied himſelf to the obſervation of the motions of the heavenly bodies with more accuracy, than they had been obſerved before, he confirmed the judgment of Bacon, and made thoſe diſcoveries, which enabled thoſe, who followed, to compleat the reformation of the *Calendar*, under Pope Gregory XIII; ſo that the merit of this work, according to Dr. Jebb, is juſtly to be aſcribed to our Author. Dr. Plot likewiſe in his *Natural Hiſtory of Oxfordſhire* (16) obſerves, that "whatever has been done in this matter from the time "of Frier Bacon to that of Pope Gregory XIII, "muſt in great meaſure be aſcribed to him, "their "whole reformation ſcarce differing from his," except in this circumſtance, which, as that Writer remarks, is well worth the obſervation; that whereas the Gregorian Reformers reduced the equinoxes and ſolſtices to the places, which they ſuppoſed they held in the time of the Nicene Council, Bacon ſeems inclinable to have brought them (and that moſt rationally) to their places, in a much more eminent epoche, viz. the winter-ſolſtice to the tenth of the Calends of January, and the vernal equinox to the tenth of the Calends of April, their true places at the time of Chriſt's Birth; which he proves by a very cogent argument drawn from the obſervations of Ptolemy, who lived but 140 years after Chriſt; in whoſe time the vernal equinox was found to be on the eleventh of the Calends of April. Now allowing, that it aſcends in the Calendar a whole natural day in 130 years, if in Ptolemy's time it fell on the eleventh of the Calends of April, it muſt neceſſarily at Chriſt's Birth have been at leaſt on the tenth; and ſo of the ſolſtice (17). According to which computation they had gone back ſince the time of our Saviour, as Dr. Plot obſerves, to the year 1676 almoſt thirteen days, the number 130 days being ſo often to be found in 1676 wanting but fourteen. *Now the Æra of Chriſt's Birth*, concludes that Author (18), *being a time of much higher value, and more to be reſpected by Chriſtians than the Nicene Council, in whatever elſe they have exceeded him, I am ſure in this they have fallen ſhort of his Reformation.* Dr. Freind (19) alſo tells us, that it was his Plan, which Pope Gregory above 300 years after followed in his reformation of the Julian Calendar, with this difference only, that Bacon would have had it begun from the Birth of our Saviour; whereas the Gregorian correction reaches no higher than the Nicene Council. With regard to *Perſpective*, he was at infinite pains and charge in the improvement of that ſcience; which was then underſtood but by very few, and he tells us (20), that no Lectures had been read upon it at Paris, and but twice at Oxford, and that there were but three, who had any ſkill in it. However theſe perſons made ſuch prodigious advances in it, that, as Dr. Jebb obſerves, they ſeem to have left nothing for poſterity to add to the perfection of their inſtruments. Bacon has very accurately deſcrib'd the uſe of reading glaſſes, and ſhewn the way of making them. We ſhall give the reader the following paſſage from his *Opus Majus* (21). *Si vero homo aſpiciat literas & alias res minutas per medium cryſtalli vel vitri, vel alterius perſpicui ſuppoſiti literis, & ſit portio minor ſphæræ, cujus convexitas ſit verſus oculum, & oculus ſit in aere, longè melius videbit literas, & apparebunt ei majores . . . & ideo hoc inſtrumentum eſt utile ſenibus & habentibus oculos debiles. Nam literam quantumcunque parvam poſſunt videre inſufficienti magnitudine.* Dr. Freind likewiſe remarks (22), that he deſcribes the *Camera Obſcura*, and all ſorts of glaſſes, which magnify or diminiſh any *object*, bring it nearer to the eye, or remove it farther off. Bacon tells us alſo himſelf, that he had made a great number of *burning-glaſſes*, and that there were none ever in uſe among the Latins, till his friend Peter de Maharn-Curia had applied himſelf to the making of them (23). He informs us in another paſſage of his writings, that this Peter had already laboured three years about one glaſs, which was to burn at a certain diſtance, and that he would ſoon compleat it thro' the favour of God, tho' the Latins knew not how to do that, nor was it ever attempted by them, notwithſtanding, ſays he, we have books concerning the method of forming glaſſes of that kind.

(13) Ibid. pag. 237. and his *Appendix*, num. 4.

(14) *In Præfat.*

(15) *Quod annorum & menſium magnitudines, atque ſolis & lunæ motus, nondum ſatis dimenſi haberentur.* Nic. Copernic. *in Proœm. Op. de Revolutionibus Orbium Cœleſtium.*

(16) Cap. 9. pag. 220. edit. 1677.

(17) *In Oper. Minor.* Part 3. cap. 69. *MS. in Bibliotb. Colleg. Univerſit.*

(18) *Natural Hiſt. of Oxfordſhire*, pag. 221.

(19) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 238.

(20) *Opus Tert. ad Clem. MS. Cot. Tib.* C. 5. fol. 6. *apud* Jebb, *ubi ſupra.*

(21) Pag. 352.

(22) Pag. 256.

(23) *MS. Reg.* 2. cap. 1. Part 5. *de Compend. Studii Theolog. apud* Jebb, *ubi ſupra.*

Learning drew upon him the attention of mankind, and his fame became ſo univerſal, that Pope Clement IV, before he was raiſed to the See of Rome, deſired to have an account of his inventions, and wrote a letter to Bacon for that purpoſe, which he ſent by Raymund de Lauduno (*r*). But our Author was at that time involved in the greateſt perplexity imaginable, occaſioned by the envy or the ignorance of thoſe who were of his own Order. For his ſuperiors had made an expreſs decree, that he ſhould not communicate

(*r*) *MS. Cot. Tib.* C. 5. fol. 3. *apud* Jebb.

Circa vero unum ſpeculum comburens in certâ diſtantiâ laboravit jam per tres annos, & cito veniet ad finem per gratiam Dei, quod omnes Latini neſcirent facere, nec unquam fuit attentatum inter eos, cum tamen libros habemus de hujuſmodi ſpeculorum compoſitione (24). We may obſerve likewiſe, that tho' Galileo aſcribes the Invention of the *optic Tube* or *Teleſcope* to himſelf (25), and Peter Borellus contends that the honour of it is due to Zachary Joannides a Citizen of Middleburg (26), yet it is evident, that the invention was known to our Author from a paſſage, wherein he tells us, that he was able to form glaſſes in ſueh a manner, with reſpect to our ſight and the objects, that the rays ſhall be refracted and reflected wherever we pleaſe, ſo that we may ſee a thing under what angle we think proper, either near or at a diſtance, and be able to read the ſmalleſt letters at an incredible diſtance, and to count the duſt and ſand, on account of the greatneſs of the angle, under which we ſee the objects, and alſo that we ſhall ſcarce ſee the greateſt bodies near us on account of the ſmallneſs of the angle under which we ſee them. *Nam poſſumus ſic figurare perſpicua, & taliter ea ordinare reſpectu noſtri viſûs & rerum, quod frangentur radii & flectentur quorſumcunque voluerimus, ut ſub quocunque angulo voluerimus, videbimus rem prope vel longè, & ſic ex incredibili diſtantia legeremus literas minutiſſimas, & pulveres & arenas numeraremus propter magnitudinem anguli, ſub quo videremus, & maxima corpora de prope vix videremus, propter parvitatem anguli, ſub quo videremus, &c.* (27). We find, that he made uſe of his teleſcope in his aſtronomical obſervations from what he ſays in his *Opus Tertium* dedicated to Pope Clement concerning thoſe things, which were neceſſary for compleating the Aſtronomical Tables, which he deſigned. " But, *ſays he*, what is much " more requiſite than theſe things, is to have men, " who underſtand Perſpective and the inſtruments of " it very well, ... becauſe the inſtruments of " Aſtronomy are only made uſe of by ſight according " to the laws of that ſcience." *Sed longe magis quam hæc oporteret homines haberi, qui bene, immo optime ſcirent perſpectivam & inſtrumenta ejus, . . quia inſtrumenta Aſtronomiæ non vadunt niſi per viſionem ſecundum leges iſtius ſcientiæ* (28). To this we ſhall add two other paſſages from him quoted by Dr. Plot (29). *De viſione fractâ majora ſunt, nam de facili patet, maxima poſſe apparere minima, & è contra; & longe diſtantia videbuntur propinquiſſimè, & è converſo; ſic etiam faceremus ſolem & lunam & ſtellas deſcendere ſecundum apparentiam hic inferius, &c.* (30) : i. e. " Greater things are per- " formed, if the viſion be refracted, for [by refracti- " on] it is eaſily made appear, that the greateſt things " may be repreſented leſs, and little things as the " greateſt; and that things afar off may be repre- " ſented near. Thus we can make the ſun, and " moon, and ſtars, to all appearance, come down to " us here below, &c." And again in his Epiſtle to Pariſienſis, concerning the ſecret Works of Art and Nature : *Poſſunt enim ſic figurari perſpicua, ut longiſſimè poſita, appareant propinquiſſima, & è contrario; ita quod ex incredibili diſtantiâ legeremus literas minutiſſimas, & numeraremus res quantuncunque parvas, & ſtellas faceremus apparere quo vellemus* (31) : i. e. " Glaſſes may " be ſo figured, that things the moſt remote may appear " near; ſo that at an incredible diſtance we may " read the ſmalleſt character, and number things tho' " ever ſo ſmall; and laſtly 'make ſtars appear as " near as we pleaſe." Theſe things, as he tells us in another place (32), were to the illiterate ſo formidable and amazing, *ut animus mortalis ignorans veritatem non poſſit aliqualiter ſuſtinere*; i. e. " that no mor- " tal ignorant of the means could poſſibly bear it." *All which put together*, ſays Dr. Plot (33), *it muſt neceſſarily be confeſt, that he had ſome ſuch inſtrument, tho' not ſo trimly made, 'tis like, as our teleſcopes are now. In favour of which truth much more might be alledged, did I not think this ſufficient to evince it with unprejudiced readers.* Dr. Freind likewiſe remarks (34), that how far he advanced *Optics* in all its branches, is ſufficiently evident from his book of *Perſpective*, wherein he diſcourſes of the *Reflexion* and *Refraction* of light (35), and deſcribes all ſorts of glaſſes, which magnify or diminiſh any object, &c; and that amongſt the reſt the uſe of the *Optic Tube* or *Teleſcope*, though thought to be a modern invention, was plainly known to him. With reſpect to his improvements in *Chymiſtry*, Dr. Freind tells us (36), that the honour of introducing it into Europe was chiefly owing to Bacon. He was at leaſt one of the firſt, (for he was contemporary with Albertus Magnus,) who cultivated that art in our Weſtern Climates; and to prove how little it had hitherto been known, he informs us, that at this time there were but three perſons in the Roman world, who underſtood any thing of it, one of whom was the famous Peter de Maharn-Court, a Picard, whom he ſtiles *Dominus Experimentorum*. He embraced the Philoſophy of Geber the Arabian, as Dr. Jebb remarks, and conſidered *mercury* and *ſulphur* as the two principles of all metals and minerals. From theſe, ſays he (37), are generated all metals and minerals, of which there are many different kinds. But nature always endeavours after the perfecting of gold. But if any accidents intervene to hinder the operation of nature, the metals are transformed; and they are produced pure or impure according to the quality of the mercury and ſulphur. From thence he endeavours to ſhew, that baſer metals may be changed into gold, by purging off the impure parts of them, and digeſting the matter of them into the form of gold. And he tells us (38), that the medicine, which will remove theſe impurities, may be made by reducing the elements almoſt to an equality; and that by means of this ſecret life may be prolonged, ſince that *medicine, which will remove all the impurities and corruptions of the baſer metal, ſo that it ſhall become the moſt pure ſilver and gold, is thought by Philoſophers capable of taking away the corruptions of the human body ſo far as to prolong life for many ages.* " Medicinam vero, quæ has impurita- " tes tollat, confici poſſe dicit, reducendo elementa " ferè ad æqualitatem, atque hinc etiam vitæ longæ- " vitati conſuli poſſe, cum *illa medicina, quæ tolleret* " *omnes immunditias & corruptiones metalli vilioris, ut* " *fieret argentum & aurum puriſſimum, æſtimatur à* " *ſapientibus poſſe tollere corruptiones corporis humani in* " *tantum, ut vitam per multa ſecula prolongaret* (39)." We may obſerve here, that the famous Monſr. Homberg, by the experiments, which he made at the command of the Duke of Orleans, in order to diſcover the art of making gold, was induced to refer it to the ſame principles with our Bacon (40). Dr. Freind tells us (41), that he ſpeaks of almoſt every operation now uſed in *Chymiſtry*, and deſcribes the method of making *tinctures* and *elixirs*. He mentions the *Incineration of Fern*, from which the Engliſh make glaſs. And in his Preface to *the Art of Chymiſtry* he extols it for being the perfection of Natural Philoſophy, and, which is its higheſt character, as it is capable of being made ſubſervient to health, long life, and the removal of diſeaſes. The ſame Author likewiſe obſerves, that we find enough in him to let us ſee, that the purſuit of the *Philoſopher's Stone* began very early; and that Lully, who owns himſelf his diſciple, (which probably might be, when both of them were at Paris) carried thoſe viſionary notions to an extravagant height. However that there is *a great deal of new and ſolid learning upon this ſubject of Chymiſtry in the works of Bacon*, particularly in his *Speculum Alchymiæ*, *de Arte Chymiæ*, *Lapis Aquilæ Philoſophicus*, *Epiſtolæ tres ad Joh. Pariſienſem*; if we ſtrip it of that jargon of language, which was ſo faſhionable in thoſe times. The compoſition and effects of *Gun-powder* were known to him, tho' that diſcovery has been generally ſuppoſed to be of a much later date. This will appear evident from a paſſage in his writings, wherein he has theſe words : *In*

(24) *MS. Cot. Tib.* C. fol. 8. *apud* Jebb.
(25) *Libell. rogator. ad Remp. Holland.*
(26) *De vero teleſcopii inventore*, cap. 12, &c.
(27) *Opus Maj.* P. 357.
(28) *MS. Cot. Tib.* C. 5. fol. 6. *apud* Jebb.
(29) *Natural Hiſtory of Oxfordſhire*, ch. 9. pag. 215.
(30) *Perſpectiv.* Part 3. *diſt. ultima*; *apud* Plot, *ubi ſupra.*
(31) *Epiſt. ad Pariſienſ.* cap. 5.
(32) *Perſpect.* Part 3. *Diſt.* 3. *apud* Plot.
(33) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 216.
(34) Pag. 236.
(35) *See* Dr. Freind's *Appendix*, num. 3.
(36) Pag. 233.
(37) *MS. Cot. Tib.* C. 5. fol. 6. *apud* Jebb.
(38) *Spec. Alch. chem.* cap. 2. *apud* Jebb.
(39) Jebb, *ubi ſupra*. *See* Baconi *Opus Maj.* pag. 471, 472.
(40) *Mem. de l'Acad. Royale des Sciences, an.* 1707. *apud* Jebb.
(41) Pag. 234.

cate his Writings to any perſon under pain of the forfeiture of his book, and being confined to bread and water for many days (5). But ſoon after upon Clement's being elected Pope, Bacon thought that he ought rather to diſregard this decree, than neglect the commands of the Pope, and therefore ſent him a letter, in which he promiſed to ſatisfy his Holineſs in whatever he ſhould demand. The Pope returned him an anſwer, inſiſting upon his former requeſt, which occaſioned our Author to ſend him his *Opus Majus* [C], with

(5) Ibid.

In omnem diſtantiam, quam volumus poſſumus artificialiter componere ignem, comburentem ex ſale Petræ & aliis (41), i. e. "From Salt-Peter and other ingredi- "ents, we are able to make a fire, that ſhall burn at "what diſtance we pleaſe;" and the *alia*, which he mentions, as Dr. John Wallis ſaw it in a manuſcript copy of the ſame Roger Bacon in the hands of Dr. Langbain, were *ſulphur* and *carbonum pulvis* or *duſt of coal* (42), concerning which he afterwards adds, "that "ſounds like thunder, and coruſcations may be form- "ed in the air, and even with greater horror, than "thoſe which happen naturally. For a little matter "properly diſpoſed, about the quantity of a man's "thumb, makes a dreadful noiſe, and occaſions a "prodigious coruſcation. And this, *ſays he*, is done "ſeveral ways, by which a city or an army may be "deſtroyed, after the manner of Gideon's ſtratagem, "who having broken the pitchers and lamps, and "the fire iſſuing out with an inexpreſſible noiſe, kil- "led an infinite number of the Midianites with only "three hundred men." *Nam ſoni velut tonitrus & coruſcationes poſſunt fieri in aere, immo majore horrore, quam illa quæ fiunt per naturam. Nam modica materia adaptata, ſcilicet ad quantitatem unius pollicis, ſonum facit horribilem, & coruſcationem oſtendit vehementem; & hoc fit multis modis, quibus civitas aut exercitus deſtruatur, ad modum artificii Gideonis, qui lagunculis fractis & lampadibus, igne exſiliente, cum fragore inæſtimabili, infinitum Midianitarum deſtruxit exercitum cum trecentis hominibus* (43). But we have a ſtill clearer paſſage in his *Opus Majus* (44), wherein he obſerves, that "ſome things affect the hearing in ſo "violent a manner, that if they were compounded in "a proper manner, and diſcharged of a ſudden, and "in the night time, a city or an army would not "bear the ſhock, for the noiſe of thunder is not com- "parable to it. That ſome things ſtrike ſuch a terror "upon the ſight, that lightning is far inferior to them; "and that Gideon was ſuppoſed to have made uſe of "ſuch contrivances in the camp of the Midianites. "We have an experiment of this, *ſays he*, in the ſport "uſed by children in many parts of the world, viz. "that from an inſtrument about as large as a man's "thumb, by the force of ſalt-petre, there ariſes ſo hor- "rible a ſound by the breaking of a bit of parch- "ment, that it ſurpaſſes the noiſe of a violent thunder, "and a coruſcation beyond that of lightning." *Quædam verò auditum perturbant in tantum, quod ſi ſubito & de nocte & artificio ſufficienti fierent, nec poſſet civitas nec exercitus ſuſtinere. Nullus tonitrûs fragor poſſet talibus comparari. Quædam tantum terrorem viſui incutiunt, quod coruſcationes nubium longe minus & ſine comparatione perturbant; quibus operibus Gideon in caſtris Midianitaram conſimilia æſtimatur fuiſſe operatus. Et experimentum hujus rei capimus ex hoc ludicro puerili, quod fit in multis mundi partibus, ſcilicet ut inſtrumento facto ad quantitatem pollicis humani ex violentiâ illius ſalis, qui Sal Petræ vocatur, tam horribilis ſonus naſcitur in rupturâ tam modicæ rei, ſcilicet modici pergameni, quod fortis tonitrui ſentiatur excedere rugitum, & coruſcationem maximam ſui luminis jubar excedit.* Dr. Plot tells us (45) that it is plain, that Bacon either invented or knew Gun-powder, tho' he thinks that we cannot allow him leſs than the firſt, till we find out an ancienter author for it, ſince he died in 1292, near a hundred years before any of the other pretended inventions; *which if no body does*, ſays he, *(as 'tis manifold odds they never will) in all probability it was invented here at Oxford, where he made the reſt of his affrightening experiments. And that out of his works Conſtantinus Ancklitzen of Friburg* (d), *or Bertholdus Swartz* (e), *and the reſt of the improvers, in all likelihood might have their pretended inventions, tho' we allow him not quite ſo explicit as in the copy of the reverend and learned Dr. Langbain, but that, as it is conjectured by Dr. Dee* (f), *he ſomewhat concealed his invention in the word* [aliis], *well knowing it might be dangerouſly deſtructive to mankind.* Dr. Freind ſeems likewiſe to ſuppoſe that he was the Inventor of *Gun-powder*; for having mentioned ſeveral of his mechanical inventions he tells us (45), that *there is ſomething too in a chymical way, which he* hit upon, *as extraordinary, and that is the ſecret of* Gun-powder; *he deſcribes the materials of its compoſition, and the amazing effects of it,* noiſe *and* light. But Dr. Jebb obſerves, that Bacon perhaps borrowed his account of it from the treatiſe of one Marcus a Greek, which he calls *Liber Ignium*, a manuſcript of which is in the poſſeſſion of the learned Dr. Richard Mead. The account of Gun-powder by Marcus is as follows: *Secundus modus ignis volatilis hoc modo conficitur.* Recip. *lib.* 1. *Sulphuris vivi, lib.* 2. *carbonis ſalicis, ſalis petroſi* 6 *libras, quæ tria ſubtiliſſimè terantur in lapide marmoreo; poſtea pulvis ad libitum in tunica reponatur volatili vel tonitrum faciente. Nota, quod tunica ad volandum debet eſſe gracilis & longa, & prædicto pulvere optimè conculcato repleta; tunica vel tonitrum faciens debet eſſe brevis, groſſa, & prædicto pulvere ſemiplena, & ab utraque parte filo fortiſſimo bene ligata.* i. e. "The ſecond kind of vo- "latile fire is made in this manner. Take one pound "of ſulphur, two pounds of charcoal, and ſix pounds of "ſalt-peter, and beat theſe three ingredients together "in a mortar. Afterwards let the powder be put in- "to a ſocket, which is to fly up into the air, or to "raiſe a prodigious noiſe. You muſt obſerve, that "the flying ſocket ought to be thin and long, and "filled with the powder above mentioned well ram- "med into it; and that which is to burſt with a "great noiſe muſt be ſhort and thick, and half filled "with the ſaid powder, and tied at both ends with "a very ſtrong thread." But to return to Bacon; his knowledge, as Dr. Freind remarks (46), was ſo univerſal, that he had ſome inſight into Phyſic; for beſides what has been mentioned in *Chymiſtry*, among other Tracts, which he has left us in that way, there is one, wherein he animadverts upon ſome *errors* of the Phyſicians; and another work of his concerning *the retarding the accidents of old age, and preſerving the ſenſes*; a book inſcrib'd to and written for the uſe of Pope Nicholas IV a little before the death of the Author, with a deſign probably to mollify that Prelate, who, as he had been General of the Franciſcan Order, had been concerned in the perſecution of Bacon. "This Treatiſe "is not ill writ; he has here collected whatever he "had met with upon this ſubject, both in the Greek "and Arabian Writers, and has added a great many "remarks of his own. . . He ſpeaks much of the *Pre-* "*parations* of Medicines, which he had made trial of "himſelf; and gives broad hints particularly about *a* "*tincture of gold*, which might contribute very greatly "to prolong life; and recites a remarkable ſtory of "an old Sicilian plow-man, who by drinking gree- "dily of a *yellowiſh* ſtream, (which our Author ſuſ- "pects was impregnated with gold) grew young again, "and lived many years in full vigour (47)." Bacon likewiſe entered into the depth of the *mechanical Sciences*, and was ſo well acquainted with the force of *elaſtic* bodies, that in imitation of Archytas, who contrived a *wooden dove*, which could fly, he, as we are told, could make a flying chariot, and had an art of putting ſtatues into motion, and producing articulate ſounds out of a *brazen head*; and this, as Dr. Freind remarks (48), not by a *magical* power, but by one much ſuperior, that of Philoſophy and Nature, which can do ſuch things, to uſe his own expreſſions, as the ignorant think *miracles*. Mr. Wood in his *Hiſtoria & Antiquitates Univerſitatis Oxonienſis* (49) obſerves, that this ſtory of the *brazen head* was likewiſe aſcribed to Robert Groſtete Biſhop of Lincoln, tho' it is generally imputed to our Author. *Bacono autem ut plurimum aſſuitur fabula ea de capite neſcio quo æneo.*

[C] *His Opus Majus.*] In this Work he gives an account of almoſt all the new improvements, which he made in the Sciences. It has been the general notion, that

(41) *In Epiſt. ad Pariſienſ.* c. 6. *apud* Plot, pag. 231.

(42) *See* Plot, ibid.

(43) *De Secret. Oper. Art. & Naturæ*, cap. 6. *apud* Jebb. *See likewiſe* Dr. Plot, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 231, 232.

(44) Pag. 474.

(45) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 232. *See likewiſe* p. 217.

(d) *Vid.* Guid. Pancirolli *rer. memorabil. recens invent.* Part 2. tit. 18.

(e) *Vid.* Steph. *Forcatulum J. C. de Gallorum Imperio & Philoſoph.* lib. 4. *ſub finem.*

(f) Dr. Dee's *Annotations in Epiſt. ad Pariſienſem.*

(46) Pag. 244.

(47) Idem, pag. 244, 245.

(48) Pag. 238, 239.

(49) Lib. 1. pag. 82. edit. 1674.

with ſeveral other Tracts, by his ſcholar John, whom he recommended to him in very ſtrong terms. This John was inſtructed by Bacon how to explain the difficulties which might

that he wrote this in order to vindicate himſelf from the imputation of Magic, of which he had been accuſed to that Pope. Dr. Cave (50) and the Author of the *Collection. Anglo-Minorit.* (51), are of the ſame opinion. But this Work does not ſeem at all to be deſigned as an apology, nor does it appear, that the Author was accuſed of Magic before Pope Clement. For, as Dr. Jebb obſerves, his only view appears to have been to endeavour to ſerve the public by gratifying the Pope's requeſt, and introducing the true principles of Philoſophy under the ſanction of the Apoſtolical See. And we may obſerve, that in ſpeaking of this work, he tells the Pope, that out of reverence to his Holineſs's ſtation in the Church, he had endeavoured to carry Philoſophy to as great a degree of perfection, as the obſtacles which he met with would permit. *Propter veſtræ celſitudinis reverentiam & officii dignitatem, quâ totius mundi utilitas debet procurari, prout potui per impedimenta, & ut memoriæ occurrebat, ſapientiam Philoſophiæ conabar uſque ad ultimam ſui deducere poteſtatem* (52). And a little after he informs him, that if it had not been out of regard to the Vicegerent of our Saviour, and the advantage of the world, which could be promoted by him alone, he ſhould not have proceeded in that work, amidſt the obſtacles, which he encountered with, though all who were in God's Church ſhould have requeſted him ever ſo earneſtly. *Niſi eſſet Vicarii Salvatoris ſolius reverentia & utilitas mundi per ipſum ſolum procuranda, non proceſſiſſem cum his impedimentis in hoc negotio pro omnibus, qui ſunt in Eccleſia Dei, quantumcunque rogaſſent & inſtitiſſent* (53). Dr. Jebb tells us, that Bacon ſeems to have propoſed two things principally in this book; either, that laying down a good ſcheme of Philoſophy he might excite the Pope to reform the errors which had crept into the Church; or, if he could not effect this, to propoſe ſuch expedients as would break the power of Antichriſt, and retard his progreſs. For he appears to have been firmly perſuaded, that the Church would ſoon be reformed either by means of the Pope himſelf, who was a man of integrity, or becauſe the exorbitant dominion of Antichriſt would become obnoxious to mankind, and ſo fall to deſtruction. *Duo ſibi potiſſimum in hoc opere præſtanda duxiſſe videtur Baconus; vel, ut purioris Philoſophiæ præcepta tradendo pontificem ad errores, qui in Eccleſiam irrepſerant, caſtigandos excitaret; vel, ſi hoc minus effici poſſet, ut remedia proferret, quæ Antichriſti vires frangerent, & progreſſus ejuſdem retardarent.* [m] *Id enim ſibi firmiter perſuaſiſſe viſus eſt, eccleſiam cito purgandam fore, vel pontificis optimi cura in eadem reformandâ adhibitâ, aut graſſante ſaltem Antichriſti tyrannide dominationem inviſam exercentis.* Mr. Edward Leigh in his *Fœtix Conſortium, or a fit Conjunction of Religion and Learning* (54), mentions this work, and tells us, that *Bacon hath a manuſcript intitled* Opus Magnum, *to ſhew, that all Sciences conduce to the underſtanding of the Scripture.* Dr. Jebb publiſhed a beautiful edition of this work from a manuſcript in the Library at Dublin College, collated with ſeveral other MSS., at London in fol. 1733, under this title; *Fratris* Rogeri Bacon *Ordinis Minorum* Opus Majus *ad Clementem Quartum Pontificem Romanum. Ex MS. Codice Dublinenſi, cum aliis quibuſdam collato, nunc primum edidit.* S. Jebb, *M. D.* The Editor has prefixed a long Epiſtle addreſſed to Dr. Richard Mead, wherein he gives an account of his Author and edition; and obſerves, that very few of his writings had been before publiſhed, though Leland, Balæus, and Pitſeus have given us a long catalogue of them. However he tells us, that Sir Kenelm Digby and Dr. G. Langbain, Provoſt of Queen's College at Oxford, had formerly undertaken to publiſh Bacon's Works at the advice of Mr. Selden, as appears from their letters to that great man, ſome fragments of which Dr. Jebb has printed. Sir Kenelm Digby has this paſſage in his letter dated from Paris Feb. 11. 1637. *Your Collections concerning Bacon I ſhall print before his Works, under your name.* Dr. Langbain in a letter dated Jan. the 30th 1653, ſays; *When I have heretofore made report to ſome judicious friends of ſeveral paſſages in Fryar Bacon's Epiſtle to Pope Clement, which I perceive is the ſame with what you call* De Utilitate Scientiarum, *they were very much taken with them, and ſuitors to me for a publication.* In a letter dated Feb. the 9th 1653, he ſays; *I am very much encouraged by your laſt to reſume thoſe thoughts which I had laid aſide, of publiſhing that piece of Roger Bacon.* And in another dated February the 20th 1653, he ſays; *That later copy is of ſo legible a hand, as, unleſs I receive a countermand from you, I ſhall not long forbear to get it tranſcribed with a purpoſe to print all together, for I judge it well deſerves to be more public.* Dr. Jebb had propoſed to have publiſhed all his Works about three years before his edition of the *Opus Majus*; but while he was engaged in that deſign, he was informed by letters from Dublin, that there was a manuſcript in the College Library there, which contained a great many Treatiſes, generally aſcribed to Bacon, and diſpoſed in ſuch order, that they ſeemed to form one complete work. But the title was wanting, which had been careleſly torn off from the reſt of the manuſcript. The Doctor ſoon found that it was a collection of thoſe Tracts, which Bacon had written for the uſe of Pope Clement IV, and to which he had given the title of *Opus Majus*, ſince it appeared, that what he had ſaid of that Work in his *Opus Tertium* addreſſed to the ſame Pope, exactly ſuited with this, which contained an account of almoſt all the new diſcoveries and improvements which he had made in the Sciences. Upon this account Dr. Jebb laid aſide his former deſign, and reſolved to publiſh only an edition of this *Opus Majus*. The manuſcripts which he made uſe of to complete this edition, are as follow: 1. MS. in the Cotton Library, inſcribed, *Jul. D. V.* which contains the firſt part of the *Opus Majus*, under the title of a Treatiſe *de utilitate Scientiarum.* 2. Another MS. in the ſame Library marked *Tib. C. V.* containing the fourth part of the *Opus Majus*, in which is ſhewn, *the uſe of Mathematics in the Sciences and affairs of the world.* In the MS. it is erroneouſly called the *fifth part.* 3. A MS. in the Library belonging to Corpus Chriſti in Cambridge, containing that portion of the *fourth part* which treats of Geography. 4. A MS. of the *fifth part*, containing the treatiſe upon Perſpective, in the Earl of Oxford's Library. 5. A MS. in the Library of Magdalen College in Cambridge, containing the ſame treatiſe of Perſpective. 6. Two MSS. in the King's Library, communicated to the Editor by Dr. Richard Bentley, one of which contains the *fourth part* of the *Opus Majus*, and the other the *fifth part.* The reader will not perhaps be diſpleaſed with a general account of a work, which till lately was imagined to have been loſt, and which is eſteemed the moſt conſiderable of all his writings. In the firſt chapter of the firſt part (55) he obſerves, that there are four chief obſtacles, which prevent men from attaining to true knowledge, namely, dependance upon the weak authority of others, the length of cuſtom, the opinion of the ignorant vulgar, and the concealment of one's own real ignorance under the oſtentation of ſeeming knowledge. *Quatuor vero ſunt maxima comprehendendæ veritatis offendicula, quæ omnem quemcunque ſapientem impediunt, & vix aliquem permittunt ad verum titulum ſapientiæ pervenire, viz. fragilis & indignæ auctoritatis exemplum, conſuetudinis diuturnitas, vulgi ſenſus imperiti, & propriæ ignorantiæ occultatio cum oſtentatione ſapientiæ apparentis.* He endeavours to remove the three firſt of theſe obſtacles by authority, experience, and reaſon, and to ſhew how injurious all of them are by miſleading mankind into the moſt abſurd and dangerous opinions, and extinguiſhing the light of truth. He concludes therefore in his ſeventh chapter, that we ought not to give our aſſent to every thing that we hear or read, but to examine carefully the opinions of thoſe who have gone before us, that we may add what was wanting to them, and correct their errors, though with all poſſible modeſty. *Quoniam igitur hæc ita ſe habent, non oportet nos adhærere omnibus quæ audimus & legimus, ſed examinare debemus diſtrictiſſimè ſententias majorum, ut addamus quæ eis defuerunt, & corrigamus quæ errata ſunt, cum omni tamen modeſtiâ & excuſatione* (56). In his twelfth chapter he complains, that a great many parts of Learning of the utmoſt importance were neglected

(50) *Hiſt. Litter.* pag. 486. edit. Colon. Allobrog. 1720.

(51) Pag. 111.

(52) *MS. Cotton. Tiber.* C. 5. fol. 1. *apud* Jebb.

(53) Ibid. fol. 3.

m *Op.* 3. *ad Clem. MS. Cot. Tib.* C. 5. fol. 2. *Op. Min.* ibid. C. 1.

(54) Lib. 3. cap. 5. pag. 125. edit. 1663. in fol.

(55) Pag. 2.

(56) Pag. 10, 11.

might occur in his writings, and carried with him ſeveral mathematical inſtruments made by Bacon, as a preſent to his Holineſs. Our Author was greatly poſſeſſed with the belief of

lected merely from the ignorance of mankind in his time; and that the knowledge of the Languages and Mathematics, though highly valued by the Antients, was deſpiſed by the Moderns, who endeavoured to vindicate themſelves in that point by the authority of ſome weak though good men. He ſhews, that many of the Saints and Fathers were involved in the common infirmities of human nature, and conſequently that their example ought not abſolutely to determine our conduct. And in the following chapter (57) he obſerves, that there were ſome peculiar reaſons which prevented them from applying themſelves to Philoſophy, and particularly, becauſe Ariſtotle's books were not then tranſlated into Latin, and they were extremely attach'd to Plato's Writings, whoſe doctrines they found to be inconſiſtent with thoſe of Ariſtotle. In his fourteenth Chapter (58) he proceeds to mention other reaſons for the neglect of Philoſophy in the primitive Church; which neglect likewiſe continued among the later Divines (59). In the laſt chapter (60) he addreſſes himſelf to Pope Clement, and tells him, that if it was not poſſible for his Holineſs during his Pontificate to perfect the whole reformation of the vulgar errors, yet he might lay the foundation for the ſuperſtructure, ſo that his ſucceſſors might with the greater facility complete what had been thus ſo happily begun. *Quod ſi non eſt temporis veſtri omnia apud vulgum conſummare, poterit veſtra magnificentia locare fundamenta, fontes eruere, radices figere, ut veſtræ ſanctitatis ſucceſſores, quod feliciter inceptum fuerit, valeant facilius adimplere.* In the firſt chapter of the *ſecond* part he tells us, that there is one perfect kind of wiſdom which is contained in the holy Scriptures, from which ſource all truth is derived. *Relegatis igitur quatuor cauſis totius ignorantiæ humanæ generalibus, volo in hac ſecundâ diſtinctione unam ſapientiam eſſe perfectam oſtendere, & hanc in ſacris literis contineri; de cujus radicibus omnis veritas eruitur.* In the following chapters he endeavours to ſhew, that true Philoſophy is not inconſiſtent with Divinity, but rather promotive of the true knowledge of the Deity and Religion, which he confirms from the authority of the antient Chriſtians themſelves. And he tells us in the beginning of the ſeventh chapter (61) that the whole deſign of Philoſophy conſiſts in this, that we may know the Creator by means of the creature, and perceive the obligations which we are under from the excellence of his nature, and the goodneſs which he has exerted in the creation and conſervation of mankind, with the aſſurances of a future felicity, to ſerve him with a proper reverence of mind, and regulation of our behaviour according to the laws of juſtice and reaſon. *Cæterum totius Philoſophiæ decurſus conſiſtit in eo, ut per cognitionem ſuæ creaturæ cognoſcatur Creator, cui propter reverentiam majeſtatis & beneficium creationis & conſervationis & futuræ felicitatis ſerviatur in cultu honorifico & morum pulchritudine & legum honeſtate, ut in pace & honeſtate vivant homines in hac vitâ.* In his *third part* (62) he treats of the Uſefulneſs of Grammar, and obſerves that it is impoſſible for the Latins to attain the knowledge of thoſe things, which are neceſſary both in divine and human learning, without a proper ſkill in other languages; ſince all the Old and New Teſtament is tranſlated from the Hebrew and Greek, and Philoſophy is likewiſe borrowed from thoſe languages and the Arabic; and ſince it is impoſſible to preſerve the propriety and force of one language in another. The conſequence of this therefore is, that none of the Latins can obtain ſuch a knowledge as is neceſſary in the holy Scriptures and Philoſophy, without underſtanding the tongues from whence they are tranſlated. *Et ideo nullus Latinus ſapientiam ſacræ ſapientiæ & philoſophiæ poterit ut oportet intelligere, niſi intelligat linguas, à quibus ſunt tranſlatæ.* The ſecond conſideration which he urges in proof of this, is, that the Tranſlators had not words enough in Latin to expreſs the terms of the ſciences. In the third place he tells us, that it is neceſſary the Tranſlator ſhould underſtand the ſcience which he treats of, and the languages which he tranſlates from and into; whereas almoſt all of them have been extremely defective in theſe points. The fourth reaſon is, that a great many things both in Philoſophy and Divinity were ſtill wanting to the Latins; of which he mentions ſeveral inſtances. The fifth reaſon is, that as the ſciences had been delivered to the Latins from other languages, all the Saints and Philoſophers among the Latins, who treat of the Sciences, have made great uſe of thoſe languages, and employed a variety of Greek, Hebrew, Chaldee, and Arabic words. The ſixth reaſon is, the neceſſity of correcting an infinite number of errors both in the text of Divinity, as he ſtiles it, and that of Philoſophy, which errors are not only in the letter, but likewiſe in the ſenſe. And becauſe the errors are of more conſequence in Divinity than in Philoſophy, he proceeds to point out the corruption of the text of the holy Scriptures, in order to ſhew the neceſſity of the knowledge of the tongues in order to correct it. *Sexta ratio eſt propter errorum & falſitatum infinitarum correctionem in textu tam theologiæ quam philoſophiæ, non ſolum in literâ, ſed in ſenſu. Quod autem correctio ſit neceſſaria, probo per corruptionis magnitudinem. Et quoniam periculoſius erratur in textu Dei quam in textu Philoſophiæ, ideo convertam linguarum poteſtatem ad corruptionem textûs ſacri, ut pateat neceſſitas earum* (63). He gives ſeveral inſtances of this corruption. His ſeventh reaſon is, that it is neceſſary for the Latins to underſtand the languages, even tho' the text were pure and uncorrupt, in order to obtain the true ſenſe of the words amidſt the variety of interpretations. His laſt reaſon for the neceſſity of the tongues, is, that the Grammar of the Latins is derived from the Greek and Hebrew. *Eſt ultima ratio ſcientialis de neceſſitate linguarum, quod Grammatica in lingua Latinorum tracta eſt à Græco & Hebræo.* Our Author's *fourth part* is deſigned to ſhew the uſe of Mathematics in the ſciences and affairs and employments of this world. *In qua oſtenditur poteſtas mathematicæ in ſcientiis & rebus & occupationibus hujus mundi.* In the firſt chapter he tells us, that there are four great ſciences, without which the reſt cannot be underſtood, but by the knowledge of which any perſon may make a noble progreſs without any difficulty both in divine and human learning. That the key of theſe ſciences is the Mathematics, which holy men diſcovered from the beginning of the world, and which was always in uſe among all holy and wiſe men above the other ſciences. But that the neglect of this for thirty or forty years paſt had deſtroyed all the learning among the Latins; ſince a perſon, who is not converſant in that ſcience, can never underſtand the reſt, nor the affairs of this world, as he ſhall ſhew in the courſe of his work. And, what is ſtill worſe, thoſe, who are ignorant of it, do not perceive their ignorance, and therefore ſeek no remedy. Whereas on the other hand the knowledge of Mathematics prepares the mind for a compleat ſkill in all things; ſo that if we make ourſelves maſters of this as the foundation of our ſtudies, and apply it to the other ſciences in a proper manner, we ſhall then be able to attain what follows with the utmoſt facility, and without any error or doubt. But without the aſſiſtance of Mathematics neither the preceding nor conſequent parts of learning can be obtained, ſince the ſtudy of it is the only means of opening the way to our farther improvement in knowledge. *Et harum ſcientiarum porta & clavis eſt mathematica, quam ſancti à principio mundi invenerunt, ut oſtendam, & quæ ſemper fuit in uſu omnium ſanctorum & ſapientum præ omnibus aliis ſcientiis. Cujus negligentia jam per triginta vel quadraginta annos deſtruxit totum ſtudium Latinorum. Quoniam qui ignorat eam non poteſt ſcire cæteras ſcientias, nec res hujus mundi, ut probabo. Et quod pejus eſt, homines eam ignorantes non percipiunt ſuam ignorantiam, & ideo remedium non quærunt. Ac per contrarium hujus ſcientiæ notitia præparat animum & elevat ad omnium certificatam cognitionem, ut ſi radices ſapientiæ datas circa illam cognoſcat, & eas radices recte applicet ad cæterarum ſcientiarum & rerum cognitiones, tunc omnia ſequentia poterit ſcire ſine errore & ſine dubitatione, ac de facili & potenter. Sine his enim nec præcedentia nec conſequentia ſciri poſſunt, unde perficiunt priora & regulant, ſicut finis ea quæ ſunt ad finem, & diſponunt & aperiunt viam ad ſequentia* (64).

(57) Pag. 18.
(58) Pag. 18, 19.
(59) Cap. 15. pag. 21.
(60) Pag. 21, 22.
(61) Pag. 28, 29.
(62) Pag. 44.
(63) Pag. 49.
(64) Pag. 57.

of judiciary Aſtrology, which was one of the reaſons that expoſed him to the imputation of magic.

In the *ſecond* chapter he proves from authority, that every one of the ſciences requires the knowledge of the Mathematics; and in the *third* he proves the ſame from reaſon. In the *ſecond* Diſtinction of the *fourth* part, he ſhews the neceſſity of that ſcience in order to underſtand the things of this world. In the *third* and *fourth* Diſtinctions he lays down mathematical principles for the explication of ſeveral of the *Phænomena* of the univerſe, and examines into the nature of the ſeveral climates of the earth, eſpecially of thoſe near the poles, and the middle of the earth. In the *fifth* chapter of the *fourth* Diſtinction he treats of the Cauſe of the ebbing and flowing of the Sea; and in the *ſeventh* chapter of the Infinity of Matter; *de Infinitate Materiæ*. In the *eighth* chapter he enquires whether bodies touch each other in a point; and in the *ninth* he treats of the Figure of the World, which he determines to be ſpherical, and aſſerts that the earth is likewiſe of the ſame form. In the *twelfth* chapter he endeavours to ſhew, that there are no more worlds, nor ſuns, nor moons, than one; and that matter is not extended *in infinitum*. In the *thirteenth* he treats of the Unity of Time, *de Unitate Temporis*; and in the *fourteenth* he aſſerts that motion occaſions heat. In the *fifteenth* he treats of the Motion of a Ballance, *de Motu Libræ*. After having ſhewn the Neceſſity of Mathematics in human affairs and ſciences, he proceeds then to ſhew it likewiſe in thoſe, which are divine. And he obſerves, that ſince he had proved, that Philoſophy cannot be underſtood without Mathematics, and ſince every one perceived that Divinity cannot be underſtood without Philoſophy, it follows therefore, that a Divine is obliged to make himſelf maſter of the Mathematics. *Cum igitur oſtenſum ſit quod philoſophia non poteſt ſciri, niſi ſciatur mathematica, & omnes ſciunt quod theologia non poteſt ſciri niſi ſciatur philoſophia, neceſſe eſt ut theologus ſciat mathematicam* (65). He ſhews that all holy men have made uſe of the Mathematics; and alledges ſeven weighty reaſons why the ſtudy of it is neceſſary to a Divine, and eſpecially from the uſe of Aſtronomy and Chronology in the explication of the Scriptures; and in this part we have ſeveral curious enquiries into thoſe Sciences and Muſic. He then anſwers the objections urged againſt Mathematics, and particularly that which is drawn from the unlawfulneſs of Judiciary Aſtrology; upon which occaſion, he obſerves, that the true Aſtrologers do not pretend to an abſolute certainty in their judgments, nor aſſert that human actions are neceſſarily determined by the influence of the ſtars (66), but always proceed upon the ſuppoſition of human liberty (67). He propoſes the reformation of the Calendar (68). Having thus ſhewn the Neceſſity of Mathematics with regard to Philoſophy, Divinity, and the Church of God, he proceeds to point out the advantage of it, with reſpect to the uſeful diſcoveries which may be made of it, and particularly in Phyſic; which requires a different management of the body according to the difference of the climate; for which purpoſe he diſcourſes at large of the ſeveral parts of the earth, and gives a deſcription of theſe countries. He afterwards conſiders the Virtues of the fix'd ſtars, the number of whom he reckons to be DXXII, and of the Planets, and their Influences upon mankind. The *fifth* part of his *Opus Majus* treats of *Perſpective*, in which he diſcourſes at large of the Faculties of the Soul, and the Organs of Sight, and ſhews that ſight is not performed in the eye itſelf, but in the optic nerve. He is very diffuſe upon the Requiſites in the organs and objects of ſight; and in his *third* diviſion of this part examines into the nature of *reflex* and *refracted Viſion*, and treats of ſeveral kind of Glaſſes. Then follows his Tract *de Multiplicatione Specierum*. The *ſixth* part of his *Opus Majus* is concerning *Experimental Knowledge*; in the *firſt* chapter of which he tells us, that having thus laid the foundation of learning in the Languages, Mathematics, and Perſpective, he ſhall proceed to the ſcience of Experiments, ſince nothing can be ſufficiently underſtood without experiments. For he obſerves, that there are two methods of obtaining knowledge, one by argument, and the other by experiment. An argument determines a queſtion, and obliges us to determine it, but it does not give us abſolute certainty, nor remove all doubt, ſo that the mind ſhall acquieſce in the perception of truth, unleſs it diſcover it by the way of experiment. Many perſons have arguments enough in the ſeveral parts of knowledge, but not having made experiments, they are negligent, and do not avoid and purſue what they ought to do. Thus if a man, who never ſaw fire, has proved by ſufficient arguments, that it burns and injures and deſtroys things, yet his mind would never be ſufficiently ſatisfied with this proof, nor would he avoid the fire, till he had put his hand or ſome combuſtible matter to it, in order to know by experience the truth of what his arguments aſſerted. This is particularly evident in the Mathematics. *Poſitis radicibus ſapientiæ Latinorum penes linguas & mathematicam & perſpectivam, nunc volo revolvere radices à parte ſcientiæ experimentalis, quia ſine experientia nihil ſufficienter ſciri poteſt. Duo enim ſunt modi cognoſcendi, ſcilicet per argumentum & experimentum. Argumentum concludit & facit nos concludere quæſtionem, ſed non certificat neque removet dubitationem, ut quieſcat animus in intuitu veritatis, niſi eam inveniat viâ experientiæ; quia multi habent argumenta ad ſcibilia, ſed quia non habent experientiam, negligunt ea, nec vitant nociva, nec perſequuntur bona. Si enim aliquis homo, qui nunquam vidit ignem, probavit per argumenta ſufficientia quod ignis comburit & lædit res & deſtruit, nunquam propter hoc quieſceret animus audientis nec ignem vitaret, antequam poneret manum vel rem combuſtilem ad ignem, ut per experientiam probaret quod argumentum edocebat; ſed aſſumptâ experientiâ combuſtionis certificatur animus, & quieſcit in fulgore veritatis, quo argumentum non ſufficit, ſed experientia. Et hoc patet in Mathematicis, ubi eſt potiſſima demonſtratio* (69). He obſerves (70), that this ſcience of Experiments has three great prerogatives above the other ſciences; the firſt of which is, that it examines and inveſtigates all the noble concluſions of thoſe ſciences by experience; and he illuſtrates this by a long explication of the phænomenon of the rainbow. The ſecond prerogative of it is, that it diſcovers ſeveral noble truths within the limits of the other ſciences, which could not be found out by means of thoſe ſciences themſelves. He mentions ſome inſtances, which he tells us that he knew by experience to be true. The firſt inſtance is as follows: Mathematics, ſays he (71), can eaſily produce a ſpherical Aſtrolabe, in which are deſcribed all the parts of the heavens, which are neceſſary, according to the longitudes and latitudes, with the proper circles and ſtars agreeable to Ptolemy's method in his *Almage*. But it is not in the power of the Mathematics to cauſe a body of that form to move naturally with a diurnal motion; whereas a man perfectly ſkilled in experimental Philoſophy is able to conſider of the methods of that motion, being induced to it by a great many things, which follow the motion of the heavenly bodies, as in the firſt place the three elements, which are moved circularly by the celeſtial influences, then the comets, ſeas, rivers, marrow, the brains of animals, and the matter of diſeaſes. Plants likewiſe open and ſhut themſelves according to the ſun's motion. The Philoſopher therefore is excited by the conſideration of theſe things, which have ſome reſemblance to what he intends, ſo that he may be able at laſt to complete his deſign. Such an inſtrument, ſays he, would be worth a King's treaſure, and the inſtruments of aſtronomy and clocks would become uſeleſs, and it would be an admirable effect of Art and Philoſophy. *Et tunc theſaurum unius regis valeret hoc inſtrumentum, & ceſſarent inſtrumenta aſtronomiæ & horologia, & eſſet pulcherrimum ſpectaculum ſapientiæ* (72). His ſecond inſtance is a Method of prolonging life; and his third the Tranſmutation of metals. The third prerogative of Experimental Philoſophy is, that without regard to any of the other ſciences, by its own power it inveſtigates the ſecrets of nature; and this, he tells us, conſiſts in two things, in the knowledge of things to come, as well as thoſe, which are paſt and preſent, and in the wonderful works, by which it ſurpaſſes the common Judiciary Aſtrology in the method of forming a judgment of things future. And under this head he mentions that ſome Authors have aſſerted the poſſibility of changing the genius and diſpoſition of a Nation, by altering the conſtitution of the air; upon which occaſion he tells us, that when Alexander

(65) Pag. 108.
(66) See p. 155.
(67) Pag. 169, & *ſeq.*
(68) Pag. 169, & *ſeq.*
(69) Pag. 445.
(70) Pag. 448.
(71) Pag. 465.
(72) Pag. 468.

magic [*D*]. It is not known whether the works which he ſent to Pope Clement proved agreeable to him, or not. Some Writers (*s*) tell us, that he admired the Author, and generouſly promoted his ſtudies, and raiſed his ſcholar John to conſiderable preferments. But it does not appear that Bacon's Writings were of any great advantage to himſelf, ſince it is certain, that he ſtill continued in the monaſtery at Paris, though he complained very highly of the perſecutions which he ſuffered from the Monks there. However this neglect

(*s*) *Hiſt. & Antiq. Univ. Oxon.* lib. 1. pag. 138.

Alexander the Great enquired of Ariſtotle whether he ſhould exterminate the barbarous nations, which he met with, on account of their intolerable ferocity, or permit them to live, that Philoſopher anſwered him in his Book of Secrets, that if he could alter the air of the country, he ſhould ſuffer them to live, if not, he ſhould deſtroy them. For he thought, continues our Author, that the air might be changed to advantage, ſo that the complexion of their bodies might be altered, and by that means their minds might produce a courſe of good actions from the freedom of their wills; and this is one of the ſecrets. *Opera vera hujus ſcientiæ, quæ oſtendunt philoſophum, quidam teſtantur eſſe in alteratione regionis, ut mores vulgi alterentur, de quibus Alexandro quærenti ab Ariſtotele gentibus, quas invenit, an eas exterminaret propter morum feritatem, an permitteret eos vivere, ipſe Ariſtoteles philoſophorum doctiſſimus in Libro Secretorum reſpondit, ſi potes alterare aerem ipſorum, permitte eos vivere; ſi non, interfice eos. Voluit enim quod aer eorum potuit alterari utiliter, ut complexiones corporum eorum alterentur, & deinde animi excitati per complexiones elicerent bonos mores ex arbitrii libertate; & hoc eſt unum ex ſecretis.* He obſerves afterwards, that ſome Writers have affirmed, that an army has been ſtruck with ſuch a terror, as to fly immediately; and he tells us, that Ariſtotle directed Alexander to carry a particular ſtone about him; by which means his enemies would always fly before him. Theſe and a great many other things, ſays he, are aſſerted by Philoſophers to be true, tho' they do not pretend, that any violence is offered to the freedom of the will, ſince Ariſtotle, who propoſes this, tells us in his Ethics, that the will cannot be forced, but that the body may be changed by the virtues of things, and the mind excited and induc'd to chooſe that voluntarily, to which it is inclined, as by means of medicinal potions many perſons have been changed not only with regard to their bodies, but likewiſe their paſſions and inclinations. *Hæc & hujuſmodi innumerabilia teſtantur eſſe vera, non intendentes quod violentia fiat libero arbitrio, cum ipſe Ariſtoteles, qui hoc proponit, dicit in Ethicis, quod voluntas cogi non poteſt, poteſt autem corpus alterari per virtutes rerum, & animi deinde excitantur & moventur, ut omnino gratis velint illud ad quod inclinantur, ſicut per potiones & medicinas multas in libro medicorum, multos non ſolum in corpore poſſe alterari, ſed in paſſionibus animæ & inclinatione voluntatis* (73). He proceeds then to treat of ſeveral other things, whoſe effects are more natural, without working any ſuch wonderful change in the will; and diſplays the great advantages, which may reſult from Experimental Philoſophy to the Public. He obſerves, that the Church of God might employ the effects of it in the improvement of Navigation and War for the deſtruction of all her enemies, which would be more eaſily deſtroyed by the inventions of Art and Philoſophy, than the weapons of war; the former of which he tells us, were made uſe of in paſt Ages by tyrants in ſubduing the world, as appears, ſays he, from innumerable inſtances. *Et jam ex iſtis ſcientiis tribus patet mirabilis utilitas in hoc mundo pro eccleſiâ Dei contra inimicos fidei, deſtruendos magis per opera ſapientiæ, quam arma bellica pugnatorum, &c.* Upon this occaſion he mentions Alexander's conqueſt of the Eaſt with a ſmall number of forces, and remarks, that Oroſius affirms, that he executed this vaſt deſign no leſs by means of art than by the valour of the Macedonians. "This, *continues Bacon*, "is not at all wonderful, when Ariſtotle attended "him, as we read in the Life of that Philoſopher; "and Seneca tells us in his *Natural Queſtions*, that "Alexander conquered the world, by the direction of "Ariſtotle and Calliſthenes; who were his inſtructors "in all kinds of wiſdom. But Ariſtotle was the principal perſon in theſe affairs; and it is evident from "what has been ſaid above how he was able to deliver up the world to Alexander by the methods "of Wiſdom and Philoſophy. The Church ought "to conſider this in oppoſing infidels and rebels, that "Chriſtian blood may be ſpared, and eſpecially on "account of future dangers in the times of Antichriſt, "which with the grace of God it would be eaſy to "obviate, if the Prelates and Princes would promote "a ſtudy of Philoſophy, and ſearch out the ſecrets of "nature and art." *Sed Oroſius dicit, non minus arte quam virtute Macedonum ſuperavit. Nec mirum, cum Ariſtoteles fuerit cum eo in his bellis, ut legimus in vita Ariſtotelis. Et etiam Seneca in Naturalibus dicit quod mundum vicit Alexander, Ariſtotele & Calliſthene ducibus, qui magiſtri ei fuerunt in omni ſapientia. Sed Ariſtoteles extitit principalis; & facile patet per prædicta quomodo per vias ſapientiæ potuit Ariſtoteles mundum tradere Alexandro; & hoc deberet eccleſia conſiderare contra infideles & rebelles, ut parcatur ſanguini Chriſtiano, & maxime propter futura pericula in temporibus Antichriſti, quibus cum Dei gratia facile eſſet obviare, ſi prælati & principes ſtudium promoverent; & ſecreta naturæ & artis indagarent* (74).

(73) Pag. 473.

(74) Pag. 477.

[*D*] *Poſſeſſed with the notion of judiciary Aſtrology, which was one of the reaſons that expoſed him to the imputation of magic.*] He imagined that the Stars had a great influence upon human affairs, ſo that by means of them he thought things to come might be foretold, and that the mind of man was diſpoſed by them to good or evil. He tells us in his *Opus Majus* (75), that God has pleaſed to regulate the world in ſuch a manner, that ſome things which he foreſaw or predetermined ſhould come to paſs, ſhou'd be diſcovered to men of Reaſon and Philoſophy by the Planets. *Voluit ergo Deus res ſuas ſic ordinare, ut quædam, quæ futura præviderit, vel prædeſtinaverit, rationabilibus per planetas oſtenderentur.* And in another place (76) he obſerves, that true Mathematicians do not preſume to be poſitive with regard to human affairs, but conſider how the body is altered by the heavens, and conſequently how the mind through the alteration of the body is influenced ſometimes to private and ſometimes to public acts, though the liberty of the will is ſtill preſerved in all points. For though the rational ſoul is not forced in its acts, yet it may be ſtrongly induced and excited to do thoſe things voluntarily, to which the celeſtial influence inclines it; as we ſee men through company, fear, love, and other paſſions of that kind, alter their reſolutions greatly, and voluntarily do what they were unwilling to do before, though they are not obliged to it; juſt as a man chooſes to throw his moſt valuable effects into the Sea out of hopes to eſcape death. *Sed in rebus humanis veri mathematici non præſumunt certificare, ſed conſiderant quomodo per cælum alteratur corpus, & alterato corpore excitatur anima nunc ad actus privatos, nunc publicos, ſalvâ tamen in omnibus arbitrii libertate. Quamvis enim anima rationalis non cogitur ad actus ſuos, tamen fortiter induci poteſt & excitari, ut gratis velit ea, ad quæ virtus cæleſtis inclinat, ſicut nos videmus homines per ſocietatem, conſilia, timorem, & amorem, & hujuſmodi, multum mutare de propoſito, & gratis velle ea quæ prius non volebant, licet non cogantur, ſicut ille, qui ſpe ſalutis projicit merces in mare cariſſimas.* From hence he concluded, that nothing was to be undertaken, unleſs the Stars were propitious. And therefore in order to give a particular account of the influences of them at all times, he reſolved to draw up a ſet of Aſtronomical Tables, in which he tells us (77) "there was to be a ſcheme of all the motions of the heavenly bodies from the beginning of "the world to the end; and that then we might "every day conſider in the heavens all things which "were renewed in the earth, and ſeek out the like "diſpoſition of the heavens in ſome paſt period, and "find the like effects, and ſo on for the future, by "which means all things would be known." This, according to Dr. Jebb, gave occaſion to the Friers of his Order to conſider him as a perſon engaged in unlawful arts, upon which he was caſt into priſon; and

(75) Pag. 168.

(76) Ibid. pag. 156.

(77) *Opus Tert. ad Clem. MS. Cot. Tib. C. 5. fol. 6. apud* Jebb.

neglect of him might be occaſioned by the death of Clement the year following. Ten years after this in 1278, under the Pontificate of Nicholas III, Jerom de Eſculo General of the Order of the Franciſcans being appointed Legate in France, came to Paris, where he is ſaid to have condemned the doctrine of Bacon [*E*], at the advice of many of the Monks of that Order, and caſt him into priſon; and to prevent the cauſe from being carried to Rome, wrote to the Pope to confirm what he had done (*q*). Bacon was kept in priſon for many years, and when Jerom de Eſculo was choſen Pope under the name of Nicholas IV, he brought his cauſe before that Pope, but met with ſuch ill ſucceſs, that he was put under a more ſevere confinement (*r*). However at laſt by the intereſt of ſeveral noble perſons he was ſet at liberty, and returned to England, and died at Oxford in 1292 (*ſ*), in about the 78th year of his age [*F*], and was buried upon the feaſt of St. Barnabas in the Church of the Franciſcans. He wrote a prodigious number of books [*G*]. Johannes Picus Mirandula ſtiles him a *moſt ingenious perſon* (*t*); Biſhop Jewel "in

(*q*) Luc. Wadding. *Annal. Fratr. Minor.* tom. 2. pag. 449. *and* Jebb, *ubi ſupra.*

(*r*) *Hiſt. & Antiq. Univ. Oxon.* l. 1. p 38.

(*ſ*) Ibid. pag. 79.

(*t*) *Vir ingenioſiſſimus.* Pic. Mirandula, *apud* Pitſeum, *ubi ſupra, and* Balæum, *Scriptor. Brytanniæ Centur. IV.* p. 342. edit. Baſil. 1557.

and obliged to deſiſt from his undertaking. He tells us himſelf (78), that he had often endeavoured to draw up thoſe tables, but could not finiſh them on account of the ignorance of thoſe with whom he lived. *Et ſæpe aggreſſus ſum compoſitionem iſtarum tabularum, ſed non potui conſummare propter .... ſtultitiam eorum, cum quibus habui facere.* He was repreſented as a Conjurer, and as one, who had made a compact with the Devil, not only among the vulgar, but even among the more intelligent of the Divines themſelves. He obſerves in his *Opus Majus* (79), that "becauſe "theſe performances in Aſtrology ſeemed to the generality of Students above the reach of human underſtanding, by reaſon that they and their teachers "do not apply themſelves to Philoſophy, ſcarce any "perſon would venture to ſpeak of them in public. "Thoſe who were converſant in this art, were immediately ſtigmatized as Magicians, though they "were only learned Philoſophers. The Divines and "Canoniſts, who are not ſkilled in theſe points, and "obſerve that bad things can be done as well as "good, neglect and deteſt them, and conſider them "as effects of magic. For they ſee that conjurers, "and thoſe who turn the rules of Philoſophy to bad "purpoſes, make uſe of them; and upon that account they eſteem them unworthy of Chriſtians." *Sed quia hæc opera* (aſtrologica ſcil.) *videntur vulgo ſtudentium eſſe ſupra humanum intellectum, quia vulgus cum ſuis doctoribus non vacat operibus ſapientiæ, ideo vix eſt aliquis auſus loqui de his operibus in publico. Statim enim vocantur magici, cum tamen ſint ſapientiſſimi, qui hæc ſciunt. Utique theologi & decretiſtæ non inſtructi in talibus, ſimulque videntes quod mala poſſunt fieri ſicut & bona, negligunt hæc & abhorrent, & computant inter magica. Vident etiam quod magici & abuſores documentorum ſapientiæ his utuntur, & ideo æſtimant indigna Chriſtianis.* Mr. Wood obſerves (80), that Balæus in the firſt edition (81) had ſtigmatized Bacon with the odious imputation of being a Conjurer, Magician, and Necromancer, *Præſtigiator, Magus, & Necromanticus*; but that in his ſecond edition at Baſil 1559 in fol. he expunged thoſe reproachful expreſſions; and tells us, that he was prodigiouſly skilled in the Mathematics, without ever engaging in the ſtudy of Necromancy, though many perſons have caſt that ſcandal upon him. *Acceſſit ei in Matheſi peritia incredibilis, ſed abſque Necromantiâ; quamvis ea à multis infametur* (82). Pitſeus (83) obſerves, that his deep reſearches into the Mathematics and Natural Philoſophy drew this odium upon him, and that his enemies took that opportunity to procure his writings to be condemned, and himſelf to be caſt into priſon. The ſame Writer remarks, that this misfortune of his was occaſioned by his uncommon merit; for his profound and fruitful genius having diſcovered a great many noble inventions, which others envied him the honour of, or did not underſtand, their malice or ignorance led them to condemn what ſurpaſſed their own capacity to diſcover or to comprehend. *Certe malum hac in parte non videtur homini eveniſſe, niſi ex ſuo bono; nam fœcundum illud & profundum litteratiſſimi hominis ingenium difficilia multa invenit, quæ aliorum ingenia, ſi alta, à ſe non inventa dolebant, & ex invidia accuſabant; ſi vulgaria, ne inventa quidem capere poterant. Itaque vel ex invidiâ vel ex ignorantiâ calumniabantur & condemnabant illa, quæ ſuam vel effugerant induſtriam, vel ſuperaverant captum.* In ſuch an unlearned age as his was, it is no wonder, as Dr. Freind obſerves (84), that his great diſcoveries were ſo little underſtood. "Indeed, *continues that Author*, for this "very reaſon, that he performed things by the help "of mathematical knowledge, which were above "common underſtandings, he was ſuſpected of Magic. And as ignorance and malice are generally "active and violent, he was perſecuted particularly "by his own fraternity, ſo that they would not receive his works into their Library, and at laſt had "intereſt enough with the General of their Order to "get him impriſoned; ſo that, as he confeſſes himſelf, he had reaſon to repent of his having taken "ſuch pains in the Arts and Sciences." Dr. Plot tells us (85) that he wrote a whole Treatiſe againſt the uſe of Magic, *Contra Necromanticos ſive de nullitate Magiæ.*

(78) Ibid.

(79) Pag. 249.

(80) *Hiſt. & Antiquit. Univerſitat. Oxon.* lib. 1. pag. 79.

(81) Printed Gippeſwici in Anglia, *ann.* 1548, 4to. fol. 114. b.

(82) Balæus, Cent. 4. num. 55. pag. 342.

(83) *Relat. Hiſt. de Rebus Anglic.* pag. 366.

(84) Pag. 243.

(85) *Natural Hiſt. of Oxfordſhire*, ch. 9. pag. 217.

[*E*] *Condemned the doctrine of Bacon.*] Balæus (86) tells us, that the Monks charged his doctrine with containing ſome ſuſpected novelties. *In ea nimirum dicebant aliquas contineri novitates ſuſpectas.* But that Hiſtorian does not inform us, what thoſe novelties were. But we may collect from what Toſſinianenſis writes (87), that it was his opinion concerning judiciary Aſtrology, which was principally objected againſt, if that Writer's account be true, when he relates, that Jerom de Eſculo condemned Bacon's books *de Necromanticis*, i. e. "Of Necromancy;" *de Prognoſticis ex Stellis*, i. e. "Of Prognoſtics from the Stars;" and *de verâ Aſtronomiâ*; i. e. "Of true Aſtronomy." This diſgrace rendered his memory very obnoxious to thoſe of his own Order; and John Twine in his *Comment. de rebus Albionicis &c.* (88) informs us, that his Writings not being underſtood by them, but imagined to relate to ſubjects of Magic and Necromancy, were chained to the ſhelves in the Library of the Franciſcans at Oxford, where they were abſolutely neglected, and left to be conſumed by the moths. But Dr. Langbain rejects this account of Twine, as appears from the following paſſage in his letter to Selden, dated Jan. the 20th 1653, and quoted by Dr. Jebb. *I doubt*, ſays he, *whether the ſtory be probable, as the ſcene is laid by Twine, where Abbot Voche ſpeaks it, as done before his time. Which, if true, I think would not have eſcaped the knowledge of Leland. And conſidering he was ſo much an admirer of Bacon, and withal ſo highly angry with that Houſe for making his acceſs into their Library ſo difficult, I do not ſee well how he could omit to have taken notice of it, &c. Though it be no neceſſary conſequence in Logick to argue* ab authoritate negativè, *yet this authority, all circumſtances conſidered, makes it to me very probable.*

(86) *Scriptor. Brytann. Cent. IV.* pag. 342. edit. Baſil. 1557.

(87) See *Collect. Anglo-Minorit.* pag. 116. *apud* Jebb.

(88) Lib. 2. pag. 130.

[*F*] *Died at Oxford in* 1292, *in about the* 78*th year of his age.*] This is the account of Mr. Wood in his *Hiſt. & Antiq. Univerſ. Oxon.* (89). Pitſeus (90) and Balæus (91) tell us, that he died in 1284. Leland erroneouſly ſuppoſes that he died in 1248, as Dr. Freind (92), and Mr. Wood (93) informs us, the former of whom is of opinion, that his death is to be fixed upon June the 11th 1292. But Dr. Cave, and Dr. Jebb place it in 1694.

(89) Lib. 1. pag. 79.

(90) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 369.

(91) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 1284.

(92) Pag. 235.

(93) *Ubi ſupra.*

[*G*] *He wrote a prodigious number of books.*] Leland aſſures of this, and obſerves, that his genuine works, which he wiſhes for an hundred tongues to commend as they deſerve, were in his time ſo difficult to be met with, or at leaſt ſo mangled and imperfect in moſt of the Libraries which he had ſeen, that it would be as eaſy to gather up the *Sybills* leaves, as to collect even a bare catalogue of the books which he wrote. *Nunc autem, pudet dicere, partim e ſuis forulis exciſi, & furto, cuſtodum negligentiâ, ſublati, partim mutili, direptis hinc inde quaternionibus, facti tam raro comparent,*

in his *Defence of his Apology*, Part IV. c. 15. tells us, that he "was notable and famous in "his time, and in all reſpects comparable then with the beſt." He was able to judge of "the Latin, Greek and Hebrew Tongues, as appears by his book *De Idiomate Linguarum.*" And Selden *De Diis Syris Syntag.* 1. *c.* 2. obſerves, that he was a very excellent Mathematician, and maſter of an extent of Learning ſuperior to the age in which he lived. Dr. Freind (*u*) tells us, that he was *the miracle of the age he lived in, and the greateſt genius perhaps for mechanical knowledge, which ever appeared in the world ſince the time of Archimedes.* He complains likewiſe (*w*), that ſo great an Author ſhould not only be in a manner unknown to foreigners, but that they, who have profeſſedly wrote our Engliſh Hiſtories, ſhould have ſcarce ſaid any thing concerning him or his Works; *though ſurely*, ſays he very juſtly, *ſome relation of ſo extraordinary a genius would have as well deſerved to have had a place in their writings, as the detail of a blazing ſtar, or a bloody ſhower; which they never fail to regiſter at large. And it might perhaps have been of as much uſe and pleaſure to the reader, as a long recital of the riſe and fall of a great Miniſter, or the wars and victories of our Kings.*

(*u*) *Hiſtory of Phyſic*, Part 2. pag. 235.

(*w*) Ibid. pag. 248.

rent, ut facilius ſit Sibyllæ folia colligere, quam nomina librorum, quos ſcripſit. Pitſeus likewiſe tells us, that he wrote an infinite number of books upon almoſt all ſubjects, which was the moſt inconteſtable proof of his various and extenſive learning, *Jam verò ad immenſam Librorum, quos de omni pene materiâ ſcripſit, multitudinem veniamus, quo nullum multiplicis ejus doctrinæ locupletius eſſe poteſt teſtimonium.* Dr. Jebb has given us a catalogue of thoſe works which are aſcribed to him, according to the order of the Sciences, as particularly in Grammar, Mathematics, and Natural Philoſophy, Optics, Geography, Aſtronomy, Chronology, Chymiſtry, Magic, Logic, Metaphyſics and Ethics, Phyſic, Divinity, and Philology, with other miſcellaneous pieces. But that Gentleman is of opinion, that this prodigious number of books, which were ſaid to have been written by him, will be reduced to a few, if we conſider the affair rightly. For the copies of his writings being diſperſed into ſeveral places, it happened that the ſame Tracts had different titles given them, or that particular chapters or fragments of them were conſidered as diſtinct Treatiſes. He proceeds then to ſhew, that our Author wrote no Tract in Philoſophy, while he continued a Layman; and nothing but a few little pieces, *Capitula quædam*, before the year 1276, when he ſent his works to Pope Clement; ſo that the eleven books of his, which are mentioned by the writers of his life, ſcarce contain ſo many pages. The firſt conſiderable volume which he wrote was his *Opus Majus*, which he divided into ſix parts, and annexed to it his Tracts *de Prognoſticis ex Stellis, de multiplicatione Specierum*, and *de Morali Philoſophia*. Theſe ſeveral parts being tranſcribed ſeparately, with each of them a proper and diſtinct title, were conſidered as entire books, and enlarged the catalogues of his works. Beſides his *Opus Majus*, he ſent two other works to Pope Clement, one of which he ſtyled *Opus Minus*, and the other *Opus Tertium*. Manuſcripts of both theſe works are extant in the Cotton Library, but that of the *Opus Minus* is imperfect. After the death of Pope Clement, Bacon about the year 1271 reviſed this work, and corrected and enlarged it conſiderably, as appears from the manuſcript of it in the Library abovementioned (94). His Treatiſe of Chronology, which in the manuſcript in the King's Library is entitled *Computus Rogeri Bacon*, is called by Balæus and Pitſeus *Computus Naturalium*. He divided it into three parts; at the end are ſubjoined a Calendar and ſome Aſtronomical Tables, which tho' they have not his name to them, are moſt probably of his own compoſition, ſince he tells us himſelf, that he had undertaken to draw up ſuch a ſett of Tables, and ſome of them relate to the year 1269, which very well agrees with the age of Bacon. It is uncertain whether he wrote any thing after this till he was caſt into priſon; tho' his three Epiſtles to Johannes Pariſienſis, publiſhed at Francfort 1620 with ſome other chymical pieces of our Author, may be well enough reduced under this period. But when Jerom de Eſculo was raiſed to the Popedom in the year 1288, in order to mitigate the reſentments of that Prelate, Bacon is ſaid to have written his Book *de retardandis ſenectutis accidentibus* for the uſe of his Holineſs. This Book was publiſhed at Oxford in 1590, and divided it into ſeveral Tracts *de Retardatione ſenectutis, de univerſali Regimine ſenum*, and *de Conſervatione ſenſuum*. Upon his recovering of his liberty, and return into his own country, tho' he was then very old, at the deſire of his friends, who requeſted him to publiſh ſome pieces in Divinity, he wrote his *Compendium ſtudii theologici*. There are ſeveral pieces falſely aſcribed to him, as particularly *Tractatus ſuper Pſalterium, Vita S. Edmundi Archiepiſcopi Cantuarienſis*, which are thought to have been written by Robert Bacon. The Treatiſe *de Fluxu & Refluxu Maris Britannici* is aſcribed to Walter Botoner; and the *Rogerina major & minor* to Thomas de Sancto Amando, and by others to Roger of Parma (95). Dr. Freind obſerves (96), that there is a copy of the two laſt Treatiſes in the Harleyan Library; but as they contain in a manner the whole practice of Phyſic in all diſtempers, he tells us, that he ſhould queſtion very much, if Bacon, who without diſpute never made this profeſſion his buſineſs, were the Author; and therefore, he thinks that it is much more probable, that they might have been written by Roger of Parma, whoſe Books of Surgery are now extant. He informs us likewiſe, that as to the writings of Bacon in general, many, which go under his name, are without doubt *ſpurious*; and that ſuch particularly is the piece ſo much cryed up by the Chymiſts concerning the Oil of Antimony, where ſome Authors are quoted, who lived long after him.

(95) Jebb, *ubi ſupra.*

(96) Pag. 249.

T.

(94) Op. Min. C. 1. *MS. Cot. Tib.* C. 5. fol. 121.

BACON (FRANCIS) Lord High Chancellor of England, under King James I, was one of the greateſt genius's of his age, and one of thoſe, who knew beſt the imperfect ſtate in which Philoſophy then was. He laboured very intenſely to find out the proper means of remedying theſe defects, and he formed ſome excellent plans for the reformation of it [*A*]. The Public received his Works with great applauſe. There was a complete edition of them publiſhed at Frankfort in folio in the year 1665. The *Journal des Savans* did not mention it without giving a great elogium to this illuſtrious Chancellor (*a*). The treatiſe *De Augmentis Scientiarum*, which was reprinted at Paris in 1624, is one of the beſt productions of the Author [*B*]. His *Moral and Political Works*, tranſlated into French by Baudouin,

(*a*) In the *Journal* of the 8th of March 1666. Obſerve, that there was promiſed an edition in ſix volumes in 12mo, in 1684. See the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, for June 1684, in the catalogue of new books, num. 5.

[*A*] *He formed ſome excellent plans for a reformation of it.*] See what Mr. Baillet has ſaid in the firſt volume of his Life of Mr. Des Cartes (1), and what Gaſſendi has ſaid in particular of Bacon's Logic (2).

(1) Pag. 147, 148.

(2) Gaſſendi, *Oper.* tom. 1. pag. 62.

[*B*] *His treatiſe* de Augmentis Scientiarum ..... *is one of the beſt productions of the Author.*] Here is what Coſtar wrote to Voiture: *I have read a few months paſt a Book written by Chancellor Bacon concerning the Advancement of Learning, in which I have found a great many admirable things* (3). He mentions afterwards ſome of thoſe things, and ſhews by that choice his own good taſte; for it is certain they are all

(3) *Entretiens de Voiture & de Coſtar.* pag. 173. Paris edit. in 1654.

douin, ſold ſo prodigiouſly, that ſeveral editions were publiſhed of them. His *Life of Henry VII, King of England*, is very much eſteemed (*b*). My Lord Bacon was ſo much employed in ſerving the Republic of Letters, that he neglected his own domeſtic affairs in ſuch a manner, that he died extremely poor. I ſhall quote two authorities upon that point [*C*]. His death is placed on the 9th of April 1626. He lived ſixty ſix years.

(*b*) See in Pope Blount, pag. 635. the judgment of Conringius, Boeclerus, &c. upon it. We find there ſeveral other judgments in favour of Bacon.

all fine and noble ſentiments. I have been informed that the works of Bacon was one of the Books, which Coſtar made the greateſt uſe of, and that from thence he took the foundation of his own Collection; that is, having found in Bacon's writings a thought, that pleaſed him, he wrote it upon a ſheet of paper; and afterwards when he met in other Books with any thing that had any relation to it, he added it to that paper; by which means he wanted no Repoſitory or Common-Place Book.

[*C*] *He died poor. I ſhall quote two authorities upon that ſubject.*] The firſt is ſupplied me by the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*, and the ſecond by the *Sorberiana*. The *Bibliotheque Univerſelle* informs me that James Howell writes in a Letter (4) *dated the 6th of January 1625* (5), . . . *that Chancellor Bacon died ſo poor, that he had ſcarce left enough to bury him; which made Howell give his opinion, that tho' he was a great genius with reſpect to the ſciences, he was not a judicious man. However he aſcribes the poverty of this famous Chancellor either to his contempt of riches, or his exceſſive liberality. A little before he died, he wrote, according to Howell's account, a complaining Letter to the King, in which he deſired him to aſſiſt him, "leſt he ſhould be "reduced in his laſt days to beggary, and he, who de-"ſired to live only in order to ſtudy, ſhould be forced "to ſtudy how to live." Which expreſſions ſeemed to our Author as mean, as thoſe in another Letter, which he wrote before to the Prince of Wales, were profane. He told that Prince, "that he hoped, that as the Father "had been his Creator, the Son would be his Redeemer."* Let us now ſee what Sorbiere ſays: "The Natural "Hiſtory of Bacon at Paris 1631, tranſlated or rather "abridged by Peter Amboiſe, Eſq; Sieur de la Made-"laine. We have there an account by the tranſla-"tor of the Life of this Chancellor, and at the end is "added a tranſlation of the *Nova Atlantis*. The few "excellent remarks which I have ſeen, makes me "prodigiouſly deſirous of ſeeing a complete and exact "tranſlation. Sir Will. Boſwel told me, that he had a "particular intimacy with this extraordinary per-"ſonage, who left him by Will all his papers, which "was the only thing, that was executed of above a mil-"lion of Legacies, which he had made out of gal-"lantry. He bequeathed four hundred thouſand livres "to an imaginary College, the plan of which he "had laid down in his *Nova Atlantis* (7)." This diſ-courſe does not ſeem to expreſs that Bacon died poor; but rather to inſinuate that he died a little whimſical (8); but if we examine it more cloſely, we ſhall find that there is a ſign of poverty in it.

(6) *Biblioth. Univerſ.* tom. 15. pag. 45.

(4) The 8th of the 4th Section of the 1ſt volume.

(5) There muſt be here an error of the preſs in the numbers; for Chancellor Bacon did not die till the 9th of April 1626.

(7) Sorberiana, pag. 41. Dutch edition.

(8) See what the Sieur de Maurier ſays concerning the will of Ceriſantes in his *Memoires de Hollande* pag. 430.

☞ BACON (FRANCIS). The diſtinguiſhed character and abilities of this great Man deſerve a much more copious article, than Mr. Bayle has given us of him. He was ſon of Sir Nicholas Bacon, Lord Keeper of the Great Seal in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, by Anne one of the daughters of Sir Anthony Cook, and eminent for her ſkill in the Latin and Greek Tongues. He was born at York-Place in the Strand January 22d 1560 (*a*). He ſhewed ſeveral marks of an excellent genius, when he was very young; ſo that he was particularly taken notice of by Queen Elizabeth [*A*]. June 10, 1573, he was matriculated in the Univerſity of Cambridge (*b*), and enter'd into Trinity College there under the care of Dr. John Whitgift, then Maſter of that College, and afterwards Archbiſhop of Canterbury. While he continued here, at about ſixteen years of age, he firſt fell into a diſlike of Ariſtotle's Philoſophy [*B*]; which induced him afterwards to endeavour after a more ſatisfactory and perfect ſyſtem. After he had paſſed through the circle of the Liberal Arts, his father thought proper to qualify him for the management of public affairs; for which purpoſe he ſent him over to France with Sir Amyas Paulet, Embaſſador to that Court; who entruſted him wirh a commiſſion to the Queen; which he diſcharged with great approbation, and returned to France, with an intention to continue there for ſome years (*c*). During his abſence his father died in 1579 [*C*]; upon which he returned to England, and applied

(*a*) *See* Dr. Rawley's *Life of him*, p. 1. in the 1ſt volume of the edition of the Lord Bacon's works, publiſhed at London 1730, in fol.

(*b*) See the Collections relating to his Life in that edition, p. 217.

(*c*) Rawley, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 5.

[*A*] *He ſhewed ſeveral works of his excellent genius, when he was very young, ſo that he was particularly taken notice of by Queen Elizabeth.*] Dr. Rawley tells us (1), that the Queen delighted much in converſing with him, and trying him with queſtions; which he anſwered with a gravity and maturity ſuperior to his years; ſo that her Majeſty uſed frequently to call him, *The young Lord Keeper*. Being once aſked by the Queen how old he was, he replied with a great deal of vivacity, tho' he was then but a child, that *he was two years younger than her Majeſty's happy reign*; with which anſwer the Queen was prodigiouſly charmed.

(1) *Life of Lord Bacon*, pag. 4. in the 1ſt vol. of his works publiſhed at London 1730, in 4 vol. in fol.

[*B*] *While he continued here, at about ſixteen years of age, he firſt fell into a diſlike of Ariſtotle's Philoſophy.*] Dr. Rawley obſerves (2), that he was informed of that particular from his Lordſhip himſelf; and that his exceptions againſt that great Philoſopher were not founded upon *the worthleſsneſs of the Author, to whom he would ever aſcribe all high attributes, but for the unfruitfulneſs of the way, being a Philoſophy (as his Lordſhip uſed to ſay) only for diſputations and contentions, but barren in the production of works for the benefit of the life of man; in which mind he continued to his dying day*. Dr. Teniſon likewiſe in his Introduction to the *Baconiana* tells us (3), that when our Author began his ſtudies, Ariſtotle was in effect the Pope in Philoſophy. The lectures both in his private College, and in the public Schools were generally expoſitions upon Ariſtotle's text; and every opinion written by him as his own was eſteemed as authentic, as if it had been given under the ſeal of the Fiſher. It was therefore a very ſingular felicity in a young Gentleman to ſee farther into nature than that celebrated Philoſopher, at whoſe feet he was placed. And it was as happy as it was extraordinary, that he took diſtaſte betimes at the vulgar ſchemes of Natural Philoſophy. *Uſe and cuſtom in that way*, continues Dr. Teniſon, *might have reconciled it to him, as it had done to others of great learning. For a Philoſopher is like a vine, of which they ſay, it muſt be ſet of a plant, and not of a tree. But tho' there was bred in Mr. Bacon ſo early a diſlike of the Phyſiology of Ariſtotle, yet did he not deſpiſe him with that pride and haughtineſs, with which youth is wonted to be puffed up. He had a juſt eſteem of that great maſter in learning* (*a*); *a greater than that, which Ariſtotle himſelf expreſſed towards the Philoſophers, that went before him; for he endeavoured (ſome ſay) to ſtifle all their labours, deſigning to himſelf an univerſal monarchy over opinions, as his patron Alexander did over men. Our Hero owned what was excellent in him; but in his enquiries into nature, he proceeded not upon his principles. He began the work anew, and laid the foundation of philoſophic theory in numerous experiments.*

(2) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 5.

(3) Pag. 9. edit. London 1679.

(*a*) *De Augm. Scient.* l. 3. c. 4. *Cæterum de viro tam eximio certe, & ob acumen ingenii mirabili*, Ariſtotele, &c.

[*C*] *During his abſence his father died in* 1579.] His father had collected a conſiderable ſum of money, which he had ſeparated with an intention to have made

applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the Common Law [*D*], which he reſolved upon as his profeſſion, though his inclinations led him much more ſtrongly to the affairs of State. He was appointed one of the Queen's Council extraordinary in the 28th year of his age, an honour, which was ſcarce ever granted before (*d*). And to her he dedicated his *Maxims and Elements* of the Common Law in the year 1596, though they were not printed till ſome years after his death, and then incorrectly; though not ſo ill as his *Reading* upon the Statute of Uſes in Gray's-Inn, which he performed with honour to himſelf and profit to his hearers, having been one of the firſt, who argued that difficult Caſe of *Uſes*, called *Chudleigh*'s Caſe, which is reported by Sir Edward Coke. But the greateſt figure, which he made in the laſt ten years of the Queen's reign, was in the Houſe of Commons; and then it is thought that he applied himſelf to Politics, ſo that the Queen and Lord Treaſurer Burghley employed his head and hand in affairs of State; for he obſerves himſelf, that in the buſineſs, which paſſed through the hands of the Queen's learned Council, either of State or Revenue, he was conſtantly employed (*e*). He was in his younger years attached to the intereſt of the Earl of Eſſex, whom he endeavoured to diſſuade from thoſe raſh attempts, which proved afterwards his ruin (*f*). He made no conſiderable advances in his fortune under Queen Elizabeth [*E*]; but upon the acceſſion of King James to the Crown he was ſoon raiſed to conſiderable honours. July 23d 1603, in the firſt year of the reign of the King he was knighted at Whitehall, and the year following he was made one of the King's Council learned in the law, with a grant of forty pound per annum fee (*g*). And as his abilities had appeared in Council, in Parliament, and in his Profeſſion, and eſpecially in his Speeches which he made in the Houſe of Commons, and the Treatiſes, which he wrote in favour of the Union of the two Kingdoms of England and Scotland, which the King ſo paſſionately deſired, he had reaſon to expect, that his ſuit for the place of Sollicitor-General, which he had likewiſe made intereſt for under the Queen, would have been immediately granted him; but it is ſuppoſed, that his preferment was obſtructed by the jealouſy of his couſin-german Sir Robert Cecil, afterwards Lord Treaſurer, and Earl of Saliſbury, and Sir Edward Coke, the Attorney-General (*h*). However at laſt, in the beginning of the year 1607 he was appointed to that poſt in the room of Sir Henry Hobart (*i*). In 1611 he was made joint Judge with Sir Thomas Vavaſor, then Knight-Marſhal, of the

(*d*) Idem, pag. 5. and Mr. Stephens's *Account of the Life of the Lord Bacon*, pag. 10, 11. in the edition of his *Letters and Remains*, London 1734, in 4to.

(*e*) Stephens's *Account of the Life of the Lord Bacon*, pag. 11.

(*f*) Rawley, pag. 6.

(*g*) See the Inſertions from Dugdale and Teniſon, ibid. p. 7.

(*h*) *See* Stephens's *Account of the Life of the Lord Bacon*, pag. 14.

(*i*) *Collections, ubi ſupra*, p. 66.

made a competent purchaſe of land for the ſupport of our Author, who was his youngeſt ſon, and the only one unprovided for, though he was particularly beloved by his father. But this purchaſe not being executed at his father's death, there came no greater ſhare to him, than his ſingle part and proportion of the money, which was divided among the five brothers; by which means his circumſtances were very narrow in his younger years. For the manner of Gorhambury near St. Albans in Hertfordſhire did not come to him till many years after, by the death of his brother, Mr. Anthony Bacon, a Gentleman equal to him in wit, tho' inferior with regard to learning; and who had a great affection for our Author, they two being the only male iſſue by a ſecond venter (4). Lord Bacon tells us himſelf in the tenth Century of his *Natural Hiſtory* (5) a remarkable incident, which happened to him at the time of his father's death. Having obſerved, that the relations touching the force of imagination and the ſecret inſtincts of nature, are ſo uncertain, that they require a great deal of examination, before we conclude upon them; and that he would have it firſt thoroughly enquired, whether there be any ſecret paſſages of ſympathy between perſons of near blood, as parents, children, brothers, ſiſters, nurſe-children, huſbands, wives, &c. ſince there are many reports in Hiſtory, that upon the death of perſons of ſuch nearneſs, men have an inward feeling of it; he relates the following ſtory: *I myſelf remember, that being in Paris, and my father's dying in London, two or three days before my father's death I had a dream, which I told to divers Engliſh Gentlemen, that my father's houſe in the country was plaiſtered all over with black mortar.*

(4) Dr. Rawley, pag. 5.

(5) Num. 986.

[*D*] *Upon his return from his travels he applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the Common-Law.*] He made a great progreſs in it, tho' he conſidered it only as an acceſſory, as himſelf ſaid, and not as his principal ſtudy. He ſeated himſelf for the convenience of his ſtudies and practice amongſt the Society at Gray's-Inn, of which he was a member; and erected that elegant building, commonly known by the name of *the Lord Bacon's Lodgings*, which he inhabited by turns for the greateſt part of his life, except for ſome years only. In this Society he behaved with ſuch a ſweetneſs and generoſity of temper, that he was equally admired and beloved by the Readers and Gentlemen of that Houſe (6).

(6) Rawley, pag. 5 and 6.

[*E*] *He made no conſiderable advances in his fortune under Queen Elizabeth.*] Dr. Rawley obſerves (7), that tho' his birth and other advantages qualified him above all others of his profeſſion for an eaſy acceſs at Court, and introduced him frequently to the Queen's preſence, who often honoured him with private and free converſation upon the moſt important affairs of State, and received the higheſt ſatisfaction from him upon ſuch ſubjects; yet ſhe never conferred upon him any place of profit, but only the reverſion of the Regiſter's office in the Star-Chamber, which was worth about 1600 pounds *per annum*, tho' it did not fall to him till about twenty years after; ſo that his Lordſhip ſaid of it in Queen's Elizabeth's time, that *it was like another man's ground buttalling upon his houſe; which might mend his proſpect, but it did not fill his barn. This neglect of him*, ſays the Writer abovementioned, *might be imputed, not ſo much to her Majeſty's averſion and diſaffection towards him, as the arts and policy of a great Stateſman there, who laboured by all induſtrious and ſecret means to ſuppreſs and keep him down, leſt if he had riſen, he might have obſcured his glory.* Mr. Stephens the late Hiſtoriographer in his *Introduction* (8) to that part of our author's Letters, which he wrote in the reign of King James, tells us, that the books, which he was known to have read, beſides thoſe of his profeſſion, and the learning he was maſter of, which made him ſo great a benefactor to the world, was turned to his own diſadvantage, and made uſe of as a reaſon, why the poſt of Sollicitor-General ſhould not be conferred upon him. This preferment he had in his eye in the year 1595 (9) thro' the intereſt of no leſs a favourite than the Earl of Eſſex. However it is obſerved, that *he was zealous in bearing teſtimony to the wiſe adminiſtration of affairs in thoſe* [*Queen Elizabeth's*] *times, in which himſelf advanced little either in profit or honour. For he was hindered from growing at Court by a very great man, who knew the ſlenderneſs of his purſe, and alſo feared, that if he grew, he might prove taller than himſelf* (10). *The little art he uſed againſt him was the repreſenting of him as a ſpeculator; though it is plain no man dealt better with kinder ways in publick buſineſs than himſelf; and it generally ripened under his hands.* At the end of the fourth volume of his works we have ſeveral Letters from him and the Earl of Eſſex to the Lord Keeper Puckering relating to the Sollicitor's place.

(7) Pag. 6.

(8) Pag. 10. London 1702, in 4to.

(9) See his *Letter* to the Lord Treaſurer Burghley, publiſhed in the 4th vol. of his Works, pag. 474.

(10) See his Letters to Sir Robert Cecill; Works, vol. 4. pag. 488, 498.

the Knight-Marſhal's Court, lately erected within the Verge of the King's Houſe (*k*); and on the 27th of October 1613 he ſucceeded Sir Henry Hobart as Attorney-General (*l*), and June the 9th 1616 he was ſworn of the King's Privy Council (*m*), a truſt rarely conferred either before or ſince on a Gentleman in that Office. Upon which occaſion he tells the King, that being exempted from pleading cauſes between party and party, he thought himſelf obliged to dedicate his leiſure time to his Majeſty's ſervice, and particularly to the reducing and recompoſing of the Laws of England, with the proper aſſiſtance of others; and in this deſign he perſiſted when he had greater leiſure, by offering the King a ſpecimen of a *Digeſt* of the ſame Laws, publiſhed by Dr. Rawley (*r*). While he was Attorney-General he diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his endeavours to reſtrain the cuſtom of Duels, which was then very frequent [*F*], and by his abilities in the management of ſeveral important cauſes. About the beginning of his promotions he married a daughter of Benedict Barnham Alderman of London; but

(*k*) *Inſertions, &c. ubi ſupra*, pag. 7.
(*l*) *Collections, &c. ubi ſupra*, pag. 67.
(*m*) Cambden's *Annals of King James.*
(*n*) Stephens's *Account*, p. 15.

[*F*] *While he was Attorney-General he diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his endeavours to reſtrain the cuſtom of Duels, which was then very frequent.*] This cuſtom is ſaid to have been introduced into England from France, where a prodigious quantity of blood had been ſhed notwithſtanding the Edicts of King Henry IV and Lewis XIII, till the evil became ſo powerful, that though the great Cardinal Richelieu gave ſome check to it by the puniſhment of de Chappelle and Bouteville, two young Gentlemen of great valour, without any regard to the intreaties of their friends, and the mediation of perſons of the greateſt quality, yet all his application and thoughts upon this ſubject, as he tells us in his *Political Teſtament*, could never gain that effect, which has ſince been accompliſhed by the reſolution and ſeverity of Lewis XIV in the year 1702; and which Monſr. le Vaſſor, a French Hiſtorian, ſays is the beſt, and perhaps the only good action he did in a reign of fifty ſix years. Sir Francis Bacon being made the King's Attorney uſed all his efforts to put a ſtop to this practice here; and his charge with regard to duels upon an information in the Star-Chamber againſt *Prieſt* and *Wright* was ſo highly approved by the Lords of the Council, who were then in the Star-Chamber, that they ordered it to be printed and publiſhed with the decree of the Court itſelf. In this charge he ſpeaks of *the nature and greatneſs of the miſchief of duels; the cauſes and remedies of it; the juſtice of the Law of England, which ſome*, ſays he, *ſtick not to think defective in this matter; of the capacity of the Court of the Star-Chamber, where certainly the remedy of that miſchief was to be found*; and of his own *purpoſe and reſolution*, wherein he humbly deſired the aſſiſtance of that Court. With regard to the miſchief itſelf, he obſerves, that when revenge is once extorted out of the Magiſtrate's hand contrary to God's ordinance, and every man ſhall bear the ſword, not to defend, but to aſſail, and private men begin once to preſume to give Law to themſelves, and to right their own wrongs, no man can foreſee the dangers and inconveniences which may ariſe and multiply by that means. Other offences yield and conſent to the Law, that is good, not daring to make defence, or to juſtify themſelves; but this offence expreſly gives Law an affront, as if there were two Laws, one a kind of gown-Law, and the other a Law of reputation, as they term it; ſo that *Paul's* and *Weſtminſter*, the Pulpit and the Courts of Juſtice, muſt give place to the Law (as King James expreſſes it in his Proclamation) of ordinary tables and ſuch reverend aſſemblies. "The year-books and ſtatute-books muſt give place "to ſome French and Italian Pamphlets, which han"dle the doctrine of duels, which if they be in the "right, *tranſeamus ad illa*, let us receive them, and "not keep the people in conflict and diſtraction be"tween two laws." He conſiders then the loſs which the nation ſuffers by the deſtruction of thoſe perſons in private and inſignificant quarrels, whoſe blood if it were adventured in the ſervice of the King and Realm, would be able to make the fortune of a day, and to change the fortune of a Kingdom. With reſpect to the cauſes of it; the firſt motive undoubtedly is a falſe and erroneous imagination of honour and credit; upon which account King James in his Proclamation called them *bewitching duels. For if one judge of it truly*, ſays the Attorney, *it is no better than a ſorcery, that enchanted the ſpirits of young men, that bear great minds with a falſe ſhew*, ſpecies falſa, *and a kind of ſatanical illuſion and apparition of honour againſt religion, againſt law, againſt moral virtue, and againſt the precedents and examples of the beſt times and valianteſt nations.* Beſides this, men have almoſt loſt the true notion and underſtanding of fortitude and honour. *For fortitude diſtinguiſheth of the grounds of quarrels, whether they be juſt; and not only ſo, but whether they be worthy, and ſetteth a better price upon mens lives than to beſtow them idly. Nay it is a weakneſs and diſeſteem of a man's ſelf to put a man's life upon ſuch lieger performances; a man's life is not to be trifled away; it is to be offered up and ſacrificed to honourable ſervices, public merits, good cauſes, and noble adventures. It is in expence of blood as it is in expence of money; it is no liberality to make a profuſion of money upon every vain occaſion; nor no more it is fortitude to make effuſion of blood, except the cauſe be of worth.* The remedies, which he propoſes for the reſtraint of this evil, are firſt, that there appear and be declared a conſtant and ſettled reſolution in the State to aboliſh it. Secondly, care muſt be taken, that it be no longer countenanced, or the humour of it indulged. Thirdly, ſays he, *I muſt acknowledge, that I learned out of the King's laſt Proclamation the moſt prudent and beſt applied remedy for this offence (if it ſhall pleaſe his Majeſty to uſe it) that the wit of man can deviſe. This offence is grounded upon a falſe conceit of honour, and therefore it would be puniſhed in the ſame kind*, in eo quis rectiſſimè plectitur, in quo peccat. *The fountain of honour is the King and his aſpect, and the acceſs to his perſon continueth honour in life, and to be baniſhed from his preſence is one of the greateſt eclipſes of honour that can be. If his Majeſty ſhall be pleaſed, that when this Court ſhall cenſure any of theſe offences in perſons of eminent Quality, to add this out of his own power and diſcipline, that theſe perſons ſhall be baniſhed and excluded from his Court for certain years, and the Courts of his Queen and Prince, I think there is no man, that hath any good blood in him, will commit an act, that ſhall caſt him into that darkneſs, that he may not behold his Sovereign's face.* Laſtly, that this Court ſhould puniſh all the middle acts and proceedings which tend to the duel, and ſo to hew and vex the root in the branches, which no doubt will kill the root, and yet prevent the extremity of the Law. The Attorney obſerves then, that the Law of England is excepted to, though ignorantly, in two points; the one, that it ſhould make no difference between an inſidious and foul murther, and the killing a man upon fair terms, as it is called. The other, that the Law has not provided ſufficient puniſhment and reparations for contumely of words, as the lie, and the like. But theſe are no better than childiſh novelties againſt the Divine Law, and againſt all Laws in effect, and againſt the examples of all the braveſt and moſt virtuous nations of the world. For in the Law of God there is never to be found any difference made in homicide, but between homicide voluntary and involuntary, which we term miſadventure. As for example, in Civil States, *all memory*, ſays he, *doth conſent, that Greece and Rome were the moſt valiant and generous nations of the world; and that which is more to be noted, they were free States, and not under a Monarchy, whereby a man would think it a great deal the more reaſon that particular perſons ſhould have righted themſelves; and yet they had not this practice of duels, nor any thing, that bare ſhew thereof; and ſure they would have had it, if there had been any virtue in it.* Nay, *as he ſaith*, (fas eſt & ab hoſte doceri:) *It is memorable, that it is reported by a Counſellor, Embaſſador of the Emperor's, touching the cenſure of the Turks, of theſe duels. There was a combat of this kind performed by two perſons of quality of the Turks, wherein one*

but had no iſſue by her. March 7, $161\frac{6}{7}$ he was appointed Lord Keeper of the Great Seal [G]; but

one of them was ſlain, the other party was convened before the Council of Baſhaws. The manner of the reprehenſion was in theſe words: How durſt you undertake to fight one with the other? Are there not Chriſtians enough to kill? Did you not know, that whether of you ſhould be ſlain, the loſs would be the Grand Seignior's? *So as we may ſee, that the moſt warlike nations, whether generous or barbarous, have ever deſpiſed this, wherein now men glory.* As for the ſecond defect pretended in our Law that it hath *provided no remedy for lies and fillips*, it may receive the ſame anſwer. It would have been thought a madneſs amongſt the antient Lawgivers, to have ſet a puniſhment upon the lie given, which in effect is but a word of denial, a negative of another's ſaying. Any Law-giver, if he had been asked the queſtion, would have made Solon's anſwer, that he had not made any puniſhment for it, becauſe he never imagined the world would have been ſo fantaſtical as to take it ſo highly. The Civilians diſpute whether an action of injury lie for it, and rather reſolve the contrary. So every touch or light blow of the perſon is not in itſelf conſiderable, except that they have got upon them the ſtamp of a diſgrace, which makes theſe light things paſs for great matter. *The Law of England, and all Laws, hold theſe degrees of injury to the perſon, ſlander, battery, maim, and death; and if there be extraordinary circumſtances of deſpite and contumely, as in caſe of libels, and baſtinadoes, and the like, the Court taketh them in hand, and puniſheth them exemplarily. But for this apprehenſion of a diſgrace, that a fillip to the perſon ſhould be a mortal wound to the reputation, it were good that men did hearken unto the ſaying of* Conſalvo, *the great and famous Commander, that was wont to ſay, a Gentleman's honour ſhould be* de telâ craſſiore, *of a good ſtrong warp or web, that every little thing ſhould not catch it; whereas now it ſeems they are but of cob-web lawn or ſuch like ſtuff, which certainly is weakneſs, and not true greatneſs of mind, but like a ſick man's body, that is ſo tender, that it feels every thing.* We find likewiſe, that in December in the year 1616 he proſecuted one Mr. Markham for diſperſing letters of challenge to the Lord D'arcy. He mentions this in a Letter to the Lord Viſcount Villiers, publiſhed in the fourth volume of his works (13).

(13) Num. 98. pag. 651.

(14) *Ad ann.* 1617.

[G] *He was appointed Lord Keeper of the Great Seal.*] Cambden tells us in his *Annals of King James* (14), that when the King delivered the Seal to him, he had admoniſhed him not to ſeal any thing till after mature deliberation; to give righteous judgment between parties; and that he ſhould not extend the prerogative too far. Sir Anthony Weldon in his *Court and Character of King James* (15) aſſerts, that the Duke of Buckingham, *to vex the very ſoul* of the Lord Chancellor Egerton *in the laſt agony ſent Bacon to him for the Seals*; and that the dying Chancellor hated that Bacon ſhould be his ſucceſſor; and that *the old man's ſpirit could not brook this, but ſent the ſeals by his own ſervant to the King, and ſhortly after yielded up his ſoul to his Maker.* But this account contains two egregious falſities; for in the firſt place the King himſelf ſent for the ſeals, and not the Duke of Buckingham; and he ſent for them not by Sir Francis Bacon, but by Secretary Winwood (16) with this meſſage, *that himſelf would be his Underkeeper, and not diſpoſe of them while he lived, to bear the name of Chancellor.* Nor did any perſon remove the Seal out of the King's ſight, till the Lord Egerton died, which happened ſoon after. In the next place the Lord Chancellor Egerton, as Dr. Teniſon obſerves (17), was willing that the Attorney-General Bacon ſhould be his ſucceſſor, and ready to promote it; ſo far was he from conceiving any hatred againſt him either upon that or any other account. He had been a friend to Sir Francis Bacon even in the Queen's time, as appears from a Letter of the latter to him mentioned by Dr. Teniſon; and this favour of his continued to the laſt. For Sir Francis Bacon writes as follows in a Letter to Sir George Villiers, dated the 15th of Febr. 1615, and printed in the fourth volume of his works (18). *My Lord Chancellor told me yeſterday in plain terms, that if the King would aſk his opinion touching the perſon, that he would commend to ſucceed him upon death or diſability, he would name me for the fitteſt man. You may adviſe, whether uſe may not be made of this offer.* And in a Letter (19) to King James dated January 29th 1614, he wrote as follows: *It pleaſed the Lord Chancellor, out of his ancient and great love to me, (which many times in ſickneſs appeareth moſt,) to admit me with a great deal of ſpeech with him this afternoon, which during theſe three days he hath ſcarcely done to any.* Sir Anthony Weldon reproaches (20) my Lord Bacon as a very neceſſitous man, and one for that reaſon made Keeper by the Duke of Buckingham, to ſerve ſuch turns as men of better fortunes would never condeſcend to. But this is a mere groundleſs and malicious inſinuation. For he had enjoyed for a conſiderable time many profitable places, which preſerved him from indigence, *tho'*, as Dr. Teniſon obſerves (21), *his great mind did not permit him to ſwell his purſe by them to any extraordinary bigneſs. And in the Queen's time, when he was in meaner circumſtances, he did not look upon himſelf as in that eſtate of neceſſity, which tempteth generous minds to vile things.* But let us hear him repreſenting his own condition in the Letter to the Lord Chancellor Egerton quoted by Dr. Teniſon. *My eſtate,* ſays he, *I confeſs a truth to your Lordſhip, is weak and indebted, and needeth comfort. For both my father (tho' I think I had greateſt part in his love of all his children) in his wiſdom ſerved me in as a laſt comer; and myſelf in mine own induſtry have rather referred and aſpired to virtue than to gain; whereof yet I am not wiſe enough to repent me. But the while, whereas Solomon ſpeaketh,* That want cometh *firſt* as a way-faring man, and *after* as an armed man, *I muſt acknowledge myſelf to be* in primo gradu, *for it ſtealeth upon me; but for the ſecond, that it ſhould not be reſiſted, I hope in God I am not in that caſe. For the preventing whereof, as I do depend upon God's Providence all in all, ſo in the ſame his Providence I ſee opened unto me three not unlikely expectations of help. The one my practice; the other ſome proceeding in the Queen's ſervice; the third the place I have in reverſion; which as it ſtandeth now unto me, is but like another man's ground buttalling upon my houſe, which may mend my proſpect, but it doth not fill my barn* (22). However it muſt be owned, that the Earl of Buckingham was very inſtrumental in the Lord Keeper's preferment, which he acknowledges in his Letter written the ſame day, that the Seals were preſented to him. *And ſurely,* ſays Mr. Stephens (23), *fewer lines did never contain a greater ſenſe of gratitude, or expreſſed it in a more becoming manner; though by the original they ſeemed to have been haſtily written, and may ſerve to confirm what had been told to one, that lived in his later times, that his firſt copies required no great labour to render them competent for the niceſt judgments.* The Letter is publiſhed in the fourth volume of his works (24), and is as follows: *It is both in cares and buſineſs, that ſmall ones ſlote upon the tongue, and great ones ſink down into the heart in ſilence. Therefore I could ſpeak little to your Lordſhip to day, neither had I fit time; but I muſt profeſs thus much, that in this day's work you are the trueſt and perfecteſt mirror and example of firm and generous friendſhip that ever was in Court. And I ſhall count every day loſt, wherein I ſhall not either ſtudy your well-doing in thought, or do your name honour in ſpeech, or perform you ſervice in deed.* In the ſame volume we have likewiſe his *Speech at the taking of his place in Chancery, in performance of the charge his Majeſty had given him, when he received the Seals in* 1617. Sir Anthony Weldon has upon this occaſion introduced another ſcandalous ſtory with regard to Sir Francis Bacon, and tells us (25), that "this great favourite [*Buckingham*] ſent "a noble Gentleman, and of much worth to him, with "this meſſage, that he knew him to be a man of ex- "cellent parts, and as the times were, fit to ſerve his "Maſter in the Keeper's place; but he alſo knew "him of a baſe and ungrateful diſpoſition, and an "errant knave, apt in his proſperity to ruin any that "had raiſed him in his adverſity; yet for all this he "did ſo much ſtudy his Maſter's ſervice (knowing "how fit an inſtrument he might be for him,) that "he had obtained the Seals for him; but with this "aſſurance, ſhould he ever requite him, as he had "done

(15) Pag. 115, 116. edit. London 1651.

(16) See *Aulicus Coquinariæ*, pag. 171.

(17) Baconiana, pag. 249.

(18) Num. 65. pag. 605.

(19) Num. 51. pag. 592.

(20) See *Court and Character of King James*, pag. 119.

(21) Baconiana, pag. 251.

(22) See above, Note [E].

(23) Introduction, pag. 42, 43. See *Collections relating to the Life of Lord Bacon*, pag. 16.

(24) Num. 99. pag. 652.

(25) Pag. 116, 117, 118.

but ſoon after was in great danger of being remov'd from that poſt [*H*]. Jan. 4, 1618, he was made Lord Chancellor of England; and on the 11th of July following created Lord Verulam. We have ſome verſes of Ben. Johnſon upon his birth-day, which he celebrated at

" done ſome others, to whom he had been more bound, " he would caſt him down as much below ſcorn, as " he had now raiſed him high above any honour he " could ever have expected." *Bacon*, continues that Author, *was at that time Attorney-General, who patiently hearing this meſſage, replied*; I am glad my noble Lord deals ſo friendly and freely with me, and hath made that choice of ſo diſcreet and noble a friend, that hath delivered his meſſage in ſo plain language. But, *faith he*, can my Lord know theſe abilities in me, and can he think when I have attained the higheſt preferment my profeſſion is capable of, I ſhall ſo much fail in my judgment and underſtanding, as to loſe theſe abilities; and by my miſcarriage to ſo noble a Patron, caſt myſelf headlong from the top of that honour to the very bottom of contempt and ſcorn? Surely my Lord cannot think ſo meanly of me. *The Gentleman replied*; I deliver you nothing from myſelf, but the words are put into my mouth by his Lordſhip, to which I neither add nor diminiſh; for had it been left to my diſcretion, ſurely tho' I might have given you the ſubſtance, yet ſhould I have apparelled it in a more modeſt attire; but as I have faithfully delivered my Lord's to you, ſo will I as faithfully return yours to his Lordſhip. *You muſt underſtand*, concludes Sir A. Weldon, *the reaſon of this meſſage was his ungratefulneſs to Eſſex, which every one could remember; for the Earl ſaved him from ſtarving, and he requited him ſo, as his Apology muſt witneſs. Were there not a great fault, there needed no apology; nor could any Age, but a worthleſs and corrupt in men and manners, have thought him worthy ſuch a place of honour.* With regard to this charge againſt him of ingratitude towards the Earl of Eſſex, we may obſerve, that tho' the Earl had been very generous to him, yet he neglected the good counſel, which Mr. Bacon had given him, and having ſome time before his inſurrection diſcontinued his friendſhip and acquaintance with him, that Gentleman thought himſelf obliged to eſpouſe the cauſe of his Queen and Country, ſo far as not to decline the ſervice, which his Miſtreſs and her Miniſters thought proper to lay upon him. The part indeed, which he acted againſt the Earl at his trial, occaſioned ſome reflections upon his conduct; upon which account he wrote his *Apology*, addreſſed to the Earl of Devonſhire, his Lordſhip's great friend, in which he declares, that he was true to the Earl of Eſſex *uſque ad aras*, and that he had on all occaſions endeavoured to pacify the Queen's diſpleaſure againſt him, tho' her commands and his duty obliged him to appear againſt his Lordſhip at the Bar. But the *Declaration* of the Earl's treaſons, publiſhed ſoon after his death, tho' drawn up by Mr. Bacon, was impoſed upon him; and much altered by the Privy-Council. The account, which he drew up for the Queen's peruſal and by her command, of what paſſed at the aſſembly at the Lord Keeper's houſe, on the 5th of June 1600, where the Earl was charged for leaving the command of the army in Ireland in 1599, much to the Queen's and the Nation's prejudice, and contrary to her expectation, was ſhewn to very few others; and if the latter part of that imperfect narration could be obtained, it would have diſcovered, as Mr. Bacon ſays in his *Apology*, his endeavours to ſerve the Earl in that diſcourſe and on that occaſion (26). When he was newly advanced to the Great Seal, Gondemar the Spaniſh Embaſſador came to viſit him. My Lord Bacon told him, that he was to thank God and the King for that honour; and yet upon condition he might be exempt from the burden, he could very willingly reſign the honour; and that he formerly had a deſire, and the ſame continued with him ſtill, to lead a private life. Gondemar anſwered, that he would tell him a ſtory of an old Rat, that would needs leave the world; and acquainted the young rats, that he would retire into his hole and ſpend his days ſolitarily, and enjoy no more pleaſure. He commanded them therefore upon pain of his high diſpleaſure not to preſume to come in to him. They forbore two or three days; at laſt one of them, that was more bold than the reſt perſuaded ſome of his fellows to go in with him, and he would venture to ſee how his father did; for he might be dead. They went in, and found the old rat ſitting in the midſt of a rich Parmeſan cheeſe. And ſo he made a facetious application of the fable to the Lord Keeper (27).

(26) *See* Mr. Stephens's *Account of the Life of the Lord Bacon*, pag. 11, 12. prefixed to his edition of the Letters and Remains of the Lord Chancellor Bacon, London 1734, 4to.

(27) *See* Lord Bacon's *Apothegms*, Numb. 103. vol. 3. of his Works, pag. 273.

[*H*] *But ſoon after was in danger of being removed from that poſt.*] Mr. Stephens tells us in his *Introduction* (28), that the Lord Keeper was ſcarce warm in his ſeat, before the ſame hand, which conducted him thither, had like to have removed him from it; the occaſion of which was as follows. Upon the 16th of June 1617 Secretary Winwood wrote to the Earl of Buckingham, who was then with the King in Scotland, that Sir Edward Coke coming to him upon buſineſs, began of his own accord to complain of his unhappineſs to be ſo far removed from his Majeſty's favour, to which he deſired to be reſtored, and without which he at length could no longer breathe. That he with much ſorrow acknowledged his former want of reſpect to his Lordſhip in relation to the treaty ſome time before propoſed of a marriage between his youngeſt daughter Frances and Sir John Villiers his Lordſhip's elder brother, deſiring that the ſame might be renewed with very advantageous propoſals upon his part. But her mother the Lady Hatton, (between whom and her huſband Sir Edward Coke there was little agreement and no love,) being either averſe to this match altogether, or becauſe it did not ariſe from her, from whom the young Lady was to expect a conſiderable addition to her fortune, employed her utmoſt endeavours to prevent it. The Lord Keeper likewiſe in his Letters to the King and to the Earl dated in July, uſed all the arguments he could think of to ſhew, that it was not adviſeable to proceed in the match, and (which was the point intended by it), that Sir Edward Coke ſhould not be readmitted into favour. In the mean time the Lady's mother removed her to Sir Edmund Withipole's near Oatlands without the knowledge of Sir Edward; who thereupon applied to the Earl of Buckingham, and by his means entreated the King to direct a Warrant to ſome of his Privy-Council to ſummon before them his wife and her confederates in order to recover his daughter. But underſtanding in a few days where ſhe was conveyed, he with his ſons and ſervants, without any Warrant or Conſtable aſſiſting, broke open Sir Edmund's houſe, and took his daughter away. The Lady Hatton complaining of this violence to the Privy-Council, Sir Edward Coke affirmed, that he could juſtify his proceedings by law. But Sir Henry Yelverton the King's Attorney maintaining the contrary, he was ordered to proſecute the father in the Star-Chamber, and to take upon him the preſent care of the young Lady. By his endeavours the Act of Council dated the 18th of July 1617, which recites this whole affair at large, declares, that Sir Edward and his Lady were ſo far reconciled, that their daughter was delivered to them again, and the information ſuſpended till his Majeſty's pleaſure was known. But the Lady Compton and her ſon Sir John Villiers preſſing the marriage, and the King and the Earl of Buckingham approving of it, the oppoſition, which the Lord Keeper Bacon, and perhaps ſome others of the Privy-Council had given to it, drew down no ſmall diſpleaſure upon them. For upon the King's return from Scotland, Buckingham wrote to his Lordſhip, that his Majeſty intended at his firſt ſitting in Council to reprimand thoſe of his Council, who had been active in that buſineſs for their ill behaviour in it; and that he would name ſome of the particular errors, tho' without accuſing any particular perſons. He then adds, that notwithſtanding the reaſon he himſelf had to be offended, yet ſeeing his Majeſty ſo much diſpleaſed, from being a party concerned he was become an advocate. The Lord Keeper in his Letter to the Earl of Buckingham dated July 25th 1617 (29) writes as follows, *I do think long to hear of your Lordſhip touching my laſt Letter, wherein I gave you my opinion touching your brother's match. As I then ſhewed my diſlike of the matter, ſo the carriage of it here in the manner*

(28) Pag. 42, & *ſeq.* See likewiſe his *Account of the Life of the Lord Bacon*, pag. 17.

(29) See his Works, vol. 4. pag. 661. Num. 109.

at York-houſe in the Strand in 1619 [*I*]. In the midſt of theſe honours, applauſes, and multiplicity of buſineſs, he forgot not his beloved Philoſophy. For in October 1620 he publiſhed his great Work, intitled, *Novum Organum*. We find by ſeveral of his letters, that he thought the convening of Parliaments was the beſt expedient for the welfare of the King and people [*K*]. January 27, 162$\frac{0}{1}$, he was advanced to the dignity of Viſcount St. Albans; and appeared with the greateſt honour and ſplendor at the opening of the Seſſion of Parliament on the 30th of that month. But he was ſoon after ſurpriſed with a melancholy reverſe

manner I diſlike as much. If your Lordſhip think it is humour or intereſt in me that leads me, God judge my ſincerity. But I muſt ſay, that in your many noble favours towards me, they ever moved and flowed from your ſelf, and not from any of your friends whatſoever; and therefore in requital give me leave, that my counſels to you again be referred to your happineſs, and not to the deſires of any of your friends. I ſhall ever give you, as I give my maſter, ſafe counſel, and ſuch as time will approve. In another Letter to the Earl dated the 23d of Auguſt following (30) he tells him, that ſince his laſt he had ſent to the Attorney General, and let him know, that ſince he had heard from Court, he was reſolved to further the match and the conditions of it for his Lordſhip's brother's advancement the beſt he could. *But*, ſays he, *I did ever foreſee, that this alliance would go near to loſe me your Lordſhip, that I hold ſo dear; and that was the only reſpect particular to myſelf, that moved me to be as I was, till I heard from you. But I will rely upon your conſtancy and nature and my own deſerving, and the firm tye we have in reſpect of the King's ſervice.* The Earl having waved his reſentments againſt the Lord Keeper, and reconcil'd the King to him, it occaſioned the following Letter of acknowledgment from his Lordſhip, dated September 22d 1617 (31). *Your Lordſhip's pen or rather pencil hath pourtrayed towards me ſuch magnanimity and nobleneſs and true kindneſs, as methinketh I ſee the image of ſome ancient virtue, and not any thing of theſe times. It is the line of my life and not the lines of my letter, that muſt expreſs my thankfulneſs; wherein if I fail, then God fail me, and make me as miſerable as I think myſelf at this time happy by this reviver, thro' his Majeſty's ſingular clemency, and your incomparable love and favour.* Sir Anthony Weldon upon occaſion of Lord Bacon's falling under cenſure from the King and the Earl of Buckingham, takes occaſion to introduce another ſtory, in order to fix a mark of infamy upon him, as far as his libel is capable of doing it. He tells us (32), that within ten days after Lord Bacon was inveſted in his office, the King went to Scotland; upon which Bacon inſtantly begins to believe himſelf King, lies in the King's lodgings, gives audience in the great banqueting houſe, makes all other Counſellors attend his motions, with the ſame ſtate the King uſed to come out to give audience to Embaſſadors; and when any other Counſellor ſate with him about the King's affairs, would bid them, if they ſat near him, know their diſtance. Upon this Secretary Winwood roſe, and would never ſit more, but inſtantly diſpatched a perſon to the King to deſire him to make haſte back, for even his very ſeat was already uſurped. *At which*, ſays the Author, *I remember the King reading it unto us, both the King and we were very merry.* If Buckingham had ſent the Lord Keeper any letters, he would not vouchſafe the opening or reading them in public, tho' they required diſpatch, nor return an anſwer to them. "In "this poſture he lived, until he heard the King was "returning, and began to believe the play was al"moſt at an end, he might perſonate a King's part "no longer, and there did again re-inveſt himſelf with "his old rags of baſeneſs, which were ſo tatter'd and "poor at the King's coming to Windſor, he attended "two days at Buckingham's chamber, being not ad"mitted to any better place, than the room where "trencher-ſcrapers and lacquies attended, there ſitting "upon an old wooden cheſt (amongſt ſuch as for his "baſeneſs were only fit companions, although the ho"nour of his place did merit far more reſpect) with "his purſe and ſeal lying by him, on that cheſt. "My ſelf told a ſervant of my Lord of Buckingham's, "it was a ſhame to ſee the purſe and ſeal of ſo little "value or eſteem in his chamber, though the car"rier without it merited nothing but ſcorn, being worſt "among the baſeſt. He told me, they had command "it muſt be ſo." *After two days he had admittance. At his firſt entrance he fell down flat on his face at the Duke's foot, kiſſing it, vowing never to riſe till he had his pardon. Then he was again reconciled, and ſince that time ſo very a ſlave to the Duke and all that family, that he durſt not deny the command of the meaneſt of the kindred, nor oppoſe any thing. By this you ſee, a baſe ſpirit is ever concomitant with the proudeſt mind, and ſurely never ſo many brave parts, and ſo baſe and abject a ſpirit tenanted together in any one earthen cottage, as in this one man.*

(30) Ibid. Num. 111. pag. 662.

(31) Ibid. Num. 112. pag. 662, 663.

(32) *Court and Character of King James*, pag. 121, 122. 123.

[*I*] *Some verſes of Ben. Johnſon upon his birth-day, which he celebrated at York-Houſe near the Strand in* 1619.] Theſe verſes are addreſſed to the Genius of the place, and are as follow:

Hail happy Genius of this ancient pile!
How comes it all things ſo about thee ſmile,
The fire, the wine, the men? and in the midſt
Thou ſtand'ſt, as if ſome myſtery thou didſt?
Pardon, I read it in thy face; the day
For whoſe return, and many, all theſe pray;
And ſo do I: This is the ſixtieth year,
Since Bacon, and thy Lord was born, and here;
Son to the grave wiſe Keeper of the Seal,
Fame and foundation of the Engliſh weal.
What then the father was, that ſince is he,
Now with a title more to the degree;
England's High Cancellor, the deſtin'd heir
In his ſoft cradle to his father's chair.
Whoſe even thread the Fates ſpin round and full
Out of their choiceſt and their richeſt wool.
'Tis a brave cauſe of joy, let it be known,
For 'twere a narrow gladneſs, kept thine own.
Give me a deep-crown'd bowl, that I may ſing,
In raiſing him, the wiſdom of my King.

[*K*] *He thought the convening of Parliaments was the beſt expedient for the welfare of the King and people.*] In a letter to the Marquis of Buckingham dated October the 7th, 1620, and publiſhed in the 4th volume of his works (33) he takes notice of the preparations that were made for a Parliament, and his ſervices in that point. He obſerves there, that he had the day before conſulted with the two chief Juſtices and others, *what perſons were fit to be of the houſe, tending to make a ſufficient and well-compoſed houſe of the ableſt men of the Kingdom, fit to be adviſed with* circa ardua Regni, *as the ſtyle of the writs goeth, according to the pure and true inſtitution of a Parliament; and of the means to place ſuch perſons without novelty or much obſervation. For this purpoſe we made ſome liſts of names of the prime Counſellors, and principal Statesmen, or Courtiers, of the graveſt or wiſeſt Lawyers, of the moſt reſpected and beſt tempered Knights and Gentlemen of the County.* The reader will obſerve from ſome paſſages in his letters, that he always was of opinion, that the calling of Parliaments was the ſureſt method of promoting the intereſt both of his Majeſty and the Kingdom. And how averſe ſoever the King had been from falling in with thoſe meaſures, yet the neceſſity of the times, and the deſires of the people, who were more concerned to ſee the Proteſtant Religion declining in Germany, and the Elector Palatine not only in danger of loſing his new crown of Bohemia, but even his antient inheritance, than the King his father-in-law ſeemed to be, forced his Majeſty from his former reſolutions. He knew well in what manner he had parted with his laſt Parliament, and that during this interval, which abounded ſo much in projects and monopolies, many grievances had ſprung up. And therefore he had reaſon to apprehend, that the ſame ſpirit might revive, unleſs ſome care was taken to allay the more vehement, and ſatisfy the more peaceable tempers. But as the unhappy fate of the King of Bohemia and his family, and the ill ſucceſs of this "Parliament

(33) Num. 136. pag. 679.

reverſe of fortune. For about the 12th of March following a Committee was appointed of ſome Members of the Houſe of Commons to inſpect the Abuſes of the Courts of Juſtice, whereof Sir Edward Sackville was named the Chairman; but by reaſon of his indiſpoſition Sir Robert Philips was put in his room. The firſt thing which they fell upon, was Bribery and Corruption, of which the Lord Chancellor Bacon was accuſed by one Aubery and Egerton, who affirmed, that they had procured money to be given to him, to promote their cauſes depending before him. This being corroborated by ſome circumſtances, a report was made from the Committee to the Houſe upon the fifteenth day of that month, yet with all imaginable tenderneſs and reſpect to his Lordſhip, *in regard*, as the Chairman declared, *it touched the Honour of a great Man, ſo endued with all parts both of Nature and Art, as that he would ſay no more of him, being not able to ſay enough* (o). Upon Monday the 19th the Commons had a Conference with the Lords, which was reported the next day by the Lord Treaſurer; after which the Marquis of Buckingham preſented to the Lords a letter written to them by the Chancellor the ſame day [*L*]. The Houſe of Lords returned him for anſwer, that they intended to proceed in his Cauſe now before them according to the right rule of juſtice, and ſhould be glad to find his Lordſhip able to clear his Honour in the points objected to him. Wedneſday March 21, the Commons ſent a meſſage to the Lords concerning their farther complaints againſt the Chancellor (*p*). In the mean time the Lords proceeded to the examination of the complaints, and took divers examinations of witneſſes in the Houſe; and appointed a ſelect Committee of themſelves to take examinations

(o) Ibid. p. 139.

(*p*) *Paſſages in Parliament againſt the Lord Chancellor, ann. Dom.* 1620, and 1621, publiſhed in the 2d volume of Lord Bacon's Works, p. 548, 549, 550.

Parliament are very well known, ſo the cauſes of calling them together are fully and excellently repreſented in a draught of a Proclamation drawn up by my Lord Bacon, and the latter part, which relates to the choice of Parliament men, is ſo well conſidered, as to make it a ſeaſonable advice at all times (34). This draught is publiſhed in the fourth volume of his works, Numb. CXL. It concludes thus: "And becauſe as "well this great cauſe (there to be handled among the "reſt, and to be weighed by the beam of this Kingdom) "as alſo the true and antient inſtitution of Parliament, "do require the Lower-Houſe (at this time if ever) "to be compounded of the graveſt, ableſt, and wor-"thieſt members that may be found; we do hereby, "out of the care of the common good, wherein "themſelves are participant, without all prejudice to "the freedom of elections, admoniſh all our loving "ſubjects, that have votes in the elections of Knights "and Burgeſſes of theſe points following: Firſt, "that they caſt their eyes upon the worthieſt men of "all ſorts, Knights and Gentlemen, that are lights "and guides in their countries, experienced Parlia-"ment Men, wiſe and diſcreet Stateſmen, that have "been practiſed in public affairs, whether at home "or abroad, grave and eminent Lawyers, ſubſtantial "Citizens and Burgeſſes, and generally ſuch as are "intereſted and have portion in the eſtate. Secondly, "That they make choice of ſuch as are well affected "in religion, without declining either on the one "hand to blindneſs and ſuperſtition, or on the other "hand to ſchiſm or turbulent diſpoſition. Thirdly "and laſtly, That they be truly ſenſible not to diſva-"lue or diſparage the houſe with bankrupts and ne-"ceſſitous perſons, that may deſire long Parliaments "only for protection; Lawyers of mean account and "eſtimation; young men that are not ripe for grave "conſultations; mean dependents upon great perſons, "that may be thought to have their voices under "command, and ſuch like obſcure and inferior per-"ſons. So that to conclude, we may have the com-"fort to ſee before us the very force of a ſufficient "and well compoſed houſe, ſuch as may be worthy "to be a repreſentative of the third eſtate of our King-"dom, fit to nouriſh a loving and comfortable meet-"ing between us and our people, and fit to be a "noble inſtrument under the bleſſing of Almighty "God, and our Princely care and power, and with "the loving conjunction of our Prelates and Peers, for "the ſettling of ſo great affairs as are before ex-"preſſed.

(34) *Collections relating to the Life of Lord Bacon*, pag. 137.

[*L*] *The Marquis of Buckingham preſented to the Lords a letter written to them by the Chancellor the ſame day.*] In this letter (35), he deſires their Lordſhips to make a favourable and true conſtruction of his abſence, which was no feigning or fainting, but ſickneſs both of his heart and back, though joined with that comfort of mind, which perſuaded him that he was not far from heaven, whereof he felt the firſt fruits. But becauſe, whether he lived or died, he ſhould be glad to preſerve his honour and fame, ſo far as he was worthy, hearing that ſome complaints of baſe bribery were coming before their Lordſhips, his requeſts unto them were as follow: "Firſt, *ſays he*, "that you will maintain me in your good opinion "without prejudice. Secondly, that in regard I "have ſequeſtered my mind at this time in great "part from worldly matters, thinking of my account "and anſwers in a higher Court; your Lordſhips "will give me convenient time, according to the "courſe of other Courts, to adviſe with my Counſel, "and to make my anſwer, wherein nevertheleſs my "Counſel's part will be the leaſt: for I ſhall not by "the grace of God trick up an innocency with ca-"villations, but plainly and ingenuouſly (as your "Lordſhips know my manner is) declare what I "know or remember. Thirdly, that according to "the courſe of juſtice I may be allowed to except to "the witneſſes brought againſt me, and to move queſ-"tions to your Lordſhips for their croſs examinations, "and likewiſe to produce my own witneſſes for the "diſcovery of the truth. And laſtly, that if there "be any more petitions of like nature, that your "Lordſhips would be pleaſed not to take any preju-"dice or apprehenſion of any number or muſter of "them, eſpecially againſt a Judge, who makes two "thouſand orders and decrees in a year, (not to ſpeak "of the courſes that have been taken for hunting out "complaints againſt me;) but that I anſwer them "according to the rules of juſtice, ſeverally and re-"ſpectively. Theſe requeſts I hope appear to your "Lordſhips no other than juſt. And ſo thinking my "ſelf happy to have ſo noble Peers and reverend Pre-"lates to diſcern of my cauſe, and deſiring no pri-"vilege of greatneſs for ſubterfuge of guiltineſs, but "meaning, as I have ſaid, to deal fairly and plainly "with your Lordſhips, and to put my ſelf upon your "honours and favours &c." The ſame day he wrote likewiſe a letter to the King, wherein he tells him, that when he enters into himſelf, he finds not the materials of ſuch a tempeſt as was caſt upon him; that he had been (as his Majeſty knew beſt) never the author of any immoderate counſel, but always deſired to have things carried *ſuavibus modis*. That he had been no avaricious oppreſſor of the people; no haughty, nor intolerable, nor hateful man in his converſation or carriage, nor inherited any hatred from his father, but was a good Patriot born. Whence ſhould this be? For theſe are the things that uſe to raiſe diſlikes abroad. For the Houſe of Commons, he had begun his credit there, and now it muſt be the place of the ſepulture thereof; and yet in the preſent Parliament upon the meſſage, touching Religion, the old love revived, and they ſaid, that he was the ſame man ſtill, only honeſty was turned into honour. "For the Upper-"Houſe, *ſays he*, even within theſe days, before "theſe troubles, they ſeemed as to take me into their "arms, finding in me ingenuity, which they took to "be the true ſtrait line of nobleneſs, without any "crooks or angles. And for briberies and gifts, "wherewith I am charged, when the books of hearts "ſhall

(35) See the 4th volume of his Works, Numb. 145. pag. 685, 686.

nations likewiſe. On Wedneſday April 24, 1621 Prince Charles acquainted the Lords, that the Lord Chancellor had ſent a ſubmiſſion [*M*], which was immediately read. But the Lords having conſidered of this ſubmiſſion, and heard the collections of Corruptions charged upon him, and the proofs thereof read, they ſent a copy of the charge without the proofs to him by Mr. Baron Denham and the Attorney-General, with this meſſage from them, that his confeſſion was not fully ſet down by him in that ſubmiſſion, ſince he had not confeſſed any particular Bribe or Corruption, nor ſhewn how he had heard the charge thereof; and becauſe the confeſſion, ſuch as it was, was afterwards extenuated in the ſame ſubmiſſion; and that therefore the Lords had ſent him a particular account of the charge, and expected his anſwer to it with all convenient expedition. He replied to this meſſage, that he would return them an anſwer with ſpeed. April the 25th the Lords conſidered of this anſwer of his, and ſent him a ſecond meſſage, that as this anſwer was doubtful, they had ſent again to him to know directly and preſently, whether his Lordſhip will make any confeſſion, or ſtand upon his defence. He replied, that he ſhould make no manner of defence to the charge, but intended to acknowledge Corruption, and to make a particular confeſſion to every point, and after that an humble ſubmiſſion; but deſired the liberty, that where the charge is more full than he finds the truth of the fact, he may make a declaration of the truth in ſuch particulars, the charge being brief, and not containing all the circumſtances (*q*). On Monday April 29th he ſent his confeſſion and ſubmiſſion to the Houſe of Lords,

(*q*) Ibid. pag. 551.

" ſhall be opened, I hope I ſhall not be found to have " the troubled fountain of a corrupt heart in a depraved habit of taking rewards to pervert juſtice, " howſoever I may be frail, and partake of the abuſes of the times. And therefore I am reſolved, " when I come to my anſwer, not to trick up my " innocency (as I writ to the Lords) by cavillations or " voidances, but to ſpeak to them the language that " my heart ſpeaketh to me, in excuſing, extenuating, " or ingenuouſly confeſſing; praying to God to give " me the grace to ſee the bottom of my faults, and " that no hardneſs of heart do ſteal upon me, without " ſhew of more neatneſs of conſcience than is cauſe. " But not to trouble your Majeſty any longer, craving pardon for this long mourning letter; that " which I thirſt after, as the hart after the ſtreams, " is, that I may know by my matchleſs friend, that " preſenteth to you this letter, your Majeſty's heart, " (which is an abyſſus of goodneſs, as I am an abyſſus " of miſery) towards me. I have been ever your " man, and counted myſelf but an uſufructuary of " myſelf, the property being yours. And now making myſelf an oblation to do with me as may beſt " conduce to the honour of your juſtice, the honour of " your mercy, and the uſe of your ſervice, reſting as " clay in your Majeſty's gracious hands, &c.

[*M*] *Prince Charles acquainted the Lords, that the Lord Chancellor had ſent a Submiſſion.*] It was dated the 22d of April 1621. He deſires firſt of their Lordſhips a benign interpretation of what he ſhall write, ſince words that came from waſted ſpirits and an oppreſſed mind, are more ſafe in being depoſited in a noble conſtruction, than in being circled in any reſerved caution. He tells them then, that in the midſt of a ſtate of as great affliction as he thinks a mortal man can endure, (honour being above life) he ſhall begin with the profeſſing of gladneſs in ſome things. The firſt is, that hereafter the greatneſs of a Judge or Magiſtrate ſhall be no ſanctuary or protection of guiltineſs; which, in few words, is the beginning of a golden world. The next, that after this example, it is like that Judges will fly from any thing that is in the likeneſs of corruption, (tho' it were at a great diſtance,) as from a ſerpent; which tendeth to the purging of the Courts of Juſtice, and the reducing them to their true honour and ſplendor. He obſerves, that he underſtood that ſome juſtification had been expected from him; and therefore he had choſen one only juſtification inſtead of all others out of the juſtification of Job. For after the clear ſubmiſſion and confeſſion, which he ſhould then make to their Lordſhips, he hoped he might ſay and juſtify with Job in theſe words, *I have not hid my ſin as did Adam, nor concealed my faults in my boſom.* That it reſted therefore, that without fig-leaves he ſhould ingenuouſly confeſs and acknowledge, that having underſtood the particulars of the charge, not formally before the houſe, but enough to inform his conſcience and memory, he found matters ſufficient and full both to move him to deſert his defence, and to move their Lordſhips to condemn and cenſure him. That he would not trouble their Lordſhips by ſingling thoſe particulars, which he thought might fall off, *Quid te exempta juvat ſpinis de millibus una?* nor prompt them to obſerve upon the proofs, where they come not home, or the ſcruple touching the credit of the witneſſes. Neither would he repreſent to their Lordſhips how far a defence in divers things might extenuate the offence in reſpect of the time and manner of the gift, or the like circumſtances; but only leave thoſe things to ſpring out of their own noble thoughts and obſervations of the evidence and examinations themſelves, and charitably to wind about the particulars of the charge, here and there, as God ſhould put into their minds, and to ſubmit himſelf wholly to their piety and grace. That having ſpoken to their Lordſhips as Judges, he ſhould ſay a few words to them as Peers and Prelates, humbly commending his cauſe to their noble minds and magnanimous affections. That their Lordſhips were not ſimply Judges, but Parliamentary Judges, and had a farther extent of arbitrary power than other Courts; and if their Lordſhips were not tyed by ordinary courſes of Courts, or precedents in points of ſtrictneſs and ſeverity, much more in point of mercy and mitigation. And yet if any thing, which he ſhould move, might be contrary to their worthy ends of introducing a Reformation, he ſhould not ſeek it. That his humble deſire was, that his Majeſty would take the Seal into his hands, which would be a great downfall, and might ſerve, he hoped, in itſelf for an expiation of his faults. Therefore if mercy and mitigation were in their Lordſhips power, and did no ways croſs their noble ends, why ſhould he not hope of their favour and commiſeration? " Your Lordſhips, *ſays he*, will " be pleaſed to behold your chief pattern the King our " Sovereign, a King of incomparable clemency, and " whoſe heart is inſcrutable for wiſdom and goodneſs. " Your Lordſhips will remember that there ſat not " theſe hundred years before a Prince in your houſe, " and never ſuch a Prince, whoſe preſence deſerves " to be made memorable by records and acts mixed " of mercy and juſtice. Your Lordſhips are either " Nobles, (and compaſſion ever beateth in the veins " of noble blood) or reverend Prelates, who are the " ſervants of him, who would not break the bruiſed " reed, nor quench the ſmoking flax. You all ſit " upon one high ſtage, and therefore cannot but be " more ſenſible of the changes of the world, and of " the fall of any of high place. Neither will your " Lordſhips forget that there are *vitia temporis*, as " well as *vitia hominis*, and that the beginning of " Reformations hath the contrary power of the pool " of Betheſda; for that had ſtrength to cure him " only that was firſt caſt in, and this hath commonly " ſtrength to hurt him only, that is firſt caſt in. And " for my part, I wiſh it may ſtay there, and go no " farther. Laſtly, I aſſure my ſelf your Lordſhips " have a noble feeling of me as a member of your " own body, and one that in this very Seſſion had " ſome taſt of your loving affections, which I hope " was not a lightening before the death of them, " but rather a ſpark of that grace, which now in

Lords [*N*], in which he confeſſed ſome facts, denied others, and endeavours to anſwer or explain the reſt in ſuch a manner as to take off the malignity of the offence (*r*). But the Lords taking this for a full and ingenuous confeſſion, ſent ſeveral of their Members to ſee, if the Chancellor would own it to be his own hand, and ſtand to it, or not; which he did in theſe words: *My Lords, it is my Act, my Hand, my Heart: I beſeech your Lordſhips to be merciful to a broken reed.* This anſwer being reported to the Houſe, the Lords agreed to move the King to ſequeſter the Seal, and on Wedneſday May the 2d it was reſolved to proceed to give ſentence againſt him the next morning; and accordingly he was ſummoned to attend; but he anſwered that he was ſick, and proteſted, that he did not feign this for any excuſe; for if he had been well, he would willingly have come (*s*). The Lords however ſent to the Houſe of Commons, that they were ready to give judgment, when they were willing to demand it; which being done by their Speaker, upon the 3d of May 1621, the Lord Chief Juſtice pronounced the following Judgment; that the Lord Chancellor ſhould undergo the fine and ranſom of forty thouſand pounds; that he ſhould be impriſoned in the Tower during the King's pleaſure; that he ſhould be for ever incapable of any office, place, or employment in the State or Commonwealth; and never ſit in Parliament, or come within the Verge of the Court (*t*). The Prince of Wales and ſome others endeavoured to have mitigated the ſeverity of this ſentence; and many of the Lords by way of excuſe for the rigour of it told him afterwards, that they knew they left him in good hands (*u*); and it might be preſumed, that the King, who, as his Lordſhip writes, had ſhed tears upon the news of his being accuſed, would be indulgent and beneficent to him upon his ſentence (*w*). There is a variety of opinions concerning his guilt in the points charged againſt him [*O*]. After the Judgment given againſt him, and a ſhort impriſonment

(*r*) *Collections, &c. ubi ſupra*, pag. 140.

(*s*) *Proceedings, &c.* pag. 557.

(*t*) Ibid. p. 558, and *Collections, &c.* pag. 141.

(*u*) *Collections*, pag. 141.

(*w*) *Stephens's Account*, p. 23.

" the concluſion will more appear. And therefore my " humble ſuit to your Lordſhips is, that my penitent " ſubmiſſion may be my ſentence, and the loſs of the " ſeal my puniſhment; and that your Lordſhips will " ſpare any further ſentence, but recommend me to " his Majeſty's grace and pardon for all that is paſt.

[*N*] *On Monday April 29th he ſent his Confeſſion and Submiſſion to the Houſe of Lords.*] He declares at the beginning of this Confeſſion, that upon adviſed conſideration of the charge, deſcending into his own conſcience, and calling his memory to account ſo far as he was able, he plainly and ingenuouſly confeſſes that he was guilty of corruption, and renounces all defence, and put himſelf upon the grace and mercy of the Houſe of Lords. He proceeds then to a particular conſideration of the charge exhibited againſt him; and with reſpect to the twenty eighth article of it, that he had given way to great exactions by his ſervants both in reſpect of private ſeals, and otherwiſe for ſealing of Injunctions; he confeſſes that it was a great fault in him, that he look'd no better to his ſervants. *This declaration*, ſays he, *I have made to your Lordſhips with a ſincere mind, humbly craving, that if there ſhould be any miſtake, your Lordſhips would impute it to want of memory, and not to any deſire of mine to obſcure truth, or palliate any thing; for I do now again confeſs, that in the points charged upon me, though they ſhould be taken, as myſelf have declared them, there is a great deal of corruption and neglect, for which I am heartily ſorry, and ſubmit myſelf to the judgment, grace, and mercy of the Court. For extenuation, I will uſe none concerning the matters themſelves, only it may pleaſe your Lordſhips out of your nobleneſs to caſt your eyes of compaſſion upon my perſon and eſtate. I was never noted for an avaritious man; and the Apoſtle ſaith, that* covetouſneſs is the root of all evil. *I hope alſo, that your Lordſhips do the rather find me in the ſtate of grace; for that in all theſe particulars there are few or none, that are not almoſt two years old; whereas thoſe that have an habit of corruption do commonly wax worſe; ſo that it hath pleaſed God to prepare me by the precedent degrees of amendment to my preſent penitency. And for my eſtate it is ſo mean and poor, as my care is now chiefly to ſatisfy my debts. And ſo fearing I have troubled your Lordſhips too long, I ſhall conclude with an humble ſuit unto you, that if your Lordſhips proceed to ſentence, your ſentence may not be heavy to my ruin, but gracious and mixt with mercy; and not only ſo, but that you would be noble interceſſors for me to his Majeſty likewiſe for his grace and favour.*

[*O*] *There is a variety of opinions concerning his guilt in the points charged againſt him.*] Arthur Wilſon in his *Life and Reign of King James I*, publiſhed in the ſecond volume of the *Complete Hiſtory of England* (36), tells us, that the great Lord Chancellor Bacon came to a cenſure for the moſt ſimple and ridiculous follies, that ever entered into the heart of a wiſe man. That he was the true emblem of human frailty, being more than a man in ſome things, and leſs than a woman in others. That his crime was bribery and extortion, (which the King hinted at in his Speech, when he facetiouſly ſaid, that *he thought the Lords had bribed the Prince to ſpeak well of them*); and theſe he had often condemned others for as a Judge, which he now came to ſuffer for as a Delinquent. " They were " proved, *continues that Hiſtorian*, and aggravated a- " gainſt him with ſo many circumſtances, that they " fell very foully on him, both in relation to his re- " ception of them, and his expending of them. For " that which he raked in and ſcrued for one way, " he ſcattered and threw abroad another. For his " ſervants being young, prodigal, and expenſive " youths, which he kept about him, his treaſure was " their common ſtore, which they took without ſtint, " having free acceſs to his moſt retired privacies; " and his indulgence to them, and familiarity with " them opened a gap to infamous reports, which left " an unſavoury tincture on him; for where ſuch leeches " are, there muſt be putrid blood to fill their crav- " ing appetites. His gettings were like a Prince " with a ſtrong hand; his expences like a prodigal " with a weak head; and 'tis a wonder a man of his " noble and gallant parts, that could fly ſo high a- " bove reaſon, ſhould ſo far fall below it; unleſs that ſpi- " rit that acted the firſt, were too proud to ſtoop to " ſee the deformities of the laſt. And as he affected " his men, ſo his wife affected hers. Seldom doth " the huſband deviate one way, but the wife goeth " another. The things came into the public mouth, " and the genius of the times (where malice is not cor- " rival) is the great dictator of all actions; for innocency " itſelf is a crime, when calumny ſets her mark upon " it." Mr. Wilſon likewiſe having tranſcribed his Submiſſion of the 22d of April, obſerves, that " this hu- " miliation might have raiſed him up again, if his " offences had not been ſo weighty as to keep him " down." The ſhocking inſinuation againſt Lord Bacon in the laſt paſſage but one from this Hiſtorian, occaſioned ſome animadverſions from Mr. Stephens (37), who having mentioned that Nobleman's regard to Religion, tells us, that he takes notice of *that qualification, to ſhew the improbability of a calumny lately divulged, that a religious Gentleman, of a ſickly conſtitution, whoſe time had been employed in ſtudying, practiſing, and governing the common Law; in ſearching into the depths and myſteries of State and Philoſophy; ſhould be guilty or thought guilty of a crime rarely known to the Nation. Nor do I remember it mentioned by any Hiſtorian but Wilſon; who writes, that his* indulgence to his ſervants and his familiarity with them, opened a gap to infamous reports; *but he thereupon adds, that* innocency

(36) Pag. 734. edit. London 1706.

(37) See his *Account of the Life of Lord Bacon*, pag. 33.

ment in the Tower, he retired from the engagements of an active life, which he had been called to very much againſt his genius, to the ſhade of a contemplative one, which he had always

innocency itſelf is a crime, when calumny ſets her mark upon it. *It appears before, that he was accuſed of being too indulgent to his ſervants, and his Lordſhip does confeſs, and Dr. Rawley, and Mr. Buſhel who was one of them, inſinuate, that ſome of them had abuſed his good nature. But that he ſhould have abuſed himſelf or any of them in the manner, that has been repreſented by a Gentleman, who was very young, when his Lordſhip was cenſured, and likely to believe any baſe ſtories of the ſervants of Kings, as well as of Kings themſelves, is no more to be credited, than the like defamation of Virgil, a moſt chaſte Poet.* Dr. Teniſon in his *Baconiana* (38) obſerves, that *his ſervants were moſt guilty of the corruption objected againſt him, and he himſelf not much acceſſary*; and that it is true, that after the Seal was taken from him, he became a great example of penitence and ſubmiſſion; *but it was a ſubmiſſion, which both manifeſted his juſt ſenſe of his fault, and the more venial nature of it, as ariſing from negligence rather than avarice and malice. He ſhewed by it, that there was not in his heart that ſtiffneſs of pride, which openly denies or juſtifies thoſe crimes, of which itſelf is ſecretly convinced.* The ſame Author likewiſe tells us (39), that it muſt be confeſſed, that he was not without infirmities intellectual or moral; the latter of which have made the greater noiſe from the greatneſs of his fall. *I do not here*, continues he, *pretend to ſpeak of an Angel, but of a man; and no man great in wit, and high in office can live free from ſuſpicion of both kinds of errors. For that heat, which is inſtrumental in making a great Wit, is apt to diſorder the attention of the mind and the ſtability of the temper. And high place, becauſe it giveth power to opportunity, though no authority to offend, is ever look'd on with a jealous eye; and corrupt men, who mete by their own meaſures, think no man can be great, and innocent too. His Lordſhip owned it under his hand (g), that* he was frail, and did partake of the abuſes of the times. *And ſurely he was a partaker of their ſeverities alſo, though they proved by accident happy croſſes and misfortunes. Methinks they are reſembled by thoſe of Sir George Sommers, who being bound by his employments to another coaſt, was by tempeſt caſt upon the Barmudas. And therefore a ſhipwrack'd man made full diſcovery of a new temperate fruitful Region, which none had before inhabited; and which Mariners, who had only ſeen its rocks, had eſteemed an inacceſſible and enchanted place. The great cauſe of his ſuffering is to ſome a ſecret. I leave them to find it out by his words to King James (h)*; I wiſh, *ſaid he*, that as I am the firſt, ſo I may be the laſt of ſacrifices in your time. *And when from private appetite it is reſolved, that a creature ſhall be ſacrificed, it is eaſy to pick up ſticks enough from any thicket, whither it hath ſtrayed, to make a fire to offer it with. But whatſoever his errors were, or the cauſes of his misfortunes, they are overballanced by his virtues, and will die with time. His errors were but as ſome excreſcences, which grow on thoſe trees, that are fit to build the palaces of Kings. For tho' they are not proper and natural parts, yet they do not very much deprive the body of its uſe and value. And further (to expreſs myſelf by a more decent image, a compariſon of his own,)* " His fall will be to poſterity, but as a little picture " of night-work remaining amongſt the fair and ex- " cellent tables of his acts and works *(i)*." Mr. Thomas Buſhel mentioned in this paſſage of Dr. Teniſon, had been a menial ſervant of my Lord Bacon (40), and eminent in his ſkill for diſcovering and opening of mines, and his curious water-works in Oxfordſhire, by which he imitated rain, hail, the rainbow, thunder and lightning (41). He gives us a particular account of his Patron's fate in his *Extract* (42), where he tells us, that there aroſe ſuch complaints againſt his Lordſhip and the then Favourite at Court (43), that for ſome days put the King to this query, whether he ſhould permit the Favourite of his affection, or the Oracle of his Council, to ſink in his ſervice. Whereupon his Lordſhip was ſent for by the King, who after ſome diſcourſe gave him this poſitive advice, to ſubmit himſelf to his Houſe of Peers, and that upon his princely word he would then reſtore him again, if they in their honours ſhould not be ſenſible of his merits. Now tho' his Lordſhip foreſaw his approaching ruin, and told his Majeſty there was little hopes of mercy in a multitude, when his enemies were to give fire, if he did not plead for himſelf; yet ſuch was his obedience to him, from whom he had his being, that he reſolved his Majeſty's will ſhould be his only law, and ſo took leave of him with theſe words, *Thoſe that ſtrike at your Chancellor, it is much to be feared will ſtrike at your Crown*; and wiſhed that as he was then the firſt, ſo he might be the laſt of ſacrifices. " Soon after, *ſays Mr. Buſhell*, according to " his Majeſty's commands he wrote a ſubmiſſive Letter " to the Houſe, and ſent me to my Lord Windſor to " know the reſult, which I was loth at my return to " acquaint him with; for alas! his Sovereign's favour " was not in ſo high a meaſure, but he like the Phœnix " muſt be ſacrificed in flames of his own raiſing, and " ſo periſhed like Icarus in that his loſty deſign, the " great revenue of his office being loſt, and his titles of " honour ſaved but by the Biſhops votes; whereto he re- " plied, that he was only bound to thank his Clergy. " The thunder of this fatal ſentence did much per- " plex my troubled thoughts, as well as others, to ſee " that famous Lord, who procured his Majeſty to call " this Parliament, muſt be the firſt ſubject of their re- " vengeful wrath; and that ſo unparallel'd a Maſter " ſhould be thus brought upon the public ſtage, " for the fooliſh miſcarriages of his own ſervants, " whereof with grief of heart I confeſs my ſelf to be " one. Yet ſhortly after the King diſſolved the Par- " liament, but never reſtored that matchleſs Lord to " his place; which made him then wiſh the many " years he had ſpent in State-policy and Law-ſtudy " had been ſolely devoted to true Philoſophy; for, " ſaid he, the one at beſt doth but comprehend man's " frailty in its greateſt ſplendor, but the other the " myſterious knowledge of all things created in the " ſix days work." Mr. Stephens in his *Introduction* (44) having obſerved that the laſt article in the charge againſt his Lordſhip, was that *he had given way to great exactions in his ſervants*, and that he confeſſed, *it was a great neglect in him, that he looked to them no better*; tells us, that he mentions this the rather, becauſe thoſe Writers, who excuſe the maſter, lay the greateſt blame upon his ſervants. And there is no doubt, but that ſome of them were very guilty, and that their Lord had that opinion of them; which it is reported his Lordſhip in the time of his troubles ſignified in paſſing through a room, where many of his retinue riſing up to ſalute him, he ſaid, *Sit you down, my maſters, your riſe hath been my fall.* We are told likewiſe by Ruſhworth in the firſt volume of his *Hiſtorical Collections*, that he treaſured up nothing for himſelf or family, but was over indulgent to his ſervants, and connived at their takings, and their ways betrayed him to that error. They were profuſe and expenſive, and had at their command whatever he was maſter of. The gifts taken were for the moſt part for interlocutory orders; his decrees were generally made with ſo much equity, that though gifts rendered him ſuſpected for injuſtice, yet never any decree made by him was reverſed as unjuſt, as it has been obſerved by ſome, who are well ſkilled in our Laws. To this we may add, what he alledges by way of excuſe, that great part of the gifts, &c. were made as preſents, in caſes where no ſuit was depending, or a good while before they were begun, or after they were ended. *Upon this occaſion*, ſays Mr. Stephens, *who can forbear to obſerve and lament the weakneſs and infirmity of human nature? To ſee a man ſo far exalted above the common level of his fellow-creatures, to ſink ſo far below it. To ſee a man, who like Seneca gave admirable rules for the conduct of life, and condemning the avaritious purſuit after riches; and what is unlike Seneca, contemning them in his own perſon, and yet to be defiled thereby. To ſee a man applauding Sir George Villiers, whilſt very young, for deſpiſing money, where it croſſed reaſon of ſtate or virtue, to take money in his mature age, in oppoſition to both, and to his own deſtruction. Above all, to ſee a great Maſter of Reaſon and Philoſophy, who had been a credit and ornament to the Reformed Religion, to abate the luſtre of his example by ſubmitting*

(38) Pag. 254, 255.

(39) Introd. pag. 15, 16, 17.

(g) In his Letter to King James, March 25, 1620. in the *Cabala*.

(h) See Mr. Buſhel's *Extract*, pag. 19.

(i) Epiſt. to Biſhop Andrews.

(40) See his *Extract*, pag. 17.

(41) See Introd. to *Baconina*, pag. 18.

(42) *Poſtſcript*, pag. 19, 20.

(43) *See* Dr. Hacket's *Life of Biſhop Williams*, pag. 49, 50.

(44) Pag. 54.

(x) *Collections*, Pag. 146.

always loved (x). The firſt, or at leaſt the greateſt act of kindneſs, which the King extended to him, was the remitting the parliamentary fine, and granting it to ſome of his Lordſhip's

ſubmitting to a temptation, which many of the Heathen Philoſophers had the power to reſiſt. But as his Lordſhip had the misfortune to be made a memorial for the greateſt and the wiſeſt to take heed leſt they fall; ſo hath he the good fortune (which he obſerves attended three famous Writers, fallen under the like circumſtances) to have the remembrance of this calamity looked on by poſterity as a little picture of night-work remaining amongſt the fair and excellent tables of his acts and works. The

(45) Pag. 55. ſame Gentleman alſo tells us (45), that the Marquis of Buckingham in a letter which he wrote to Sir Lionel Cranfield, ſoon after the accuſing of the Chancellor, ſays, that he hoped that God, who had given that Lord many other great gifts, had alſo preſerved him from being guilty of ſuch crimes; yet that he likewiſe hoped, that the Houſe of Commons would wave their application to the Lords, and go their direct way to the King, who both could and would do them juſtice. Dr. Heylin likewiſe in his *Life of Archbiſhop Laud*

(46) Part 1. *ad ann.* 1620. (46), and Mr. Elſing in a manuſcript Diſcourſe concerning Parliaments, conſidered the giving up of this great Miniſter to the Parliament as a falſe ſtep made by the King, and a leading card to others ſoon after. Yet the Committee ſeemed to be of another opinion, when they told the Peers, that they followed ancient precedents, which ſhewed that great perſons had been accuſed for the like crimes in Parliament. From what Mr. Stephens obſerves, it appears how miſtaken the Editor of Moreri's *Dictionary* is, when he affirms under the articles of King James and the Lord Bacon, that the Duke of Buckingham was the cauſe of the Lord Chancellor's downfall; *nor do I know*, ſays Mr. Stephen, *any Hiſtorian that aſſerts the ſame.* In the year 1721 there was publiſhed the fifth edition of a Pamphlet in 8vo intitled, FRANCIS *Lord* BACON, *or the Caſe of private and national Corruption and Bribery impartially conſidered. Addreſs'd to all South-Sea Directors, Members of Parliament, Members of State and Church-Dignitaries. By an Engliſhman.* It was dedicated to Philip

(47) Pag. 13. Duke of Wharton. The Author tells us (47), that my Lord Bacon's caſe *was a preſumption of bribery (as ſome have ſaid) for a private decree pronounced in the Court of Chancery*; and having ſtated his character

(48) Pag. 15. from Dr. Rawley's Life of him, he obſerves (48), that he had *all the qualifications of a faithful, wiſe, and an able Miniſter, and was a man that ſeemed made to draw the affections of the people upon their Prince; yet all ſullied by one inglorious imputation, which made him at the ſame time both pitied and deſpiſed.* He remarks then that the Hiſtorians of thoſe times are very obſcure as to the particulars of the fact, and that moſt of them, who have written any thing of him, *ſeem willing to think him innocent of the crime ſuſpected.* That there is one *ex poſt facto* circumſtance which goes a great way to prove him ſo, which is his poverty after he was degraded; and that Mr. Echard in his *Hiſtory of England* ſays, that he treaſured up nothing either for himſelf or his family; but his fatal error was his indulgence to his ſervants. In ſhort, that *his decrees were always made with ſo much equity, that none were ever*

(49) Pag. 19, & *ſeq.* *reverſed as unjuſt.* The Author afterwards (49) mentions the caſe of Sir Giles Mompeſſon and Sir Francis Mitchel, and obſerves, that none of the Hiſtorians (at leaſt as far as he had either read or could remember) are particular enough, or ſeem to ſuppoſe that my Lord Chancellor Bacon had any feeling in that affair.

(50) Pag. 21. *But*, continues he (50), *I ſhall bring in one witneſs, from whom the information might be ſuſpected, who intimates a bribe in this very caſe to have been the ſlip, which overthrew this great Man.* The Author here meant is Dr. Hacket Biſhop of Lichfield, who in his Life of Archbiſhop Williams has the following paſſage. " The Parliament, whoſe bearing was dutiful to the " King, was quick and minatory againſt ſome vile " perſons who had ſpoiled the people by illegal op- " preſſions. Theſe were cankerworms, harpies, pro- " jectors, who between the eaſineſs of the Lord Mar- " quis to procure, and the willingneſs of the Lord " Chancellor Bacon to comply, had obtained Patent- " Commiſſions for latent knaveries. Which exorbi- " tances being countenanced in the Court, were grown " too ſtrong for any juſtice but the Parliament's to " root them up. There the appeals of the vexed " ſubject were heard, more like to outcries than " complaints, which fell thick upon Sir Giles Mom- " peſſon and Sir Francis Mitchel, for fines and levies " raiſed upon inns and alehouſes, arbitrary impoſiti- " ons, and a precedent dangerous to ſpread even to " ſhops and warehouſes. Others remonſtrated againſt " a pack of cheaters, who procured the monopoly of " gold-thread, which with their ſpinning was palpa- " bly corrupted and embaſed. . . . . Together with " theſe vermin, (and much more than theſe) the Lord " Chancellor was queſtioned, and (without pity to his " excellent parts) the Caſtle of Munera (as I borrow " it from Mr. Spencer's divine wit) muſt be quite de- " faced." The Author of *The Caſe of private and national Corruption, &c.* (51) proceeds to obſerve from (51) Pag. 23. Biſhop Hacket, that the Parliament wearied with long ſittings and great pains was content againſt the Feaſt of Eaſter to take ſome relaxation, and was prorogued from the 27th of March to the 18th of April. The Marquis of Buckingham had an eye in it upon the Lord Chancellor, to try if time would mitigate the diſpleaſure, which was ſtrong againſt him in both Houſes. But the leiſure of three weeks multiplied new ſuggeſtions againſt him. *In ſhort*, adds the Author, *the opinion of his being faulty ſpread among the crowd, and innocency itſelf then becomes a crime, when calumny once ſets her mark upon it. He was immediately degraded from his peerage, and rendered incapable of any employment of truſt or honour, only upon the ſuſpicion of his bribery. I ſay, only the ſuſpicion; for the proofs, I think, (at leaſt at firſt) were no more than circumſtantial; a purſe of gold found under the Chancellor's ſeat. Had the Houſe probably gone cloſely to work upon the queſtion of his fault, evidence might have been wanting to amount to a conviction. But my Lord Bacon, who knew that all wounds ake with lying open, and that circumſtances are ſufficient to blaſt a reputation, took a method to ſave the Parliament the trouble of an examination. For in a ſupplicating letter, which he wrote to them, he ingenuouſly acknowledges* (52), *that having underſtood the particulars of the charge, not* formally *from the Houſe, but enough to inform his* conſcience *and* memory, *he found matter ſufficient and full both to move him to deſert his defence, and to move their Lordſhips to condemn and cenſure him. . . . We hardly have a greater inſtance in Hiſtory how little compaſſion follows the perſon of a great Miniſter, that is once ſtigmatized with ſordid corruption.* The ſame Author ſays likewiſe in another place (53), that " in my Lord Bacon's caſe, the pu- (53) Pag. 27. " niſhment was equal to the crime. There were cir- " cumſtances to give a ſuſpicion of bribery, and there- " fore he was unqualified for the ſervice of the pub- " lic." And again he tells us (54), that my Lord (54) Pag. 53. Chancellor Bacon knew very well that the evidence againſt him in this caſe could not have come up to affect him at *common Law*; but he knew too, that *he was to be tried by a Court, whoſe power can ſupply the deficiences of formal proof*; and therefore in his Letter of Submiſſion to the Houſe of Peers, he tells them, that *their Lordſhips are not ſimply Judges, but Parliamentary Judges; that they have a further extent of arbitrary power than other Courts; and are not tied by ordinary courſe of Courts, or precedents in points of ſtrictneſs and ſeverity.* Mr. Pope in his fourth *Eſſay upon Man* (55), has given us this character of him; (55) Ver. 277, 278.

If parts allure thee, think how Bacon ſhin'd
The wiſeſt, brighteſt, meaneſt of mankind.

But let us ſee in what manner he ſpoke himſelf of his misfortune in a Letter to Dr. Lancelot Andrews, Biſhop of Wincheſter, prefixed to his *Advertiſement touching an Holy War, written in the year* 1622. He obſerves in that Letter, that amongſt conſolations it is not the leaſt to repreſent to a man's ſelf like examples of calamity in others; and as it ſavours of vanity to match ourſelves highly in our own conceit, ſo on the other ſide it is a good ſound concluſion, that if our betters have ſuſtained the like events, we have the leſs cauſe to be grieved. That in this conſolation he had not been wanting to himſelf; tho' as a Chriſtian he had taſted, thro' God's great goodneſs, of higher remedies.

(52) Wilſon's *Life of King James I.*

Lordſhip's friends, in order to give him a little reſpite from his creditors, to whom he is ſaid to have paid 8000*l.* after his fall (*y*); and in his CXLIX Letter printed in the fourth Volume of his Works (*z*), which is a very moving expoſtulation with the King [*P*], he tells him, that *the poor remains, which he had of his former fortunes in plate and jewels he had ſpread upon poor men to whom he owed, ſcarce leaving himſelf a convenient ſubſiſtence.* In another letter to the King, dated July 30th 1624, wherein he uſes the moſt pathetic expreſſions imaginable, he implores his Majeſty to grant him a total remiſſion of his ſentence, *to the end that blot of ignominy might be removed from him, and from his memory with poſterity.* This requeſt very probably was granted him, for we find that he was ſummoned to Parliament in the firſt year of King Charles I (*aa*). It may be preſumed, that the preſſing of his creditors, and the ill payment of his penſions upon his diſgrace, obliged him to write to the King ſeveral complaining letters. But it is by no means certain, that he died in ſo low a condition as Mr. Howel and ſome other writers pretend [*Q*]. However it appears from

(*y*) Ibid. pag. 147.

(*z*) Pag. 691.

(*aa*) *Collections, &c.* pag. 147.

medies. Having therefore thro' the variety of his reading ſet before him many examples both of ancient and later times, his thoughts he confeſſed had chiefly ſtaid upon three particulars, as the moſt eminent and the moſt reſembling. All three perſons, that had held chief place of authority in their countries; all three ruined, not by war, or by any other diſaſter, but by juſtice and ſentence, as delinquents and criminals; all three famous Writers, inſomuch as the remembrance of their calamity is now to poſterity but as a little picture of night-work remaining amongſt the fair and excellent tables of their acts and works. And all three (if that were any thing to the matter) fit examples to quench any man's ambition of riſing again; ſince they were every one of them reſtored with great glory, but to their farther ruin and deſtruction, ending in a violent death. The men were Demoſthenes, Cicero, and Seneca; perſons that he durſt not claim affinity with, except the ſimilitude of their fortunes had contracted it. That when he caſt his eyes upon theſe examples he was carried on farther to obſerve how they bore their fortunes, and principally how they employed their times, being baniſh'd and diſabled for publick buſineſs, to the end that he might learn by them, and that they might be as well his counſellors as his comforters. Whereupon he happened to note how differently their fortunes wrought upon them, eſpecially in that point at which he moſt aimed, which was the employing of their times and pens. "In Cicero, *ſays he*, I ſaw that dur- "ing his baniſhment, (which was almoſt two "years) he was ſo ſoftened and dejected, as he wrote "nothing but a few womaniſh Epiſtles. And yet "in mine opinion he had leaſt reaſon of the three "to be diſcouraged; for that although it was judged, "and judged by the higheſt kind of judgment in "form of Statute or Law, that he ſhould be baniſh'd "and his whole eſtate confiſcated and ſeized, and his "houſes pulled down; and that it ſhould be highly pe- "nal for any man to propound a Repeal; yet his caſe "even then had no great blot of ignominy; for it "was thought but a tempeſt of popularity, which "overthrew him. Demoſthenes contrariwiſe, tho' "his caſe was foul, being condemned for bribery, "and not ſimple bribery, but bribery in the nature "of treaſon and diſloyalty, yet nevertheleſs took ſo "little knowledge of his fortune, as during his ba- "niſhment he did much buſy himſelf, and intermeddle "with matters of State, and took upon him to coun- "ſel the State (as if he had been ſtill at the helm) "by Letters, as appears by ſome Epiſtles of his, "which are extant. Seneca indeed, who was con- "demned for many corruptions and crimes, and ba- "niſhed into a ſolitary iſland, kept a mean; and "though his pen did not freeze, yet he abſtained from "intruding into matters of buſineſs; but ſpent his "time in writing Books of excellent argument and "uſe for all Ages; though he might have made bet- "ter choice ſometimes of his Dedications. Theſe "examples confirmed me much in a reſolution (where- "unto I was otherwiſe inclined) to ſpend my time "wholly in writing, and to put forth that poor ta- "lent or half talent, or what it is that God hath "given me, not as heretofore to particular exchanges, "but to banks or mounts of perpetuity, which will "not break."

[*P*] *Which is a very moving expoſtulation with the King.*] He tells his Majeſty, that in the midſt of his miſery, which was rather aſſuaged by remembrance than by hope: his chiefeſt worldly comfort was to think, that ſince the time he had the firſt vote of the Houſe of Commons for Commiſſioner of the Union, until the time that he was in the laſt Parliament choſen by both Houſes for their Meſſenger to his Majeſty in the petition of Religion; (which two were his firſt and laſt ſervices,) he was always ſo happy as to have his poor ſervices graciouſly accepted by his Majeſty, and likewiſe not to have any of them miſcarry in his hands. That unto this comfort of nineteen years proſperity there ſucceeded a comfort even in his greateſt adverſity ſomewhat of the ſame Nature, which is, that in thoſe offences, wherewith he was charged, there was not any one, that had ſpecial relation to his Majeſty, or any of his particular commands. "I am a year and half old "in miſery, *ſays he*, though I muſt ever acknowledge "not without ſome mixture of your Majeſty's grace "and mercy; for I do not think it poſſible, that any "one whom you once loved ſhould be totally miſer- "able. Mine own means, through my own impro- "vidence, are poor and weak, little better than my "father left me. The poor things that I have had "from your Majeſty, are either in queſtion, or at "courteſy. My dignities remain marks of your paſt "favour, but burdens of my preſent fortune. The "poor remnants, which I had of my former fortunes "in plate and jewels, I have ſpread upon poor men "unto whom I owed, ſcarce leaving my ſelf a con- "venient ſubſiſtence. So as to conclude, I muſt pour "out my miſery before your Majeſty ſo far as to ſay, "*Si deſeris tu, perimus*.... But if it may pleaſe your "Majeſty (for Saints I ſhall give them reverence, but "no adoration, my addreſs is to your Majeſty the "Fountain of Goodneſs,) your Majeſty ſhall by the "grace of God, not feel that in gift, which I ſhall "extremely feel in help: for my deſires are moderate, "and my courſes meaſured to a life orderly and re- "ſerved, hoping ſtill to do your Majeſty honour in "my way. Only I muſt humbly beſeech your Ma- "jeſty to give me leave to conclude with theſe words, "which neceſſity ſpeaketh; help me, dear Sovereign "Lord and Maſter, and pity me ſo far, as that I that "have born a bag, be not now in my Age forced in "effect to bear a wallet; not that I that deſire to live "to ſtudy may not be driven to ſtudy to live." Mr. Le Clerc in his *Reflections upon what the world commonly call* Good Luck and Ill Luck *with regard to Lotteries*, chap. XII. wherein he diſcourſes of liberality, and the obligations, which are upon Princes and great men to extend their bounty to learned men, in reſpect of the benefit, which the world receives from them, obſerves upon occaſion of the laſt paſſage of my Lord Bacon's Letter above quoted, that one cannot without a juſt indignation read the account of that famous Chancellor, whom King James I. ſuffered to languiſh in poverty, whilſt he preferred worthleſs perſons, who were fit for nothing but to diſgrace their Benefactor. And then citing the pathetic concluſion of his letter to the King, he tells us, that tho' thoſe expreſſions have been repreſented as marks of abjectneſs of mind in my Lord Bacon; yet they caſt a much greater imputation of it upon his Maſter, who forced ſo great a man to the neceſſity of making ſo poor a requeſt; and who had the inhumanity to let him die in circumſtances ſo deplorable, that he had ſcarce enough left to bury him. We ſhall examine this laſt fact with regard to the poverty of my Lord Bacon in the following note.

[*Q*] *But it is by no means certain that he died in ſo low a condition, as Mr. Howel and ſome other writers ſuppoſe.*]

from the Works, which he compoſed and deſigned during his retirement, that his thoughts were ſtill free, vigorous and noble (*bb*): and, as Dr. Teniſon obſerves (*cc*), it did not appear by any thing during all the time of his eclipſe of fortune, that there was any abjectneſs of ſpirit in him. His Writings ſhew a mind in him not diſtracted with anxiety, nor depreſſed with ſhame, nor ſlow for want of encouragement, nor broken with diſcontent. Such a temper is inconſiſtent with ſuch noble thoughts and deſigns, ſuch ſtrict attention, ſuch vigour of conceit, ſuch a maſculine ſtyle, ſuch quickneſs in compoſition, as appeared in his learned labours. The laſt five years of his life he devoted entirely to his ſtudies; a thing which he would often ſpeak of during the active part of his life, as if he affected to die in the ſhadow, and not in the light (*dd*). In this receſs he compoſed the greateſt part of his Latin and Engliſh Works; which we ſhall give an account of in the order, in which they are diſpoſed by Mr. Blackbourne in his edition of them publiſhed at London in four Volumes in folio in the year 1730. The firſt Volume includes his *Inſtauratio magna*, the

(*bb*) Ibid. pag. 148.

(*cc*) Baconiana, p. 255.

(*dd*) *See* Dr. Rawley's *Life of Lord Bacon.*

* Letter VIII. vol. 1. Sect. 4. pag. 158, 159, 6th edit. London 1688.

ſuppoſe.] Mr. Howel tells us in a letter of his * dated Jan. the 6th 1625, that my Lord Chancellor Bacon *was lately dead of a long languiſhing weakneſs, and that he died ſo poor, that he ſcarce left money to bury him; which though he had a great Wit, did argue no great wiſdom, it being one of the eſſential properties of a wiſe man to provide for the main chance . . . . I believe he died poor out of a contempt of the pelf of fortune, as alſo out of an exceſs of generoſity, which appeared as in divers other paſſages, ſo once when the King had ſent him a ſtag, he ſent up for the Under-keeper, and having drunk the King's health unto him in a great ſilver gilt bowl, he gave it him for his fee. He writ a pitiful letter to King James not long before his death, and concludes,* Help me, dear Sovereign Lord and Maſter, and pity me ſo far, that I, who have been born to a bag, be not now in my age forced in effect to bear a wallet; nor I that deſire to live to ſtudy, may be driven to ſtudy to live; *which words in my opinion, argue a little abjection of ſpirit, as his former letter to the Prince did of profaneneſs,* wherein he hoped, that as the father was Creator, the ſon will be his Redeemer. *I write not this to derogate from the noble worth of the Lord Viſcount Verulam, who was a rare man, a man* reconditæ ſcientiæ, & ad ſalutem literarum natus, *and I think the eloqueneſt, that was born in this Iſle.* This letter of Mr. Howel confirms the ſuſpicion mentioned by Mr. Wood in his *Athenæ Oxonienſes* †, that *many of the letters publiſhed by him were never written before the Author of them was in the Fleet, as he pretends they were, only feigned, (no time being kept with their dates,) and purpoſely publiſhed to gain money to relieve his neceſſities.* For we may obſerve, that this letter, which mentions my Lord Bacon's death, is dated January 6th 1625, whereas he did not die till April 9th 1626; and with regard to what that Author ſays, that he *died ſo poor, that he ſcarce left money to bury him,* this will be conſidered in the ſequel of this note. And here we ſhall take notice of another miſtake in Mr. Howel, who in a letter (57) dated Feb. the 2d 1621. ſtiles my Lord Bacon, *Lord Keeper*, whereas he had been appointed *Lord Chancellor* January the 4th 1618. However it may not be improper to mention the ſtory which he there relates. " There is, *ſays he*, a flaunting French Ambaſſador come over lately, and I " believe his errand is nought elſe but compliment; " for the King of France being lately at Calais, and " ſo in ſight of England, he ſent his Ambaſſador, " M. Cadenet, expreſly to viſit our King. He had " audience two days ſince, where he with his train " of *ruffling long-hair'd Monſieurs* carried himſelf " in ſuch a light garb, that after the audience, " the King aſked my Lord Keeper *Bacon* what he " thought of the French Ambaſſador? He anſwered, " that *he was a tall proper man: Ay*, his Majeſty replied, *but what think you of his head piece? Is he " a proper perſon for the office of an Ambaſſador? Sir*, " ſaid Bacon, *tall men are like high houſes of four or " five ſtories, wherein commonly the uppermoſt room is " worſt furniſhed.*" But to proceed to the other Authors, who mention the wretched circumſtances of Lord Bacon. Arthur Wilſon in his *hiſtory of the life and reign of King James* I. (58) tells us, that to heighten his miſery the more, many others were cruſhed to pieces by his fall; for he had a vaſt debt upon him, which they were forc'd to pay; and though he had a penſion allow'd him by the King, he wanted to his laſt, living obſcurely in his Lodgings at *Grays-Inn, where his loneneſs and deſolate condition wrought upon his ingenious, and therefore then more melancholy temper, that he pined away; and had this unhappineſs after all his height of plenitude to be denied beer to quench his thirſt. For having a ſickly taſte, he did not like the beer of the houſe, but ſent to Sir Fulk Grevil Lord Brook, in the neighbourhood, now and then for a bottle of his beer, and after ſome grumbling the Butler had order to deny him. So ſordid was the one, that advanced himſelf to be called Sir Philip Sidney's friend, and ſo friendleſs was the other, after he had dejected himſelf from what he was.* Sir Anthony Weldon in his *Court and Character of King James* (59) has the following paſſage: " I ſhall not remember his baſeneſs, being " out of place, of pinning himſelf for very ſcraps on " that noble gentleman, Sir Julius Cæſar's hoſpitality, " that at laſt he was forc'd to get the King's warrant " to remove him out of his houſe. Yet in his proſperity, the one being Chancellor, and the other " Maſter of the Rolls, did ſo ſcorn and abuſe him, as " he would alter any thing the other did." But Mr. Stephens in his *Introduction* (60) obſerves, that tho' his liberality and neglect of treaſuring up money, and his great expence in making of experiments ſeem to have exhauſted the gains of his profeſſion and preferments, yet Dr. Rawley, his domeſtic Chaplain, and a perſon much truſted by his Lordſhip aſſures us, that the King had given him out of the Broad-Seal, and out of the Alienation-Office to the value of eighteen hundred pounds *per annum*, which with his manor of Gorhambury and other lands adjoining, amounting to a third part more, he retained till his death; and ſo it is to be preſumed he did the profits of the Office of Regiſter in the Star-Chamber, computed at ſixteen hundred pounds *per annum*, which fell to him towards the latter end of King James the Firſt's reign. However Mr. Stephens obſerves in his *Account of the Life of the Lord Bacon* (61), that it is true, though it be known to few perſons, that when the Marquis of Buckingham went into Spain, the Lord Bacon's affairs were at ſo low an ebb, that upon the death of Mr. Murray, he ſollicited the King by Secretary Conway to be made Provoſt of Eaton-College, where indeed he would have enjoyed a pleaſant retreat in the ſociety of learned men. The Secretary anſwered him in a letter of the 21ſt of March 1623, that the King could not value his Lordſhip ſo little, or conceive that he limited his deſires ſo low; in which however he ſhould have been gratified, had not the King been engaged by the Lord Marquis for Sir William Becher his Agent in France. But the place was ſoon after obtained by Sir Henry Wotton, who had been his Majeſty's Embaſſador in ſeveral Courts, and that by an honeſt artifice, as Mr. Iſaac Walton writes in his account of Sir Henry's life. But in Lord Bacon's laſt will, dated the 19th of December 1625, beſides what was ſettled and left to his Lady, anſwerable to her quality, he gives ſeveral large charities and legacies to his friends and ſervants, and makes an eſtimate of his eſtate, by which his debts and legacies might be ſatisfied; and appoints that out of the remainder a Lecture ſhould be founded in each Univerſity for Natural Philoſophy and the Sciences, which he hoped would at leaſt amount to two hundred pounds a year each. He directs likewiſe his Truſtees to have regard in that affair to the meaſures, which Sir Henry Savile had lately taken in his; and entreats his noble and conſtant friend the Duke of Buckingham to be an Overſeer of his Will, and that his Executors would take ſome pains in the performance; that conſidering what he

† Vol. 2. Col. 382. 2d edit. London 1721.

(57) Letter 1. Sect. 2. vol. 1. pag. 65.

(58) See the *Complete Hiſtory of England*, vol. 2. pag. 735, 736. edit. London 1706.

(59) Pag. 123, 124.

(60) Pag. 58. See likewiſe his *Account of the Life of the Lord Bacon*, pag. 25, 26, and 29.

(61) Pag. 26.

the first part of which contains his IX Books *De Augmentis Scientiarum* [*R*], and the second his *Novum Organum* [*S*]. The second Volume contains his *Parasceve ad Historiam Naturalem & Experimentalem*; a Fragment of a book of his entitled *Abecedarium Naturæ*; *Præfatio Historiæ Naturalis ad condendam Philosophiam*; his *History of Winds, of density and*

he had been, his good mind by their care might effect that good work. Yet Monsieur Sorbiere takes upon him to tell the world as from Sir William Boswel, a friend of my Lord Bacon's, that his Lordship made his will by way of gallantry, and that he therein left four hundred thousand Livres to an imaginary College, whereof he had designed the Plan in his new *Atlantis*. But this is a mere chimerical imagination; for it is well known, that my Lord Bacon in the fable of the new *Atlantis* exhibited a model, rather possible to be effected, than probable to be ever attempted by the greatest and most opulent Prince. It is true however, that his Lordship's Executors declined to act, finding, as it is probable, his debts greater, and the estate less than the Testator conceived, so that the administration was granted to Mr. Meautys and another of his creditors.

[*R*] *The first part of his* Instauratio Magna *contains his nine Books* de Augmentis Scientiarum.] His *Instauratio* is undoubtedly the most considerable of all his works. And it is evident that he thought so himself from his Letter to Dr. Andrews Bishop of Winchester prefixed to his *Advertisement touching an holy War*; in which Preface he observes, that *this is the work that in his own judgment* (si nunquam fallit imago) *he most esteemed.* In this work, as Dr. Tenison remarks (62), he designed to take in pieces the former model of sciences; to lay aside the rotten materials; to give it a new form and enlarge it; and to found it not upon imagination, but reason assisted by experience. *This Great Instauration* was to consist of six parts. The first part proposed was *the Partitions of the Sciences*; and this the Author perfected in his excellent treatise of the *Advancement of Learning*, addressed to King James, a labour, which he termed in his Letter to Sir Thomas Bodley (63) in the year 1605, *the comfort of his other labours.* This he wrote at first in two books in English; and it is of this his first edition that we are to understand that passage in his Letter to the Earl of Salisbury (64), wherein he tells him, that *he should content himself to awake better spirits, like a bell-ringer, who is first up to call others to church.* He afterwards enlarged the second of these two Discourses, which contained particularly the abovementioned *Partition*, and divided the matter of it into eight Books. And knowing that this work was desired by foreigners, and considering likewise that Books written in a modern language, which receives a great change in a few years, grow out of use; he caused that part, which he had written in English, to be translated into Latin by Mr. Herbert, Ben. Johnson, and some others, who were esteemed Masters in the Roman Eloquence. However he so adapted the style to his conceptions by a strict castigation of the whole work, that it may justly be considered as his own. The translation of this work, (that is, of a great part of the two Books) he first recommended to Dr. Playfer, a Professor of Divinity in the University of Cambridge; but the specimen, which he sent, was written with so much affectation of elegance, that my Lord Bacon did not encourage him to proceed in that work, since he wanted not so much a polite as a clear, masculine, and proper expression. The whole of this Book was translated into English by Dr. Gilbert Watts of Oxford, and the translation, printed at London 1674, has been well received by many. But others wished for a translation, in which the genius and spirit of the Lord Bacon had appeared to greater advantage. And Dr. Tenison tells us (65), that he had seen a Letter written by certain Gentlemen to Dr. Rawley, wherein they thus importune him for a more accurate version by his own hand. *It is our humble suit to you, and we do earnestly sollicit you . . . to give yourself the trouble to correct the too much defective translation of* de Augmentis Scientiarum, *which Dr. Watts hath set forth. It is a thousand pities, that so worthy a piece should lose its grace and credit by an ill expositor, since those persons, who read that translation, taking it for genuine, and upon that presumption not regarding the Latin edition, are thereby robbed of that benefit, which (if you would please to undertake the business) they might receive. This tendeth to the dishonour of that noble Lord, and the hindrance of the advancement in learning.* This work has also been translated into French at the desire of the Marquis D'Effiat. But there are many things wholly omitted in it, many things perfectly mistaken, and some things, especially such as relate to Religion, designedly perverted; so that in one place the translator makes his Lordship extol the Legend; a book, which was undoubtedly of very little credit with him, when he thus begins one of his Essays (66); *I had rather believe all the fables in the Legend, and the Talmud, and the Alcoran, than that this universal frame is without a mind.* The fairest and most correct edition of this book in Latin before that published in his works in 1730, is that in folio printed at London 1623. Dr. Tenison observes (67), that those, who would understand the Lord Bacon's cypher (68), must consult that accurate edition; since in some other editions the form of the letters of the alphabet, in which much of the mystery consists, is not observed; but the Roman and Italic shapes of them are confounded. To this book we may reduce the first four chapters of that imperfect treatise published in Latin by Isaac Gruter, and entitled *The Description of the Intellectual Globe*, since they are but a rude draught of the *Partition of Sciences*, so accurately and methodically disposed in the book *de Augmentis Scientiarum.* We may likewise refer to the same head the *Thema Cœli*, published in Latin by Gruter; which particularly belongs to the fourth chapter of the third book of that treatise; as it is a Discourse tending to the improvement of the System of the Heavens. For the same reason we may reduce to the same place of the *Advancement* the fifth, sixth, and seventh chapters of the *Descriptio Globi Intellectualis* (69).

[*S*] *His* Novum Organum.] This is the second part of his *Instauratio Magna*, and so considerable a part of it, that, as Dr. Tenison observes (70), the name of the whole is given to it. It was written by himself in Latin, and dedicated to King James I, with with this excuse, that if he had stolen any time for the composure of it from his Majesty's other affairs, he had made some kind of restitution by doing honour to his name and his reign. *Poterit fortasse Majestas tua me furti incusare, quod tantum temporis, quantum ad hæc sufficiat, negotiis tuis suffuratus sim. Non habeo quod dicam. Temporis enim non fit restitutio; nisi forte quod detractum fuerit temporis tuis rebus, id memoriæ nominis tui & honori sæculi tui reponi possit, si modo hæc alicujus sint pretii.* The King wrote to him, who was then Chancellor, a letter of thanks with his own hand, wherein he promises him to read it over with the utmost attention; *and in the mean time*, says he, *I can with comfort assure you, that you could not have made choice of a subject more befitting your place and your universal and methodical knowledge.* Three copies of this *Organum* were sent by the Lord Bacon to Sir Henry Wotton, who took a pride, as himself says, in a certain congeniality with his Lordship's studies. And how much he valued the present, we may learn from his Letter published in his *Remains* (71). *Your Lordship*, says he, *hath done a great and ever-living benefit to all the children of nature, and to nature herself in her uttermost extent of latitude; who never before had so noble, nor so true an interpreter, or (as I am readier to style your Lordship) never so inward a secretary of her cabinet. But of your said work (which came but this week to my hands) I shall find occasion to speak more hereafter; having yet read only the first book thereof, and a few aphorisms of the second. For it is not a banquet, that men may superficially taste, and put up the rest in their pockets, but in truth a solid feast, which requireth due mastication. Therefore when I have once myself perused the whole, I determine to have it read piece by piece at certain hours in my domestic college as an ancient author. For I have learned thus much by it already, that we are extremely mistaken in the computation of antiquity, by searching it backwards; because indeed the first times were the youngest, especially in points of natural discovery and experience.*

(62) *Baconiana, or an Account of all the Lord Bacon's Works*, pag. 23, & *seq.*

(63) See his Works, vol. 4. pag. 561.

(64) Ibid. pag. 562.

(65) *Baconiana.* pag. 26, 27.

(66) *Essay of Atheism.*

(67) *Ubi supra*, pag. 27.

(68) In lib. 6. cap. 1.

(69) Tenison, *ubi supra*, p. 28.

(70) Ibid.

(71) Pag. 298, 299.

and rarity, of gravity and levity, of ſympathy and antipathy, of ſalt, ſulphur and mercury, and

ence. This *Novum Organum*, as Dr. Teniſon obſerves (71), contains in it inſtructions concerning a better and more perfect uſe of reaſon in our enquiries after things. And therefore the ſecond title which he gave it, was, *Directions concerning Interpretations of Nature.* By this art he deſigned a Logic more uſeful than the vulgar, and an *Organon* more proper for the aſſiſtance of the intellectual powers, than that of Ariſtotle. For he propoſed here not ſo much the invention of arguments as of arts; and in demonſtration he uſed induction more than ſyllogiſm; and in his induction he did not immediately proceed from a few particular ſenſible notions to the moſt general of all, but raiſed axioms by degrees, deſigning the moſt general notions for the laſt place, and inſiſting on ſuch of them as are not merely notional, but coming from nature lead likewiſe to her. This Book contains three parts, the *Preface*, the *Diſtribution* of the work of the *Great Inſtauration*; and *Aphoriſms* directing to the Interpretation of Nature. The *Preface* conſiders the preſent unhappy ſtate of learning, with counſels and advices to advance and improve it. To this Preface therefore may be reduced the *Indicia* and the *Proem* publiſhed by Gruter concerning the Interpretation of Nature; the firſt Book *de Augmentis Scientiarum*, which treats in general of the Dignity and Advancement of the Sciences; and his *Cogitata* and *Viſa*. To the *Diſtribution* belong the Latin Fragment publiſhed by Gruter, intitled *The Delineation and Argument of the ſecond part of the Inſtauration*; and his Tract concerning the Philoſophy of Parmenides, Teleſius, and Democritus. For, as he obſerves in the beginning of that part, he deſigned firſt to conſider the learning, which the world was poſſeſſed of, and then to perfect it; and afterwards to open new ways to further diſcoveries. To the *Aphoriſms* may be reduced his Letter to Sir Henry Savil concerning *Helps for the Intellectual Powers*, which he wrote in Engliſh. This was a part of knowledge ſcarce attempted at that time, as it was the general opinion, that nature was here rather to be followed, than guided by art. But it was as neceſſary in his Lordſhip's judgment, as the grinding and whetting of an inſtrument, or the quenching it, and giving it a ſtronger temper. There belong likewiſe to this head the fragment intitled *Aphoriſmi & Conſilia de Auxiliis Mentis*; and his *Sententiæ duodecim de Interpretatione Naturæ*, publiſhed by Gruter. In perfecting this work he uſed the utmoſt care and deliberation; ſo that Dr. Rawley informs us in his Life of him, that he had ſeen twelve copies of his *Inſtauration* reviſed year by year, one after another; and every year altered and corrected in the frame of it, till at laſt it was reduced to the model in which it was publiſhed. In ſhort, as Dr. Teniſon (72) obſerves, *it was like a mighty pyramid, long in its erection; and it will probably be like to it in its continuance.* With regard to his *Inſtauration* he obſerves in his letter to Biſhop Andrews quoted above, that *although he had received from many parts beyond the ſeas teſtimonies touching that work, ſuch as beyond which he could not expect at the firſt in ſo abſtruſe an argument; yet nevertheleſs*, ſays he, *I have juſt cauſe to doubt that it flies too high over mens heads. I have a purpoſe therefore (tho' I break the order of time) to draw it down to ſenſe by ſome patterns of a natural ſtory and inquiſition.* Ben. Johnſon in his *Diſcoveries* (73) having obſerved, that it is the office of a wiſe Patriot among the greateſt affairs of State to take care of the commonwealth of learning; tells us, that this made the late Lord St. Albans entitle his work *Novum Organum; which tho' by the moſt of ſuperficial men, who cannot get beyond the title of* Nominals, *it is not penetrated nor underſtood, really openeth all defects of learning whatſoever, and is a Book,*

Qui longum noto ſcriptori prorogat ævum.

The Author of the *Journal des Sçavans* (74) having obſerved, that *the great Chancellor Bacon* was one of thoſe perſons, who have contributed moſt to the Advancement of the Sciences, and that he publiſhed his book *de Augmentis Scientiarum* to ſhew the ſtate of learning, and what is ſtill wanting to render it perfect; tells us, that his Lordſhip had proved that the Logic, which was in uſe, was more proper to carry on the diſputes of the ſchools, than to diſcover the truth, and to teach men how to chicane upon mere words, than to penetrate the ſubſtance of things; and that Ariſtotle, from whom we have borrowed that art, had accommodated his Phyſics to his Logic, inſtead of making his Logic ſubſervient to his Phyſics, by which means he has revers'd the natural order of things, and ſubjected the end to the means. "It was with a "view to remedy this diſorder, *continues that Author*, "that this great Chancellor publiſhed a ſecond work, "entitled, *Novum Organum*, in which he teaches us "a new Logic, the principal deſign of which is to "ſhew us the Method of forming a good Induction, "as the chief end of Ariſtotle's Logic was to make "a good Syllogiſm. This work is an excellent one, "and the Author always conſidered it as his maſter-"piece; and it is ſaid that he ſpent eighteen years "in compleating it before he publiſhed it." Mr. Baker in his *Reflections upon Learning* (75) remarks, that my Lord Bacon ſaw clearer into the defects of the art of reaſoning, than moſt men did, and being neither ſatisfied with the vulgar Logic, nor with its reformations that were made, ſuitably to his vaſt and enterprizing genius, attempted a Logic wholly new, the plan of which is laid down in his *Novum Organum*. The way of ſyllogizing *ſeemed to him very fallacious, and too dependent upon words, to be much relied on. His ſearch was after things; and therefore he brought in a new way of arguing from induction, and that grounded upon obſervation and experiments.* But the ſame Gentleman obſerves, that *this plan, as laid by him, looks liker an* univerſal Art, *than a diſtinct Logic, and the deſign is too great, and the induction too large to be made by one man or any ſociety of men in one age, if at all practicable. For whatever opinion he might have of the concluſiveneſs of this way, one croſs circumſtance in an experiment would as eaſily overthrow his induction, as an ambiguous word would diſorder a ſyllogiſm; and a man needs only make a tryal in any part of* Natural Hiſtory, *as left us by my Lord Bacon, to ſee how concluſive his induction was like to have been. To ſay nothing, that notwithſtanding his blaming the common Logics, as being too much ſpent in words, himſelf runs into the fault that he condemns; for what elſe can we make of his* Idola Tribus, Idola Specus, Fori, Theatri; *or his* Inſtantiæ ſolitariæ, migrantes, oſtenſivæ, clandeſtinæ, conſtitutivæ, &c. *but fine words put to expreſs very common and ordinary things? After the way of free thinking had been laid open by my Lord Bacon, it was ſoon after greedily followed; for the underſtanding affects freedom as well as the will, and men will purſue liberty, tho' it ends in confuſion.* Dr. Henry Pemberton in the *Introduction* (76) to his *View of Sir Iſaac Newton's Philoſophy* having remark'd that the Lord Bacon has judiciouſly obſerved (77), that the neglect of the proper means to enlarge our knowledge, joined with the preſumption of attempting what was quite out of the power of our limited faculties, is the great obſtruction to the progreſs of ſcience; tells us, that "indeed that excellent perſon was the firſt, "who expreſly writ againſt this way of Philoſo-"phizing; and he has laid open at large the abſur-"dity of it in his admirable treatiſe intitled, *Novum* "*Organon Scientiarum*; and has there likewiſe de-"ſcribed the true method, which ought to be follow-"ed." Mr. Voltaire in his *Letters concerning the Engliſh Nation* (78) remarks, that the moſt ſingular and the beſt of all his pieces is that which is the moſt uſeleſs and the leaſt read; *I mean*, ſays that Author, *his* Novum Scientiarum Organum. *This is the ſcaffold, with which the new Philoſophy was raiſed; and when the edifice was built, part of it at leaſt, the ſcaffold was no longer of ſervice. The Lord Bacon was not yet acquainted with nature; but then he knew and pointed out the ſeveral paths that lead to it. He had deſpiſed in his younger years the thing called Philoſophy in the Univerſities, and did all that lay in his power to prevent thoſe ſocieties of men inſtituted to improve human reaſon, from depraving it by their quiddities, their horrors of* vacuum, *their ſubſtantial Forms, and all thoſe impertinent terms, which not only ignorance had rendered venerable, but which had been made ſacred by their being*

(71) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 31, & ſeq.

(72) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 34.

(73) Pag. 701. edit. 1692.

(74) *Du Lundy* 8. *Mars* 1666. pag. 199. edit. de Cologne 1666.

(75) Chap. 5. pag. 71, 72. 4th edit. London 1708.

(76) Pag. 5. edit. London 1728. 4to.

(77) *Novum Organ. Scient.* lib. 1. Aphoriſm. 9.

(78) Letter 12,

and of life and death, in Latin, which Tracts we ſhall give an account of in the Note [T]. In the ſame Volume are likewiſe contained his *Hiſtoria Soni & Auditus*, his *Articuli Quæſtionum circa Mineralia*, his *Inquiſitio de Magnete*, his *Inquiſitio de Verſionibus, Tranſmutationibus, Multiplicationibus, & Affectionibus Corporum*, and his *Topica Inquiſitionis de Luce* & *ing ridiculouſly blended with Religion*. There was an Epitome of this Book publiſhed in Engliſh at London in 1676, under the title of *The* Novum Organum *of the Lord Viſcount St. Albans epitomized, for the clearer underſtanding of his Natural Hiſtory. Tranſlated, and taken out of the Latin by M. D. B. D.* This, as Dr. Shaw obſerves (79), affords but a very faint, imperfect and diſadvantageous idea of the plan, deſign, and diſcoveries of that extraordinary piece; yet the epitomizer ſeems by his Preface acquainted with the author's general view in that work, and has given a ſhort account of them; but when he comes to tranſlate and epitomize, he ſtrangely mangles the ſenſe, and defaces the whole, ſo that it cannot eaſily be known, or tolerably underſtood. Indeed the deſign was imperfect, for the *Novum Organum* being entirely aphoriſtical, its nature will not admit of epitomizing to any advantage, but, as the Epitomizer himſelf obſerves, rather requires a Comment.

(79) *General Preface to the Philoſophical Works of Francis Bacon Baron of Verulam, &c. methodiz'd and made Engliſh from the Originals*, p. 4. London 1733, in 4to.

[T] *Which Tracts, we ſhall give an account of in the Note.*] The *third part* of the *Inſtauratio*, which he called the *Phænomena of the Univerſe*, or the Hiſtory natural and experimental ſubſervient to the building of a true Philoſophy, conſiſts of ſeveral Tracts. The firſt is his *Paraſceve* or Preparatory to the Hiſtory natural and experimental. We have in it ten aphoriſms concerning the general manner of forming a natural Hiſtory. After which follows a catalogue of particular Hiſtories of celeſtial and aerial bodies, and of thoſe in the terreſtrial globe, with the ſpecies of them; ſuch as metals, gems, ſtones, earths, ſalts, plants, fiſhes, fowls, inſects, man in his body and in his inventions mechanical and liberal. To this *Paraſceve* we may reduce the fragment of the *Abecedarium Naturæ*. Dr. Teniſon tells us (80), that this was commonly ſaid to be loſt, and that it was almoſt ſo, the latter part of it only remaining; but that where the whole is good, each part is of value, as the Antiquaries, who travel in the dominions of the Grand Signior, do not deſpiſe the antient ſtatues which they find there, though Mahometan ſuperſtition has broken off their heads. He obſerves likewiſe, that this work is ſaid to be a metaphyſical piece, but that it is not ſo in its ſtricteſt ſenſe. Its principal deſign is the partition of things into their ſeveral claſſes; a deſign, which his Lordſhip brought to more perfection in his *Novum Organum* and his book *de Augmentis Scientiarum*. And tho' it treated of the *Conditions of Being*, yet it was not abſtractly from all body, but with reference to it. And therefore he did not call it *Abecedarium Hyperphyſicum*, but the *Alphabet of Nature*. And in his book *de Augmentis Scientiarum* (81) he expreſly declares, that when he ſpeaks of Conditions of Entities, which are called tranſcendental, ſuch as *much, little, the ſame, diverſe, poſſible, impoſſible*, he is not to be interpreted in a logical but phyſical ſenſe. He was averſe to high and uſeleſs ſpeculations, and he uſed to expreſs his averſion to them by the following compariſon; that the lark flies high, and in its flight does nothing but ſing; whereas the hawk flies high, and deſcends thence, and catches its prey. The *Præfatio Hiſtoriæ Naturalis &c.* publiſhed by Gruter is, as appears from the title of it, a Preface to the *Phænomena of the Univerſe*, or the *Natural Hiſtory*. *The Hiſtory of Winds* was written by him in Latin, and tranſlated into Engliſh by R. G. Gentleman, London 1671. It was dedicated, as Dr. Teniſon obſerves (82), to Prince Charles, as the firſt-fruits of his *Natural Hiſtory*. This was the product of the firſt of thoſe ſix months, in which he determined to write ſix ſeveral Hiſtories of natural things. In his *Aditus* or Preface he calls the winds the wings, by which men fly on the ſea, and the beeſoms of the air and earth. And he obſerves concerning theſe *poſt-nati*, (for, as he ſays, they are not a part of the ſix days works or primary creatures,) that the generation of them has not been well underſtood, becauſe men have been ignorant of the nature and power of the air, on which the winds attend, as Æolus on Juno. *Natura ipſorum inter ſecreta & abdita reponi ſolet; nec mirum, cum nec aeris natura ac poteſtas cognita quoquomodo ſit, cui famulantur & paraſitantur venti, ut (apud Poetas) Æolus Junoni. Primariæ creaturæ non ſunt, nec ex operibus ſex dierum; quemadmodum nec reliqua meteora quoad actum, ſed poſt-nati ex ordine creationis.* In *The Hiſtory of denſe and rare Bodies* his Lordſhip aſſerts, that though nothing is ſubſtracted or added to the total ſum of matter, yet in the ſame ſpace there may be much more or leſs of matter; and that, for inſtance, there is ten times more matter in one tun of wine, than in one of air. By which he ſeems to grant, what we do not however find in any other place, either that there is a *vacuum* in nature, or penetration of parts in bodies (83). *The Hiſtory of Gravity and Levity* was but deſigned; and the *Aditus* of it only remains. The world has ſuſtained a great loſs in this, tho' he had proceeded no further than the general delineation of that work; for thoſe out-lines drawn by ſo great an Artiſt, would have been of prodigious ſervice to others in deſcribing thoſe important *Phænomena of Nature* (84). However we have his *Topics* or *Articles of Enquiry concerning Gravity and Levity* in his Book *de Augmentis Scientiarum* (85); and in the *Aditus*, which is ſtill extant, he rejects the inclination of heavy bodies to the center of the earth as a ſcholaſtic fancy. He takes it likewiſe for a certain truth, that body does not ſuffer but from body, or that there is any local motion, which is not occaſioned either from the parts of the body itſelf, which is moved, or from bodies adjacent, either contiguouſly, or very near it, or at leaſt within the ſphere of their activity. He approves alſo of the magnetic virtues introduced by Gilbert; but he cenſures that Author for making himſelf as it were a magnet, and drawing every thing to his hypotheſis. *Verum miſſis verbulis certiſſimum eſt, corpus nonniſi à corpore pati; nec ullum fieri motum localem qui non ſollicitetur, aut partibus corporis ipſius, quod movetur, aut à corporibus adjacentibus, vel in contiguo, vel in proximo, vel ſaltem intra orbem activitatis ſuæ. Itaque vires magneticas non inſcitè introduxit Gilbertus; ſed & ipſe factus magnes, nimio ſcilicet plura quam oportet ad illas trahens, & navem ædificans ex ſcalmo.* His *Hiſtory of Sympathy and Antipathy* follows next. Of this we have only the *Aditus* remaining, and a few inſtances in his *Sylva Sylvarum* (86). In this Hiſtory he deſigned to avoid magical fancies, which raiſe the mind in theſe things to an undue height; and the pretence of occult qualities, which lays the mind aſleep, and prevents further enquiry into theſe uſeful ſecrets of nature. We have only the *Aditus* to his *Hiſtory of Salt, Sulphur, and Mercury*, the three principles of the common Chymiſts; of which three he thought the firſt to be no primordial body, but a compound of the other two united by an acid ſpirit. The treatiſe itſelf is ſuppoſed to have never been written. *The Hiſtory of Life and Death* was written by him in Latin, and firſt rendered into Engliſh by an injudicious tranſlator; but tranſlated afterwards by an abler hand, aſſiſted by Dr. Rawley. This work, tho' rank'd laſt amongſt the ſix monthly Deſignations, was publiſhed in the ſecond place, his Lordſhip inverting the order out of regard to the great uſe of that argument. He undertook it with a view to make art ſhort, and life eaſy and long; and he tells us in his Preface, that it was a particular deſire, that the nobler ſort of Phyſicians might not employ their time wholly in the ſordidneſs of cures, nor be honoured for neceſſity only; but become coadjutors and inſtruments of the divine Omnipotence and mercy in prolonging and renewing the life of man, and in helping Chriſtians, who pant after the Land of Promiſe, ſo to journey thro' the wilderneſs of this world, as to have their ſhoes and garments (theſe of their frail bodies) little worn and impaired. *Speramus enim & cupimus futurum ut id plurimorum bono fiat; atque ut medici nobiliores animos nonnihil erigant, neque toti ſint in curarum ſordibus, neque ſolum propter neceſſitatem honorentur, ſed fiant demum omnipotentiæ & clementiæ divinæ adminiſtri, in vita hominum prorogandâ & inſtaurandâ, præſertim cum hoc agatur per vias tutas*

(80) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 94.

(81) Lib. 3. cap. 2.

(82) Pag. 36.

(83) Teniſon, pag. 38.

(84) Idem, pag. 22.

(85) Lib. 5. cap. 3.

(86) *See* Exper. 95, 96, 97, 462, 480 to 498.

(87) Pag. & ſeq.

(88) Se Works, pag. 34 London

(89) S Works, pag. 18

(90) P

& *Lumine*, with his Philoſophical Pieces publiſhed by Iſaac Gruter [*U*]; his Treatiſe *De Sapientia Veterum* [*W*], *Imago Civilis Julii Cæſaris*, and *Imago Civilis Auguſti Cæſaris*, and his Tract *In felicem memoriam Elizabethæ Angliæ Reginæ* [*X*], his *Meditationes Sacræ* with his Letters in Latin, and his *Two Books of the Proficience and Advancement of Learning divine and human* [*Y*]. The third Volume contains his *Natural Hiſtory* [*Z*], his *Phyſiological*

tutas & commodas & civiles licet intentatas. Etſi enim nos Chriſtiani ad terram promiſſionis perpetuo aſpiremus & anhelemus; tamen interim itinerantibus nobis, in hac mundi eremo etiam calceos iſtos & tegmina (corporis ſcilicet noſtri fragilis) quam minimum atteri, erit ſignum favoris divini.

[*U*] *His Philoſophical Pieces publiſhed by Gruter.*] The titles of them are as follow: *Filum Labyrinthi ſive Inquiſitio legitima de Motu*; *De Sectione Corporum*; *Continuo & Vacuo*; *De Fluxu & Refluxu Maris*; *Indicia vera de interpretatione Naturæ*; *Partis Inſtaurationis ſecundæ Delineatio & Argumentum*; *Aphoriſmi & conſilia de auxiliis mentis & accenſione luminis naturalis*; *De Interpretatione Naturæ ſententiæ duodecim*; *De Interpretatione Naturæ proœmium*; *Cogitata & viſa de interpretatione Naturæ*; *Bodlei Epiſtola, in qua candide expendit cogitata & viſa*; *Deſcriptio Globi intellectualis*; *Thema Cœli*; *Parmenidis, Teleſii, & Democriti Philoſophia, tractata in fabula*; *Scala Intellectus ſive Filum Labyrinthi, quæ eſt Inſtaurationis magnæ Pars IV*; & *Prodromus, ſive anticipationes Philoſophiæ ſecundæ*; *Inſtaurationis Magnæ Pars V.* With regard to the *Scala Intellectus*, which the Lord Bacon deſigned for the fourth part of the *Great Inſtauration*, Dr. Teniſon obſerves (87), that there was ſome kind of entrance to this in his diſtribution of the *Novum Organum*, and in the little piece publiſhed by Gruter. But the work was never executed, and only the model of it invented by the Author. That which he intended was a particular explication and application of the *ſecond part* of the *Inſtauration*, which lays down general rules for the interpretation of nature, by gradual inſtances and examples. He thought that his rules, without ſome more ſenſible explication, would be like diſcourſes in Geometry or Mechanics, without figures and types of engines. He therefore deſigned to ſelect certain ſubjects in nature or art, and as it were to draw to ſenſe a certain ſcheme of the beginning and progreſs of Philoſophical diſquiſition in them, ſhewing by degrees where our conſideration takes root, and how it ſpreads and advances. Something of this kind is done by thoſe, who from the *Cicatricula* or the *Punctum Saliens* obſerve and regiſter all the Phænomena of the animal unto its death, and after that in the medical, culinary, or other uſe of the body, together with all the train of the thoughts occaſioned by thoſe Phænomena, or by others in compariſon with them. And becauſe he intended to exhibit ſuch obſervations, as they gradually ariſe, he gave to that deſigned work the title of the *Scale* or *Ladder of the Underſtanding*. He likewiſe expreſſed the ſame thought by another metaphor (88), adviſing young ſtudents to imitate thoſe, who by going by degrees from ſeveral eminencies of ſome very high mountain, at laſt reach the top of it. The *fifth part* of the *Inſtauration*, which he deſigned, was what he called *Prodromi ſive Anticipationes Philoſophiæ Secundæ*. The Preface to this is ſtill extant, and we have ſome attempt towards it in the *Diſtribution* (89). And tho' his Lordſhip is not known to have compoſed any part of this work by itſelf, yet ſomething of it is to be collected from the axioms and greater obſervations, interſperſed in his Natural Hiſtories, which are not pure but mixed writings. The *Anticipations* he intended to pay down as intereſt, till he might furniſh the world with the principal in the *ſixth* and *laſt part* of his *Inſtauration* deſigned, which was *Philoſophia Secunda ſive Scientia Activa*. This general Philoſophy founded upon ſenſible nature or artificial experiments, and built up by degrees in obſervations and axioms, he at laſt deſpaired of, and recommended to poſterity. *Time only*, ſays Dr. Teniſon (90), *can thoroughly finiſh what his Lordſhip began, and ſufficiently commend his diligence and ſagacity, who collected ſo many materials, and diſpoſed them into ſuch order, and made in ſo ſhort a time, and (for the moſt part) in the midſt of civil buſineſs, ſuch mighty preparations towards the building of the* Houſe of Wiſdom.

(87) Pag. 48, & ſeq.

(88) See his Works, vol. 2. pag. 343. edit. London 1730.

(89) See his Works, vol. 1. pag. 18.

(90) Pag. 51.

[*W*] *His Treatiſe* de Sapientia Veterum.] This book was written by him in Latin (91), and publiſhed a ſecond time with additions. It was tranſlated into Engliſh by Sir Arthur Gorges. Dr. Teniſon obſerves (92), that it is a book in which the Sages of former times are rendered more wiſe than perhaps they really were, by ſo ingenious an interpreter of their fables. It is this piece that Mr. Sandys means in theſe words, which he prefixed to his notes upon *Ovid's Metamorphoſes* (93): *Of modern Writers I have received the greateſt light from Geraldus, Pontanus, Ficinus, Vives, Comes, Scaliger, Sabinus, Pierius, and the crown of the latter, the Viſcount of St. Albans.* The deſign of it was inſtruction in natural and civil matters, either couched by the Antients under thoſe fictions, or rather made to ſeem to be ſo by his Lordſhip's wit, in the opening and application of them.

(91) See his Letter to Mr. Matthews, vol. 4. of his Works, pag. 580.

(92) Pag. 56.

(93) Pag. 18.

[*X*] *His Tract* in felicem memoriam Elizabethæ Angliæ Reginæ.] Dr. Teniſon calls this *A Memorial of the Felicities of Queen Elizabeth*, and tells us, that it was written by his Lordſhip in Latin only; but that a perſon of more good will than abilities tranſlated it into Engliſh in the year 1651 in 16mo, and called it in the ſingular her *Felicity*. But we have a verſion of it much more accurate and judicious by Dr. Rawley, who undertook that labour, becauſe he knew the value which the Lord Bacon put upon it, ſince he gave this charge in his will (94); *In particular, I wiſh the Elogy which I writ in* felicem memoriam Elizabethæ *may be publiſhed.* As for the occaſion of it, his Lordſhip writes thus in a Letter to Sir George Carey (95), then in France, to whom he ſent it. *Becauſe one muſt begin, I thought to provoke your remembrance of me by a letter; and thinking to fit it with ſomewhat beſides ſalutations, it came to my mind, that this laſt ſummer vacation, by occaſion of a factious book, that endeavoured to verify* Miſera Fœmina, *(the addition of the Pope's Bull) upon Queen Elizabeth, I did write a few lines in her memorial, which I thought you would be pleaſed to read, both for the argument, and becauſe you were wont to bear affection to my pen.* Verum ut aliud ex alio; *if it came handſomely to paſs, I would be glad the Preſident* de Thou *(who hath written an Hiſtory, as you know, of that fame and diligence) ſaw it; chiefly becauſe I know not, whether it may not ſerve him for ſome uſe in his ſtory; wherein I would be glad he did right to the truth, and to the memory of that Lady, as I perceive by that he hath already written, he is well inclined to do.*

(94) This appears to have been a former will, and not the laſt, as Dr. Teniſon aſſerts.

(95) See his Works, vol. 4. pag. 572.

[*Y*] *His two books of the* Proficience and Advancement of Learning divine and human.] This work was firſt printed in the year 1605, and is referred to in many of the Letters in the fourth volume of his Works beginning pag. 561. It is entirely contained in his Treatiſe *De Augmentis Scientiarum*. No writing can challenge the credit and authority of an original better than this, and no performance ever reflected more honour upon the Engliſh language, on account of its beautiful and maſterly expreſſion, its juſt and inimitable method, and its ſurprizing and important diſcoveries. Beſides it is the beſt preparatory for the reading of the book *De Augmentis* (96).

(96) Mr. Blackbourne's *Account of his edition of Lord Bacon's Works*, p. 163.

[*Z*] *His* Natural Hiſtory.] Dr. Teniſon obſerves (97), that the great branch of the third part of the *Inſtauration* is his *Sylva Sylvarum, or Natural Hiſtory*, which contains many materials for the building of Philoſophy, as the *Organum* furniſhes directions for the work. It is an hiſtory not only of nature freely moving in her courſe, as in the production of Meteors, Plants and Minerals, but alſo by nature in conſtraint, and vexed and tortured by human art and experiment. But it is not an hiſtory of ſuch things digeſted into order, but thrown into an heap. For his Lordſhip, that he might not diſcourage other Collectors, did not caſt this book into an exact method, for which reaſon it has the leſs ornament, but not much the leſs uſe. In this book are contained *Experiments of light, and experiments of uſe*, as he uſed to diſtinguiſh them, and amongſt them ſome *extraordinary*,

(97) Pag. 41.

ſiological and Medical Remains [*AA*], *The New Atlantis* [*BB*], a Work, which he left unfiniſhed; *A Collection of Apothegms new and old* [*CC*], *Ornamenta Rationalia*; *Eſſays or*

nary, and others *common*. He knew that what was common in one country, might be ſcarce in another; for which reaſon Dr. Caius, when he was in Italy, thought it worth his pains to give a large and elegant account of our method of brewing (97). His Lordſhip likewiſe knew, that an experiment evident to the vulgar was a good foundation for Philoſophers to build upon. And himſelf rendered common experiments extraordinary by his directions for further trials and improvements. Hence he took occaſion to ſay (98), that his writing of the *Sylva Sylvarum was (to ſpeak properly) not a natural Hiſtory, but a high kind of natural Magic, becauſe it was not a deſcription only of Nature, but a breaking of Nature into great and ſtrange works*. This book was written by him in Engliſh, and tranſlated by an obſcure interpreter into French, and from thence into Latin by James Gruter, in ſo ill a manner, that they darkned his Lordſhip's ſenſe, and debaſed his expreſſion. James Gruter was ſenſible of this ill ſucceſs, being acquainted with it by Dr. Rawley; and he left behind him divers corrections publiſhed by his brother Iſaac Gruter in a ſecond edition at Amſterdam 1661 in 16mo. Yet ſtill ſo many errors have eſcaped, that the work requires another hand. Monſieur Ælius Deodatus had once engaged an able perſon in the tranſlation of this book, who went through the three firſt Centuries, and then deſiſted, at the deſire of Monſieur Deodatus, who was diſſatisfied with his ſlow proceeding in it. His tranſlation of the *Third Century* was in the hands of Dr. Teniſon, who was of opinion, that the verſion of the two firſt was loſt. While we are ſpeaking of this *Natural Hiſtory*, we ſhall take notice of a remarkable ſtory related by Dr. Rawley. One day his Lordſhip was dictating to that Doctor ſome of his experiments in his *Sylva*. The ſame day he had ſent a friend to Court to receive for him a final anſwer with relation to a grant which had been made him by King James. He had hitherto only had hopes of it, and he was deſirous to know the event of the affair, and to be freed one way or other from the ſuſpence of his thoughts. His friend returning told him plainly, that he muſt hereafter deſpair of that grant, whatever occaſion his circumſtances might have of it. *Be it ſo*, ſaid his Lordſhip, and then diſmiſſed his friend very chearfully with thankful acknowledgments of his ſervice. His friend being gone he came immediately to Dr. Rawley, and ſaid to him; *Well, Sir! yon buſineſs won't go on; let us go on with this, for this is in our power*. And then he dictated to him again for ſome hours without the leaſt heſitation of ſpeech or any diſcernible interruption of thought. But to return to our ſubject. Such a collection of *Natural Hiſtory* as we have in this Treatiſe, was of neceſſity, as Dr. Teniſon remarks (99), to be undertaken anew. For the Collections, which were before in men's hands, were but a ſmall and inconſiderable heap, when the chaff and fable were ſifted from them, though the more conſiderable for that ſeparation. Beſides, as his Lordſhip obſerves (100), too many of theſe Hiſtories were at firſt framed rather for delight and table-talk, than for Philoſophy. Stories were feigned for the ſake of their morals, and they were frequently taken upon groundleſs truſt; and the later Writers borrowed out of the more antient, and were not experimenters, but tranſcribers; and ſuch was Pliny himſelf both in his larger and leſſer work; I mean that of Solinus, who is but Pliny contracted. Some perſons have accuſed the Lord Bacon himſelf for taking experiments too readily upon truſt, and without ſufficient deliberation and choice. But we may anſwer them in his own words (101); *The rejection, which I continually uſe of experiments, (though it appeareth not,) is infinite; but yet if an experiment be probable in the work, and of great uſe, I receive it, but deliver it as doubtful.*

(97) *Ephem. Britan.*

(98) *Nat. Hiſt.* Cent. 1. Exper. 93. vol. 3. pag. 25.

(99) Pag. 47.

(100) *De Augment. Scient.* lib. 2. cap. 3.

(101) *Nat. Hiſt.* Cent. 1. Exper. 25.

[*AA*] *His phyſiological and medical remains.*] The firſt piece is entitled, *Inquiſitions concerning compounding of Metals*; then follow his *Articles of Queſtions touching Minerals*, and the *Anſwers of Dr. Meverel*; his *Inquiſition concerning the Verſions, Tranſmutations, Multiplications, and Affections of Bodies*; *a Speech touching the Recovery of drowned Mineral Works*, prepared for the Parliament, as Mr. Buſhel ſays (103), when he was Lord High-Chancellor. Dr. Teniſon obſerves (104), that his Lordſhip no doubt had ſuch a project, and he might prepare a Speech likewiſe for the facilitating of it; but that he would not aſſert, that this is a true copy of that Speech; ſince his Lordſhip's Speeches were generally digeſted into more method; his periods were more round, his words more choice, his alluſions more frequent, and managed with more decorum. And as no man had a greater command of words for the illuſtration of his ſubject, ſo in this caſe had a ſubject, which admitted of the moſt beautiful expreſſion. The *ſixth paper* about natural Things contains *Experiments* made by him *about Weight in Air and Water*. The *ſeventh* contains a few propoſals to the countryman called *Experiments for profit*. The *eighth*, experiments about the *Commixture of Liquors*. The ninth, *a Catalogue of Bodies attractive and not attractive; together with experimental obſervations about Attraction*. Under the head of his *Medical Remains* is contained a paper, which he called *Grains of Youth*; in which he preſcribes divers things, as means to keep the body in vigour. Among theſe is the Receipt of the *Methuſalem Water* againſt the dryneſs of age, which he valued and uſed. Next follows *a Catalogue of aſtringents, openers, and cordials, inſtrumental to health*. Then comes an *Extract* by his Lordſhip *for his own uſe, out of the Hiſtory of Life and Death; together with ſome new Advices in order to health*. To theſe are ſubjoined four medical Receipts; the firſt of which is his *Broth and Fomentation againſt the ſtone*; the ſecond an Ointment, which he calls *Unguentum fragrans ſive Romanum*, conſiſting of aſtringents to prevent exceſs of tranſpiration, and of cordials to comfort the parts. Dr. Teniſon tells us (105), that he called it *Roman Unguent*, becauſe that people particularly made uſe of baths and anointings. He himſelf likewiſe was of opinion, that the anointing with oil was one of the moſt powerful means to prolong life (106); and that it conduced to health both in winter by the excluſion of the cold air, and in ſummer by detaining the ſpirits within, and keeping off the force of the air, which then preys moſt upon the body. But he thought, that it was beſt to anoint without bathing, though he thought bathing with anointing to be injurious. The *third* and *fourth* are Receipts to comfort the ſtomach.

(103) *Extract*, pag. 18, 19.

(104) Pag. 97.

(105) Pag. 99.

(106) See his *Hiſtory of the Life and Death, of the Operation upon Excluſion of the Air*, § 21.

[*BB*] *The new Atlantis.*] This work is not finiſhed. Dr. Rawley tells us in his Preface to it, that this fable was invented by his Lordſhip, in order to exhibit therein a model or deſcription of a College inſtituted for the interpreting of nature, and the production of great and prodigious works, for the benefit of mankind, under the name of *Solomon's Houſe*, or the *College of the ſix days Work*. His Lordſhip has proceeded ſo far as to finiſh that part. *Certainly*, continues the Doctor, *the model is more vaſt and high, than can poſſibly be imitated in all things; notwithſtanding moſt things therein are within mens power to effect. His Lordſhip thought alſo in this preſent fable to have compoſed a frame of laws, or of the beſt ſtate or mould of a commonwealth; but foreſeeing it would be a long work, his deſire of collecting the Natural Hiſtory diverted him, which he preferred many degrees before it*. The Doctor then obſerves, that the Author directed, that this piece ſhould follow his *Natural Hiſtory*, ſince one part of it has ſo near an affinity to that *Hiſtory*. We have here, according to Dr. Shaw (107), as in miniature, a ſummary of univerſal knowledge; Examples, Precepts, and Models for improving the mind in Hiſtory, Geography, Chronology, military Diſcipline, Civil Converſation, Morality, Policy, Phyſics, &c. whence it appears like a kind of epitome and farther improvement of the ſcheme of the *de Augmentis Scientiarum*. The dignity and uſefulneſs of the deſign may appear from hence, that not only Mr. Cowley endeavoured to imitate it in his *Plan of a Philoſophical Society*; but even the Royal Society of London and the Royal Academy of Paris, have from their firſt inſtitution employed themſelves, and ſtill continue employed, in its execution.

(107) Preface to it in pag. 277. of his 1ſt vol. of Lord Bacon's *Philoſophical Works methodiz'd &c.*

[*CC*] *His* Collection of Apothegms new and old.] Dr. Teniſon obſerves (108), that theſe *Apothegms*, of which

(108) Pag. 59.

or Counſels Civil and Moral [*DD*], with a Fragment of *The Colours of Good and Evil* [*EE*]. Next follow his *Hiſtory of the Reign of King Henry VII* [*FF*], a Fragment of his *Hiſtory of the Reign of King Henry VIII*, which he undertook at the deſire of King Charles I, but he

which the firſt edition printed at London 1625 in 8vo, is the beſt, were, as he ſays likewiſe of his *Eſſays* in his Letter to Biſhop Andrews, but *as the recreations of his other ſtudies*. They were dictated one morning out of his memory. And his Lordſhip tells us in his Preface, that he made this Collection, *fanning the old, not omitting any, becauſe they are vulgar (for many vulgar ones are excellent good), nor for the meanneſs of the perſon, but becauſe they are dull and flat, and adding many new, that otherwiſe would have died.*

[*DD*] *Eſſays or Counſels civil and moral.*] Dr. Teniſon tells us (109), that theſe *Eſſays*, tho' a by-work, yet *coming home to mens buſineſs and boſoms*, his Lordſhip entertained this perſuaſion concerning them, as appears from his Dedication of them to the Duke of Buckingham, that the *Latin volume might laſt as long as books ſhould laſt*. He wrote them in Engliſh, and enlarged them as occaſion ſerved, and at laſt added to them *the Colours of Good and Evil*. The Latin Tranſlation of them was performed by divers hands; particularly Dr. Hacket, afterwards Biſhop of Lichfield, Ben. Johnſon the Poet, and others. To this Latin edition he gave the title of *Sermones Fideles*, after the manner of the Jews, who called the words, adagies, or obſervations of wiſe men, *faithful Sayings*, that is, credible propoſitions worthy of firm aſſent and ready acceptance. He ſeems likewiſe to allude more particularly to a paſſage in *Eccleſiaſtes*, *c.* xii, 1. 10, 11. where the Preacher ſays, that he ſought to find out *verba delectabilia* (as Tremellius renders the Hebrew) *pleaſant words*, that is, perhaps his Book of *Canticles*; and *verba fidelia* (according to the ſame Tremellius) *faithful ſayings*, meaning perhaps his *Proverbs*. In the next verſe he calls them *words of the wiſe*, and ſo many goads and nails given *ab eodem paſtore*, from the ſame ſhepherd of the flock of Iſrael. He had given the world a ſpecimen thereof in the year 1597, and dedicated them to his only brother Mr. Anthony Bacon; and in 1612 he review'd and enlarged them with a Dedication deſigned to Prince Henry; but upon that Prince's death he inſcribed them to his brother-in-law Sir John Conſtable. The laſt edition of 1625 was committed to the patronage of his faithful friend, the Duke of Buckingham. The former edition had been tranſlated into Italian by Mr. Tobie Matthew, and into French by the Marquis D'Effiat, Embaſſador from France; but he and Mr. Matthew omitted in the tranſlation what they thought might be offenſive to the rigid Roman Catholics (110). We have an Engliſh tranſlation of the *Sermones Fideles* publiſhed at London in two volumes in 8vo under the title of *Lord Bacon's Eſſays*, or *Counſels moral and civil. Tranſlated from the Latin by William Willymot, L. L. D. Fellow of King's College in Cambridge, and Maſter of a private School at Iſleworth in Middleſex*. Mr. Voltaire in his *Letters concerning the Engliſh Nation* (111) obſerves, that his moral Eſſays *are greatly eſteemed, but they were drawn up in the view of inſtructing rather than pleaſing; and as they are not a ſatyr upon mankind, like* Rochefoucault's Maxims, *nor written upon a ſceptical ſcheme, like* Montagne's Eſſays, *they are not ſo much read as thoſe two ingenious Authors.*

(109) Pag. 60.

(110) *See* Mr. Stephens's *Account of the Life of the Lord Bacon*, pag. 28, 29.

(111) Letter 12.

[*EE*] *A Fragment of* the Colours of Good and Evil.] He tells us in his Introduction to this piece, that *in deliberatives the point is what is good, and what is evil; and of good, what is greater, and of evil, what is leſs. So that the perſuader's labour is to make things appear good or evil, and that in higher or lower degree, which as it may be performed by true and ſolid reaſons, ſo it may be repreſented alſo by colours, popularities and circumſtances, which are of ſuch force, as they ſway the ordinary judgment either of a weak man or of a wiſe man, not fully and conſiderately attending and pondering the matter. Beſides their power to alter the variety of the ſubject in appearance, and ſo to lead to error, they are of leſs uſe to quicken and ſtrengthen the opinions and perſuaſions which are true; for reaſons plainly delivered, and always after one manner, eſpecially with fine and faſtidious minds, enter but heavily and dully; whereas if they be varied, and have more life and vigour put into them by theſe forms and inſinuations, they cauſe a ſtronger apprehenſion, and many times ſuddenly win the mind to a reſolution. Laſtly, to make a true and ſafe judgment, nothing can be of greater uſe and defence to the mind, than the diſcovering and reprehenſion of theſe colours, ſhewing in what caſes they hold, and in what they deceive; which as it cannot be done but out of a very univerſal knowledge of the nature of things, ſo being performed, it ſo cleareth man's judgment and election, as it is the leſs apt to ſlide into error.*

[*FF*] *His Hiſtory of the Reign of King Henry VII.*] Dr. Teniſon obſerves (112), that this Hiſtory, which was firſt publiſhed in 1622, was written by his Lordſhip in Engliſh, and addreſſed to Prince Charles, and afterwards tranſlated into Latin. It was the firſt Book which he wrote after his retirement from an active life (113); upon which occaſion he wrote thus in his Epiſtle Dedicatory to Dr. Andrews Biſhop of Wincheſter before his advertiſement touching an holy War. "Now having in the work of my Inſtauration had "in contemplation the general good of men in their "very being, and the dowries of nature; and in my "work of Laws the general good of men likewiſe "in ſociety, and the dowries of government; I "thought in duty I owed ſomewhat unto my own "country, which I ever loved, inſomuch as although "my place had been far above my deſert, yet my "thoughts and cares concerning the good thereof were "beyond and over and above my place; ſo now be-"ing (as I am) no more able to do my country ſer-"vice, it remained unto me to do it honour; which "I have endeavoured to do in my work of the Reign "of King Henry VII." He tells the Prince in his Dedication, that he had *not flatter'd that King, but took him to life as well as he could, ſitting ſo far off, and having no better light*. Henry Conringius (114) obſerves that this Hiſtory is written with great elegance and judgment, tho' the Author is not remarkable for the beauty and propriety of his Latin ſtyle. *Henrici ſeptimi hiſtoriam perſecutus eſt ſeorſim, elegan-ter admodum, Cancellarius Regni Angliæ Baco de Verulamio; qui multum prudentiæ inſeruit, etiamſi non ſit facundus & probe Latinus ſcriptor.* Grotius in his Letter to du Maurier dated the 26th of July 1629 remarks that this Hiſtory is written with admirable judgment. *Baconi habemus librum ſanè magno judicio ſcriptum de rebus Henrici VII.* Degory Whear in his *Methodus legendi Hiſtorias Civiles* (115) tells us, that this performance of my Lord Bacon is ſo happily executed, that he has equalled, if not ſurpaſſed, the greateſt Hiſtorians. *Cujus* (Henrici ſeptimi) *vitam & res geſtas haud ita pridem nobis repræſentavit nobiliſſimus Vicecomes Sancti Albani, adeò fæliciter adeoque plenè, ut Hiſtoricorum præſtantiſſimos, ſi non ſuperaverit, certè prorſus æquaverit.* The Author of the Preface to the three volumes of the *Complete Hiſtory of England*, which is ſaid to be Mr. Hughes (116), ſtiles it *one of the moſt applauded pieces of Hiſtory, that has ever been writ in our own or any other language, either ancient or modern.* He tells us, that it is impoſſible to exceed in his praiſe; that one may obſerve in him all the depth of a Stateſman and Philoſopher, all the ornament of a diſcreet Orator, and the conduct of a juſt Hiſtorian. That from him alone might ſufficiently be learned the idea of that true ſublime which ennobles Hiſtory; which conſiſts rather in a greatneſs of thinking than in a pomp of expreſſion, and is therefore reconcileable with that ſimplicity required too, tho' theſe are beauties rarely ſeen united. *He traces things*, continues the Author, *with extraordinary judgment, relates them with clearneſs of ſenſe and good connection, and has the ſecret of making every part of the ſtory inſtructive without ſprinkling it over with perpetual adages and obſervations, which retard it, and are the falſe jewels for which coquet writers affect to be admired. Another maſterly excellence in him is that he does not content himſelf with a ſuperficial narration, but enters deeper into his ſubject, and diſcovers the motives of affairs, which every where ſeem true repreſentations, and not fanciful conjectures. This is the more worthy of notice, becauſe Tacitus, who is much admired for it by many,*

(112) Pag. 51.

(113) See the Catalogue of his Works in his Life, by Dr. Rawley.

(114) *Apud* Pope Blount, *Cenſur. Celebrior. Authorum*, p. 903. edit. 1694, in 4to.

(115) Sect. 30. pag. 144. edit. Oxon. 1637.

(116) See the *Life of Biſhop Kennet*, pag. 334 edit. London 1730, in 8vo.

he did not live to finiſh it; and what we have of it was only the work of a ſingle morning (*ee*). *The beginning of the Hiſtory of Great Britain*; which was an Eſſay ſent to King James, whoſe times it conſider'd. This was a Work worthy of his pen; becauſe, as he tells the King in a Letter publiſhed in the IVth Volume of his Works (*ff*), *he ſhould write of times not only ſince he could remember, but ſince he could obſerve*; and, as he obſerves in his letter to the Lord Chancellor Egerton (*g*), of times, wherein he found *the greateſt variety, that in ſo little a number of ſucceſſions of any hereditary Monarchy hath ever been known.* The ſame Volume likewiſe contains his *Conſiderations touching a War with Spain, inſcribed to Prince Charles, in* 1624, *An Advertiſement touching an Holy War*, written in 1622, with his *Queſtions about the lawfulneſs of a War for the propagating of Religion*; *An hiſtorical account of the Office of Alienations*, written about the latter end of the year 1598, and *Advice to Sir George Villiers, afterwards Duke of Buckingham.* The Fourth Volume contains his *Propoſition to his Majeſty for the compiling and amendment of our Laws* [GG]; *An offer to King James of a Digeſt to be made of the Laws of England*; and *The Elements of the Common Laws of England*; *containing*, 1. *A Collection of ſome principal Rules and Maxims of the Common Law, with their latitude and extent*: 2. *The uſe of the Common Law, for the preſervation*

(*ee*) Dr. Rawley's *Life of Lord Bacon.*

(*ff*) Pag. 567.

(*gg*) Ibid. pag. 565.

* *Sa maniere de critiquer eſt fine par elle-meme; mais elle devient groſſiere par l'envie qu'il a de critiquer tout.* Rapin, Reflex. *C'eſt plus la politique que la Verité, qui le fait parler.* Ibid.

is by others thought to have over-acted the Politician, and by too much ſubtilty to have expounded the ſimpleſt actions in the world into deſign and artifice. But as nothing is more improving than this way of writing when well managed, ſo it ſeems to be the talent of a wiſe rather than of a cunning head.* Mr. Nicholſon in his *Engliſh Hiſtorical Library* (116) tells us, that the Hiſtory of King Henry the ſeventh "was the "moſt effectually undertaken and compleated by "the incomparable Sir Francis Bacon, who has "bravely ſurmounted all thoſe difficulties, and paſſed "over thoſe rocks and ſhallows, againſt which he "took ſuch pains to (*t*) caution other leſs experienced "Hiſtorians. He has perfectly put himſelf into King "Henry's own garb and livery, giving as ſpritely a "view of the ſecrets of his Council, as if himſelf had "been Preſident in it. No trivial paſſages, ſuch as "are below the notice of a Stateſman, are mixed "with his ſage remarks; nor is any thing of weight "or moment ſlubbered over with that careleſs haſte "and indifferency which is too common in other "Writers. No allowances are given to the Author's "own conjecture and invention, where a little pains "and conſideration will ſerve to ſet the matter in its "proper and true light. No impertinent digreſſions "nor fanciful comments diſtract his readers, but the "whole is written in ſuch a grave and uniform ſtyle, "as becomes both the ſubject and the artificer." But we have a ſevere Criticiſm upon this Hiſtory in the *Guardian* (117), wherein we are told, that my *Lord Verulam is ever in the tedious ſtile of declaimers, uſing two words for one; ever endeavouring to be witty, and as fond of out of the way ſimilies as ſome of our Play-writers. He abounds in low phraſes, beneath the dignity of Hiſtory, and often condeſcends to little conceits and quibbles. His political reflections are frequently falſe, almoſt every where trivial and puerile. His whole manner of turning his thoughts is full of affectation and pedantry; and there appears throughout his whole work more the air of a recluſe ſcholar, than of a man verſed in the world.* The Author then mentions ſome inſtances of theſe defects, and afterwards obſerves, that the whole work is ill conducted, and that the ſtory of Perkin Warbeck (which ſhould have been only like an Epiſode in a Poem) is ſpun out to near a third part of the book. That the character of Henry VII, at the end, is rather an abſtract of his hiſtory than a character, and tedious, and diverſified with ſo many particulars as confound the reſemblance, and make it almoſt impoſſible for the reader to form any diſtinct idea of the perſon. But he concludes, that *after all it muſt be conſidered in favour of my Lord Verulam, that he lived in an age, wherein chaſte and correct writing was not in faſhion, and when pedantry was the mode even at Court; ſo that it is no wonder, if the prevalent humour of the times bore down his genius, though ſuperior in force perhaps to any of his countrymen, that have either gone before or ſucceeded him.* Mr. Rapin de Thoyras in his *Hiſtory of England* (118), tells us, that my Lord Bacon has not given King Henry VII a juſt character, which he obſerves is not ſurpriſing, ſince as "his eſtate was forfeited by the ſentence paſſed upon "him, and as he lived only on a penſion from the "King, who always ſpoke of Henry VII his great "grandfather with high commendations, he made his

(116) Pag. 223, 224. edit. London, 8vo.

(*t*) *De Augment. Scientiar.* lib. 2. cap. 5.

(117) Vol. 1. Numb. 25.

(118) Book 18. *ad ann.* 1621.

"court to the King by repreſenting that Prince as a "pattern of wiſdom and virtue." Mr. Voltaire in his *Letters concerning the Engliſh Nation* (119) obſerves, that this Hiſtory was conſidered as a maſter-piece; but he wonders how it is poſſible, that *ſome perſons can preſume to compare ſo little a work* with that of the illuſtrious Thuanus. He then quotes a paſſage, wherein Lord Bacon ſpeaks about the famous impoſtor Perkin, ſon to John Oſbeck a converted Jew, who aſſumed the name and title of Richard the Fourth King of England, at the inſtigation of the Ducheſs of Burgundy; and who diſputed the Crown with Henry VII. *At this time*, ſays Lord Bacon, *the King began again to be haunted with ſprites, by the magic and curious arts of the Lady Margaret, who raiſed up the Ghoſt of Richard Duke of York, ſecond ſon to King Edward the fourth, to walk and vex the King.... After ſuch time as ſhe thought he (Perkin Warbeck) was perfect in his leſſon, ſhe began to caſt with herſelf from what coaſt this blazing Star ſhould firſt appear, and at what time it muſt be upon the Horizon of Ireland; for there had the like meteor ſtrong influence before.* Mr. Voltaire remarks upon this, that the ſagacious Thuanus does not give into ſuch fuſtian, which formerly was look'd upon as ſublime, but in the preſent age is juſtly called nonſenſe.

(119) Letter 12.

[*GG*] *His propoſition to his Majeſty for the compiling an amendment of the Laws.*] In this piece he tells us, it is certain that our Laws, as they now ſtand, are ſubject to great uncertainties and variety of opinions, delays, and evaſions; from whence it follows. 1. That the multiplicity and length of ſuits is great: 2. That the contentious perſon is armed, and the honeſt ſubject wearied and oppreſſed: 3. That the Judge is more abſolute, who in doubtful caſes has a greater liberty: 4. That the Chancery Courts are more filled, the remedy of Law being often obſcure and doubtful: 5. That the ignorant Lawyer ſhrouds his ignorance of Law in this, that there are ſo many and ſo frequent doubts: 6. That mens aſſurances of their lands and eſtates by Patents, Deeds, and Wills are often ſubject to queſtión, and precarious; and many inconveniences of that nature. He then obſerves, that if it had not been for Sir Edward Coke's *Reports*, the Law by that time had been almoſt like a ſhip without ballaſt; ſince *the caſes of modern experience are fled from thoſe that are adjudg'd and ruled in former time. But the neceſſity of this work*, continues he, *is yet greater in the Statute-Law. For, firſt, there are a number of enſnaring penal Laws, which lie upon the ſubject; and if in bad times they ſhould be awaked and put in execution, would grind them to powder. There is a learned Civilian, that expoundeth the curſe of the Prophet*, pluet ſuper eos laqueos, *of multitude of penal Laws; which are worſe than ſhowers of hail or tempeſt upon cattle, for they fall upon men. There are ſome penal Laws fit to be retained, but their penalty too great; and it is ever a rule, that any over great penalty, (beſides the acerbity of it) deadens the execution of the Law. There is a further inconvenience of penal Laws, obſolete, and out of uſe; for that it brings a gangrene, neglect, and habit of diſobedience upon other wholeſome Laws, that are fit to be continued in practice and execution; ſo that our Laws endure the torment of Mezentius,*

The living die in the arms of the dead.

The

ſervation of our Perſons, Goods, and good Names, according to the Laws and Cuſtoms of the Land [*HH*]. Next follow his *Caſes of Treaſon, Felony, Præmunire, the King's Prerogative, and the Office of Conſtables*; his *Arguments in Law*; *Draught of an Act againſt an uſurious Shift of Gain, in delivering of Commodities inſtead of Money*; his *Ordinances in Chancery*; his *Reading on the Statute of Uſes*; Treatiſes relating to the *Union*; *Charges*; *Speeches*; *Obſervations on a Libel, &c. Report of the Treaſon of Lopez*; *Apology concerning the Earl of Eſſex*; *Conſiderations touching the Plantation in Ireland*; *Advice to the King, touching Mr. Sutton's Eſtate* [*II*]; his *Theological Works* [*KK*]; his *Remains in quarto.*

Laſtly, there is ſuch an accumulation of Statutes concerning one matter, and they ſo croſs and intricate, as the certainty of Law is loſt in the heap.. The Scheme, which he propoſes, conſiſts of two parts; the *Digeſt* or recompiling of the *Common Laws*; and that of the *Statutes*. In the firſt of theſe three things are to be done: 1. The compiling of a Book *de Antiquitatibus Juris:* 2. The reducing or perfecting of the courſe or body of the Common Laws: 3. The compoſing of certain introductive and auxiliary Books concerning the Study of the Law. The Reformation and Recompilement of the *Statute-Law* conſiſts of four parts. 1. The firſt to diſcharge the Books of thoſe Statutes, in which the caſe by alteration of time is vaniſhed. 2. To repeal all Statutes, which are dormant and not in uſe, and yet enſnaring and in force. 3. To mitigate the rigour of the penalty in many Statutes, tho' the ordinances ſtand. 4. To reduce concurrent Statutes heaped one upon another to one clear and uniform Law. This piece was written while he was Attorney-General, and one of the Privy-Council.

[*HH*] *The Elements of the common Laws of England, containing &c.*] In the *Epiſtle Dedicatory* to King James I, he takes notice of *his Majeſty's purpoſe for many years infuſed into his breaſt, to enter into a general amendment of the ſtate of the Laws, and to reduce them to more brevity and certainty, that the great hollowneſs and unſafety in aſſurances of lands and goods may be ſtrengthened, the ſwerving penalties that lie upon many ſubjects removed, the execution of many profitable Laws revived, the Judge better directed in his ſentence, the Counſellor better warranted in his counſel, the Student eaſed in his reading, the contentious ſuitor that ſeeketh but vexation diſarmed, and the honeſt ſuitor that ſeeketh but to obtain his right relieved.* In his Preface he tells us, that with regard to the manner of ſetting down of the rules, he has in all points applied himſelf not to that, which might ſeem moſt for the oſtentation of his own wit or knowledge, but to that, which may yield moſt uſe and profit to the ſtudents and profeſſors of our Laws. And therefore whereas theſe rules are ſome of them ordinary and vulgar, which now ſerve but for grounds and plain ſongs to the more ſhallow and impertinent ſort of arguments, others of them are gather'd and extracted out of the harmony and congruity of caſes, and are ſuch as the wiſeſt and deepeſt ſort of Lawyers have in judgment and uſe, tho' they be not able many times to expreſs and ſet them down. Secondly that whereas ſome of theſe rules have a concurrence with the Roman Civil Law, and ſome others a diverſity, and many times an oppoſition to ſuch grounds, which are common to our Law and theirs, he had not affected to diſguiſe them in other words than the Civilians uſe, that they might ſeem invented by him, and not borrow'd or tranſlated from them. Thirdly, that he choſe to write in diſtinct aphoriſms, becauſe that method leaves the mind more at liberty to make uſe of what is delivered to a greater variety of purpoſes. Fourthly, that he has put the rules themſelves in Latin; and with regard to the expoſitions and diſtinctions, retained the peculiar language of our Law. Fifthly, that he has abſtained from alledging of authorities; and laſtly, that he accompanied his rules with a clear and perſpicuous expoſition, breaking them into caſes, and opening them with diſtinctions, and ſometimes ſhewing the reaſons above, upon which they depend, and the affinity they have with other rules.

[*II*] *Advice to the King touching Mr. Sutton's eſtate.*] Dr. Teniſon obſerves (120), that in this *Advice* with relation to that eſtate, (in the ſettling of which in the Hoſpital of the Chartreux the event ſhewed, that his Lordſhip was miſtaken, when he called it *a ſacrifice without ſalt*,) he propoſed four other ends of that valuable gift. As firſt the erection of a College for controverſies for the refuting of Papiſts. Secondly the erection of a *Receipt*, (for the word *Seminary* he diſliked) for converts to the Reformed Religion. Thirdly a ſettlement of ſtipends for itinerary Preachers in places, which wanted them, as in Lancaſhire, where ſuch care had been taken by Queen Elizabeth. And laſtly an increaſe of ſalary to the Profeſſors in both the Univerſities. And therefore as his Lordſhip declared himſelf not averſe to the charity, but the manner of diſpoſing it, it was very unjuſt in thoſe, who publickly defamed him, by ſuggeſting that he had been bribed by the heir.

(120) Introduct. Pag. 68.]

[*KK*] *His Theological Works.*] Dr. Teniſon obſerves (121), that they are but few, and that there *appears nothing ſo extraordinary in the compoſure of them, as is found in his Lordſhip's other labours.* His *Confeſſion of Faith* was written by himſelf in Engliſh, and tranſlated into Latin by Dr. Rawley. Then follow his *Advertiſement touching the Controverſies of the Church of England*: his *Conſiderations touching the better Pacification and Edification of the Church of England, dedicated to his moſt excellent Majeſty*; and his *Prayers*, the firſt of which is mentioned in the *Tatler* (122) in the following manner: *I was infinitely pleaſed to find among the works of this extraordinary man a Prayer of his own compoſing, which for the elevation of thought, and greatneſs of expreſſion ſeems rather the devotion of an Angel than a man. His principal fault ſeems to have been the exceſs of that virtue, which covers a multitude of faults. This betrayed him to ſo great an indulgence towards his ſervants, who made a corrupt uſe of it, that it ſtripp'd him of all thoſe riches and honours, which a long ſeries of merit had heaped upon him. But in this Prayer, at the ſame time that we find him proſtrating himſelf before the great Mercy-ſeat, and humbled under afflictions, which at that time lay heavy upon him, we ſee him ſupported by the ſenſe of his integrity, his zeal, his devotion, and his love to mankind; which give him a much higher figure in the minds of thinking men, than that greatneſs had done, from which he had fallen.* The *Tranſlation of certain Pſalms* concludes his theological works. Dr. Teniſon tells us (123), that he diverted himſelf with his pious exerciſe in the time of his ſickneſs in the year 1625. When he publiſhed it, he made a Dedication of it to his *very good friend*, Mr. George Herbert, as he judged the ſubject to be ſuitable to him in his double character of a Divine and a Poet. His Lordſhip had very great judgment in Poetry, as appears by his diſcourſe about it in his Book *de Augmentis Scientiarum* (124); and the Author of the *Tatler* (125) quoting a paſſage from him, tells us, that *it gives a truer and better account of this art, than all the volumes that were ever written upon it.* We find likewiſe in my Lord Bacon's *Apology in certain imputations concerning the late Earl of Eſſex*, that when Queen Elizabeth deſigned to dine at his lodge at Twicknam-Park, he prepared a Sonnet, in order to procure the reconcilement of her Majeſty to that Earl, who was then out of favour. " But, *as Dr. Teniſon obſerves* " (126), it was very ſeldom that he courted the Muſes; " and therefore his vein does not appear ſo elegant " and happy, as exerciſe might have made it. The " truth is, it is one of the hardeſt things in the " world to excel in Poetry: and to attempt and not " to excel, is to loſe both time and reputation; for " in this Art mediocrity will not paſs for virtue. In " this ſqueamiſh Age (as Monſr. Rapin ſays in his judicious Reflections) verſes are ridiculous, if they " be not admirable. They are, it ſeems, like ſome " modern diſhes, which if they have not an high taſte, " occaſion diſguſt."

(121) Pag. 72.

(122) Vol. 4. Num. 267.

(123) Pag. 72.

(124) Lib. 2. cap. 13.

(125) Vol. 2. Num. 108.

(126) Pag. 73.

quarto [*LL*]; his Letters in the reign of Queen Elizabeth; Treaſons of Robert Earl of Eſſex; Letters in the reign of King James; and Letters concerning the Solicitorſhip. There have been lately publiſhed *Letters and Remains of the Lord Chancellor Bacon, collected by Robert Stephens, Eſq; late Hiſtoriographer-Royal. London* 1734 *in quarto.* And Dr. Shaw has rendered all his Philoſophical Works into Engliſh, and digeſted them into a proper method, under the title of *The Philoſophical Works of Francis Bacon, Baron of Verulam, Viſcount St. Albans, and Lord High-Chancellor of England, methodized and made Engliſh from the Originals with occaſional Notes to explain what is obſcure, and ſhew how far the ſeveral Plans of the Author, for the Advancement of all parts of Knowledge, have been executed to the preſent Time. By Peter Shaw, M. D. Three Volumes quarto. London* 1733. His Lordſhip had happily eſcaped the Plague, which infeſted the ſummer of the year 1625, and with ſome difficulty, being of a weak and tender conſtitution, paſſed the ſevere winter, which followed; but going in the ſpring to make ſome Experiment in Natural Philoſophy, he was taken ſo ill, that he was obliged to ſtay at the Earl of Arundel's houſe at Highgate [*MM*] about a week (*bb*), and there expired on Eaſter Day the ninth of April 1626, in the ſixty ſixth year of his age, of a gentle fever attended with a great cold, which occaſioned ſuch a defluxion of rheum, that he was ſuffocated with it. He was buried near his mother in St. Michael's Church at St. Albans, according to the direction in his laſt Will; and had a Monument of white marble erected to him by Sir Thomas Meautys, who had formerly been his Secretary, and was afterwards Clerk of the Privy Council under two Kings (*ii*). This Monument repreſented his full portraiture in a contemplative poſture, with an inſcription written by Sir Henry Wotton [*NN*]. Arthur Wilſon in his *Life and Reign of King James I* (*kk*) tells us, that *he was of a middling ſtature; his countenance indented with age before he was old; and his preſence grave and comely.* He had one peculiar temper of body, that he always fainted at an Eclipſe of the Moon, tho' he knew nothing of it (*ll*). He was the Author of ſeveral mechanical inventions [*OO*]; and Mr. Voltaire ſtiles him *the Father of Experimental Philoſophy* (*mm*), and tells us, that no

(*bb*) Stephens's *Account of the Life of the Lord Bacon*, p. 31.

(*ii*) Dr. Rawley's *Life of Lord Bacon.*

(*kk*) See the *Complete Hiſtory of England*, vol. 2. p. 736. edit. London 1706.

(*ll*) Dr. Rawley, *ubi ſupra.*

(*mm*) *Letters concerning the Engliſh Nation*, Letter 12.

[*L L*] *His* Remains *in quarto.*] We are informed in an *Adverti ſement* prefixed to them in Mr. Blackbourne's edition of Lord Bacon's Works (127), that theſe fragments were never acknowledged by Dr. Rawley among his genuine Writings, and do not appear to come up to the ſpirit and penetration of that noble Author. However as they are vouched to be authentic in an edition of the *Remains* of the Lord Verulam printed in 1648, and as Archbiſhop Sancroft has reflected ſome credit on them by a careful review, having in a great many inſtances corrected and prepared them for the preſs among other unqueſtioned Writings of his Lordſhip, they have been inſerted in the laſt edition of his Works. The titles of theſe pieces are as follow: I. *An Explanation what manner of perſons thoſe ſhould be that are to execute the power or ordinance of the King's prerogative.* II. *Short Notes for civil converſation.* III. *An Eſſay on Death.* IV. *The Characters of a believing Chriſtian in Paradoxes and ſeeming Contradictions.* V. *A Prayer made and uſed by the Lord Chancellor Bacon.* But this prayer does not appear to be caſt in the ſame mold with that mentioned in the preceding note.

(127) Vol. 4. pag. 458.

[*MM*] *At the Earl of Arundel's houſe at Highgate near London.*] We have a Letter of his to that Earl juſt before his death, and the laſt which he ever wrote, wherein he tells him, that he was likely to have had the fortune of Caius Plinius the Elder, who loſt his life by trying an experiment about the burning of the Mountain Veſuvius; for he himſelf was alſo deſirous to try an experiment or two touching the conſervation and induration of bodies. "As for the experiment it "ſelf, *continues he*, it ſucceeded excellently well, but "in the journey (between London and Highgate) I "was taken with ſuch a fit of caſting, as I knew "not whether it were the ſtone, or ſome ſurfeit, or "cold, or indeed a touch of them all three. But "when I came to your Lordſhip's houſe, I was not "able to go back, and therefore was forced to take "up my lodging here, where your houſe-keeper is "very careful and diligent about me, which I aſſure "myſelf your Lordſhip will not only pardon towards "him, but think the better of him for it. For in"deed your Lordſhip's houſe was happy to me, and "I kiſs your noble hands for the welcome, which I "am ſure you give me to it, &c. I know how unfit "it is for me to write to your Lordſhip with any o"ther hand than my own; but by my troth my fingers "are ſo disjointed with this fit of ſickneſs, that I can"not ſteadily hold my pen."

[*NN*] *An inſcription written by Sir Henry Wotton.*] It is as follows: FRANCISCUS BACON *Baro de Verulam, S. Albani Vicecomes; ſeu notioribus titulis, Scientiarum lumen, facundiæ Lex, ſic ſedebat. Qui poſtquam omnia naturalis ſapientiæ & civilis arcana evolviſſet, Naturæ decretum explevit. Compoſita ſolvantur, Anno Dom. MDC XXVI. ætatis LXVI. Tanti veri memoriæ* THOMAS MEAUTUS *ſuperſtitis cultor, defuncti admirator, H. P.* That is, according to Dr. Teniſon's tranſlation (128), "FRANCIS BACON, Ba"ron of Verulam, Viſcount of St. Albans, or "in more conſpicuous titles, the Light of the Sci"ences, the Law of Eloquence, ſate on this manner; "who, after he had unfolded all the myſteries of na"tural and civil wiſdom, obeyed the decree of Na"ture. *Let the companions* be parted ‖, in the year "of our Lord 1626, and in the ſixty ſixth year of "his age. THOMAS MEAUTYS, a reverencer of "him whilſt alive, and an admirer of him now "dead, hath ſet up this to the memory of ſo great a "man."

(128) See *Baconiana*, pag. 259.

‖ i. e. *Soul and Body.*

[*OO*] *He was the Author of ſeveral mechanical inventions.*] Dr. Teniſon tells us (129), that he doubts not but there were many of theſe inventions; but that he can recollect but three, and of them can give but a very broken account. And with regard to his inſtruments and ways in recovering deſerted mines, that he can give no account at all; though certainly without new tools and peculiar inventions he would never have undertaken that new and hazardous work. Of the three inventions which he recollected, the *firſt* was an *Engine repreſenting the motion of the Planets*, which my Lord Bacon ſpeaks of in one of his miſcellany papers in manuſcript. *I did once*, ſays he, *cauſe to be repreſented to me by wires the motion of ſome Planets, in fact as it is, without Theories of Orbs, &c. And it ſeemed a ſtrange and extravagant motion. One while they moved in ſpires forwards; another while they did unwind themſelves in ſpires backwards. One while they made larger circles and higher; another while ſmaller circles and lower. One while they moved to the North in their ſpires, another while to the South, &c.* His *ſecond* invention was a ſecret curioſity of Nature, whereby to know the ſeaſon of every hour of the year by a philoſophical glaſs, placed (with a ſmall proportion of water) in a chamber. This deſcription is in the words of Mr. Thomas Buſhel (130), one of his Lordſhip's menial ſervants. Dr. Teniſon tells us (131), that this ſecret cannot be that inſtrument, which is called *Vitrum Calendare*, or the *Weather Glaſs*, ſince my Lord Bacon in his Writings (132) ſpeaks of it as a thing in ordinary uſe, and recommends not water (133), but

(129) Pag. 17.

(130) See his *Extract*, pag. 17.

(131) Pag. 18.

(132) *Hiſt. Vit. & Mortis*, vol. 2. of his Works, pag. 118.

(133) *In formâ Calidi*, § 24. vol. 1. pag. 339. Organ.

no perſon before him was acquainted with that Philoſophy, or with the ſeveral phyſical Experiments which have been made ſince his time. That there is ſcarce one of them, but is hinted at in his Work; and that he himſelf made ſeveral; and particularly a kind of *pneumatic engine*, by which he gueſſed the elaſticity of the air, and very near diſcovered the weight of it. The ſame Author likewiſe obſerves, that what ſurprized him moſt was to read in his Work in expreſs terms the new *Attraction*, the invention of which is aſcribed to Sir Iſaac Newton [*PP*]. Mr. Evelyn in his deſcription of our Author in his book of Medals (*nn*) tells us, that he had a ſpacious forehead and a piercing eye, always, "ſays he, "as I have been told by one, who knew him well, looking upward, as a ſoul in ſublime "contemplation, and as the perſon, who by ſtanding up againſt Dogmatiſts, was to "emancipate and ſet free the long and miſerably captivated *Philoſophia*, which hath ever "ſince made ſuch conqueſts in the territories of nature." The greateſt Writers of our nation, as well as thoſe of other countries, conſpire in giving him the nobleſt character imaginable [*QQ*]; and the late Duke of Buckingham, Sheffield, in particular aſſures us (*oo*), that *all his Works are, for expreſſion as well as thought, the glory of our nation and of all later*

(*nn*) Pag. 340.

(*oo*) Vol. 1. of his Works, pag. 264.

but rectified ſpirit of wine in the uſe of it. Nor, as it was an inſtrument made with water, was it likely to have ſhewed the changes of the air with ſo much exactneſs, as the later Baroſcope made with Mercury. And yet it appears to be a ſecret of great value from the reward which it is ſaid to have procured. For Mr. Buſhel tells us in his *Extract* (134), that when Mr. Bacon made a preſent of it to the Earl of Eſſex, that Nobleman beſtowed upon him *Twicknam Park and its Garden of Paradiſe, as a place for his ſtudies.* Dr. Teniſon remarks, that he has not faith enough to credit the whole of this relation. And yet he believed the Earl of Eſſex was extremely liberal and free even to profuſeneſs; that *he was a great lover of learned men, being in ſome ſort one of them himſelf* (135); and that with ſingular patronage he encouraged the promiſing genius of Mr. Bacon, who alſo ſtudied his fortunes and ſervice. Yet Mr. Bacon himſelf in the place, where he profeſſes his unwillingneſs to be ſhort in the commemoration of the favours of that Earl, is abſolutely ſilent with regard to this ſignal favour (136). But there is in his *Apology* another ſtory, which may ſeem to have given occaſion to Mr. Buſhel's miſtake. *After the Queen had denied to Mr. Bacon the Solicitor's place, for which the Earl of Eſſex had been a long and earneſt ſuitor on his behalf, it pleaſed that Earl to come to him from Richmond to Twicknam-Park, and thus to break with him:* "Mr. Bacon, the Queen hath de-"nied me the place for you.... You fare ill, be-"cauſe you have choſe me for your mean and de-"pendance. You have ſpent your time and thoughts "in my matters; I die... if I do not do ſomewhat "towards your fortune. You ſhall not deny to ac-"cept a piece of land, which I will beſtow upon you." This piece of land was ſo large, that he underſold it for no leſs than eighteen hundred pounds. His *third invention* was a kind of *mechanical index of the mind.* Mr. Buſhel in his *Extract* (137) has given us the following deſcription of it. *His Lordſhip preſented to Prince Henry two triangular ſtones (as the firſt fruits of his Philoſophy) to imitate the ſympathetical motion of the Load-ſtone and Iron, although made up by the compounds of Meteors (as Star-ſhot Jelly), and other like magical ingredients, with the reflected beams of the Sun, on purpoſe that the warmth diſtilled into them through the moiſt heat of the hands, might diſcover the affection of the heart by a viſible ſign of their attraction and appetite to each other, like the hand of a watch, within ten minutes after they are laid on a marble table, or the theatre of a great looking-glaſs. I write not this as a feigned ſtory, but as a real truth; for I was never quiet in my mind, till I had procured theſe jewels of my Lord's Philoſophy from my friend Mr.* Archy Primroſe, *the Prince's page.* Dr. Teniſon obſerves (138), that he finds nothing of this either in his Lordſhip's *Experiments touching emiſſion, or immateriate virtues from the minds and ſpirits of men* (139), or in thoſe concerning the *ſecret virtue of ſympathy and antipathy* (140).

(134) Pag. 17.

(135) *MS. Hiſt. of Queen Elizabeth*, p. 39. *apud* Teniſon, p. 19.

(136) *See* Bacon's *Apology concerning the Earl of Eſſex*, vol. 4. of his Works, p. 390, 391.

(137) P. 17, 18.

(138) Pag. 21.

(139) *Nat. Hiſt.* Cent. x. Exper. 939, &c.

(140) Ibid. Exper. 960, &c.

[*PP*] *What ſurprized Mr. Voltaire moſt was to read in his works in expreſs terms the new Attraction, the invention of which is aſcribed to Sir Iſaac Newton.*] The paſſages which Mr. Voltaire cites from my Lord Bacon, without quoting the place, are as follow: *We muſt ſearch whether there may not be a kind of* magnetic power, *which operates between the Earth and heavy Bodies, between the Moon and the Ocean, between the Planets, &c.* And in another place he ſays, that *either heavy bodies muſt be carried towards the center of the earth, or muſt be reciprocally attracted by it; and in the latter caſe it is evident, that the nearer the Bodies in their falling draw towards the Earth, the ſtronger they will attract one another.* "We muſt, ſays he, "make an Experiment to ſee whether the ſame clock "will go faſter on the top of a mountain, or at the "bottom of a mine. Whether the ſtrength of the "weights decreaſes on the mountain, and encreaſes "in the mine. It is probable that the Earth has a "true attractive power."

[*QQ*] *The greateſt Writers of our Nation, as well as thoſe of other Countries conſpire in giving him the nobleſt character imaginable.*] Ben. Johnſon the Poet, in his *Diſcoveries* (141), ſtiles him *a noble Speaker*, who was full of gravity in his ſpeaking. That his language, where he could ſpare or paſs by a jeſt, was nobly cenſorious. "No man ever ſpake more neatly, more "preſtly, more weightily, or ſuffered leſs emptineſs, "leſs idleneſs in what he uttered. No member of "his ſpeech but conſiſted of his own graces. His "hearers could not cough or look aſide from him with-"out loſs. He commanded where he ſpoke, and had "his judges angry and pleaſed at his devotion. No "man had their affections more in his power. The "fear of every man that heard him was, leſt he "ſhould make an end." He afterwards obſerves, that Lord Egerton the Chancellor was a great and grave Orator, but his *learned and able, tho' unfortunate* ſucceſſor, the Lord Bacon, was he who hath filled up all members, and performed that in our tongue, which may be compar'd or preferred either to inſolent Greece or haughty Rome. That, in ſhort, within his view and about his time, were all the Wits born, that could honour a language, or could help ſtudy. *Now things,* ſays he, *daily fall; wits grow downwards, and eloquence goes backward; ſo that he may be named and ſtand as the mark or* [illegible] *of our language.* He tells us likewiſe, that his *conceit of his perſon was never increaſed towards him by his place or honours. But I have and do reverence him for the greatneſs, that was only proper to himſelf; in that he ſeemed to me ever by his works one of the greateſt men and moſt worthy of admiration, that had been in many Ages. In his adverſity I ever prayed that God would give him ſtrength; for greatneſs he could not want; neither could I conddle in a word or ſyllable for him, as knowing no accident could do harm to virtue, but rather help to make it manifeſt.* Dr. Heylin in his *Life of Archbiſhop Laud*, Book 1, p. 78. *ad ann.* 1620, tells us, that the Lord Chancellor Bacon was "a man of a moſt ſtrong brain "and a chymical head, deſigning his endeavours to "the perfecting of the works of nature, or rather "improving nature to be the beſt advantages of life, "and the common benefit of mankind. Pity it was "he was not entertained with ſome liberal ſalary, "abſtracted from all affairs both of Court and Judi-"cature, and furniſhed with ſufficiency both of means "and helps for the going on in his deſign; which "had it been, he might have given us ſuch a body of "Natural Philoſophy, and made it ſo ſubſervient to "the public good, that neither Ariſtotle nor Theo-"phraſtus amongſt the ancients, nor Paracelſus or the "reſt of our later Chymiſts would have been conſi-"derable." Mr. Oſborn in the ſecond part of his

(141) Pag. 701. edit. 1692.

later ages.. Morhof in a variety of places of his *Polyhiſtor* undertakes to ſhew, that all the modern improvements made by our nation in Philoſophy, are owing to the Lord Bacon; who, as that Writer expreſſes it, *every where abounds with the ſeeds of things*; many whereof, we may add, were ſown ſo deep, as not yet to have ſprung up (*pp*). Dr. Shaw remarks upon the queſtion of Lord Bacon, "What innovator follows the example of time, "which inſinuates new things ſo quietly, as to be almoſt imperceptible?" that it may juſtly be anſwered, *the Lord Bacon, who*, ſays he (*qq*), *has reformed the ſtate of Learning ſo quietly, that his countrymen ſcarce perceive how or by whom it was effected*. The learned Boerhaave likewiſe in his *Methodus diſcendi Medicinam* (*rr*) highly extolls him, and ſays, that if there is any thing in Des Cartes valuable, it is owing to our Author. However Spinoza in his ſecond letter to H. Oldenburg, publiſhed among his *Opera poſthuma* (*ss*), has excepted

(*pp*) See Dr. Shaw's Note upon pag. 267. vol. 1. of the *Philoſophical Works of Lord Bacon, methodiz'd and made Engliſh*, London 1733, in 4to.

(*qq*) See his Note upon pag. 169. vol. 1. ibid.
(*rr*) Printed at Amſterdam in 12mo, 1726.
(*ss*) Pag. 398, 399.

(141) Pag. 150. edit. 1689.

Advice to a Son (141) aſſures us, that *in all companies he appeared a good proficient, if not a maſter in thoſe Arts entertained for the ſubject of every one's diſcourſe. So as I dare maintain*, continues he, *without the leaſt affectation of flattery or hyperbole, that his caſual talk deſerveth to be written, as I have been told his firſt or fouleſt copies required no great labour to render them competent for the niceſt judgments.... So as I have heard him entertain a Country Lord in the proper terms relating to hawks and dogs, and at another time out-cant a London Surgeon.... Now this general knowledge he had in all things, huſhanded by his wit, and dignified with ſo majeſtical a carriage he was known to own, ſtruck ſuch an awful reverence in thoſe he queſtioned, that they durſt not conceal the moſt intrinſic part of their myſteries from him for fear of appearing ignorant or ſaucy*. Dr.

(142) Part 1. § 16. pag. 35, 36.

Sprat in his *Hiſtory of the Royal Society* (142) preſmiſes this conſideration before his character of our Author, that the third ſort of *new Philoſophers* have been thoſe, who have not only diſagreed from the ancients, but have alſo propoſed to themſelves the right courſe of ſlow and ſure experimenting, and proſecuted it as far as the ſhortneſs of their own lives, or the multiplicity of other affairs, or the narrowneſs of their fortunes have given them leave; but that ſuch as theſe we are to expect to be but few; ſince they muſt diveſt themſelves of many vain conceptions, and overcome a thouſand falſe images, which lie like monſters in their way, before they can get as far as this. The Doctor then tells us, that of theſe he "ſhall only mention "one great man, who had the true imagination of the "whole extent of this enterprize, as it is now ſet on "foot, and that is the Lord Bacon; in whoſe Books "there are every where ſcattered the beſt arguments, "that can be produced for the defence of Experimental Philoſophy, and the beſt directions, that are "needful to promote it. All which he has already "adorned with ſo much art, that if my deſires could "have prevailed with ſome excellent friends of mine, "who engaged me in this work, there ſhould have "been no other preface to the *Hiſtory of the Royal So*"ciety, but ſome of his writings." *But methinks in this one man I do at once find enough occaſion to admire the ſtrength of human wit, and to bewail the weakneſs of a mortal condition. For is it not wonderful that he, who had run through all the degrees of that profeſſion, which uſually takes up mens whole time, who had ſtudied and practiſed, and governed the common Law; who had always lived in the crowd, and born the greateſt burden of civil buſineſs, ſhould yet find leiſure enough for theſe retired ſtudies, to excel all thoſe men, who ſeparate themſelves for this very purpoſe? He was a man of ſtrong, clear, and powerful imaginations. His genius was ſearching and inimitable. And of this I need give no other proof than his ſtyle itſelf, which as for the moſt part it deſcribes mens minds, as well as pictures do their bodies, ſo it did his above all men living. The courſe of it is vigorous and majeſtical; the wit bold and familiar; the compariſons fetch'd out of the way, and yet the moſt eaſy; in all expreſſing a ſoul equally ſkilled in men and nature. All this and much more is true of him; but yet his philoſophical works do ſhew, that a ſingle and buſy hand can never graſp all this whole deſign, of which we treat. His rules were admirable; yet his Hiſtory not ſo faithful as might have been wiſhed in many places. He ſeems rather to take all that comes, than to chooſe, and to heap rather than to regiſter. But I hope this accuſation of mine can be no injury to his memory, ſeeing at the ſame time that I ſay he had not the ſtrength of a thouſand men, I do alſo allow him to have had as much as twenty*. Mr. Cowley in his *Poem to the Royal Society* pays a fine compliment to my Lord Bacon:

Bacon at laſt, a mighty man, aroſe,
Whom a wiſe King and Nature choſe
Lord Chancellor of both their Laws,
And boldly undertook the injur'd pupil's cauſe.

And again in the fifth Stanza:

Bacon, like Moſes, led us forth at laſt,
The barren wilderneſs he paſt,
Did on the very border ſtand
Of the bleſt promis'd land,
And from the mountain's top of his exalted wit
Saw it himſelf, and ſhewed us it.

The Author of the *Tatler* (143) ſtiles him "a man, "who for the greatneſs of genius and compaſs of "knowledge did honour to his Age and Country; I "could almoſt ſay, to human nature itſelf. He poſſeſſed at once all thoſe extraordinary talents, which "were divided amongſt the greateſt Authors of antiquity. He had the ſound, diſtinct, comprehenſive "knowledge of Ariſtotle, with all the beautiful lights, "graces, and embelliſhments of Cicero. One does "not know which to admire moſt in his writings, "the ſtrength of reaſon, force of ſtyle, or brightneſs "of imagination." The ſame Writer in the *Spectator* N. 554, tells us, that he was *one of the moſt extenſive and improved Genius's we have had any inſtance of in our Nation or in any other. This great man by an extraordinary force of nature, compaſs of thought, and indefatigable induſtry had amaſſed to himſelf ſuch ſtores of knowledge, as we cannot look upon without amazement. His capacity ſeems to have graſped all that was revealed in Books before his time; and not ſatisfied with that, he began to ſtrike out new Tracts of Science, too many to be travelled over by any one man in the compaſs of the longeſt life. Theſe therefore he could only mark down, like imperfect coaſtings in maps, or ſuppoſed points of land, to be farther diſcovered and aſcertain'd by the induſtry of after-ages, who ſhould proceed upon his notices or conjectures*. Dr. Shaw (144) tells us, that *it appears impoſſible, that the Lord Bacon's diſcoveries ſhould grow out of date, unleſs the frame of things was to alter; ſince he conſtantly endeavours to copy nature, which is always the ſame; ſo that his diſtinguiſhing merit lies in this, and in having every where opened the ſprings of knowledge and practice*. "As to the mo"dern diſcoveries and improvements, however great "and numerous they may be, yet they are, in general, "no more than a part of what this Author foreſaw in "his mind, and taught the ways of bringing to light, "adding withal ſuch farther directions, that if men "are not wanting to themſelves, they may obtain "ſtill greater things. For he has ſhewn us the *Art "of inventing Arts*; which many of the ancients "ſeemed to deſpair of; and which the moderns per"haps are not hitherto ſufficiently vers'd in. So that, till "no more diſcoveries remain to be made in nature, "it ſhould ſeem that this Author's philoſophical writ"ings cannot be ſuperſeded." The great reputation he enjoyed even during his life-time in foreign countries appears from a Letter written from Italy to the Earl of Devonſhire, then Lord Cavendiſh, and quoted by Dr. Rawley; wherein it is ſaid, that my Lord *Bacon is more and more known, and his books here more and more delighted in; and thoſe men, that have more than ordinary knowledge in human affairs, eſteem him one of the moſt capable ſpirits of this Age; and he is truly*

(143) Numb. 267.

(144) Pag. 9. of his *General Preface* to the *Philoſophical Works of Lord Bacon methodiz'd*, &c.

excepted againſt his method [*RR*]. Dr. Rawley obſerves, that he was eminent for the ſharpneſs of his wit, his memory, judgment, and elocution; ſo that Sir Walter Raleigh once ſaid before the Doctor, that the Earl of Saliſbury was an excellent ſpeaker, but no good pen-man; the Earl of Northampton, and the Lord Henry Howard, excellent pen-men, but no good ſpeakers; but that Sir Francis Bacon was eminent in both. Tho' he was a great reader of books, yet he had not his knowledge from them, but from ſome grounds and notions within himſelf; which notwithſtanding he did not publiſh but with the utmoſt caution and circumſpection. He preferred a clear and maſculine expreſſion in his Works, to an affectation of elegance, and would often aſk whether the ſenſe was repreſented plainly enough. He read much and with great judgment; and after a moderate relaxation of his mind from ſtudy, returned to it with freſh vigour, and would not ſuffer any moment to eſcape him without improvement (*tt*). His converſation was extremely delightful and inſtructive [*SS*]. When his Office called him, as he was of the King's Council, to charge any offenders, he did it with the greateſt lenity; and in civil affairs, as Counſellor of State, he never engaged his Maſter in any ſevere or precipitate courſes. Neither was he leſs in favour with the ſubject than with his Sovereign; for he was always acceptable to the Houſe of Commons, when he was a Member thereof; and being appointed the King's Attorney, he was allow'd to ſit there, which was not permitted to other Attornies. He was very generous to his ſervants; *which was the cauſe*, ſays Dr. Rawley, *that ſo many young Gentlemen of Blood and Quality ſought to liſt themſelves in his retinue. And if he were abuſed by any of them in their places, it was only the error of the goodneſs of his nature, but the badges of their indiſcretions and intemperances.* He was religious [*TT*]; free from malice, *which*, as he ſaid himſelf, *he never bred nor fed*; no revenger

(tt) *See* Dr. Rawley's *Life of him.*

truly ſuch. Several Perſons of Quality croſſed the ſeas on purpoſe to ſee and diſcourſe with him.... Among the reſt the Marquis Fiat (145), a French Nobleman, who was Embaſſador to England in the beginning of the reign of King Charles I, had a great inclination to ſee him; and when he came to his Lordſhip, who was then confined by his ſickneſs to his bed, the Marquis ſaluted him with this high compliment, that *his Lordſhip had been ever to him like the Angels, of whom he had often heard, and read much of them in Books, but he never ſaw them*; to which he replied, *Sir, the charity of others does liken me to an Angel, but my own infirmities tell me I am a man* (146). After which they contracted an intimate acquaintance, and the Marquis rever'd him ſo highly, that beſides his frequent viſits, they wrote Letters to each other under the titles of Father and Son (147). Mr. Voltaire relates this ſtory (148), and repreſents the Marquis's compliment in this manner: *You reſemble the Angels; we hear thoſe beings ſpoken of perpetually, and we believe them ſuperior to men, but are never allowed the conſolation to ſee them.* We ſhall add but one authority more from any foreign Writer in his favour, and that is from the great Baron Puffendorff, who tells us (149), that this wiſe Chancellor of England was the chief Writer in our age, who engaged us in a further and more accurate enquiry into philoſophical affairs, than had ever been purſued in the ſchools before. So that if Philoſophy has received any improvement in our times, it is greatly owing to his diſcoveries. *Sapientiſſimus quondam Angliæ Cancellarius, qui præcipuè noſtro ſæculo velut claſſicum cecinisſe & ſignum ſuſtuliſſe videtur, ut in rebus Philoſophicis aliquid ulterius & exquiſitius inveſtigaretur, quam quo hactenus ſcholarum parietes reſonuerant. Sic ut ſi quæ eſt pulchriùs noſtro tempore efflorescentis Philoſophiæ gratia, iſti viro non minimâ ex parte debeatur.*

(145) Mr. Voltaire in his 12th Letter concerning the Engliſh Nation calls him *d'Effiat.*

(146) *See* Dr. Rawley's *Life of Lord Bacon*, and Dr. Teniſon's *Account of all the Lord Bacon's Works*, pag. 101, 102.

(147) Dr. Rawley, *ubi ſupra*, and Lord Bacon's *Works*, vol. 4. Letter 159.

(148) *Ubi ſupra.*

(149) *Specim. Controverſ.* c. 1. Sect. 5. *apud* Pope Blount, *ubi ſupra*, p. 904.

[*RR*] *Spinoza ... has excepted againſt his method.*] Dr. Teniſon tells us (150), that he objects againſt it, becauſe, as he alledges, it fails in the very entrance of it through a miſtake about the original of error. My Lord Bacon's opinion is the ſame with that, which Des Cartes (151) inſiſts upon in his latter Philoſophy. Both of them ſhew, that man deceives himſelf, becauſe his *will*, being larger in its deſires than the *underſtanding* is in its comprehenſions, and haſtning its opinion of ſuch objects as it wants to know, before it has ſufficiently attended to them, and obtained a clear and diſtinct perception of them, cauſes it to yield a blind and raſh, and therefore groundleſs aſſent to inſufficient evidence. His Lordſhip expreſſes it thus in his *Novum Organum* (152). *The underſtanding is not only made up of dry light, but it receives an infuſion from the will and affections; and that begets ſuch ſciences as the heart deſires. For a man ſooneſt believes that which he would have to be true. He therefore rejects difficult truths through impatience in enquiring; and ſober truths, becauſe they reſtrain his hope* [*or deſire*]; *and the deeper natural truths by reaſon of ſuperſtition; and the light of experiments by reaſon of arrogance and pride, leſt the mind ſhould ſeem to be converſant in mean and tranſitory things; and paradoxes out of reſpect to the opinion of the vulgar. In ſhort, the will ſeaſons and infects the mind by innumerable ways, and by ſuch as are ſometimes not at all perceived.* Spinoſa endeavours to ſhew this opinion to be a groſs and fundamental miſtake by denying, that there is any ſuch thing in man as will; as if that general name was ever uſed to ſignify a particular act, and not rather to expreſs the general notion of that power. He tells us, that all volitions are particular acts, and as fatally determined by a chain of phyſical cauſes, as any effects whatſoever of natural bodies. " So that, *as Dr. Teniſon obſerves* (153), we are like to learn well from his Phi- (153) Pag. 154.
" loſophy how to amend our erroneous aſſent, whilſt
" it teaches us, that it is neceſſary, and not to be
" mended, unleſs men could have other bodies, and
" there were another ſcheme of nature."

(150) Introd. p. 13.

(151) Dr. Teniſon erroneouſly calls him *de Chart.*

(152) Lib. 1. Aphor. 49. pag. 279. of his Works, vol. 1.

[*SS*] *His converſation was extremely delightful and inſtructive.*] Dr. Rawley tells us, that his meals were refections of the ear as well as of the Stomach, like the *Noctes Atticæ* or Banquets of the *Deipnoſophiſts*; and he knew ſome perſons of no mean parts, who profeſſed that they made uſe of their Note-Books, when they roſe from his table. He was not the leaſt overbearing in diſcourſe, nor apt to engroſs the whole converſation to himſelf, or to endeavour to excell others; but took a pleaſure in engaging them upon thoſe ſubjects, which they were peculiarly ſkilful in, or loved to talk upon. He contemned no man's obſervations, but would light his torch at every man's candle. *His opinions and aſſertions*, continues the ſame Author, *were for the moſt part binding, and not contradicted by any, rather like oracles than diſcourſes; which may be imputed to the well-weighing of his ſentence by the ſcales of truth and reaſon, and alſo to the reverence and eſtimation, wherein he was commonly had, that no man would conteſt with him; ſo that there was no argumentation or* pro *and* con *(as they term it) at his table; or if there chanced to be any, it was carried with much ſubmiſſion and moderation. I have often obſerved, and ſo have other men of great account, that if he had occaſion to repeat another man's words after him, he had an uſe and faculty to dreſs them in better veſtments and apparel, than they had before; ſo that the Author ſhould find his own ſpeech much amended, and yet the ſubſtance of it ſtill retained, as if it had been natural to him to uſe good forms, as Ovid ſpoke of his faculty of verſifying,*

Et quod tentabam ſcribere, verſus erat?

[*TT*] *He was religious.*] Though the world has been

venger of injuries. He never endeavoured to remove others from their places, or accuſed any man to his Prince. However his Lordſhip has not been well treated by Mr. Rapin de Thoyras [*VV*]. In his Will he has this remarkable paſſage; *For my name and memory, I leave it to mens charitable ſpeeches, and to foreign nations, and the next ages* [*WW*]. Upon his death ſeveral Scholars of the Univerſity of Cambridge compiled a Monument of Latin Verſes to his memory, which were ſoon after printed.

been apt to ſuſpect great Wits and Politicians to have very faint ſentiments of religion, yet the contrary appears to have been the caſe of our Author from the whole current of his writings; otherwiſe he would have contradicted his own principles, which were, that *a little Philoſophy inclineth men's minds to Atheiſm; but depth in Philoſophy bringeth men's minds about to Religion; for while the mind of man looketh upon ſecond cauſes ſcattered, it may ſometimes reſt in them, and go no farther; but when it beholdeth the chain of them confederate and linked together, it muſt needs fly to Providence and Deity* (154). Dr. Rawley informs us, that he repaired frequently to the ſervice of the church to hear ſermons, and to receive the Sacrament, and died in the faith of the eſtabliſhed Church of England.

(154) *Eſſay* xvii.

[*VV*] *His Lordſhip has not been well treated by Mr. Rapin de Thoyras.*] That Author in his *Hiſtory of England* (155) having commended his great abilities, and declared that he was a very great genius, and one of the moſt learned men in Europe, has thought proper to aſſert, upon the authority of Sir Anthony Weldon's *Court of King James*, that his Lordſhip was *a ſervile flatterer of thoſe in favour, exceeding haughty, while fortune ſmiled; but ſubmiſſive and fawning, when ſhe frowned.* And in another place he remarks, that though Bacon, the Lord-Keeper, was *well verſed in the Laws of the land, and capable of giving good advice, yet he made it his whole ſtudy to adapt himſelf to the King's humour, and make his court to the Favourite.* Mr. Stephens in his *Account of the Life of the Lord Bacon* (156), vindicates him from theſe imputations, and obſerves, that with regard to flattery it may be anſwered, that ſome perſons repreſent the civil and decent expreſſions contained in addreſſes to Kings and great perſons as flattery; whereas the Lord Bacon writes in his *Eſſay of Praiſe*, that ſome praiſes come of good wiſhes and reſpects, which is a form due in civility to Kings and men of ſuperior rank, *Laudando præcipere*, when by telling them what they are, they repreſent to them what they ſhould be. And if his Lordſhip was guilty of exceſs in that point, it may be conſidered as one of the vices of the age, which infected other great men and writers of that time. But the counſels which he always gave the King and his Favourite, were the advices of a ſincere ſervant and friend, and not of a ſycophant; he aſſuring the Lord Buckingham in one of his Letters, that he ſhould ever give him, as he gave the King his Maſter, ſafe counſel, and ſuch as time would approve. As to the haughtineſs with which he is charged, we may refer the reader to the account of him written by Dr. Rawley, and publiſhed above thirty years after his deceaſe, and therefore not to be ſuſpected of flattery. Nor ought his ſubmiſſion upon his misfortunes to be too much objected to him, ſince that might proceed from the ſenſe of his faults and of his condition, wherein others were like to ſuffer with him. But that he ſupported himſelf under them as a Chriſtian and a Philoſopher, appears from the learned and noble works which he compoſed the laſt five years of his life.

(155) B. 18. *ad ann.* 1621. See likewiſe the ſame Author, ibid. *ad ann.* 1616.

(156) Pag. 34, 35.

[*WW*] *In his laſt will he has this remarkable paſſage:* For my name and memory, &c.] This paſſage is mentioned in the *Tatler* (157), though with ſome variation in the words. *I have*, ſays the Author, *often read with a great deal of pleaſure, a legacy of the famous Lord Bacon, one of the greateſt genius's that our own or any country has produced. After having bequeathed his ſoul, body, and eſtate in the uſual form, he adds*, My name and memory I leave to foreign nations, and to my countrymen, after ſome time be paſſed over. T.

(157) Vol. 3. Num. 133.

BACOUE (LEO), born at Caſteljaloux in lower Guienne, abandoned the Religion in which he was born, which was the Reformed, and entered himſelf into the Franciſcan Order. He was raiſed afterwards to the Prelacy, and became Biſhop of Glandeve. The Author, who informs me of this, obſerves, that Father Leo Bacoue is the only converted Huguenot, who was raiſed to a Biſhoprick in the reign of Lewis XIV (*a*). This Franciſcan Friar publiſhed a *Latin Poem upon the Education of a Prince*, about the time when the Dauphin was to have Preceptors appointed him. He had it reprinted at Paris in the year 1685. The Journal des Savans mentions it the year following (*b*).

(*a*) Rocoles, *Hiſtoire veritable du Calviniſme*, pag. 166.

(*b*) See the *Journal* of the 21ſt of January, pag. 23.

☞ BACONTHORP (*a*) or BACONDORP (JOHN) an eminent Engliſh Philoſopher and Divine in the XIVth Century, was born at Baconthorp, an inconſiderable village in the County of Norfolk. He was entered when he was young into a Monaſtery of the Carmelites at Blackney about five miles from Walſingham, where he was educated in Learning and Religion under the moſt learned men of that Order. Here he gave ſuch excellent marks of genius, that they thought proper to ſend him to the Univerſity of Oxford for his further improvement in the Sciences (*b*). From thence he removed to Paris, where he diſtinguiſhed himſelf to great advantage [*A*]; and upon his return to his own country was choſen the twelfth Provincial of his Order by the unanimous ſuffrages of the whole Aſſembly in the year 1329. Four years after this he was ſent for to Rome, in order to declare his opinion upon ſome important queſtions relating to Marriage [*B*]. He was diſtinguiſhed

(*a*) Trithemius and ſome other Writers call him *Bacon*.

(*b*) Joan. Pitſeus, *Relat. Hiſtor. de Reb. Anglic. ad ann.* 1346. pag. 451. edit. Paris 1619, 4to; and Joan. Balæus, *Scriptor. Major. Brytanniæ illuſtr.* Cent. 5. pag. 382. edit. Baſil, 1557.

[*A*] *Removed to Paris, where he diſtinguiſhed himſelf to great advantage.*] Pits (1) tells us, that he went thither, in order to compleat his ſtudies, which he had begun with ſuch great ſucceſs in his own country. He anſwered in all points the great hopes, which were conceived of him, and even far ſurpaſſed the moſt ſanguine expectations of all who knew the ſtrength of his natural genius. At Paris he took the Degrees of Doctor of Laws and Divinity, his prodigious parts, extenſive learning and ſolid judgment being univerſally admired. He was a ſtrenuous defender of all the opinions of Averroes, and was conſidered as the Head of the Sect of Averroiſts in that age. He was honoured likewiſe with the title of *Doctor Reſolutus*. Having finiſh'd his ſtudies in all parts of learning, he returned to his own country. *Sed inde miſſus Lutetiam perrexit, ut quæ in patriâ fæliciter inceperat, apud exteros fælicius perficeret & finiret. In omnibus nullius de ſe bonam opinionem conceptam fefellit, imò omnem planè omnium ſpem longe ſuperavit. Ibi utriuſque Juris & Theologiæ Doctor creatus eſt, admirantibus omnibus ſtupendum hominis ingenium, multiplicem doctrinam, & ſolidum judicium. Omnes Averrois ſententias mordicus tenuit, & illius ſcholæ ſuo tempore quaſi princeps haberi voluit. Cognomentum accepit* Doctoris Reſoluti. *Collecto igitur undique inſtar apis ſedulæ dulciſſimo ſcientiarum melle, in patriam reverſus eſt* (2).

(1) *Relat. Hiſt. de Rebus Anglic.* pag. 451. edit. Paris 1619.

(2) Idem, ibid. See likewiſe Balæus, *Script. Maj. Brytanniæ Illuſtr.* pag. 382.

[*B*] *He was ſent for to Rome, in order to declare his opinion upon ſome important queſtions relating to marriage.*] This is all that Pits tells us of this affair; but he informs

ſtinguiſhed by the title of *Doctor Reſolutus*, or *the Reſolute Doctor*, and particularly maintained the opinions of Averroes in Philoſophy (*c*). He wrote a great number of Books [*C*]. He was very low of ſtature, but this defect of his body was recompenſed by the greatneſs of Genius and the extent of his Learning. Paulus Panſa, an Italian Author quoted by Bale and Pits, gives him a noble character, and tells us, that no Writer has treated of the Nature and Attributes of the Deity to greater advantage than our Author, whoſe philoſophical Works are likewiſe equally admirable. That he has defended the Chriſtian Religion againſt the attacks of the Jews, Mahometans, and Infidels with uncommon ſucceſs, and confounded Hereticks in the ſtrongeſt manner. That he has detected the impoſtures of Antichriſt, and explained the obſcure paſſages of the Holy Scripture, and penetrated into the moſt abſtruſe myſteries of it, and repreſented them in an eaſy and familiar light. This character of him, according to Pits, is ſufficiently evident from his Writings, which that Wrirer tells us will prove as laſting as the World. Bale likewiſe ſpeaks of him in very favourable terms [*D*]. After a long courſe of ſtudy and indefatigable labour in the promotion of Religion and Learning, he died at London, and was interred there in the year 1346, in the reign of King Edward the third (*d*).

(*c*) See note [*A*].

(*d*) Balæus, pag. 385; *and* Pitſeus, pag. 454. Wharton, *Append. ad Hiſt. Litter.* G. Cave, pag. 18. edit. Colon. Allobrog. 1720. *and* Caſ. Oudin. *Commentar. de Script. Eccleſ.* tom. 3. col. 908. edit. Lipſiæ 1722.

forms us, that his fame grew every day more and more conſiderable in Italy, as it had done before in France. *Romam vocatus eſt, ſuper græviſſimis de matrimonio dubiis. Tum cœpit fama hominis apud Italos, uti prius apud Gallos, magis magiſque indies clareſcere.* But Bale is more particular upon this ſubject, and obſerves, that he was ſent for by Letters to Rome, where he was once hiſſed, as he was diſputing; which contempt was not ſhewn him on account of any want of acuteneſs or fluency in the diſpute, but becauſe for ſome time he aſcribed too much to the Pope's authority in diſpenſing with the Laws of God with regard to marriage. Bale tells us, that he did this very probably out of want of ſufficient reflection; but that being convinced of his error by the Word of God, he acknowledg'd his miſtake, and made a modeſt recantation, proving very ſolidly from Scripture and Reaſon, that the Pope had no right to give Diſpenſations in thoſe degrees of conſanguinity, which are prohibited by God. The ſame Hiſtorian informs us, that he got a great reputation by that action, an ample account of which is given in Jacobus Calcus of Pavia's Treatiſe concerning the Divorce of King Henry VIII. *Et quum eo magiſtratu quatuor annos functus fuiſſet, per literas accerſitus, magnis itineribus Romam venit, ubi inter diſputandum vel ſibilos ſemel paſſus eſt; non quod parum acutè & facundè diſſeruiſſet, ſed quod diverſam ſententiam aliquandiu tueretur, vel, ut apertius dicam, quia Pontificis Romani authoritati nimium in cancellandis divinis de matrimonio legibus, fortaſſis incogitantèr, attribuiſſet. Sed erroris à Dei verbo admonitus, vitium agnovit, deteſtabatur noxam, ac palinodiam modeſtiſſimè cecinit, ſolidiſſimis ſcripturis & rationibus probans, in gradibus conſanguinitatis divinâ lege prohibitis Papam diſpenſare non poſſe. Et magnam ab eo facto famam per literas ibidem ſibi peperit, ut fuſius narrat Jacobus Calcus Papienſis in opere ſuo de Henrici octavi Anglorum regis divortio* (3).

(3) Balæus, pag. 382.

[*C*] *He wrote a great number of Books.*] Trithemius in his Book *de Scriptoribus Eccleſiaſticis* (4), Anthony Poſſevinus in the firſt volume of his *Apparatus Sacer* under the word *Joannes de Bacone*, Bale (5), and Pits (6) give a long catalogue of his writings; the greateſt part of which were never printed. He wrote Commentaries upon all the Old and New Teſtament, and upon St. Auguſtin *de Civitate Dei*; ſeveral Treatiſes againſt the Jews; divers Tracts upon Ariſtotle; Sermons; Commentaries upon St. Anſelm of the Incarnation of the Word, and concerning the Queſtion why God was made Man; a Treatiſe againſt Pope John XXII, concerning the beatific Viſion, with a variety of other works. Thoſe of his writings which are publiſhed are I. *Commentaria ſeu Quæſtiones ſuper quatuor libros Sententiarum*; i. e. "Queſtions and Anſwers upon the four Books of Sentences;" printed at Milan 1510 and 1611, at Cremona 1618, twice at Paris, and once at Venice (7). II. *Compendium Legis Chriſti*; i. e. "An Abridgment of the Law of Chriſt" (8); Venice 1527 in fol. III. *Quodlibeta*, publiſh'd at Venice with the preceding work, and with the *Commentaries upon the Sentences*, at Cremona 1618 (9).

(4) *Ad ann.* 1340.

(5) Pag. 383, 384, 385.

(6) Pag. 452, 453 and 454.

(7) Wharton; *Appendix ad Hiſtor. Litter.* G. Cave, p. 18. edit. Colon. Allobrog. 1720, in fol.

(8) Du Pin, *Bibliotb.* tom. 11. pag. 77. edit. Paris 1702, gives this piece the title of *An Abridgment of the Life of Chriſt.*

(9) Wharton, *ubi ſupra.*

[*D*] *Bale likewiſe ſpeaks of him in favourable terms.*] He tells us, that he was maſter of various and abſtruſe learning; *Opus non eſt, ut variam & reconditam ejus eruditionem accuratâ hic oratione depingam* (10). He obſerves alſo, that if he had not lived in that dark age, and under the tyranny of Antichriſt, he would have done a great many excellent things, and appeared one of the moſt perfect genius's in the world. That he ſaw a great deal notwithſtanding the darkneſs of thoſe times, though he durſt not declare his ſentiments. The ſame Hiſtorian tells us, that he had found ſome ſentences in his writings more weighty, than any in the other Authors of that age; which ſentences he had collected as marks of his juſt ſenſe of religion, though he was fearful, that he had loſt them in Ireland. *Si non fuiſſet hic ſcriptor ejus ætatis caligine impeditus, ſub Antichriſti tyrannide, multa & magna præſtitiſſet, nec eo fuiſſet quicquam abſolutius. Multa certe in ipſis tenebris vidit, quæ pronunciare non audebat. Porro inveni ſententias aliquot graviores apud illum, quam apud omnes ejus temporis ſcriptores. Et eas ut fragmenta quædam pietatis ejus collegi; quæ tamen apud Hybernos periiſſe timeo* (11).

T.

(10) Pag. 382.

(11) Pag. 382.

BADIUS (JODOCUS or JOSSE) ſirnamed *Aſcenſius*, on account of his being born in the Borough (*a*) of Aſſche near Bruſſels, raiſed himſelf a conſiderable character by the number of books, which he printed and commented upon. He was born in the year 1462. He performed his firſt ſtudies at Ghent, and continued them in Italy; and he made a great progreſs in Greek at Ferrara under Baptiſta Guarini. He ſettled at Lyons, and taught there as well publickly as privately the Latin and Greek Tongues. After that he removed to Paris, and ſet up a Printing-houſe there, which advanced his reputation [*A*]. He

(*a*) Moreri was miſtaken in calling it an Houſe. The Authors, whom he quotes, uſe the word *Municipium.* Geſner gives Badius the ſirname of *Gandenſis.*

[*A*] *He ſet up at Paris a Printing-houſe, which advanced his reputation.*] Father du Moulinet tells us, that Jodocus Badius was the firſt who brought the round characters into France, and that before him all the Printers of that Kingdom uſed the Gothic characters. *He came from Italy to France about the year* 1500, *with a deſign both to teach the Greek Language at Paris, and to ſet up a very noble Printing-houſe, which he called* PRÆLUM ASCENSIANUM (1). Father du Moulinet forgot that Badius ſtaid a long time at Lyons, before he came to Paris. See the remark [*H*]. Beſides, Mr. Chevillier has proved againſt this Father, that *printing in France did not begin with the Gothic character* (*a*), *and that there were ſeveral impreſſions in Roman Letter before the time of Joſſe Badius* (2), *and that though he printed a great number of editions in a good Letter . . . . yet he printed likewiſe ſeveral in Gothic* (3).

(1) See the *Journal des Savans* of the 31ſt of January 1684, pag. 38.

(*a*) Gabriel Naudé, ch. vii. of his *Addition à l'Hiſtoire de Louis XI.* pag. 317 and 318 of the edition in 1630, aſſerts, that theſe workmen, *who were leſs deſirous of reputation than profit*, were the perſons who introduced the Gothic character; but I cannot tell what he means by this, ſince the number of editions which we have in the *ſquare* Letter, are as full of abbreviations as the Gothic which ſucceeded them. CRIT. REM.

(2) Chevill. *Origine de l'Imprimerie de Paris*, pag. 54.

(3) Ibid. p. 128.

He publiſhed a conſiderable number of Claſſic Authors, with his own Explications and Notes [B]. He took the ſame pains with ſeveral modern Authors, as Petrarch, Politian, Laurentius Valla, Baptiſta Mantuanus, &c. He publiſhed likewiſe ſeveral books of his own compoſition, both in verſe and proſe (b) [C]; and good judges have agreed, that if his domeſtic cares had not obliged him to direct his labours as much or more to gain, than to glory, he would have ſucceeded much better than he did [D]. Eraſmus happened to compare him to Budæus in ſome points; and it is incredible what a prodigious noiſe was raiſed at Paris againſt this compariſon [E]. Thoſe, who place Badius's death in the year 1526, are miſtaken [F]. He had the charge of a large family; and it is ſaid in his Epitaph, that probably he would have produced as many children as he did books, if he had applied himſelf to one of thoſe functions as early as to the other [G]; but that he had been a long while an Author, before he engaged in marriage. I would not affirm that this was exactly true [H]. CONRADE BADIUS, his ſon, was born at Paris, and ſettled at Geneva. He became a hearty Proteſtant, which he gave a proof of in his *Alcoran of the*

(b) *Ex* Valerii Andreæ *Bibliothecâ Belgic.* pag. 588, 589.

[B] *He printed a conſiderable number of Claſſic Authors with his own Explications and Notes.*] Valerius Andreas gives a catalogue of them, among which are Horace, Perſius, Terence, Juvencus, Theocritus, Salluſt, Valerius Maximus, Quintilian, Aulus Gellius, and ſeveral Tracts of Cicero. *Commentarii verò, ſive familiares Enarrationes circumferuntur in Horatium Flaccum, &c.* (4). The catalogue of Swertius is more full: Ovid and Seneca's Tragedies are mentioned in it (5).

(4) Valer. Andreas, *Bibl. Belg.* pag. 589.
(5) Swert. *in Athen. Belgicis.*

[C] *He publiſhed ſeveral books of his own compoſition both in verſe and proſe.*] Valerius Andreas mentions the following: *Pſalterium B. Mariæ; Epigrammatum Liber; Navicula Stultarum Mulierum; de Grammaticâ; de conſcribendis Epiſtolis; Vita Thomæ a Kempis.*

[D] *If his domeſtic cares had not prevented him . . . he would have ſucceeded much better than he did.*] Eraſmus ſpeaks very freely. *Nec infeliciter omnino ceſſit conatus Badio: adeſt illi Facilitas non indocta, felicius tamen ceſſurus; niſi curæ domeſticæ reique parandæ ſtudium interrupiſſent otium illud Muſis amicum hujus laudis candidato neceſſarium* (6). He confirms this judgment of his in one of his Letters (7). *Aliis liberum erit de Badio judicare quod volunt, ego ſemper illum habui in eorum numero, quorum nec eruditionem, nec ingenium, nec eloquentiam poſſis contemnere; tametſi non diſſimulo illum longe majorem fuiſſe futurum, ſi fortuna benignior otium ac tranquillitatem ſtudiorum ſuppeditâſſet.* Brixius after he has given a very indifferent character of Badius, accuſes him of having applied himſelf more to his intereſt, than to the ſtudy of eloquence. *Scio Badium non eſſe prorſus ἄμουσον. Verum qualis qualis eſt, talem ſe certe hominibus noſtris hactenus probavit, ut quoties de doctis ſermo inter doctos incidit de Badio planè ἰδιὸς λόγος. Illi, quod non inficiaris, quæſtus tantum non eloquentia ſcopus eſt* (8).

(6) Eraſm. *in Ciceronian.* pag. 73.
(7) The 28th of 22d book, pag. 1172, 1173.
(8) Brixius *in Epiſt. ad Eraſm. inter Epiſt. Eraſmi*, xxvii. lib. 22. pag. 1166.

[E] *Eraſmus compared him with Budeus; and it is incredible what a noiſe was raiſed at Paris againſt this compariſon.*] Brixius, who was a friend of Eraſmus, wrote to him upon this affair the Letter, which I quoted ſome expreſſions from above. He did not conceal from him that the learned men at Paris were angry to ſee that Badius was in ſome meaſure preferred to Budæus: *Quo major indignatio noſtrorum omnium animas ſubit, quod hac in opinione, juſta de cauſa quum ſint, exiſtiment illum abs te non tantum* BADIO *collatum, ſed & præpoſitum . . . Ea una commiſſura adeò noſtris omnibus invidioſa eſt, ut multorum tibi benevolorum animos à tui ſtudio abalienârit, ob id, quod exiſtimant* BUDÆUM *cum* BADIO *commiſſum perinde eſſe, ac ſi quis* ACHILLEM *cum* THERSITE *committeret* (9). Eraſmus juſtified himſelf, and ſhewed that he had very clearly aſſerted the ſuperiority of Budæus. He was ſurprized, that they had not perceived this in France, or if they had perceived it, that they ſhould exclaim ſo much againſt him, and write ſo many ſatyrical verſes upon him. *Demiror iſthic eſſe doctos, qui hæc non videant, & ſi vident, magis etiam demiror eſſe, qui vociferentur, qui maledicis verſiculis rem dignam exiſtiment* (10). This affair was ſo much talk'd of that it came to the ears of Francis I. *Si verus eſt rumor, ſic fremunt amici* Budæi, *quaſi in cineres patris ac matris illius imminxerim. Clamant, O Cœlum! O Terra!* Budæum *cum* Badio! *Clamant me invidere gloriæ Budæi, meque multis Epigrammatis dilacerant. . . Cauſa delata eſt ad Regis cognitionem. Volenti cognoſcere diſſidii cauſam, dictum eſt* Budæum *me taxâſſe in loco quodam, eo me offenſum quæſiſſe vindictam, eumque cum* Badio *contuliſſe* (11). If Eraſmus had a deſign to have done honour to Badius by this compariſon, he was much deceived; for with what cruelty did they ſtab that poor man to the heart, every time that they complained of the injuſtice, which was done to Budæus? It would have been much better for Badius, that Eraſmus had never thought of him. The place was corrected in the ſecond edition.

(9) Ibid. pag. 1168.
(10) Eraſm. *Epiſt.* 28. lib. 22. pag. 1172.
(11) Eraſm. *Epiſt.* lxxii. lib. 20. pag. 1030.

[F] *Thoſe who place his death in the year* 1526, *are miſtaken.*] Swertius contented himſelf with ſaying, that he found, that Badius lived to the year 1526 (12). This ſhews that he did not know whether he lived beyond that year; but he did pretend to aſſert, that he lived no longer. Konig, inſtead of uſing this reſerve, affirms that Badius died in the year 1526. Others have ſaid the ſame after him. But let us conſider a little Brixius's Letter, which I quoted above. It was written in 1528, and Badius appears in it to be ſtill living. Valerius Andreas ſays nothing of his death. Moreri places it about the year 1529 or 1530. He is miſtaken; for it is certain that Eraſmus, in a Letter dated in September 1530 (13), rejoices that the news, which had been diſperſed of Badius's death, was not true; and we have an edition of Longolius's Epiſtles, printed by Badius in 1533. Geſner in his *Bibliotheca* printed in 1545 obſerves, that it was about ten years ſince Badius died. He was living, when Alphonſo de Caſtro's Book againſt Hereſies was printed at Paris; for he was one of thoſe, who printed it in 1534 (14). The firſt page of Peter Lombard *in Epiſtolas Pauli* contains theſe words, *Pro Hæredibus Jodoci Badii*, 1535, *menſe Decembri* (15). So that he was not living in December 1535.

(12) In *Athen. Belgic.* pag. 490.
(13) It is the 23d of the 25th book, pag. 1373.
(14) *See* La Caille *Hiſtoire de l'Imprimerie*, pag. 74.
(15) Chevill. *de l'Origene de l'Imprim. de Paris*, pag. 138.

[G] *He would have produced as many children as books, if he had applied himſelf to one of theſe functions as early as to the other.*] This thought was the ſubject of an Epitaph, which was written for him; and is as follows:

Hic liberorum plurimorum qui parens,
Parens librorum plurimorum qui fuit,
Situs JODOCUS BADIUS *eſt* ASCENSIUS.
Plures fuerunt liberis tamen libri,
Quod jam ſeneſcens cœpit illos gignere,
Ætate florens cœpit hos quod edere (16).

This Epitaph is not the ſame with that upon the tomb of Jodocus Badius in the Charnel-houſe of the Collegiate-Church of St. Bennet at Paris (17). He was buried there (18). If the verſes, which are quoted above, are a faithful account of him, he followed the maxim of the greateſt part of Scholars, by marrying late. See the Book entitled *Valeſiana* (19).

(16) Swert. *Ath. Belgic.* pag. 490. mentions this Epitaph as written by a friend of Badius. He ſhould have ſaid by his grandſon. See the following remark.
(17) You may read it in La Caille, *Hiſtoire de l'Imprimerie*, pag. 75.
(18) Rocoles, *Hiſtoire veritable du Calviniſme*, pag. 218.
(19) Pag. 5. Amſterdam edition.

[H] *He had been a long time an Author, before he engaged in marriage. . . . I would not affirm that this was exactly true.*] The Sieur de la Caille ſuggeſts this doubt to me; he informs me that Badius, upon his return from Italy, taught ſeveral Gentlemen at Lyons, *and compoſed and printed a great many Books, at the houſe of John Trechſel, Printer at Lyons, whoſe daughter Thelif Trechſel he married . . .* (20). *It was to him*, continues that Author, *that the learned Robert Gaguin, the twentieth General of the Order of the Trinitarians, who knew his merit and capacity for correcting the preſs, wrote to print his works, as we ſee from the Letter, which that General addreſſed to him, and which*

(20) *Hiſtoire de l'Imprimerie*, pag. 72, 73.

the Franciſcan Monks. He tranſlated the firſt book, and compiled the ſecond, and illuſtrated both of them with marginal notes, which are extremely ſatyrical. He was a Printer and Author, and ſometimes amuſed himſelf with writing *French Verſes.* He wrote ſome againſt Noſtradamus (*c*). Three of his ſiſters were married to famous Printers [*I*]. I was for ſome time ignorant of what a modern Author meant, who ſeems to accuſe Henry Stephens for having cenſured Joſſe Badius [*K*]. I have nothing to ſay concerning one CONRADUS BADIUS, who died of the Plague with all his family at Orleans, where he was Miniſter in the year 1562 (*d*), and who had been a friend of Theodore Beza's from his youth (*e*).

(*c*) Du Verd'er Vau-Privas, *Biblioth. Françoiſe*, pag. 237.

(*d*) Beze, *Hiſtoire des Egliſes*, liv. 6. pag. 149.

(*e*) Ant. Fayus, *in Vita Th. Bezæ*, pag. 45.

Mr. Chevillier, who has collected ſeveral elogiums upon Joſſe Badius, aſſures us, that he *had been Profeſſor of polite Learning in the Univerſity of Paris, and afterwards in the city of Lyons*, where he read public Lectures upon the Poets (*f*).

(*f*) Chevill. *Orig. de l'Imprimerie*, pag. 137.

There is probably an error in the title of one of the books, which Valerius Andreas aſcribes to him [*L*].

which is printed before his Epiſtles in quarto *in the year* 1498. *This obliged Badius to go to Paris about the year* 1499 or 1500, *after the death of his father-in-law, as well to teach the Greek language, as to reſtore the Art of Printing, which began to decline there.* It follows from this paſſage, that Badius was married in 1500. Now he was then but thirty years old; and therefore he cannot be ſaid to have delayed his marriage to old age, *jam ſeneſcens cæpit illos gignere*; and yet we are aſſured of this by Henry Stephens, his grandſon; for he was the Author of that Latin Epitaph, and of a Greek one, which turns upon the ſame thought. *Jodoco Badio elegantiſſimis hiſce Epitaphiis parentavit ex filia nepos Henricus Stephanus, quæ propter elegantiam non potui non adſcribere* (21). Theſe Epitaphs are printed in a book of Henry Stephens *de Artis Typographicæ Querimoniâ*. Mr. Almeloveen has given them both, with another Latin one of the ſame Author, in his curious Diſſertation *de Vitis Stephanorum.*

(21) Almeloveen *de Vitis Stephanorum*, p. 28.

[*I*] *Three daughters of J. Badius were married to famous Printers.*] Catherine Badius, daughter of Jodocus, was married to Michel Vaſcoſan (22). Perrette Badius, another of his daughters was wife to Robert Stephens (23). Jane Badius, her ſiſter, married John de Roigny (24), *who took his father-in-law's mark, and ſet the* Prelum Aſcenſianum *on his editions for above twenty five years* (25). Perrette underſtood the Latin tongue, either from her father's inſtructions, as Mr. Almeloveen thinks (26), and from hearing the language talk'd at her huſband's houſe. Theſe two opinions have each of them probable grounds to ſupport them; thoſe, who incline to the latter, may argue from this, that a ſiſter of Henry Stephens, and daughter to Perrette Badius, learned Latin without the aſſiſtance of Grammar, and only from uſe. For Robert Stephens's houſe was full of people, who always talk'd Latin, ſo that even the maids learn'd to ſpeak it. See the Epiſtle Dedicatory before Aulus Gellius by Henry Stephens; where you will find this mentioned; the Author addreſſes himſelf to his ſon. *Aviæ tuæ eorum, quæ Latinè dicebantur, (niſi rarius aliquod vocabulum intermiſceretur,) haud difficilior erat intellectu, quam ſi dicta ſermone Gallico fuiſſent. Quid de ſuperſtite ſorore meâ, amitâ autem tuâ, nomine Katherinâ dicam? Illa quoque eorum, quæ Latinè dicuntur, interpretem non deſiderat; multa verò & ipſa eodem loqui ſermone poteſt; & quidem ita (licet nonnunquam impingat) ut ab omnibus intelligatur. Unde illi hæc Latinæ linguæ cognitio? Artem certe Grammaticam haud magiſtram habuit, nec alius illi hac in re quam uſus præivit.* He explains what he meant by this uſe; which was that the Printers and Correctors of Robert Stephens ſpoke nothing but Latin.

(22) La Caille, *Hiſt. de l'Imprimerie*, pag. 102.
(23) Ibid. p. 96.
(24) Ibid. pag. 96.
(25) Chevillier, *de l'Origine de l'Imprimerie de Paris*, pag. 138.
(26) Almeloveen, *de Vitis Stephanor.* p. 28.

[*K*] *I was for ſome time ignorant of what a modern Author meant who ſeems to accuſe Henry Stephens for having cenſured Joſſe Badius.*] I was at a loſs in this point, by not being able to underſtand a French period of the Sieur de la Caille; but at laſt I think I have gained the ſenſe of it. This period contains theſe words: "Here is an Epitaph related by Henry Ste-" phens in his Book *de Artis Typographicæ Querimonia*, " printed by the ſame Stephens in 1569, wherein " there are ſeveral complaints addreſſed to this Ba-" dius both in Greek and Latin (27)." I thought at firſt that he meant that Henry Stephens reproached Badius in a ſevere manner both in the Greek and Latin tongues, with having injured the buſineſs of Printing; but reflecting that he was grandſon to him, and not finding any thing againſt Badius in the *Querimonia Artis Typographicæ*, which Mr. Almeloveen publiſhed, I continued very much in ſuſpence. Mr. Almeloveen having aſſured me, that he had retrenched nothing in the *Querimonia*, I was induced to read that period again, and then I apprehended that the words *both in Greek and Latin* ought not to be referred to *Complaints* but to *Epitaph*. At leaſt I had an opportunity of conſulting Henry Stephens's work itſelf (28); wherein I found, 1, a Preface in proſe againſt the ignorance of Printers; 2, a Poem, in which he introduces the Art of Printing complaining of its decay; 3, the Epitaph both in Greek and Latin, or in Latin only, of ſeveral learned Printers. I found there no complaints either againſt Badius, or addreſſed to Badius. This paſſage of the Sieur la Caille is a mere riddle to me, if it is not a miſtake. Is it any wonder, that the dead languages, with their various tranſpoſitions, which are permitted them, have ſo many obſcurities with regard to us; when our own language throws us into prodigious obſcurity, when we recede from the natural order of the words?

(27) La Caille, *Hiſt. de l'Imprimerie*, pag. 74.

(28) Mr. Almeloveen, who lends his books in ſo obliging a manner, was ſo kind as to ſend me the *Artis Typographicæ Querimonia.*

[*L*] *There is probably an error in the title of one of the Books, which Valerius Andreas aſcribes to him.*] He aſcribes to him a Book intitled, *Navicula ſtultarum Mulierum* (29), and does not mention either the place or time of its impreſſion. He only copies in this particular the Catalogue of Swertius. I have been informed (30), that Badius publiſhed in 1513 a Book intitled, *Navis ſtultiferæ collectanea ab Jodoco Badio Aſcenſio vario carminum genere, non ſine eorundem familiari explanatione conflata.* It is probable, that the Book mentioned by Valerius Andreas is not different from this; or at moſt, that it differs no more than a part from the whole. I believe likewiſe that the work publiſhed by Badius in 1513 was taken from that, which was intitled, *Navis Narragoniæ*, the Author of which was Sebaſtian Brandt (31), a native of Straſbourg, Profeſſor of Law, and a good Poet for that Age, which was about the end of the fifteenth Century. See Geſner's *Bibliotheca* (32) concerning *Navis Narragoniæ*, or *Navis Stultorum.*

(29) See Remark [*C*].

(30) By Monſieur de la Coſte, a Miniſter of Holland.

(31) Or *Titio.*

(32) Geſneri *Bibliothec.* folio 593.

BADUEL (CLAUDE) in Latin *Baduellus*, lived in the XVIth Century. He was of the Reformed Religion, as appears by his Latin tranſlation of ſeveral ſermons of John Calvin, which he publiſhed at Geneva, as alſo from the *Acts of the Martyrs*, which he printed in Latin in the ſame city, in 1566 (*a*). I doubt not but that he taught polite Learning in the College of Nîmes; for we find among his printed Works *Oratio ad inſtituendum Gymnaſium Nemauſenſe de Studiis Literarum*, and another piece intitled, *De Collegio & Univerſitate Nemauſenſi.* He wrote well in Latin, and he was a good Orator, a good Father, and a good Chriſtian. Theſe two laſt characters appear very eminently in his *Epiſtola Paræneticæ ad Paulum filium de vero Patrimonio & Hæreditate quam Chriſtiani Parentes ſuis Liberis debent relinquere.* I ſhall refer the reader, for the titles of his other books, to

(*a*) Friſii *Epitome, Bibliothecæ Geſneri*, p. 150.

to the Epitome of the Bibliotheca of Geſner; but I ſhall mention ſomething relating to the Treatiſe, which he publiſhed of the Marriage of Men of Letters [*A*]; and ſhall obſerve that the abbreviators of Geſner have omitted ſome things, which they ſhould have mention'd; for they have forgot to tell us, that Baduel compoſed in Latin *A Funeral Oration for the Lady de St. Veran* (*b*). The Catalogue of the Oxford Library aſcribes to him *Notes upon the Apocryphal Books*, printed at London in 1660.

(*b*) She was daughter to the firſt Preſident of the Parliament of Toulouſe. This *Funeral Oration*, tranſlated into French by Charles Rozel, was printed at Lyons in 1546. See the *Biblioth.* of Du Verdier.

[*A*] *I ſhall ſay ſomething of the Treatiſe, which he publiſhed of the Marriage of Men of Letters.*] The title is as follows: *De Ratione Vitæ ſtudioſæ ac literatæ in matrimonio collocandæ ac degendæ.* It was printed at Lyons by Sebaſtian Gryphius in the year 1544 in 4to, and printed at Leipſic in 1577 and 1581 (1). This laſt edition contains 143 pages in 8vo. A Profeſſor of Leipſic, whoſe name was Gregory Breſman, wrote a Preface to it, in which he very much commends the Author and the Book itſelf. It is certainly a piece full of good ſenſe and morality. Baduel dedicated it to Mr. de Maſencal (2), firſt Preſident of the Parliament of Toulouſe. He extolls there the excellence of a married ſtate, and ſhews the diſorders, which generally attend that of a bachelor; and he refutes thoſe, who aſſert that marriage is not proper for Men of Letters, ſince it diverts them from their ſtudies, and prevents them from applying themſelves entirely to their books. He tells us (3), that he had choſen that ſtate himſelf, and he gives ſome directions for the choice of a wife to thoſe who are willing to join, as he earneſtly perſuades them to do, the pleaſures of a happy marriage with the profeſſion of letters. He ſays, that William Bigot, a man well ſkilled in the knowledge of Phyſic and Natural Philoſophy, had promiſed a Treatiſe, which was to ſhew that marriage was neceſſary; that is, according to Baduel's notion of it, that a man without marrying could not enjoy a good ſtate of health. *Guillelmus Bigotius*, ſays he (4), *qui in medicis ac phyſicis diligenter verſatur, ſummam harum rerum habet ſcientiam, aliquando promiſit ſe de conjunctione matrimonii uſuque ejus neceſſario ſcripturum. Neceſſarium (opinor) intelligit, ſine quo homo non poteſt valere. Itaque eam partem naturæ, conjugium ad bonam corporis conſtitutionem appetentis, nos ei explicandam relinquamus: in quo valdè prudenter faciet, ſi eam commoditatem ex legitimâ uteri conjunctione, ejuſque moderatâ conſuetudine, petendam eſſe doceat; & ea incommoda oſtendat, quæ ex liberis illis ac diſſolutis ſcortationibus humanis corporibus multa & magna afferuntur.*

(1) This occaſioned Mr. Konig to believe erroneouſly, that Baduel had written it in 1581. See his *Bibliotheca vetus & nova.*

(2) *Ad Joannem Maſſecalum.*

(3) *De Ratione Vitæ ſtudioſæ in Matrimonio collocandæ*, p. 3.

(4) Ibid. pag. 47, 48.

To give a proper notion of this work, I ſhall borrow ſomething from the Profeſſor of Leipſic, who procured a ſecond edition of it. He obſerves, that there is nothing of greater importance in the conduct of life, than to conſult the rules of prudence; but that very few perſons take this care, even when the queſtion is concerning Marriage, a circumſtance, which above all things is the moſt difficult to determine upon in a prudent manner (5). They engage in it from the impetuoſity of youth; they only conſult the dictates of paſſion or intereſt, &c. and yet it is an affair, in which miſtakes are irreparable. *Plerique vigentis adoleſcentiæ annis*, continues he (6), *cum ineſt maxima conſilii imbecillitas atque imperitia, cæco quodam amoris impetu commoti ac fervore juvenili inflammati, ante implicantur conjugio, quam quod illud vitæ genus ſit judicare potuerunt. Multi formæ venuſtate allecti, plures dotis magnitudine ineſcati, neque pauci ſplendore generis faſcinati, his autoribus & conſuaſoribus agunt omnia. . . . Quos, meo quidem judicio, ſatius erat, cum animis ſuis conſiderantes, illud Publii Syri*, Deliberandum eſt diu, quod ſtatuendum eſt ſemel; & *hoc item alterum*, Deliberare utilia, mora eſt tutiſſima. *Diu ſecum multumque deliberare, atque ad naturæ ſuæ rationemque vitæ inſtitutum conſilium conferre omne, præſertim cum in diligendo matrimonio, ſi quid erroris acciderit (accidit autem ſæpiſſimè), non quod aliis in rebus facere in promptu eſt, cum quis forte ſe erraſſe intelligit, rationem & conſiliorum mutationem inſtituere cuiquam ſit integrum; ſed aut ſtultitiæ pœnam luere, aut negligentiæ culpam præſtare oporteat ſempiternam.* As it is therefore ſo neceſſary, and at the ſame time ſo rare a thing to engage with prudence in that ſtate, it was thought to be a ſingular ſervice to the Public to reprint Baduel's Book, ſince it contains the beſt Inſtructions in the world, and particularly that Advice of having recourſe by earneſt prayers to the Holy Spirit for its aſſiſtance. The Author of the Preface affirms, that we ought to begin with that, when we are deliberating upon an affair of ſo much delicacy and danger. *Qui hanc vitæ conjugalis viam ingreſſuri ſunt, operam ante omnia dabunt, ut Deum ſibi conſiliarium, atque in rei tam arduæ conſultatione atque effectione moderatorem, piâ ac religioſâ nominis divini imploratione aſciſcant . . . . de qua unius & trini Dei, in coeundo conjugio ardenti invocatione diligenter faciendâ, præter complura alia prudentiæ & circumſpectionis & cautionis in hoc vitæ genere conſtituendo, præcepta ſedulò tenenda, piè, ſapienter, & eruditè admodum, in hoc, quem tibi, Lector benevole, de alieno largientes offerimus, libello diſſeritur.*

(5) *In deliberatione de contrahendo matrimonio, quæ eſt una omnium difficillima.* Gregor. Breſmanus, *Præfatione ad Lectorem.*

(6) Idem, ibid.

This work of Baduel was tranſlated into French by Guy de la Garde (7); but if he ſucceeded no better in the tranſlation of the Book, than in that of the title, it muſt neceſſarily be a mean performance. He intitled his tranſlation, printed at Paris in 1548 in 8vo, *A very uſeful Treatiſe of the Dignity of Marriage, and of the honeſt Converſation of Men of Learning and Letters.*

(7) A private Lieutenant in the Seneſchal's Juriſdiction in Provence at the ſiege of Arles. See the *Bibliotheque de la Croix du Maine*, pag. 134, and that of Du Verdier, pag. 532.

BAGNI (JOHN FRANCIS) lived in the 17th Century. He was made a Cardinal by Pope Urban VIII in the year 1629 at the recommendation of the Court of France (*a*). Moreri ſpeaks of him very fully; but not without ſeveral miſtakes, which it will be proper to remark [*A*]. This Cardinal had paſſed through more employments than Moreri mentioned, as

(*a*) Under the Miniſtry of Cardinal Richelieu, in the beginning of the year 1630.

[*A*] *Moreri ſpeaks of him. . . . . but has committed ſeveral miſtakes, which it will be proper to remark.*] He ſays, I. That Cardinal Bagni was of *the family of the Counts of Guidi*. This is to intimate that the name of his family was Guidi; but we muſt not ſeparate the name of Guidi from that of *Bagni* or *a Balneo*. Naudé never ſeparates them. II. That he was born the 4th of October 1573. This does not agree with an Author, whoſe exactneſs is a thouſand times more certain ſecurity than Moreri (1). This Author places the death of Cardinal Bagni on the 24th of July 1641, and tells us, that he was then ſeventy ſix years of age. So that his birth muſt be placed in 1565. III. That Clement VIII ſent Bagni into France to congratulate Henry the Great upon his marriage with Mary de Medicis. This is not true, Moreri did not underſtand Thomaſini, whom he quoted. He might have read in that Author, that Cardinal Aldobrandini, who was ſent Legate of Clement VIII into France, in order to congratulate Henry IV upon his marriage, and to manage the peace with Savoy, had John Francis Bagni in his retinue. This is all that his pretended deputation conſiſted in. IV. Moreri multiplies more than he ought the Nunciatures of Bagni; he will have it that he was ſent twice Nuncio into France, once under Gregory XV, and another time under Urban VIII; and that beſides this, Gregory XV ſent him Nuncio into Flanders. Thomaſini does not ſay ſo much, and only tells us, that Bagni was ſent to Paris by Gregory XV as Nuncio Extraordinary, and that he went from Paris to Flanders, in the quality of Nuncio in Ordinary. Gaſſendi ſays even leſs than Thomaſini; he tells us, that Bagni, going to receive the character of Nuncio at Bruſſels, paſſed through Paris, and ſaw there *incognito* all that was to be ſeen. *Tranſiit ſub id tempus*, (that is in July 1621,) *Pariſiis memoratus ſupra Vicelegatus a Balneo, Pontificis Nuncius* DESTINATUS *in Flandriam, qui cum vellet ſingularia quæque in urbe ſpectare, ſed tamen quaſi* INCOGNITUS, *commodum profectò convaluit Peireſkius, qui*

(1) Baillet, *Vie de Des Cartes*, tom. 1. p. 119.

as will appear from our remarks. There is a thing said of him in the *Sorberiana*, which is false in many respects [*B*]. He had a brother, who was called the Marquis of BAGNI [*C*], and was General of the troops of the Pope in the Valteline in the year 1624.

(2) Gassend. *in vita Peireskii*, lib. 3. *ad ann.* 1621, pag. 289.

qui ipsum variè deducerat ad eruditos, ad Musæa, ad opera omnia rariora (2). I know indeed that he was Nuncio in France, but it was at another time. The same Gassendi, giving an account of the acquaintance which Mr. de Peiresc contracted with illustrious men in the year 1614, writes thus of our John Francis Bagni. *Unus fuit Joannes Franciscus Vidius a Balneo, Patracensis Archiepiscopus, & per ea tempora Avenionensis Vicelegatus. Singularis enim deinceps necessitudo intercessit, seu donec ille Avenione degit, seu cum est versatus perillustris Nuncius tam apud Principes Belgarum, quam apud Regem Christianissimum, seu postquam factus est Cardinalis raræ ac spectatæ Virtutis* (3). It is very certain that Bagni was twice Nuncio; for Naudé, who was a long time his Domestic and Library-Keeper, writes thus to him in the dedication of his *Coups de Etat:* "My Lord, as you are now at Rome, enjoying the honours, which are the reward of your merits, and the retirement which you have gained by having discharged the most public offices, in seven Governments, one Vice-Legateship, and two NUNCIATURES, I thought, &c." He was sent Nuncio to Brussels by Gregory XV, and into France by Urban VIII. Thomasini and Moreri are both mistaken; they could not give a clear account of a matter, which was the easiest imaginable to relate. It was while he was Nuncio in France, that he was made Cardinal. Gassendi tells us, that in the spring of the year 1631, he passed through Provence in his return to Rome, and that he went to see his old friend Mr. de Pieresc. *Vere novo Cardinalis a Balneo, utrâque sua Legatione functus, & accepto Parisiis purpurato Pileo, Romam rediit* (4). He carried with him the learned Gabriel Naudé. He continued at Paris to discharge the functions of a Nuncio for above a year after he was raised to the Cardinalship, and interposed particularly in order to pacify the differences between the Queen-Mother and Cardinal Richelieu (5).

(3) Ibid. p. 281.

(4) Ibid. pag. 307.

(5) See *Histoire du Cardinal de Richelieu, par Aubery*, tom. 1. pag. 264 and 279. Dutch edit. in 12mo.

A manuscript memorial of Monsieur Baudrand informs us, I. That he was not made Cardinal at the recommendation of France, *though we are assured so in the History of the Ministry of Cardinal de Richelieu; but merely by the Pope, as he was Nuncio of the Holy See; which dignity is very often conferred on the Nuncio's to France, Spain, and the Court of the Emperor:* II. That there is an error in these words of Gassendi, which I quoted (6); *Accepto Parisiis purpurato Pileo Romam rediit;* "The Pope does not send the red Hat to those, whom "he makes Cardinals; but they are obliged to go to "Rome for it; for the Pope sends only the *Calot* at "first by the Courier, and afterwards the red Cap "by one of his Chamberlains. Thus the Cardinals "Richelieu and Mazarin never had the red Hat, be"cause they were never at Rome after their promo"tion. There has been for a hundred and twenty "years past only the Cardinal Infant, whom the "Pope sent the red Hat to in Spain; and this "was a particular favour, as he was brother to the "King of Spain." All this is very curious; but notwithstanding this Monsieur Baudrand should not have found fault with these words of Gassendi; for they do not mean that the Cardinal received the red Hat, but only that he received the red Cap at Paris. Gassendi uses the word *pileo*, and not *galero*. It is said, that Paul V receded from the custom introduced by Sixtus V, in favour of the Duke of Lerma, to whom he sent the Cardinal's Hat and Ring to Madrid in 1618, when that Duke was seventy years old (7). See the 11th chapter of the 15th book of *The History of the Council of Trent* by Pallavicini.

(6) Above, quotation (4).

(7) *Mercure Galant* of April 1706, pag. 109.

[*B*] *There is a thing said of him in the* Sorberiana, *which is false in many respects.*] It is pretended, that upon seeing the Councils printed at the Louvre in thirty seven volumes, he cried out, *I am surprized that there are any Heretics in France still. Where is there a Christian, who can resolve henceforth not to be a Catholic?* Sorbiere admires this thought: *Optimè Cardinalis Banius in Galliâ Nuncius,* says he, *dum 37 vol. Concil. cerneret typis regiis impressa, aiebat,* "*Miror* "*unde jam in Galliâ hæretici fiant; quis enim hypo*"*thesium Christianarum servans potest non esse Catholi*"*cus* (8)?" It is not true, that this Cardinal saw these thirty seven volumes. He died in the year 1641, and that edition of the Councils was in 1644. But if he had said what is imputed to him, he would have made a very false reflection; for there is nothing so improper for the conversion of Heretics, as a work of several volumes, as thirty seven volumes of Councils. Of ten thousand Protestants, scarce two can be found who can read a single page in this Louvre edition; and amongst those who understand Latin, the greatest part have neither the taste nor patience necessary to undertake so immense a reading. This inconvenience would not be removed by a translation of them into the vulgar tongue; for where are the ignorant persons, who would not lose themselves upon such a wide Sea as this? Without the grace of God, and the force of education, the reading of the Councils would make an hundred times more Unbelievers than Christians. There is no History which furnishes more subjects of scandal, nor a more shocking scene of passions, intrigues, factions, Cabals, and Artifices, than that of Councils (9). Those, who published the *Menagiana*, omitted a good jest, that I heard several times in the *Mercuriales* of Menage. A man of wit was mentioned there, who, when he was told, *Such an one was condemned in such a Council*, said, *It is a sign that he did not understand how to cabal so well as his adversaries, or that he had not the support of the secular arm as they had.* Must not those who know Mr. Sorbiere's religion, be much edified by his *Optimè?*

WHETHER the Councils in 37 volumes are capable of converting Heretics?

(8) *Sorberiana*, pag. 52. Dutch edition.

(9) See remark [*B*] of the article NESTORIUS.

[*C*] *He had a brother who was called the Marquis of Bagni.*] Mr. Baillet assures us, that this Marquis was brother to the Cardinal John Francis Bagni; and that having quitted the army, he raised himself in Ecclesiastical Dignities till he was made Cardinal in the year 1657 (10). He had been *Nuncio in France during the Pontificate of Innocent X, and the two first years of Alexander VII. . . . . He died at Rome the 23d of August* 1663, *aged eighty years* (11). Mr. Baillet thinks it probable that Monsr. Des Cartes went to see him in the Valteline; he grounds this conjecture upon that Marquis's inclination to the studies of Natural Philosophy (12). That which is very certain is, Des Cartes was well known and esteemed by Cardinal John Francis Bagni (13). The French Mercury informs us, *that the Marquis de Bagni, to whom the Holy See had given the command of the soldiers in the Valteline, was known to be a partisan of Spain, being descended from the House of Colonna, which is entirely Spanish, Chief of the Gibelins in Romagna, and which has always been a Pensionary of Spain, having as such attended the Constable of Colonna in his voyage to Spain four years ago* (14).

(10) Baillet, *Vie de Des Cartes*, tom. 1. pag. 161.

(11) Ibid. pag. 119, 120.

(12) Ibid. pag. 119. See likewise pag. 161.

(13) Ibid. pag. 253, 254, 300, 301, 302.

(14) *Mercure François*, tom. 10. pag. 179. in the year 1624, quoting the *Venetian Gazette*.

☞ BAILLET (ADRIAN) was born June the 13th 1649 at Neuville a village four leagues distant from Beauvais in Picardy. His father was not in very good circumstances, having only a small estate, which he cultivated with his own hands, so that he could have no thoughts of raising his son's fortune, or even of giving him a polite and learned education; yet he sent him to a little school in his neighbourhood. But young Baillet was soon tired with the few and trifling things, which they taught him there, and found means to learn a little Latin by visiting every day the Friars of a Convent near the village where he lived [*A*]. They, finding some marks of genius in him, presented him to the Bishop of Beauvais,

[*A*] *He found means to learn a little Latin by visiting every day the Friars of a Convent.*] Father Niceron's account of this particular, is fuller than what we find in Mr. de la Monoye's Life of Mr. Baillet. "There

(a) Where young perſons deſigned for holy Orders are taught Latin and Greek.

Beauvais, who put him into a little Seminary (*a*), where though he was generally the firſt of his form, yet he did not appear to any great advantage at firſt. However it was not long before his love of books, and his ſtrong inclination for learning appeared even to ſuch a degree, that he ſometimes took money privately from his father in order to buy books. Having gone through his courſe of Latin and Greek, he applied himſelf to Philoſophy, but not with much vigour, having more inclination for Hiſtory, Chronology and Geography, than for Philoſophy; yet he made ſuch a progreſs in this laſt ſcience, that he maintained his publick Theſes with applauſe before the whole city of Beauvais. In 1670 he went into the great Seminary (*b*), where he ſtudied Divinity with great ſucceſs [*B*]. In the year 1672 he was appointed by his Biſhop to teach the fifth form in the College of Beauvais, and two years after, the fourth. Whilſt he was engaged in this province, he did not neglect to improve himſelf. His employment procured him about ſixty pounds (*c*) a year, beſides his board; and as he ſpent little or nothing for his own pleaſure, he employed part of his income to help his poor relations, and the reſt in books, of which he had made a pretty large collection, when he left the College: for he had already written two volumes of obſervations upon ſuch Authors, as had diſguiſed their names, which he had diſcovered. His Diſſertations in Latin and French upon that ſubject, are ſtill extant in manuſcript. He has only publiſhed the Preface of that Work in one volume with the title of *Auteurs Déguiſez*, that is, "diſguiſed Authors." The whole Work, for which he had obtained a privilege, remained amongſt his Manuſcripts. In the year 1676 he received holy Orders [*C*], and the Biſhop of Beauvais, who was a ſtrict obſerver of the Canons, and never uſed to give Orders, unleſs a man had a Church or Pariſh to ſerve, preſented him to the Vicarage of Lardieres, a very poor pariſh, which afforded the Vicar only thirty pounds a year; yet Mr. Baillet, who had no eſtate of his own, and had beſides himſelf, a brother of his, and a footboy to maintain, found means to aſſiſt the poor, and had ſtill ſome money left, to go once a year to Paris, to buy books. This ſeems a little ſurpriſing; but his temperate way of living will render it leſs wonderful (*d*) [*D*]. The care of his flock

(b) A ſchool for Divinity: moſt of the Biſhops in France have eſtabliſhed ſuch Seminaries for the Clergy of their Dioceſſes.

(c) 600 Livres, which at that time were worth very near 60 *l.* of our money.

(d) *Abregé de la Vie de Mr. Baillet*, in the 2d volume of the *Jugemens des Savans*, edit. d'Amſterd. 1725 pag. 1-17.

(1) *Mem. pour Servir à l'Hiſt. des Hom. Illuſtr.* tom. 3. pag. 26, 27.

"There is near Neuville, ſays Father Niceron (1), a "Convent named *la Garde*, which belongs to the "Franciſcan Friars. Thither young Baillet went very "often; in the morning he aſſiſted the Prieſts, when "they ſaid Maſs, and the reſt of the day he employed "in doing all the little ſervices he could to the Sex"ton, or to the other Fathers of the houſe. The Sexton "pleaſed with the officious behaviour of the lad, en"tertained a great affection for him, and taught him "to read and write. Tho' Baillet was then but eight "or nine years old, yet he ſoon diſcovered the great "love, which he ſhewed ever ſince for books: he had no "reliſh for the ordinary diverſions of children; he "loved to be retired, and all the time he could ſpare, "he ſpent in reading or writing. The Superior of "the Convent taking notice of this ſtrong and extra"ordinary inclination in ſo young a lad, and perceiv"ing that in him it was joined with great ſprightli"neſs, a lively genius, and a very happy diſpoſition "for the ſciences, thought it would be very advanta"geous for the Order of St. Francis, if they could en"gage him to take the habit. He therefore aſk'd "him of his father; who was willing enough to give "his ſon to the Franciſcans. But the Curate of his "Pariſh, whom he aſk'd advice of, was not of that "mind; and the deſign of the Superior of the Fran"ciſcans made the Curate take the reſolution of "examining young Baillet; upon which he was "charmed with his wit, and the progreſs he had al"ready made; ſo that he took him into his own "houſe, and having taught him the firſt principles of "the Latin tongue, he placed him in the College of "Beauvais." This is the ſame ſeminary with that (2) Quotation (*a*). mentioned above (2). The reader will obſerve a ſmall difference between this account and that of Mr. de la Monoye. Mr. de la Monoye adds ſome circumſtances, relating to Baillet's manner of ſtudying, which deſerve to be taken notice of. Having learned by himſelf with the aſſiſtance only of the Grammar for the Latin tongue, written in French by Meſſieurs de Port-Royal, the Rules of Latin or French Poetry, he uſed to turn all his leſſons either into Latin and French verſe; and in this manner he treated every ſubject that pleaſed him, or made any impreſſion upon him. This he called his *Comic Farce*. He indulged himſelf in that poetical humour, till he entered into the great Seminary to receive holy Orders. He read all the Latin Poets, which he could find among his friends or acquaintance, from whom he borrowed them; as Virgil, Horace, Ovid, Juvenal, Seneca, &c. He was more cautious with regard to the French Poets, reading thoſe only, who are recommended in the Grammar of Port-Royal. As the reading the Poets diverted him, without requiring much application, he ſpent moſt of his time in them, except what he employed in making extracts, and turning into verſe what was read to him out of ſacred or profane Hiſtory. Theſe extracts he called his *Juvenilia*; and enlarged them ſo much, that they made two large volumes. He was but ſeventeen years old when he made them, in order that he might remember whatever he found remarkable in the Poets, concerning the Theology of the Heathens, their falſe Gods, ſacrifices, temples, public games, and whatever elſe had any relation to them. Theſe *Juvenilia* were afterwards of great uſe to Mr. de Lamoignon's ſon, and ſerved to direct him in his ſtudies, when Mr. Baillet was made Library-Keeper to his father (3).

(3) La Monoye, *Vie de Baillet*, pag. 7, 8.

[*B*] *He ſtudied Divinity with great ſucceſs.*] He applied himſelf chiefly to that part of Divinity, which is called *poſitive*, and which conſiſts in the expoſition of what has been taught by the Fathers and the Councils. He loved that ſtudy, becauſe it is connected with Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, in which he had already made a conſiderable progreſs (4). The love of truth, ſays Mr. de la Monoye (5), was the only motive of his ſtudy. Being averſe to trifles, curioſity and vain glory, he ſtudied only to improve himſelf in knowledge and virtue. He was ſo humble that he thought himſelf qualified only for retirement and learning; and reſolved to leave the world, and to live without the impediments and avocations of it. He had a brother, named Stephen, who often viſited him in the College, and conſtantly entertained him with thoſe thoughts of retirement; and they began already to take ſome meaſures in order to go to the Abbey called *la Trappe* (6), one of the moſt ſtrict and auſtere in all France; but he was prevented by his being choſen by the Biſhop, to teach the fifth form in the College of Beauvais.

(4) Niceron, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 28.
(5) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 11.

(6) An Abbey of the Order of Citeaux, which is a branch of that of the Benedictines; that Abbey is ſituated in the Province of Perch, on the borders of Normandy.

[*C*] *He received holy Orders.*] The Biſhop and others who examin'd him, tho' very learned men, found in him not only all the learning neceſſary for a Clergyman, but much more than was uſually met with in perſons of his age. But notwithſtanding his great learning, they were ſo ſtrict, that they would not have admitted him into holy Orders, if they had not diſcovered in him ſuch a degree of humility, as would keep him free from that vanity, which is ſo common amongſt the learned. This is what Mr. de la Monoye tells us (7).

(7) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 16.

[*D*] *His temperate way of living will render it leſs wonderful.*] After our Baillet's death, his brother Stephen

flock did not make him leave his ſtudies; yet the unavoidable avocations, which it occaſioned continually, obliged him to petition his Superiors, in order to be diſcharged from the care of ſouls. His petition was granted, and he was preferred to another living (*e*), in which he was only obliged to ſing at Church, and to explain the Catechiſms. The reſt of his time he employed in his ſtudy amongſt his books. He did not continue long in that employment; for the next year (*viz.* 1680) he was made Library-keeper to Mr. de Lamoignon [*E*], not the firſt Preſident of the Parliament at Paris, as Father Niceron ſays (*f*), for that Gentleman was then dead; but his ſon, who was then only the Advocate General (*g*). Mr. Baillet, though troubled with a great pain in his legs, which ſometimes grew very violent, and notwithſtanding the many viſits he received, which continually interrupted his labours, applied himſelf with ſo much diligence to the drawing up of an Index of all the ſubjects treated of in the books in Mr. de Lamoignon's library [*F*], that he finiſhed it in Auguſt 1682. That Index grew to ſuch a length, by the additions, he continued to make to it, that it contains thirty five volumes (*b*) in folio, all written by Mr. Baillet himſelf. When he had finiſhed that laborious but uſeful Work, he wrote a Latin Preface to it, which he publiſhed. We find there an account of the manner, in which he drew up that Index. He alſo promiſed in the ſame place, to write an Index or Catalogue of all the Authors, whoſe books were in Mr. de Lamoignon's library. That Preface has been ſeverely cenſured, not only by Mr. Menage (*i*), but alſo by an anonymous Author *. But theſe cenſures relate only to his ſtyle [*G*], and not to his obſervations, nor to the manner in which he treats his ſubject. When Mr. Baillet had finiſhed this arduous taſk, he put the laſt hand to the four volumes of his *Jugemens des Savans*, and gave them to the Bookſeller with ſo much generoſity, and at the ſame time with ſuch a diſtruſt of their ſale, that he was contented to have nothing for them, except a few copies, which he deſigned to make

(*e*) Niceron, *Memoires pour Servir à l'Hiſtoire des Hommes Illuſtres*, tom. 3. pag. 29.

(*f*) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 29.

(*g*) *Vie de Baillet, ubi ſupra*, pag. 22, 23.

(*b*) And not 32, as F. Niceron ſays, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 30.

(*i*) In his *Anti-Baillet*, pag. 2. ch. 109. p. m. 382, &c.

* See the remark [*N*].

Stephen declared, that they uſed to drink nothing but water at his houſe; that they eat brown bread, without any butcher's meat, but only a little bacon, and ſometimes a few herbs out of his garden boiled in water with ſalt, and whitened with a little milk. Thus they lived almoſt in the ſame manner as they do at la Trappe, whither Baillet and his brother had always an inclination to retire, being already inured to the auſterity, which is there practiſed. It happened once on a Sunday, that this Stephen had a mind to make a more delicate meal than uſual. Baillet going to ſay Maſs, ſmelled the ſauce; he was naturally quick and haſty; ſo that in the height of his paſſion he threw the pot down, and ſeverely reprimanded the Cook (8), who never ventured to ſerve him in that manner any more (9).

(8) His own brother Stephen, for he had no other Cook.

(9) *Vie de Baillet*, pag. 18.

[*E*] *He was made Library-Keeper to Mr. de Lamoignon.*] Mr. de Lamoignon, who had been inſtructed by his father how to put a proper value upon learned men, and diſtinguiſh thoſe, who were able to give him good advice, addreſſed himſelf to Mr. Hermant, an eminent Doctor of the Sorbonne, deſiring him to procure him a perſon who might be his Library-Keeper, and at the ſame time aſſiſt him in his office of Advocate-General, upon all the ſubjects, which he had to treat of, and for which he had occaſion to find hints and materials in the books in his Library. I know a perſon, ſaid Mr. Hermant, who will ſuit your purpoſe, if you be not ſhocked at his aukwardneſs. I want a man of learning, anſwered the Advocate, and do not mind the outward appearance. The air of this place and a little diſcretion will ſoon poliſh him. Upon this Mr. Haillant preſſed Mr. Baillet to come and offer his ſervice to Mr. de Lamoignon. Baillet loved Paris, ever ſince he had been in that city to buy books. The Bookſellers were then extremely civil and courteous, which he thought a very great advantage. But when Mr. Hermant made the propoſal to him from Mr. de Lamoignon, he was ſo ſurprized at it, that he fancied his friend had only a mind to try him, or at leaſt, that he had miſtook his meaning. When he knew that he was in earneſt, he found a thouſand new difficulties; his pretended incapacity, his unpromiſing appearance, his aukwardneſs, the offence, which this would give to thoſe, who recommended him, and to the perſon who expected him. Mr. Hermant anſwered, that he would take all upon himſelf, deſiring Mr. Baillet not to put any conſtraint upon himſelf in any thing, but only with regard to the manners of the city, and to behave himſelf diſcreetly towards ſuch perſons, as he ſhould ſee at the Advocate's houſe (11). Thus Mr. Baillet was prevailed upon to accept the place, which was offered to him.

(11) *Vie de Baillet*, pag. 23, 24.

[*F*] *An Index of all the ſubjects treated of in the books in Mr. de Lamoignon's Library.*] Mr. Baillet obſerves in the Latin Preface (12), which he publiſhed concerning this Index, that in moſt of the catalogues of Libraries, we find only the name of the Author, with a very inaccurate account of the ſubject he treats of. He owns that Dr. Hyde's Catalogue of the Bodleian Library does not labour under that defect; but then as he follows the alphabetical order of the Author's names, and not of the ſubjects, which they treat of; this renders his Catalogue in that reſpect very defective. And indeed to make uſe of that Catalogue, we ought to know, not only that there are books upon ſuch or ſuch a ſubject, but alſo the names of the Authors, who wrote thoſe books; otherwiſe we ſhall never be able to find them in the Catalogue, except by chance. This is the reaſon why Mr. Baillet undertook another Index, in which the names of the Authors were placed in an alphabetical order. Thus, if you know the ſubject treated of, but not the name of the Author, you find it in the firſt Index; if you know the Author's name, and not the ſubject, which he wrote upon, you find it in the ſecond Index. The firſt Index, which Mr. Baillet made, was ſo much eſteemed by all the learned, that ſeveral Prelates and Magiſtrates, who had ſeen in it Mr. de Lamoignon's Library, deſired to have a copy of it; and others an exact abſtract. In that Index were found in a very good order all the ſubjects treated of in the books of the Library, with references to the places, where theſe ſubjects were handled. This was a great conveniency for the Advocate-General, who by means of that Index, found immediately what he wanted upon any ſubject whatſoever. This was an advantage ſo much the more conſiderable, as there was almoſt nothing wanting in his Library of all that had been written upon the Law either ancient or modern, or upon the Decrees of the Courts of Judicature. And Mr. Baillet had taken a particular delight, and the utmoſt care to range thoſe ſubjects in the beſt order poſſible. This part of the Catalogue, which made it ſo uſeful, gained the Author the applauſe, not only of his patron, but of all thoſe, who came to conſult that Index. The order, in which he placed the ſubjects relating to Religion and the Church, has likewiſe given equal ſatisfaction. Several learned men have ſo much applauded this work of Baillet, that the Bookſellers have often deſired him to have it printed (13).

(12) *Jugem. des Savans*, ed. de 1726, Amſterd. tom. 2. p. 143.

(13) *Vie de Baillet, ubi ſupra*, pag. 28, 29.

[*G*] *Thoſe cenſures relate only to his ſtyle.*] The Author of the four Letters, which contain critical reflections upon Mr. Baillet's *Jugemens des Savans* (14), cenſures the following paſſage in his Latin Preface. *Alterum, quod tu jam pridem in votis habebas, ut ne in illud vitium aut incommodum concurreretur, quo laborant omnes*

(14) *Jugem. des Sav.* Amſt. ed. 1725, tom. 15. pag. 334, &c.

make a preſent of to his friends. The Bookſeller had not ſo ill an opinion of the Work; he haſtened the publication of it as much as he could, and printed a vaſt number, which he ſold in ſo ſhort a ſpace, that he ſcarce gave the Author time to recollect himſelf, in order to finiſh the five volumes that were to follow. The Author had written a particular account of his deſign [*H*], but he did not care to print it, fearing leſt his firſt eſſay ſhould not meet with a good reception from the publick; ſo that the four volumes were printed without it, in 1685, with this title, *Jugemens des Savans ſur les principaux Ouvrages des Auteurs* (*k*): That is, "The Judgment of the Learned concerning the principal Works of Authors," printed at Paris in four volumes 12*mo*. As ſoon as this book was publiſhed in France, Mr. Bayle ſpoke of it (*l*) in this manner. "We expect very ſoon a curious book entitled, "*Jugemens des Savans &c.* If we conſider, that Mr. Baillet, who gives us this Work, "is Librarian to the Advocate General Mr. de Lamoignon, who inherits the virtue and "learning of the celebrated firſt Preſident de Lamoignon (that very name is an elogium) "we ſhall infer from thence a very good omen, eſpecially if we remember thoſe learned "conferences, in which the greateſt wits of Paris, guided by the wiſdom and taſte of "the late firſt Preſident de Lamoignon, could ſo well diſtinguiſh the merit of every thing, "and pointed out with ſo much learning the niceſt and moſt delicate ſubjects in polite literature." Some time after Mr. Bayle gave a very favourable account of Mr. Baillet's Work [*I*]. But notwithſtanding the great uſefulneſs of that compilation, and though the Author

(k) *Vie de Baillet, ubi ſupra*, p. 29, 30.

(l) *Rep. des Lett.* 1685. Sept. p. 1026.

nes ferè quotquot hactenus Bibliothecarum contexti ſunt Catalogi, qui ſolam ac rudem voluminum frontem & antipagmentum vix enunciantes, incoctam ac indigeſtam rerum, quæ in iis jacent, molem nihil fere juvant (15). "Is not this, *ſays the Author of the Reflections*, very "bad Latin, and the moſt exquiſite nonſenſe, that "ever was writ? In what Author of note has Baillet "found, *concurritur in vitium*, inſtead of *currere, in-*"*currere in vitium?* And what does he mean by theſe "words, *Catalogi, qui vix enunciantes frontem ſolam* "*ac rudem, & Antipagmentum voluminum, nihil fere* "*juvant molem incoctam, & indigeſtam rerum, quæ in* "*iis jacent?* I deſire Baillet to give us a tranſlation "of this paſſage, which ſhall be faithful, intelligible "and reaſonable." There are ſome other paſſages in the ſame Preface which are deſervedly criticiſed upon; but we are obliged in juſtice to Mr. Baillet, to obſerve that theſe paſſages are but few; and that his Preface, tho' not written in a very Ciceronian ſtyle, is yet for the moſt part plain and intelligible, and full of excellent obſervations relating to the manner of drawing up the Catalogue of a Library; and Mr. Menage's criticiſms (16) are for the moſt part mere cavils; as for inſtance when he aſſerts, that the following phraſe is a mere Galliciſm. *Priorem indicem, qui de rebus ſive argumentis agit, menſium novem ſpatio confeceram.* Mr. de la Monoye very well obſerves (17), that Mr. Menage ought to have pointed out that Galliciſm. He thought perhaps it was in the word *res*; but as it is here oppoſed to perſons, or to the names of Authors, it may very well paſs, ſince it has been employed in that ſenſe by very good Latin Writers. We may add here what Mr. Bayle ſays, of the Index, which Mr. Baillet had made. "One may eaſily "judge, *ſays he* (18), by this Preface, that Mr. Baillet has drawn up that Catalogue in a very well contrived method."

(15) Ibid. tom. 2. pag. 143.

(16) *Anti-Baillet*, tom. 1. Part 2. ch. 109. p. m. 382.

(17) Ibid. not. 2.

(18) *Repub. des Lett.* 1685, Decemb. p. 1376.

[*H*] *The Author had written a particular account of his deſign.*] That account is printed in the ſecond volume of the Amſterdam edition of his *Jugemens des Savans*. And that the reader may know how great an undertaking Mr. Baillet had engaged himſelf in, we ſhall give here an abſtract of his Plan. He began firſt with ſome obſervations upon the manner of judging of books, and the good and bad qualities of thoſe, who paſs their judgment upon them. He then treated of men's prepoſſeſſions concerning Authors and Books. Theſe were only the preliminaries of his work, which was to be divided into ſix parts. I. In the firſt he was to treat of thoſe Printers, who had diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their learning, ability, accuracy and fidelity. Of Critics, that is, of thoſe who acquaint us with Authors, and their Books, and in general thoſe, who give us an account of the ſtate of Literature, and of all that belongs to the Republic of Letters. Of Philologiſts, and all thoſe, who treat of polite Literature. Of Grammarians and Tranſlators of all kinds. II. The ſecond part was deſigned for the Poets ancient and modern; for writers of Romances and Tales in proſe; for Rhetoricians, Orators, and Writers of Letters, either in Latin, or in any of the modern languages whatſoever. III. In the third part he was to ſpeak of the Hiſtorians, Geographers, and Chronologiſts of all ſorts, IV. The Philoſophers, Phyſicians, and Mathematicians, were to be the ſubject of the fourth part. V. The fifth was to contain the Authors, who wrote upon the Civil and Canon Law, upon Politics, and upon Ethics. VI. In the ſixth and laſt part, he was to ſpeak of the Writers on Divinity; as particularly thoſe, who wrote upon the Scripture, the Fathers, School-Divinity, upon Heretics of all kinds &c. All theſe different articles are divided into ſeveral branches, which are again ſubdivided into others, and that ſometimes more than one. The reader will eaſily judge, that this was too great a Plan for a ſingle man to execute; it required an extenſive learning, and almoſt an infinite reading. Mr. Baillet himſelf was ſenſible of it, and ſaid (19), that tho' he had his whole deſign in view, yet he was almoſt determined to drop it; which he actually did; for of the ſix parts, of which his work was to conſiſt, he publiſhed only the firſt, and half the ſecond. We ſhall give in the following remark a farther account of that work; but we may obſerve here, that Mr. Baillet ſeemed impartial enough with regard to the Proteſtants. "I hope, *ſays he* (20), "that thoſe of the other communion, (meaning the "Reformed) will do me the favour to think, that I "never had any deſign to diſoblige them, much leſs "to inſult them, when I have ſaid any thing againſt "ſome of their Miniſters. This is the reaſon why I "almoſt every where uſe the word *Proteſtants*, even "when I ſpeak of the Huguenots of France, and of "the other Calviniſts of the Low-Countries, or of "England, tho' the name of *Proteſtants* belong more "properly to thoſe of Germany. But I know that "the others are not offended, when they are called by "that name."

(19) *Jugem. des Sav.* tom. 2. pag. 139.

(20) Ibid. tom. 1. *Avertiſſement*, § 12. pag. xli.

[*I*] *Mr. Bayle gave a very favourable account of Mr. Baillet's work.*] "This book, *ſaid he* (21), is "not only very proper to ſatisfy the curioſity of Men "of Letters, but it will alſo be very uſeful to them, "becauſe they will find here the good and ill, that "has been ſaid of the books, they intend to read. I "own, that many perſons would reap a greater advantage from it, if they found every where a peremptory judgment upon the different opinions, "which have been held concerning Authors; but it "muſt not be expected that a private man, if he has "good ſenſe, will take it upon him to paſs ſuch a "judgment. It would be expoſing one's ſelf too much, "and uſurping an authority which would ſoon be ſhaken "off, and would not ſucceed at Rome, even with regard "to a Council of Trent. Mr. Baillet ſays ſomething "very reaſonable with great modeſty upon this ſubject "in his Preface to the Reader; where he gives us an "account of his conduct in that reſpect, as well as "with regard to ſome other points. Yet he does not "leave us entirely undetermined with regard to the "judgment, which we are to paſs upon the Authors "he mentions; for he ſometimes points out to us "what opinion we are to chooſe, either by his own "reflections, or by the manner in which he relates

(21) *Rep. des Lett.* 1685. Dec. pag. 1366, &c.

Author ſeldom ſpoke his own opinion, relating only the judgment of others, yet it made a great deal of noiſe in the world. It was not free from errors [*K*], as may eaſily be imagined; but it was not this that moſt exaſperated the Critics, it was the liberty which the Author had taken of relating not only what was favourable to the authors, whom he mentions, but alſo what had been cenſured in them. This, eſpecially with regard to authors ſtill living, raiſed the indignation of ſeveral perſons, who could not bear to ſee a great many writers, for whom they had a great eſteem, thus blamed and cenſured: ſo that their friends, and particularly thoſe of Mr. Menage, of whom Mr. Baillet had ſpoken in a manner which bordered upon ridicule (*m*), made a great clamour; the Poets exerted their

(*m*) See particularly *Jugem. des Sav.* tom. 5. pag. 230, 231.

" and places the judgment of others. It his certain " that his book will undeceive thoſe, who think, " that the Republic of Letters groans in France un- " der a grievous ſlavery, *oppreſſa gravi ſub religione*, " and that the Gentlemen of the Clergy both ſecular " and regular, whom they look upon as the profeſ- " ſed enemies of the liberty of the ſciences, have at " laſt oppreſſed it under the heavy weight of their " deſpotic authority. They, who think ſo, are miſ- " taken; things are not yet reduced to that extremity " in France; and this book, printed with a privilege, " ſhews ſuch remains of the ancient liberty, that we " may infer from thence a good omen for the time to " come." It would be too long to tranſcribe here Mr. Bayle's whole account of this work, our deſign is only to let the reader know what opinion he had of it, for which reaſon we ſhall tranſcribe but two paſſages more. " The preliminary diſcourſe, *ſays Mr.* " *Bayle* (21), contains a thouſand very good obſerva- " tions, and ſome very remarkable facts. The ge- " neral ſcope of the Author is to teach us how to " judge well of the books we read." And when Mr. Bayle ſpeaks of the three volumes, which contain the judgment of the Learned upon the Critics, Printers, Grammarians, and Tranſlators, he ſays (22), that " we find here a large collection of a thouſand things " very curious, and neceſſary for thoſe, who have a " mind to be thoroughly acquainted with Authors, " and their writings. It abounds with a great num- " ber of particulars, ſome of which relate to Authors " ſtill living, and which will be ſoon tranſcribed in " other books by means of quotations, to which it is " well known, that our Northern Writers are not yet " very averſe."

(21) Ibid. pag. 1367, 1368.

(22) Ibid. pag. 1376.

[*K*] *It was not free from errors.*] Let us hear Mr. de la Monoye's opinion concerning this work. " It " is true, *ſays he* (23), that Mr. Baillet's deſign of " collecting the judgments of the Learned upon all " ſorts of Authors, was very well contrived. He " was in the right to think, that nothing could be " more uſeful nor more agreeable to the lovers of " Literature, than to be thus acquainted with what " has been judged concerning the moſt famous books. " He knew that if the number of Authors is very " large, thoſe who judge of them are almoſt infinite, " ſince there are as many judges as there are readers. " He was not ignorant how much thoſe, who with " a very little ſkill in Literature pretend to cenſure " both the ancient and the modern, had been ridicul- " ed by Perſius among the Latins, by Caperal amongſt " the Italians, and by Regnier and Boileau amongſt " the French. To teach therefore theſe proud Critics " how to diſtruſt their own taſte, he firſt treated tho- " roughly of thoſe prejudices, againſt which we are " to be upon our guard, when we read any book " whatſoever; and as he would not expoſe himſelf to " the reproach of vanity and conceit, he preferred " the deciſions of others to his own. He thought that " the ſafeſt way to acquire a thorough knowledge of " Authors was to examine their own judgment. With " this view he propoſed to collect their teſtimonies " concerning thoſe Writers, who have acquired ſome " reputation by their Works either upon the Sciences " in general, or upon the liberal Arts. This was, no " doubt, a very great undertaking; and to render it " more acceptable to the generality of his readers, he " did not think fit to begin with his collections upon " the Lawyers, Phyſicians, or Mathematicians, but " choſe to ſet out with that part of his deſign, which " ſeems beſt ſuited to the majority of the publick. " After he had given a ſufficient account of the moſt " eminent Printers, he added to it ſeveral volumes " concerning the Critics, Grammarians, Tranſlators, " and Poets. No ſuch work had ever been ſeen be- " fore in the Kingdom (24); it was a kind of Mo- " ſaic-work, compoſed of different pieces, cut out by " ſeveral hands, and artfully diſpoſed by him. Co- " lomies, who might be thought to have given him " the hint in his *France Orientale*, had not put his ab- " ſtracts together with the ſame ſkill; he had ſpread " them through his work without any order or con- " nection, leaving them in French or in Latin, in " ſhort, rough and unpoliſhed, ſuch as he found " them, if I may ſo ſay, in the mine, whence he had " drawn them. Mr. Baillet has not done the ſame; " he has given his work more regularity and a " more noble air. He makes all the Authors he " quotes, ſpeak French, and to avoid an ungraceful " mixture of Greek, Latin, Italian, and Spaniſh quo- " tations, he choſe to expoſe himſelf to all the incon- " veniences and difficulties which attend a tranſlation, " either when ſomething material is left out, or added " to the original, or when in any ways the true ſenſe " of it is altered by an erroneous tranſlation. It is " very difficult for a Tranſlator in a voluminous work " always to avoid theſe faults; and as Mr. Baillet has " ſometimes been guilty of them, it was ſo much the " more neceſſary to correct them, as an unwary " reader might be in danger of being miſled by his " authority. Pope-Blount, Morhof, and the Conti- " nuators of Moreri have already too much copied " the errors of Mr. Baillet; and it were to be feared " that they would thus be propagated to poſterity, if " care was not taken to prevent it. Among theſe er- " rors ſome are very ancient, and have been in books " long ago, ſo that they belong to Mr. Baillet only " by way of adoption, becauſe he has tranſcribed " them. Others he has committed himſelf, and muſt " be accountable for them. . . . It appears that origi- " nally his deſign in collecting the judgments of o- " thers was not to give his own opinion. This law " he preſcribed to himſelf, and for want of having " kept cloſe to it, he has been engaged in a great " many diſputes, the iſſue of which has not been very " much to his advantage; which ſhews that his work, " in order to become uſeful, wanted to be exactly re- " viſed. This, *adds Mr. de la Monoye*, I have done, " and without meddling with the text, the order, or " number of chapters and articles, I have confined " myſelf to point out, in notes printed under the text, " the errors which Mr. Baillet had committed, in " names, in chronology, or with regard to the paſſa- " ges he quotes, or the facts he relates. I have alſo ad- " ded ſome remarks, to explain ſuch paſſages in his " book, as I thought wanted to be cleared up. . . . . " I have alſo defended him againſt his adverſaries, " when their criticiſms ſeemed to me to be ill-ground- " ed. One of the moſt impertinent cavils of Mr. " Baillet's adverſaries, was that of thoſe, who pre- " tended that his book was entirely uſeleſs, becauſe " upon the ſame Author he relates opinions very often " oppoſite to one another, and which deſtroy one an- " other. But the Critics, who object this, ſhould " have obſerved, that ſince Mr. Baillet had intitled " his book, *The Judgments of the Learned*, and not " *An Examination of thoſe Judgments*, he was only " obliged to relate them faithfully, without being " bound to correct them, or to make them agree with " one another. Beſides, who is there that does not " know what a vaſt difference there is between the " taſte of ſeveral men? And do we not acknowledge " every day, that the Learned, who have paſſed dif- " ferent judgments upon the ſame Writers, have " ſometimes all of them been in the right. For con- " ſidering the faults which are found in every work, " the beſt, after all, is, generally ſpeaking, but the " leaſt imperfect (25)."

(23) Preface to the new edit. of Baillet's *Jug. des Sav.* in tom. 1. pag. viii, &c.

(24) Of France.

(25) Ibid. p. xv.

their wits againſt him, and Father Commire in particular wrote a ſhort poem in Latin, in defence of Mr. Menage, to whom he addreſſed it. It was intitled, *Aſinus in Parnaſſo* [*L*], that is, "The Aſs upon Mount Parnaſſus." Notwithſtanding the railleries of the Poets, and the more grave cenſures of other learned men, Mr. Baillet's Work ſold ſo well, that the Bookſeller preſſed very hard upon him to publiſh the following volumes; ſo that he employed all his time to finiſh them, and in the year 1686, came out his five volumes upon the Poets. The Author prefixed to it a kind of Preface (*n*), in which he owns and corrects ſome miſtakes he had committed, anſwers his adverſaries, and defends himſelf. The account we ſhall give of this piece, after Mr. Bayle, will give the reader a true notion of it, and of what had been objected againſt Mr. Baillet [*M*]. Soon after the judgments

(*n*) It is intitled, *Diſcours pour Servir d'Eclairciſſement, à quelques endroits, qui ont pû arrêter quelques perſonnes dans les premiers Volumes de cet ouvrage, & de Preface au Recueil ſuivant des Poëtes.*

[*L*] *Aſinus in Parnaſſo.*] We have enquired after that Poem, in order to give ſome account of it here, but have not been able to find it, ſo that we muſt content ourſelves with tranſcribing here only a paſſage, which will give the reader a notion of M. Commire's Latin Poetry. He addreſſes himſelf to Mr. Menage, and tells him, that being aſleep, he dreamt that he was upon one of the heaths of Mount Parnaſſus, where the moſt famous Greek, Latin, and French Poets were preſent, and that they all with one accord gave Mr. Menage the firſt place after Apollo.

In alto ſedere Parnaſſi jugo
Videbar. Aderant ingenii & ſcientiæ
Quos laude claros fama ſuper aſtra extulit,
Græcique, Romanique; & utriuſque æmulos
Quos litterarum Gallia eduxit parens:
Omnes decorum floribus vincti caput.
His miſtus aderas tu quoque, & Phœbo locum
Tibi omnis ultro proximum dederat Chorus (26).

(26) *Anti-Baillet*, pag. 1. § 29. p. m. 85.

This piece conſiſts of above ſixty lines (27).

(27) Bayle, *Rep. des Lett.* 1686. Dec. pag. 1436.

The ſame Father wrote alſo two other pieces againſt Mr. Baillet, the one intitled *Aſinus ad Lyram*, i. e. "The Aſs playing upon the Harp;" the other *Aſinus Judex*, i. e. "The Aſs Judge." This laſt piece not being very long, we preſume the reader will not be diſpleaſed to find it here. It is as follows:

Mellis artifices, vagæ volucres,
Queis Phœbi per amæna fas vireta,
Hortoſque Aonidum volare pictos;
Cur ceſſatis, Apes? Ad arma, ad arma:
Arcas hoſtis adeſt. Aſellus ille
Portitor Satyri ebrius protervi,
Quem facto agmine nuper expuliſtis,
In Cyrrham redit ultor, atque tanto
Pares dedecori vires minatur.
Auditis fremitus feros rudentis?
Ut pede, ô ſcelus! atterit petulco
Inſcriptos foliis ſuperba Regum
Flores nomina, lividoque dente
Dis ipſis petit arbores amatas.
Et jam cerea diſſipare caſtra,
Veſtros perdere jam parat labores.
Illoque ore ſuo vepreta, & hircos
Sueto rodere carduos, Olympi
Miſſum munere Nectar inquinabit!
Et ceſſatis adhuc? Adeſte, adeſte.
Tela ſtringite quotquot eſtis omnes.
Nares, labra, oculos, & hinc, & illinc
Ferite; ſtimuloſque calcitranti
Alte figite; duplicate plagas.
Ut durâ cute ſit, tamen
Ictus ſentiet intimis adactos:
Capiſtro & cupiet, molæque reddi (28).

(28) *Anti-Baillet, ubi ſupra.* pag. 89. § 30.

Another Poet wrote *Aſinus Pictor*, i. e. "The Aſs "turned Painter." Theſe four Poems gave occaſion to the following epigram, in which Grammarians are adviſed not to offend the Poets any more, as Mr. Baillet had done.

Grammaticum de plebe unus, ludique Magiſter,
Expers judicii, Doctrinæ BAJULUS *expers,*
Vateſque, & Vatum ſanctos carpebat amores,
Non tulit Vatum princeps COMMIRIUS. *Ipſum*
Carmine ſublimi, victuro carmine in ævum,
Ilicet in ſtolidum vindex mutavit Aſcellum.
Et nunc ecce vocat Lutetia tota rudentem;
Contemptorem illum Vatum, Vatum illum inimicum.
Diſcite, Grammatici, doctos non temnere Vates (29).

(29) Ibid. § 29. pag. 86, 87.

Mr. Bayle ſpeaking of the *Aſinus in Parnaſſo*, ſays (30), "It has been thought, that the *Aſinus in Par-*
"*naſſo, ad Clar. V. Ægidium Menagium*, was ano-
"ther Satyr againſt the ſame Author (Boileau); but
"we have heard ſince, that it is againſt Mr. Baillet,
"and that the Jeſuit Commire, an eminent Latin
"Poet, wrote that piece. Mr. Amelot has openly de-
"clared himſelf in favour of Mr. Baillet, in his Pre-
"face to his *Morale de Tacite. He is a man of merit,*
"ſays he, *and very learned, notwithſtanding all the*
"*poetical ſentences that have been given to baniſh him*
"*from Parnaſſus.* It is ſaid, *adds Mr. Bayle*, that
"the following part of the *Jugemens des Savans*,
"which concerns the Poets, is Printing. Mr. Baillet
"will in all probability reply there to the Poet, who
"has attack'd him, and will be ſo honeſt and ſincere,
"as not to deny him the glory of writing very good
"verſes."

(30) *Rep. des Lett.* 1686, Juin. pag. 709.

(37) Ibi

[*M*] *An account . . . which will give the reader a true notion of this piece, and of what has been objected againſt Mr. Baillet.*] "This is, ſays Mr. Bayle (31)
"ſpeaking of the *Jugemens ſur les Poetes* (the Judgment
"upon the Poets), the continuation of the work, of
"which I ſpoke a year ago, and of which I ſaid,
"that it contained ſome remains of the ancient liber-
"ty, and was proper to undeceive thoſe who think
"&c. (32). The great noiſe, which theſe remains of
"liberty have made, do clearly prove, that it is im-
"poſſible for an Author to pleaſe every body. People
"have complained, that Mr. Baillet often relates ſome
"things, which are not favourable to the learned
"men, whom he mentions, and every day I am
"blamed for not ſpeaking ill of the books, of which
"I give an account. This is the way of the world.
"Men will find fault with every thing; and con-
"demning both extremes, they will not ſuffer us to
"keep a juſt medium between them. . . . Yet if Mr.
"Baillet will conform to the majority of votes, he
"will not alter his method. He makes a very cu-
"rious and agreeable apology for it in the *explanation*,
"which he has prefixed to this work. This was ne-
"ceſſary after the great clamour of his adverſaries,
"ſome of whom are men of great merit, and diſ-
"ſtinguiſhed reputation. An Author ought in reaſon
"to give an account of his conduct, and to ſet right
"thoſe, who have miſunderſtood him. This he owes
"to himſelf and to the public. It cannot be doubted,
"but that ſome of thoſe, who have exclaimed againſt
"him, did not take notice, that Mr. Baillet never in-
"tended to warrant the truth and exactneſs of the opi-
"nions and judgments which he relates. It was
"therefore neceſſary, that he ſhould again ſet this
"particular in a true light, and with this he begins
"his Apology; he even ſays (33), that *he endeavoured*
"*in ſeveral places to make the reader obſerve, that the o-*
"*pinions of the Judges whom he mentions were ſo far from*
"*being irrevocable ſentences, that they are often nothing*
"*more than a proof of their own ignorance, or ill na-*
"*ture, and contribute more to the glory and reputation*
"*of thoſe, whom they cenſure, than if they had com-*
"*mended them.* He adds (34), that *it is impoſſible for*
"*a man, who is in the leaſt acquainted with books, not*
"*to know how little credit criticks have always had with*
"*the public, when the queſtion has been either to eſta-*
"*bliſh or to ruin the reputation of an Author. I ſpeak*
"*even of the beſt criticks, of thoſe who have the greateſt*
"*authority amongſt the learned.* He quotes ſeveral in-
"ſtances of this from antiquity, and ſays (35), that
"*it is not eaſy to point out one ſingle Author, whoſe*
"*good or bad reputation could depend upon the judgment,*
"*which an Eraſmus, a Scaliger, a Lipſius, a Salma-*
"*ſius, or any other Critic might paſs upon him.* Mr.
"Baillet

(31) Ibid. Sept. 1686. pag. 1430, &c.

(32) See above, Rem. [*I*].

(38) I

(33) *Jugem. des Savans*, tom. 6. pag. 2.

(34) Ibid. p. 3.

(35) Ibid. pag. 4.

ments of the Learned upon the Poets were printed, Mr. Menage publiſhed his Anti-Baillet, in which he pretends to correct a great many errors, which Mr. Baillet had committed. Another Author publiſhed four Letters [*N*], in which the ſtyle and manner of writing of Mr. Baillet are ſeverely cenſured. It muſt be owned, that ſeveral of theſe cenſures are very well grounded. But there are ſome that are mere cavils, and even the Author, who cenſures him, is ſometimes guilty himſelf of falſe reaſoning, as we ſhall ſhew with

" Baillet examines afterwards a point of greater deli-
" cacy; ſome perſons have found fault with him, for
" having related the favourable and unfavourable
" judgments, which have been paſſed upon Authors
" ſtill living. If he had collected only their elogiums, he
" would have been the man according to their own
" heart; he would have entirely fulfilled their deſire.
" But this mixture of good and ill has ſpoiled all.
(36) Ibid. p. 5. " To this he anſwers (36) among other things, that
" the Authors, who are ſtill alive, may make uſe of
" the judgment which is paſſed upon their works;
" they may confute thoſe who cenſure them; or at
" leaſt it will give them a fair opportunity of ſhew-
" ing the greatneſs of their mind by being equally
" unconcerned, whether they are prais'd or cenſured. . .
" Some Authors have given Mr. Baillet to underſtand,
" that *they wanted their reputation, in order to write*
(37) Ibid. p. 10. " *with ſucceſs* (37), and that if their works were cen-
" ſured, they would not publiſh any more the labours
" of their brains. To this he anſwers, 1. That *in*
" *what manner ſoever an Author is criticiſed, it can*
" *be prejudicial only to an ill grounded and unjuſt re-*
" *putation; but it will be wonderfully uſeful to confirm*
" *ſuch a reputation, as is eſtabliſhed upon a ſolid foun-*
" *dation.* 2. That an honeſt man ought not to pro-
" poſe to himſelf his reputation as the chief end of his
" labours. 3. That if an Author thinks his reputa-
" tion is neceſſary to prompt him, he ought alſo to
" know, that his readers want to employ their time
" in an uſeful manner, and to improve their genius,
" and that he ought not to trifle with either in order
" to acquire that fantaſtic reputation. That if an au-
" thor be not diſintereſted enough, not to require praiſes,
" he muſt ſuffer others to examine whether he deſerves
" what he requires. With regard to that dreadful threat-
" ning not to write any more, nor to reſiſt the encroach-
" ments of the ancient darkneſs, Mr. Baillet anſwers
" it in a manner which approaches near to ridicule
(38) Ibid. p. 12. " (38); he thinks the threatning too dreadful to be
" effectual, and that theſe Gentlemen would have
" been very much puzzled, if they had been ſolemnly
" challenged to put it in execution. But, adds he,
" tho' they ſhould be determined to this fatal extre-
" mity, the danger of ſeeing the world without books
" is not much to be feared, ſince it is very probable,
" that there will always be more writers than men of
" ſenſe. He applies to this purpoſe a thought of St.
" Auguſtin. Thoſe, who obſerved that he very ear-
" neſtly exhorted every body to continency, thought
" themſelves obliged to repreſent to him the inconve-
" niencies which might follow from thence, and that
" if all men would keep their virginity, mankind
" muſt ſoon periſh entirely. St. Auguſtin laughed
" at them, becauſe he knew very well, that his exhor-
" tations would never be generally practiſed, and that
" there would always be perſons enough of both ſexes,
" who would not for the world renounce their ſhare
" of the pleaſure of matrimony. Whatever may be
" ſaid in favour of continency, it does not prevent
" child-bearing; it may in like manner be affirmed,
" that whatever is ſaid or done againſt Authors, it
" will never hinder them from producing book after
" book. *Superfetation* is infinitely more frequent a-
" mongſt them, than amongſt women; for how often
" do they enter upon a new deſign, before they have
" finiſh'd that, which they have begun? So that we
" are not to be frightened by their threatenings. It
" is true, that when they find that their books are
" cenſured, they form the ſame project which Apollo
" did, when his ſon Phaeton had been killed by a
" thunder-bolt: I mean, that they take a reſolution
" not to communicate their light any more to the
" world. But this is not laſting; they ſoon recover
" from their paſſion, and, as Mr. Baillet obſerves,
" they would be ſadly puzzled, if they were taken
" at their word. They would chuſe rather to be treat-
" ed, as Apollo was, who was humbly deſired not to
" leave the world in the dark,

" ——— *Neve velit tenebras inducere rebus*
" *Supplice voce rogant.*

" They would even be glad if theſe prayers were
" attended with an expreſs command, and with
" threatnings, as it was done with regard to Apollo,

" ——— *Precibuſque minas regaliter addit.*

" Mr. Baillet makes afterwards ſome reflections upon
" the ſatyrical verſes that had been wrote againſt him,
" and particularly upon thoſe of Father Commire.
" He then examines what has been objected to him in
" the *Journal des Savans* of Nov. the 12th, 1685, and
" chiefly juſtifies himſelf in regard to the imprudence
" which ſome perſons accuſed him of, concerning the
" Jeſuits. It had been pretended, that he ought to have
" talked in a manner more ſuitable to the diſtance,
" which there is between a private man, as he is, and
" ſo large a body, a ſociety ſo conſiderable and ſo
" powerful both in Church and State (39). They, (39) Ibid. p. 27.
" who talk after this manner, may as well be the ene-
" mies as the friends of the Jeſuits; for if it be natu-
" ral for the friends of a powerful body to alledge
" immediately its credit, and that a man muſt be very
" bold, if he does not ſhew them the utmoſt com-
" plaiſance; it is not leſs natural for the enemies of
" ſuch a body, to endeavour to render it odious by
" the ſame means. For it is certain, that one can
" hardly traduce a religious ſociety in a more malici-
" ous manner, than by affecting to ſpread abroad,
" that a man has every thing to fear, if he has been
" ſo imprudent, as to offend ſuch a Society. Since
" therefore the objection, which Mr. Baillet examines,
" may come from the enemies, as well as from the
" friends of the Jeſuits, one cannot infer from thence,
" that the Jeſuits have any ſhare in this objection, or
" that they much regard what Mr. Baillet has ſaid of
" them. When a certain Author, diſguiſed under the
" name of *Cleanthe*, publiſhed his Critical Obſervati-
" ons upon Father Bouhours's Dialogues, it was ſaid,
" that he had been ill adviſed, and had not gone into
" the way to preferment. He anſwered, that ſuch a
" diſcourſe, and ſuch inſinuations were injurious to the
" King, and that the Jeſuits themſelves could not bear
" them. However Mr. Baillet, being willing to play
" a ſure game, and ſeeing on the other hand that he
" was falſly accuſed, did not think fit to keep ſilence.
" He unfolds carefully what he has ſaid in favour of
" the Jeſuits, and explains the obſervations he has re-
" lated concerning the Fathers Sirmond, Petavius,
" and Bouhours. What he ſays upon theſe ſubjects
" is very ſenſible and curious: nor does he forget to
" cloſe his defence by anſwering what had been object-
" ed to him with regard to the Gentlemen of Port-
" Royal, whom they accuſed him with having praiſ-
" ed too much. The paſſage where he ſpeaks of Mr.
" Menage, is very artfully written. He highly ex-
" tols the learning, wit, politeneſs and virtue of that
" great man; but at the ſame time criticiſes him up-
" on ſeveral accounts, and ſometimes renews his cen-
" ſures in his Preface."

[*N*] *Another Author publiſhed four Letters &c.*] They are intitled, *Reflexions ſur les Jugemens des Savans, envoyées à l'Auteur par un Academicien.* That is, "Re-
" flections upon the Judgments of the Learned ſent to
" the Author by a Member of the French Academy."
They were printed in the year 1691, not at the Hague, as was put in the title-page, but ſecretly in France. Father Niceron ſays (40), that Father le Tellier a Je-
ſuit was the Author of them; and Mr. Bayle ſays (41), (40) *Hommes Illuſtr.* tom. 10. Part 2. pag. 127.
" It is eaſily found that they come from the Jeſuits, (41) Let. CXI. pag. 423.
" who were exaſperated againſt Mr. Baillet, becauſe
" he

with regard to what Mr. Baillet ſays of Giovanno Della Caſa [O], Archbiſhop of Benevento, and the reputed author of a poem *De Laudibus Sodomiæ, ſive Pæderaſtiæ.* In the year 1688 Mr. Baillet publiſhed his book entitled, *Les Enfans devenus celebres par leurs Etudes & par leurs Ecrits:* That is, "Of Children, who are become famous by their "Study, and their Writings." Mr. Baillet was ſorry to ſee a great many perſons of Quality, prepoſſeſſed with this notion, that ſtudy is hurtful to the health and wit of children. He knew ſeveral, who were of the ſame age and quality with young Mr. de Lamoignon, his pupil, and who by their parents indulgence grew up in ſloth and indolence, for fear of impairing their health. This obliged him to ſhew by ſeveral inſtances both ancient and modern, that children may be in a very good ſtate of health, though they apply themſelves to the Sciences (*o*). He deſigned this book at firſt only as a Dedication, which was to be prefixed to a larger Work; but this growing under his pen, he reſolved at laſt to publiſh it by itſelf (*p*), and addreſſed it to his pupil, for whoſe inſtruction and emulation it was chiefly written. This Work was very well received by the Publick, the Profeſſors of the Univerſities adviſed their ſcholars to purchaſe it, and made them read ſuch paſſages of it, as ſeemed moſt proper to excite their emulation. When Mr. Menage's Anti-Baillet was publiſhed, the two firſt words ſurpriſed our Author. The word *Anti* being joined to that of *Baillet* gave him the notion of a perſonal ſatyr, which attacks not the works of a man, but his very perſon. This gave him the hint to write a book concerning ſuch ſatyrs, in which a man's name was connected to the word *Anti*, beginning from the *Anti-Cato* of Cæſar, which is the firſt and moſt ancient of the *Anti's*, to the *Anti-Baillet*, which is the laſt. He publiſhed it in 1689 with this title, *Des Satyres perſonelles, Traité Hiſtorique & Critique de celles, qui portent le Titre d'Anti:* That is, "Of perſonal "Satyrs, or, an Hiſtorical and Critical Treatiſe of thoſe Satyrs, which bear the Title of "Anti." Paris 2 voll. in 12mo. We ſhall give ſome account of it in the Note [P]. He afterwards applied himſelf to a very large Work, in which he intended to diſcover the true name of thoſe Authors, who had diſguiſed themſelves under fictitious names. He had gathered a great many materials for this Work, and about the year 1678 he had already compoſed a Latin piece upon this ſubject, which he had entitled, *Elenchus Apocalypticus Scriptorum Cryptonymorum, &c.* That is, "A collection of diſguiſed Authors whoſe "names are diſcovered." But though he had his materials in a manner ready, as they were in Latin, and he did not care to print them in that language, he publiſhed only a ſort of Preliminary Treatiſe to his great Work, and entitled it, *Auteurs deguiſez ſous des noms étrangers, empruntés, ſuppoſés, feints à plaiſir, abregés, chifrés, renverſés, retournés, ou changés d'une langue en un autre; Tome I, contenant le Traité preliminaire, ſur le changement*

(o) *Vie de Baillet, ubi ſupra,* pag. 34.

(p) Adverti-ſement prefixed to it.

"he had ſhewn himſelf a little partial in favour of "the Gentlemen of Port-Royal, and ſpoken in a diſ-"obliging manner of ſome of the Jeſuits." Upon which Mr. Marchand the Editor of Mr. Bayle's Letters obſerves in a note, that theſe Letters really came from the Jeſuits; that they have been printed at Roan, and are generally aſcribed to Father Michael le Tellier, Confeſſor to Lewis XIV. But the Author of the Advertiſement, prefixed to the Amſterdam edition of Baillet's *Jugemens des Savans*, printed in 1725, ſays, that ſome perſons pretend, that theſe Letters were written by a Jeſuit, who had a great deal of wit and genius, and who died very young at la Fléche, a little city in the Province of Anjou.

[O] *Falſe reaſonings, ... concerning what Mr. Baillet ſays of Giovanno della Caſa.*] Mr. Baillet aſcribes (42) to that Archbiſhop the Poem, which we have mentioned in the text of this article, and ſays, "It is needleſs now to pretend to conceal the name, "ſubject and fate of that famous and abominable "Poem, of which the Author thought he could juſtify himſelf before men; for the ſcandal it gave "at firſt, is now over, and the Proteſtants have not "thought proper to let that piece be buried in obli-"vion." We ſhall perhaps examine in another place, the reaſons which Mr. Baillet alledges, to prove that Della Caſa is really the Author of that piece, and Mr. Menage's confutation of them (43); and ſhall only lay here before the reader the falſe reaſoning of one of Mr. Baillet's adverſaries. Having related the words which we quoted above (44), he adds (45), "Upon this Mr. Baillet renews the ſcandal; he gives "us the title of that ſcandalous Poem; tells us the "place where it was printed, the name of the Printer, "and the year in which it was publiſhed; and as if "it were doing the world a ſervice, to acquaint it "thoroughly with ſo brutiſh a work, he relates the "two points that are treated of in it. If he had "known more of it, he would not have bluſhed to "tell it, nor would he have regarded his reader's mo-"deſty. I own that if it were not for the reſpect we "owe to Baillet's protectors and friends, we ſhould "make him ſenſible, that he ought to have ſpared a "perſon who is ſacred, and that charity, prudence "and modeſty ſhould have obliged him not to ſpeak "of a work, that treats of thoſe things, which St. "Paul forbids us to name, and of which the ve-"ry name is ſhocking to a good man." That is to ſay, in plain Engliſh, that becauſe a man is a Biſhop or an Archbiſhop, his character muſt be ſacred, and when we are writing his Life, or giving an account of his works, we ought not to mention what he has done or written amiſs. Is this conſiſtent with the character of a faithful Hiſtorian? And would not Mr. Baillet have juſtly been accuſed of partiality, if ſpeaking of this Prelate, he had omitted to mention a piece of his, which is ſo much to his diſhonour, and which is publicly known to have been aſcribed to him by all Authors, Catholics as well as Proteſtants? For it muſt be obſerved, that tho' Mr. Menage denies, that Della Caſa ever wrote a Poem entitled *De Laudibus Sodomiæ* or *Pæderaſtiæ*, yet he confeſſes, that he wrote a Poem intitled *Capitolo del Forno*, wherein there are ſome verſes, in which he approves and praiſes the love of boys (46). Why then ſhould ſuch a circumſtance be omitted in his Life, tho' he was an Archbiſhop?

[P] *We ſhall give ſome account of it.*] His deſign is not to anſwer directly to Mr. Menage, but rather to prepoſſeſs the public in his favour, by ſhewing that thoſe Satyrs, in which the word *Anti* is joined with a man's name, are not levelled againſt the errors, which he may have committed, but attack his perſon and his reputation, and for that reaſon ought to be look'd upon as mere libels (47). This book is full of excellent obſervations; and the anſwer to Mr. Menage, who was the occaſion of it, contains only a few pages. Mr. Baillet was in a pleaſant humour when he wrote it; for finding fault with the title of Anti-Baillet, which ſavours too much of a perſonal ſatyr, he ſays, that Mr. Menage might have intitled his Book, *Contre-Jugemens*, or if that title being entirely French, did not ſhew any learning, he might have given it a Greek turn thus, *Anti-critique des Gnoſtiques* (48).

(42) *Jugem. des Sav.* tom. 8. p. 224.

(43) *Anti-Baillet*, Part ii. § 119, 120. p. m. 449, &c.

(44) Quotat. 42.

(45) *Reflex. ſur les Jugem. des Sav.* in tom. 15. of theſe *Jugem.* pag. 353.

(46) *Anti-Baillet, ubi ſupra,* pag. 464.

(47) Niceron, *ubi ſupra,* p. 32.

(48) *Satyres Perſonel. in Jugem. des Sav.* tom. 13. p. 160.

changement & la ſuppoſition des noms parmi les Auteurs. That is, "Authors diſguiſed under names foreign, borrowed, ſuppoſed, feigned, abridged, cyphered, turned, as by way of anagram, or tranſlated from one language into another. Vol. I. which contains a preliminary Treatiſe concerning the alteration and ſuppoſition of names amongſt Authors," printed firſt at Paris, in 1620, 12mo. This preliminary Treatiſe is all that has been publiſhed of that Work. It appears by this title, that Mr. Baillet's deſign was very like that of Mr. Placcius, who wrote a Latin Treatiſe *De Anonymis & Pſeudonymis*, "Of anonymous and diſguiſed Authors," and had heard of Mr. Baillet's undertaking [Q]. In the year 1691 he publiſhed in French the life of Carteſius in two volumes in 4to. This life has been ſeverely criticiſed upon [R], and Father Niceron ſays (p), that the Author might have left out ſome things, which have no relation to Carteſius, and ſeveral trifles, though they have a relation to him. However this life ſold very well, and the Bookſeller was going to print a ſecond edition of it, when he was prevented by death. But as the Publick deſired to have a life of Carteſius, that ſhould be ſhort and cheap, and ſome perſons intending to abridge that, which Mr. Baillet had publiſhed, he undertook the taſk himſelf, and reduced the two volumes in 4to to one volume in 12mo (q). Several of his friends deſired him alſo for his own ſatisfaction, and for theirs, to write the life of Edmund Richer, Doctor of the Sorbonne, which he did, but he did not publiſh it [S]. In 1693 he publiſhed an Hiſtory of Holland [T], from the peace concluded between the Seven Provinces and Spain in 1609 to the peace of Nimmegen in 1679. The next year he publiſhed *De la Devotion à la Sainte Vierge & du Culte qui lui eſt du.* That is,

(p) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 33.

(q) *Vie de Baillet, ubi ſupra.* pag. 41.

[Q] *Placcius had heard of Mr. Baillet's undertaking.*] Mr. Lipſtorpius, a learned Phyſician of Germany, being at Paris, ſome years before Mr. Baillet publiſh'd his *Diſguiſed Authors*, went to viſit him, and deſired him to ſhew him what he had already collected upon that ſubject, in order to know whether his deſign was like that of Placcius. It was found to be ſo; and Mr. Placcius being acquainted with it, and having ſeen Mr. Baillet's *Elenchus*, wrote to him in 1688 a long letter in Latin, to thank him for the obliging manner, in which he had communicated his Plan to him, and offered him his own obſervations upon that ſubject. He importuned him likewiſe to publiſh immediately his work in Latin, that it might be uſeful to all the learned in Europe. Mr. Baillet intended certainly then to print his work in French (50). But, if we may give credit to Father Niceron (51), he dropt his deſign, becauſe it was repreſented to him, that ſuch an undertaking would raiſe him a thouſand enemies; ſo that he reſolved at laſt to publiſh only the preliminary diſcourſe, tho' the whole work was finiſhed, and he had already obtained a privilege for it (52).

(50) *Vie de Baillet, ubi ſupra*, pag. 40.
(51) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 33.
(52) *Vie de Baillet, ubi ſupra*, pag. 38.

[R] *This Life has been ſeverely criticiſed upon.*] There were two Letters privately printed in France in the year 1691, though in the title-page it was ſaid at the Hague. They were intitled, *Reflexions d'un Academicien ſur la vie de Mr. Des Cartes, envoyées à un de ſes amis en Hollande*; i. e. "Reflections of a Member of the French Academy upon the Life of Carteſius, ſent to a friend of his in Holland," in two Letters. F. Le Long aſcribes this piece to Mr. Gallois, though Mr. Merchand ſays, that F. Le Tellier was the Author of it (53). Mr. Bayle ſpeaking of that piece ſays (54), that Mr. Baillet is there ridiculed in a very ſevere manner. This will appear to be true, by two or three paſſages which we ſhall tranſcribe from it. "When Mr. Baillet, *ſays the Author* (55), "ſhall undertake to write the life of ſome "eminent perſon, let a Writer of the firſt rank "take the ſame life, we ſhall then have a compleat "hiſtory of ſuch a man; for whatever the excellent "Author ſhould think fit to leave out, Mr. Baillet "would certainly acquaint us with it, &c." The Author then criticiſes Mr. Baillet's trifling accounts, and his perpetual digreſſions; "I was delighted, *ſays he* (56), when caſting my eyes upon ſeveral paſſages "of the firſt and ſecond book, I found here the wars "of Prince Maurice; in another place thoſe of Bohemia; then thoſe of Hungary, and a great many "more military expeditions. I was not leſs pleaſed, "when I happened to read an account of the Synod "of Dort, of the Aſſemblies of Francfort, Nurembergh, and Ulm. I then ſaid to myſelf, I muſt "certainly have been miſtaken; I looked upon Carteſius as a man entirely taken up with the ſtudy of "Nature, who only travelled as a private man for a "few years through Europe, before he ſhut himſelf "up in his cloſet. But I find by the bare titles of "his Hiſtory, that he had a ſhare in all the greateſt "actions that have been performed in the wars in "Flanders, Holland, Germany, Bohemia, Hungary, "Italy, and France. I find him employed in political affairs, in the Synod of Dort, in the Aſſemblies in Germany, and eſpecially in that of Ulm. "Therefore I begin with the utmoſt curioſity to "read the account of thoſe wars, and of thoſe aſſemblies. I expect to ſee the young warrior at the "head of a ſquadron of Hollanders, break through "the army of the Spaniards; in Bohemia, commanding under the Duke of Bavaria, ſuppreſſing the rebellion of the revolted Germans; in Hungary in "imitation of the brave Count du Bucquoy, making "the Uſurper Bethlen-Gabor tremble, diſtinguiſhing "himſelf at the ſiege of Rochelle. But I find my "ſelf very much diſappointed; the Hiſtorian tells "me, that Carteſius was at all thoſe wars only as a "mere ſpectator, and not as an actor; firmly determined to view every thing like a Philoſopher, and "never to do any thing like a ſoldier. This makes "me almoſt ſwear againſt the Hiſtorian. I aſk, to "what purpoſe does he give ſo many accounts of military actions, in the life of a very quiet and pacifick man? The reaſon he gives for it calms my "reſentments. The Hero had ſeen all thoſe tranſactions during his life; it is therefore the duty of an "Hiſtorian to relate them in his Hiſtory." The whole piece runs in the ſame ſtrain; it is a continued ridicule upon Mr. Baillet, and it muſt be owned that he too much deſerved it by his continual digreſſions, which are entirely foreign to his deſign.

(53) *Avertiſſement à la Tete des Jugem. des Sav.* ed. d'Amſt. 1725.
(54) Let. cxi. pag. 423.
(55) In the *Jug. des Sav.* tom. 15. pag. 414.
(56) Ibid. pag. 421.

[S] *The Life of Dr. Richer . . . . but he did not publiſh it.*] "I am here, *ſays he in a Letter to a friend*, "in a very great but agreeable ſolitude, and divert "myſelf with writing the life of the famous Richer, "on whoſe account your Sorbonne has had ſo much "trouble. But it will not be a work proper for a "privilege in this Kingdom." The life of Carteſius had made a great deal of noiſe; but that of Richer ſeemed to Mr. Baillet of ſuch a nature, as to cauſe a greater clamour ſtill, both in France and in Italy (57). It was printed ſeveral years after his death at Liege in 1714, in 12mo (58).

(57) *Vie de Baillet, ubi ſupra*, pag. 42.
(58) F. Niceron, *ubi ſupra*, p. 35.

[T] *He publiſhed an Hiſtory of Holland.*] It was intended as a continuation of that of Grotius, and it was expected that it would be written with the ſame impartiality. It contained four pretty thick volumes in 12mo, of a ſmall letter. The Author publiſhed it under the name of *Balthaſar d'Hezenail de la Neuville*, which is the anagram of *Baillet de la Neuville en Hez.* (*La Neuville en Hez* is the place of his birth.) No body except a few of the Author's particular friends were acquainted with the ſecret. The ſtyle of the Hiſtory, adds the Author of his Life (59), ſeemed clear and correct enough, to be thought to come from the pen of one Mr. de la Neuville, who had already publiſhed ſome other Hiſtories with ſucceſs. But F. Niceron ſays (60), that Hiſtory is not much eſteemed, and contains very groſs miſtakes.

(59) *Vie de Baillet*, p. 43.
(60) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 34.

is, " Of the Devotion towards the holy Virgin, and of the worſhip which is due to her." It was only a ſmall volume in 12mo, deſigned for the inſtruction of the Roman Catholicks; it had been approved by four Doctors of the Sorbonne, whereupon it had been licenſed by the Chancellor (*r*). Yet it was ſoon attacked from two different quarters, in two pieces, the one intitled, *Mémoire addreſſé à la Sorbonne, touchant le livre de la Devotion à la Sainte Vierge*. That is, " A Memorial directed to the Sorbonne, concerning the book of the " Devotion towards the holy Virgin;" in 12mo. The title of the other is, *Lettre à Mr. Hideux, Curé des SS. Innocens, ſur ſon approbation au nouveau livre de la Devotion à la Vierge*. That is, " A Letter to Mr. Hideux, Curate of the Holy Innocents, concerning " his approbation of the new book upon the Devotion to the Virgin." Printed at Liege in 1694, in 12mo. We ſhall give a ſhort account of the other books, which Mr. Baillet wrote in the Note [*V*]. It appears by his works, and eſpecially by his *Judgments of the Learned*, that he was a man of vaſt projects. Another inſtance of it is, that he formed the deſign of writing a compleat ſyſtem of Divinity upon the points of the Chriſtian Faith, upon Morality, and upon the Church Diſcipline, and all this ſupported by the authority of the holy Scripture, and the conſent of the Interpreters or Commentators, by the Councils, and the authentic Records of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory; by the Fathers of the Church, and laſtly by the example of the Saints. He propoſed to give to this Compilation the title and form of an *Univerſal Eccleſiaſtical Dictionary*, in which Students in Divinity, and even the Learned, as well as the Unlearned might eaſily find in an alphabetical order whatever relates to theſe three points, viz. Doctrine, Morality, and Diſcipline. This he called already his great and laſt work; and looked upon it as finiſhed, either becauſe he had the plan of it, or becauſe he flattered himſelf to have it compleated in three years time, if God ſhould grant him his uſual health. That work was to contain three volumes in folio. But his death, which happened after a lingering illneſs, the 21ſt of Jan. 1706, in the 56th year of his age, put an end to all his deſigns. We ſhall give his character in the Note [*X*].

(*r*) Ibid. pag. 44.

(61) Niceron, *ubi ſupra*, p. 34.

(62) *Nouvell. de la Repub. des Lett.* 1701. Juillet, pag. 109.

(63) *Apud* Niceron, *Hom. Illuſt.* tom. 10. Part 2. pag. 128.

[*V*] *An account of the other books which Mr. Baillet wrote.*] In 1695 he publiſhed a little piece intitled, *De la conduite des Ames*, i. e. " Of the care of Souls," in 12mo; it contains twenty ſeven chapters, he publiſhed it under the fictitious name of Daret de la Villeneuve, and under that diſguiſe he eſcaped the criticiſm of his adverſaries. In 1700 he publiſhed *Diſcours ſur la vie des Saints*, i. e. " A Diſcourſe upon the " life of the Saints." Paris 8vo; it is alſo printed at the head of the following book, *Les Vies des Saints*, i. e. " The Lives of the Saints," in three volumes in folio, and twelve in 8vo, Paris, 1701 (61). This work was ſo well received by the publick, that the Bookſellers ſaid, the two editions would be ſold off in ſix months time. The Author had retrenched ſome part of it, and it was then ſaid, that he would ſoon acquaint the world with what he had retrenched, and the reaſons he had for it (62). This book has been printed four times; the firſt and ſecond editions in folio and 8vo are the beſt; the third in 1704, is pretty well printed, but ſeveral things have been altered in it, as appears by the great number of ſeparate leaves with which it abounds. The laſt is very mean, in bad letter, and upon bad paper. " Theſe Lives of the Saints, *ſays Mr. Langlet* (63), " are written with a very great " exactneſs, with regard to Hiſtory. The ſtyle of " them is natural, but ſtrong and lively. This is " one of thoſe works which have been long wiſhed " for, and which may be very uſeful hereafter. The " Author is a judicious Critic, who does not let any " miracle paſs, without a thorough examination. " This is the beſt work that Mr. Baillet ever wrote. " It has been cenſured; but what book ever eſcaped " cenſure? One fault, which may juſtly be found in " it, is, that the Author did not write with that de- " votion which was requiſite in a book deſigned for " the uſe of the faithful." In 1703 Mr. Baillet publiſhed the Hiſtory of the moveable Feaſts; the Lives of the Saints of the Old Teſtament, and the Chronology and Topography of the Saints, *Hiſtoire des Fêtes mobiles*; *Les Vies des Saints de l'ancien Teſtament, la Chronologie & la Topographie des Saints*, printed at Paris in one volume in folio, and five in 8vo. *Les maximes de St. Etienne de Grammont*; i. e. " The Maxims " of St. Stephen of Grammont," Paris, 1704, in 12mo; it is a tranſlation from the Latin. *La Vie de Godfrey Hermant, Docteur de Sorbonne, & Chanoine de l'Egliſe de Beauvais*; i. e. " The Life of Godfrey " Hermant, &c." printed after the Author's death at Amſterdam, in 1717, in 12mo. *Hiſtoire des demeles du Pape Boniface VIII avec Philippe le Bel Roy de France*; i. e, " The Hiſtory of the Diſputes between " Pope Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair, King of " France," Paris 1718, in 12mo. This Hiſtory is very well drawn up, it contains a faithful extract of original pieces (64).

(64) F. Niceron, tom. 3. pag. 34, 35.

[*X*] *We ſhall give his character in the note.*] Mr. Baillet had a very lively genius, and a capacious underſtanding. He had an admirable skill to diſtinguiſh truth, from what has only the appearance of it, and a ſolid judgment; and his taſte with regard to works of wit and genius was ſuch, as might ſafely be depended upon. But above all he had an inſatiable ardour for the Sciences, and an unwearied application in his ſtudies. His knowledge was not confined to one Science only, as ſufficiently appears by his writings; but through his eagerneſs to know every thing he had not time to apply himſelf to the poliſhing of his ſtyle. He regarded the things themſelves more than the manner of ſaying them; and the firſt expreſſion which offered itſelf to him, was generally that which he made uſe of; and there never was any blot or raſure to be ſeen in his Writings (65).

(65) Idem, ibid. pag. 29, 30.

☞ BAINBRIDGE (JOHN), an eminent Phyſician and Aſtronomer in the XVIIth Century, and author of ſeveral tracts [*A*], was born of a good family at Aſhby de la Zouch

[*A*] *Author of ſeveral Tracts.*] I. *An aſtronomical Deſcription of the late Comet from the 18th of November 1618 to the 16th of December following.* London 1619, 4to (1). Dr. Thomas Smith tells us (2), that this piece was only a ſhort epitome of a larger work, which he deſigned to publiſh in the Latin tongue under the title of *Cometographia*; tho' it is not known whether he ever finiſh'd that deſign. The ſame author obſerves, that he was induced by the importunity and curioſity of the Public to publiſh this *Deſcription* ſeparately from the reſt of his work. It muſt be confeſſed, that our Author paid too great a regard to the vulgar notions concerning Comets, as preſages of dreadful calamities; with which view he has ſubjoined to his Treatiſe certain *moral Prognoſtics*. II. He publiſhed *Procli Sphæra. Ptolomæi de Hypotheſibus Planetarum Liber ſingularis, &c.* London 1620, 4to; and he has given us a Latin Verſion of *Proclus's Sphere*. In his Introduction he tells us, that this piece, tho' it bears the name of Proclus, is rather to be aſcribed to Geminus, a celebrated Geometrician and Aſtronomer, from whoſe *Iſagoge* upon the φαινόμενα Proclus exactly tranſcribed

(1) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 34. 2d edit. 1721.

(2) *Commentar. de Vitâ & Studiis Jo. Bainbridgii*, pag. 5.

Zouch in Leiceſterſhire in the year 1582, and educated at the public ſchool of that town; from whence he was tranſplanted to Emanuel College in Cambridge, and put under the care of Dr. Joſeph Hall, afterwards Biſhop of Norwich, to whom he was related (*a*). He took the degrees in Arts, and ſtudied Phyſic there; after which he retired into his own country, where he taught a grammar ſchool for ſome years, and practiſed Phyſic with great ſucceſs (*b*). He employed his leiſure hours in the ſtudy of mathematics, and particularly of Aſtronomy, which he had been extremely fond of from his earlieſt years. By the advice of his friends, who thought that his diſtinguiſhed merit and abilities ought not to be confined to the obſcurity of a country life, he removed to London, in order that he might improve himſelf in his ſtudies by converſation and the advantage of books, and was admitted a Fellow of the College of Phyſicians (*c*). His *Deſcription of the Comet*, which appeared in 1618, raiſed him a very great character, and introduced him to the acquaintance of Sir Henry Savile, who having founded two Lectures, one for Geometry, and the other for Aſtronomy, in the Univerſity of Oxford in Auguſt 1619, preferred Mr. Bainbridge to the Profeſſorſhip of the latter, without any ſolicitation; upon which he removed to Oxford in 1620 [*B*], and was enter'd a Maſter-Commoner of Merton-College (*d*). He was likewiſe incorporated Doctor of Phyſic, as he had ſtood at Cambridge (*e*), and reſided for

(*a*) Thomæ Smith *Commentariolus de Vitâ & Studiis Joannis Bainbridgii*, pag. 3. publiſhed in his *Vitæ quorundam eruditiſſimor. & illuſtr. viror.* London 1708, in 4to.

(*b*) Idem, ibid. *and* Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 34. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*c*) Smith, pag. 4.

(*d*) Idem, pag. 5, 6. *and* Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(*e*) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

it. *Alteram titulo quidem Procli, jure tamen Gemini, Geometræ & Aſtronomi nobiliſſimi, ex cujus in Φαινόμενα Iſagoge eam totam & ad verbum λογιστικος excerpſit Proclus.* To this he joined an edition of Ptolemy περὶ ὑποθέσεων Πλανωμένων, and his Κανὼν Βασιλείων, or *Canon of the Kingdoms*; with a Latin Tranſlation of the former. He ſuppoſes that Ptolemy brought down this *Canon* to the time of Antoninus Pius the Emperor; and that the reſt was added by Theon, the Interpreter of Ptolemy. Our Author collated theſe pieces with ſeveral manuſcripts, and illuſtrated them with figures. III. *Canicularia*; Oxford 1648, in 8vo. This piece treats of the *Canicular Year*, or the natural year of the Egyptians, which began with the heliacal riſing of the dog-ſtar, and of the canicular-days, and the riſing of that ſtar, and the *Sothiacal* period. He has enlivened this ſubject with a great variety of agreeable learning from the ancient Greek and Latin Authors, whoſe opinions he relates and corrects. Dr. Bainbridge wrote this Treatiſe at the requeſt of Archbiſhop Uſher; but left it imperfect, being prevented either by the breaking out of the civil war, or by death, ſo that he was not able to finiſh his Demonſtration of the Heliacal Riſing of the Dog-Star, *which*, as Mr. John Greaves obſerves, *was the only Pillar of that Diſcourſe*; and which was ſupplied for the parallel of Lower-Egypt by that Gentleman, who publiſhed this treatiſe of our Author. *V. Cl. Johannes Gravius commentarios Bainbridgii* de anno Caniculari, h. e. *de Ægyptiorum anno naturali, à Caniculæ ortu heliaco incipiente, ſuaſu ac impulſu reverendiſſimi Archiepiſcopi Armachani conſcriptos, A. D. MDCXLVIII. Oxonii edidit; in quibus etiam de diebus canicularibus, ortuque ipſius ſplendidiſſimæ ſtellæ, & de periodo Sothiaca, non ſine varia amœnioris literaturæ ex Græcis Latiniſque veteribus Auctoribus, quorum ſententias exponit & caſtigat, admixtione, agitur. Hos verò Bainbridgius, ſive turbatiſſimis illis, flagrante rebellione Parlamentariâ, rebus impeditus, ſive morte in ipſis viridis ſenectæ initiis præreptus, imperfectos reliquit, ad iſtius ſtellæ ortûs heliaci demonſtrationem*, quod unicum erat, *uti Gravius loquitur*, iſtius Diatribæ columen, *neutiquam progreſſus* (3). Since that time we have had none of our Author's writings publiſh'd; tho' ſeveral Diſſertations of his compoſition were prepared for and committed to the preſs the year after his death, with the Approbation of the Vice-Chancellor of the Univerſity of Oxford; but the edition of them was never compleated. The titles of them are as follow: *Antiprognoſticon, in quo μαντικῆς Aſtrologicæ, cœleſtium domorum, & triplicitatum commentis, magniſque Saturni & Jovis (cujuſmodi anno 1623 & 1643 contigerunt, & viceſimo ferè quoque deinceps anno, ratis naturæ legibus, recurrent,) conjunctionibus innixæ, vanitas breviter detegitur*: i. e. "Antiprognoſtics, in which is briefly "ſhewn the vanity of Aſtrological Predictions, which "depend upon the falſe ſuppoſition of the celeſtial "houſes and triplicities, and the grand conjunctions "of Saturn and Jupiter (ſuch as happened in 1623 "and 1643, and will recur once in almoſt every "twenty years hereafter, agreeably to the ſtated laws "of nature)." *De Meridianorum ſive Longitudinum differentiis inveniendis Diſſertatio*: i. e. "A Diſſertation concerning the method of finding out the differences of the Meridians or Longitudes." *De Stellâ Veneris Diatriba*: i. e. "A Diſſertation concerning "the Star of Venus." To theſe pieces was to be added the ſhort Oration ſpoken at his funeral by Mr. William Strode, the public Orator of the Univerſity. Theſe learned Tracts fell into the hands of Dr. Thomas Smith, who promis'd to publiſh them, if the avarice of the Bookſellers, as he terms it, would ſuffer him. *Cum verò eruditæ hæ lucubrationes mihi in manus felicissimo caſu inciderint, ne penitus interirent, quantum in me erit, & ſi per Bibliopolarum avaritiam liceat, tandem aliquando curabo* (4). A Specimen of celeſtial Obſervations, which Dr. Bainbridge made at Oxford, may be ſeen in Iſmael Bullialdus's *Aſtronomia Philolaica* (5) publiſh'd at Paris, in 1645. But theſe pieces are very inconſiderable in compariſon of thoſe other Tracts of his, which were never publiſhed, but left in his Will to Archbiſhop Uſher, among whoſe manuſcripts they are preſerved in the Library at Trinity-College at Dublin. Dr. Smith (6) mentions the following Treatiſes extant there among others; *a Theory of the Sun*; *a Theory of the Moon*; *a Diſcourſe concerning the Quantity of the Year*; *two Volumes of aſtronomical Obſervations*; *and nine or ten volumes of miſcellaneous papers relating to the Mathematics*. And that Gentleman obſerves, that it would be of great ſervice to the Public, if any of the Mathematicians in Ireland, who have the opportunity of examining thoſe manuſcripts, would communicate to the learned World what they find in them of importance to Aſtronomy. For tho' every intelligent perſon muſt confeſs, that a great many noble diſcoveries unknown to him, have been made ſince Dr. Bainbridge's time in that ſcience, by Gaſſendus, Hevelius, Ricciolus, Bullialdus, Caſſini, and our countrymen Dr. Ward, Hook, Flamſted, Halley, and others (7); yet it is not only a pleaſure but even an advantage to learn from the writings of the former Aſtronomers, what obſervations they have made, and by what ſteps and methods the ſcience has been brought to perfection; ſince their imperfect notices, conjectures, and hints may give occaſion for the diſcovery of many things, which might otherwiſe be never thought of. *Quid Aſtronomi tempore priores obſervaverint, quibuſque mediis, ratione, & methodo ſideralis hæc ſcientia ad culmen aſſurrexerit, ex illorum ſcriptis deducere, id quidem non ſoli ſtudioſorum voluptati, ſed commodo inſervire poſſit; ansâ ex illorum imperfectis notitiis, conjecturis, & ſuggeſtionibus, plura, quibus non aliter veniſſent in mentem, inveniendi & excogitandi inde arripiendâ* (8). He undertook likewiſe *a Deſcription of the Britiſh Monarchy*, diſtinguiſhed into three columns, in order to ſhew the advantages of the Union of England and Scotland under one Monarch; as appears from his *Dedication of the Deſcription of the Comet in* 1618, to King James I; but this Treatiſe is loſt or was ſuppreſſed by him (9).

(3) Ibid. pag. 14.

(4) Ibid.

(5) Lib. 12. p. 467.

(6) Pag. 15.

(7) Dr. Smith ought undoubtedly to have mentioned Sir Iſaac Newton upon this occaſion, with peculiar honour and diſtinction.

(8) Smith, pag. 15.

(9) Idem, pag. 15, 16.

[*B*] *Removed to Oxford in* 1620.] Dr. Walter Pope in his *Life of Seth Ward Lord Biſhop of Saliſbury* (10) mentions a very odd ſtory relating to our Author, after he had entered upon his Profeſſorſhip. He tells us, that he was *a learned and good Mathematician*; "yet "there goes, *ſays he*, a ſtory of him, which was in "many ſcholars mouths, when I was firſt admitted "there;

(10) Cap. 3. p. 10, 11. edit. London, 1697.

for ſome years in that College, the Society of which conferred upon him the place of junior Reader of Linacre's Lecture in 1631 (*f*) and of ſuperior Reader of the ſame Lecture in 1635 (*g*). In this calm retirement, which he enjoyed for the purſuit of his ſtudies, he reſolved upon publiſhing correct editions of the antient Greek Aſtronomers, as well thoſe, which had not yet been printed, as thoſe, which had already ſeen the light, agreeably to the Statutes of the Founder of that Profeſſorſhip (*h*); and in order to make himſelf maſter of the diſcoveries of the Arabian Aſtronomers, he began the ſtudy of the Arabic Language, when he was above forty years of age (*i*). He died at his houſe over againſt Merton-College November 3d 1643, in the 62d year of his age; and his body was conveyed to the public ſchool, where an Oration having been pronounced in honour of him by Mr. William Strode, the Univerſity Orator, it was carried to Merton-College Church, and there ſolemnly depoſited on the left ſide of Mr. Henry Briggs's grave, near the Altar (*k*); and an Epitaph was inſcribed upon his Monument [*C*]. Dr. Smith (*l*) tells us, that as his unaffected piety and humanity procured him an univerſal eſteem among his contemporaries; ſo his great ſkill in the Mathematics and polite Learning will ſecure him to poſterity the character of one of the greateſt men of his age.

(*f*) Smith, pag. 6.
(*g*) Idem, ibid. *and* Wood, *ubi ſupra.*
(*h*) Smith, pag. 6.
(*i*) Idem. pag. 10, 11.
(*k*) Idem, pag. 12. *and* Wood, *ubi ſupra.*
(*l*) Pag. 16.

"there; that he put upon the ſchool-gate an *Affiche* "or written paper, as the cuſtom is, giving notice "at what time, and upon what ſubject the Profeſſor "will read; which ended in theſe words, *Lecturus de* "*Polis & Axis*; under which was written by an un- "known hand, as follows;

"*Doctor Bambridge* (11) *came from Cambridge,*
"*To read* de Polis & Axis:
"*Let him go back again, like a Dunce as he came,*
"*And learn a new* Syntaxis."

(11) Dr. Pope likewiſe calls him erroneouſly *Bambridge*, inſtead of *Bainbridge*.

Dr. Smith takes notice of this imputation caſt upon him; and tells us, that his reputation had ſuffered, tho' upon a trifling account, from the falſe and malicious calumny of ſome perſons, who charged him with a fault in Syntax in one of his Lectures; which abſurd and ridiculous ſtory he ſhould have omitted as unworthy of any reply, if *a certain eminent buffoon*, ſays he, had not introduced that ſtupid epigram in a late book of his. *In vindicias illius famæ, quam, licet in re leviculâ, læſit mendaciſſima quorundam obtrectatio, quaſi in prælectione habitâ contra Grammaticæ Syntaxeos regulas ex ignorantia ſemel peccâſſet; quam, utpote ſcomma abſurdum ridiculumque, & quod ſeriò refutetur, prorſus indignum, penitus omiſiſſem, niſi inſignis quidam ſannio in nupero libello epigramma iſtud inficetum, rythmis Anglicanis olim conſcribillatum, ad captandum puerorum plauſum, irriſorium plane in modum inſeruiſſet* (12).

(12) Smith, pag. 16.

[*C*] *An Epitaph was inſcribed upon his monument.*] It is as follows: *Si cupias, Viator, quis & quantus hic jacet, alibi quæras, oportet, dicere ſatis nequeo. Britannia tota Viri famam non capit. Ne cætera tamen ignores, in rem tuam pauca hæc accipe.* JOANNES BAINBRIDGIUS, *Vir famæ integerrimæ, & doctrinæ incomparabilis, Medicinæ Profeſſor & Matheſeos, morborum tam felix expugnator novorum, quam ſagax indagator ſyderum. Quem primum Aſtronomiæ Profeſſorem, & dignum Collegam, in mathematicis prælecturis, quas magnifice erexerat, prudens hominum & librorum æſtimator elegit*; Savilius. *Quem Cantabrigiæ educatum, Academia Oxonienſis fovit, ut ſuum, defunctum publice deflevit, ut par utriuſque ornamentum. Qui Scaligerum felicius correxit, quam Scaliger tempora; in non levem literarum jacturam immaturus obiit MDCXLIII. Abi jam; cætera quære vel ab Exteris.* i. e. "If you deſire, Paſſenger, to know who and "how great a man lies here, you muſt enquire elſe- "where; for I cannot ſufficiently inform you; for "even all Britain itſelf cannot contain his fame. "However, that you may not be ignorant of the o- "ther circumſtances relating to him, read the follow- "ing account of him. JOHN BAINBRIDGE, a man "of the cleareſt character and incomparable learning, "Profeſſor of Phyſic and Mathematics, as ſucceſsful "in removing new diſeaſes, as ſagacious in his ob- "ſervation of the Stars; who was appointed by that "excellent Judge of men and books, Sir Henry Sa- "vile, his firſt Profeſſor of Aſtronomy, and the worthy "Collegue in thoſe Lectures of Mathematics, which "he had founded in a magnificent manner; who being "educated at Cambridge, was entertained by the "Univerſity of Oxford as her own ſon, and honour- "ed by her with a public funeral, as an equal orna- "ment to both the Univerſities; who corrected Sca- "liger with more ſucceſs, than Scaliger had done "Chronology. He died too early for the intereſts "of learning in 1643. Go now, Paſſenger, and "learn even from foreigners what elſe relates to his "character." Dr. Smith tells us (3), that he is not certain, whether this Epitaph was written by Mr. Greaves his ſucceſſor in the Profeſſorſhip of Aſtronomy, tho' ſome aſſert it; but that he had tranſcribed the following Epitaph from a manuſcript written by Mr. Greaves. *Quid ſupereſt clariſſimi viri, D. Joannis Bainbridge, in Academiâ Oxonienſi publici Aſtronomiæ Profeſſoris, ſub hoc marmore clauditur. Quod verò amavimus, quod ſuſpeximus, quod mæſti deſideramus, fruſtra hic quæras: illud cœlo, cui vivus animo cogitationeque incubuit, receptum eſt. Obiit A. D.* CIↃ. IↃC. XLIII. IX.*bris III. ætatis ſuæ LXII. Horâ ſextâ matutinâ.* i. e. "The remains of the cele- "brated Dr. John Bainbridge, public Profeſſor of A- "ſtronomy in the Univerſity of Oxford, are incloſed "under this marble. But that part of him, which "we loved, which we admired, and which we la- "ment the loſs of, it is in vain to ſeek for here; "ſince it is raiſed to heaven, which his mind and all "his thoughts were fixed upon, while he lived. He "died in the year 1643, November 3d, in the 62d "year of his age, at ſix a clock in the morning."

(13) Pag. 13.

T.

BAIUS (*a*) (MICHAEL) Profeſſor of Divinity at Louvain, was born at Melin in the territory of Aeth in the year 1513. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf in ſuch a manner by his progreſs in learning, and his prudent conduct, during the courſe of his ſtudies at Louvain, that as ſoon as he was paſſed from the ſtation of a Scholar, he was made Principal of the Houſe of Standonck (*b*). After he had diſcharged this office for three years, he applied himſelf to teach Philoſophy, and when he had filled that Profeſſorſhip for ſix years, he obtained the Office of Principal of the Pope's College in the year 1549 (*c*). The ſame year he took his Degree of Licentiate in Divinity. Two years after he received his Doctor's Degree, and was made Regius Profeſſor of the Scriptures. In 1563 he was one of the Divines, who were ſent by the King of Spain from Louvain to Trent [*A*]. He made himſelf

(*a*) He is better known under this Latiniz'd name, than under that of De Bay, which was his true name.
(*b*) This is the Founder's name.
(*c*) I correct Valerius Andreas ſo; for his number CIↃ IↃXCV is a very abſurd error of the Printers.

[*A*] *He was ſent by the King of Spain from Louvain to Trent.*] See in Cardinal Pallavicini the ſeveral ſprings, which retarded or advanced the deputation of Michael Baius (1). The author of the Life of Commendon has paſſed very lightly over this, and with too much flattery (2); but the Author of the Hiſtory of the Council

(1) Pallav. *Hiſtoria Concil. Trident.* lib. 15. c. 7.
(2) Antonio Marie Gratiani, *Vie de Cardinal Commendon*, tranſlated by Monſ. Flechier, pag. 158.

(d) *Ex* Valer. Andreæ, *Bibliotb. Belgic.* pag. 670.

(c) See remark [H].

(f) Swert. *in Athen. Belg. Valer. Andr.*

self greatly admired in the Council. He obtained the Deanery of St. Peter's in Louvain in 1575. About three years after he had the dignity of Conservator of the Privileges of the University conferred upon him (*d*). His Epitaph informs us, that he was Chancellor of that University, and Inquisitor General of the Low Countries. He was a man of great abilities, and no less commendable for his exemplary life, piety, and modesty, than for his genius and knowledge (*e*). He had read St. Augustin's Works nine times over (*f*): he composed several books in Divinity [*B*], which have a tincture of that reading (*g*), and in which it was pretended there were found a great many propositions, that were censured by Pope Pius V [*C*]. He wrote likewise some controversial pieces against those of the Reformed Religion [*D*]. He had so much deference for the Pope's Censure [*E*], that though he did not think that he had taught any heterodoxy, he would not suffer the books, in which those censured propositions were pretended to be contained, to be reprinted (*b*). Valerius Andreas has committed several errors in speaking of this Censure [*F*]. There is expected a new edition of the Works of Michael Baius; which will contain

(g) See remark [E].

(b) Valer. Andr. *Bibliotb. Belg.* pag. 671.

Council has very clearly unfolded all the intrigues of Commendon, and gives him nothing but what belongs to him. This Nuncio being at Brussels in the year 1561, took notice of the disputes which had been agitated at Louvain, because Baius and Hessels did not follow the common way of thinking in the doctrine of free-will, and works, and in some other points. These two Doctors had been silent for some time, out of deference to those who advised them to it; but when they found that the Sorbonne, at the sollicitation of the Franciscans, had censured eighteen propositions, and they were importuned by their scholars to maintain that cause, they prepared for their defence. Commendon stopped this war of Pens, not by his fine discourses, as Gratiani affirms, but because the Letters which he wrote occasioned the Pope to give orders to Cardinal Granvelle to enjoin them silence (3).

(3) Pallavic. *Hist. Concil. Trident.* lib. 15. cap. 7. num. 2.

[*B*] *He wrote several books in Divinity.*] He published some of them, the titles of which, as we find them in Valerius Andreas, are as follow. *De meritis operum lib. II; de primâ hominis Justitia & Virtutibus impiorum lib. II; de Sacramentis in genere, contra Calvinum; de formâ Baptismi.* All these Treatises were printed together at Louvain in 1565. The year following were printed these in the same city: *de libero hominis arbitrio liber I; de Charitate, Justitiâ, & Justificatione libri III; de Sacrificio liber I; de peccato Originis liber I: de Indulgentiis liber I; de Orationepro defunctis liber I.*

[*C*] . . . . *in which it was pretended there were found a great many propositions, that were censured by Pope Pius V.*] I say, *as it was pretended*, for the question of fact is not yet determined; and I find, that Michael Baius is far from granting, that he had taught what was ascribed to him. *Notwithstanding*, says he (4), *amongst these propositions* (5), *there were some very far from our sentiments*; others, *which we had never maintained nor treated of in any sense; but all, or at least the greatest part of them, were turned or expressed in so malicious a manner, that the expressions alone might make them suspected, especially in the minds of those, who had not directly studied those kinds of questions.* This is the perpetual management of the ODIUM THEOLOGICUM. This passion, which has long been turned into a proverb, discovers heresies wherever it has a mind to find them; it forms extracts so artful, and so proper to inflame the people, that it changes into pernicious heresies that, which is not so much as heterodox, when it is considered with its principles, and the proper restrictions and applications. This passion is contagious; a Physician, who shall affect to appear as an informer only from a principle of zeal, is immediately seized with the sacerdotal spirit; he brings sophisticated extracts; he separates what he ought to join; he joins what he ought to separate; he gives the propositions such a turn as is most likely to surprize the religion of the Judges. The Physician Francis Blondel will soon give us an instance of this. This is not the only injustice which is observed in persons actuated by this passion; their double weights and measures is another iniquity which attends them. Bid them to censure those who put them upon this affair, those inveterate persons, who prompted their resentments; shew them ever so plainly the justice of your cause; they will yet turn a deaf ear to you, or pay you with nonsense: in that case their charity will bear all things, excuse all things.

(4) In his *Letter to Cardinal Simonetta*, quoted by Gery, *Apologie des Censures*, pag. 42.

(5) He speaks of those, which the Franciscans shewed to Cardinal Granvelle, and which were sent afterwards to Rome. See *Apologie des Censures*, pag. 42, 43.

THE method of extracting propositions from a book, which one would have censured.

[*D*] *He wrote some controversial pieces against those of the reformed Religion.*] The same Valerius Andreas gives us the titles of them, which are as follow: *Responsio ad Quæstiones* Phil. Marnixii *de Ecclesia Christi & Sacramento Altaris*, at Louvain in 1579; *Apologia pro Responsione contra Objectiones ejusdem de veritate Corporis Christi in Eucharistia*, at Louvain in 1581; *Epistola de Statuum Inferioris Germaniæ unione cum iis, qui se desertores Romanæ Ecclesiæ vocant, & de Juramento, quod eorum jussu à Clero & Monachis exigitur*, at Louvain, and at Cologne in 1579. He wrote likewise a letter *de Juramento, jussu Ducis Alenzonii Antwerpiæ in prætorio concepto & comprobato.*

[*E*] *He had a great deal of deference for the Pope's censure.*] To give a just comment upon this text, I shall make use of the words of the Sieur Gery, Bachelor in Divinity. *This pious and learned Doctor*, says he, speaking of Baius (6), *in the midst of his great reputation, saw of a sudden a Bull issued out against seventy six propositions, which those who sollicited that censure ascribed to him entire, though there were some which did not belong to him; others which had been turned in a malicious manner, in order to expose them to censure; and others, which the Bull itself owned might be maintained in a Catholick sense. They were not satisfied with sending it to Louvain in the usual form in* 1570, *but they published it again nine or ten years after; and they affected to have it done by a Jesuit in* 1580, *which the Society had without doubt sollicited to make a shew of their credit. What did Baius, and the Faculty do upon this? Nothing but submit themselves humbly, and suppress, for peace sake, and the edification of the faithful, all the justifications and all the explications which they might have made use of, and every thing that they might have represented in their favour.* However we are not to conclude, that Baius wrote nothing in justification of himself; his *Letter to Cardinal Simonette* (7) proves the contrary; for he shews there that Doctor John Hessels and himself put into the hands of Cardinal Granvelle their answer to certain propositions, which that Cardinal had communicated to them. The Scotists, in order to run down these two Doctors, formed these propositions, and presented them to *some persons of great dignity*, without naming either Hessels or Baius. If it be asked why they wanted to run down these two Professors? I answer, because they made use of a method which had the appearance of a dangerous innovation. *After the explication of the Master of Sentences, they endeavoured to reduce the study of Divinity to the holy Scriptures, and to the writings of the ancient Fathers* (8), *and especially to those of St. Augustin. This was by no means pleasing to persons accustomed to different sentiments, and especially to those, who being unwilling to give themselves the pains of studying much, thought it better to follow the opinions, which were received by the majority, than those, which were established with a great deal of care upon the solid foundation of the Scriptures; and these persons imagined that there was a design to reproach and stigmatize them, as often as any person in Lectures or Disputations spoke otherwise than they did, or taught any thing different from what they had been used . . . . to read in certain Authors.* Baius was not contented with writing this Letter (9); but he sent *an Apology for his Opinions* to the Pope in the year 1569.

(6) Gery, *Apologie Historique de deux Censures de Louvain & de Douai*, pag. 26, Cologne edition in 1688.

(7) The Sieur Gery, pag. 40. produces a part of it, which he had translated from the Latin, which is printed in the *Fasti of the University of Louvain*, p. 366.

(8) Gery, *Apologie des Censur.* pag. 40, 41.

(9) It is quoted in the *Bibliotheque Universelle*, tom. 14. pag. 198, as being printed at the end of *Apologia de Baius*, at Roan in 1666.

[*F*] *Valerius Andreas has committed several errors in speaking of the censure of* Pius V against Baius (10).] I. He tells us as a certain fact, that the Bull of Pius V against

(10) Valer. And. *in Fastis Academicis Studii Lovaniensis.*

contain ſeveral pieces, which have never been printed yet. The perſon, who has collected them, will illuſtrate them with a great many theological and hiſtorical Notes. He has compared the editions of the Works of this Author with the Manuſcripts, which are found in good Libraries. It was reported that Michael Baius, in order to revenge himſelf upon the Jeſuits, whom he believed to be the promoters of the Cenſure of his Doctrine, employed all his intereſt at Louvain, to obtain a Cenſure upon the Doctrines of Leonard Leſſius (*i*). I muſt not paſs over in ſilence that care was taken of his honour in the Bull of Pius V [*G*]. His Will was a proof of his great charity [*H*]; for he left all his

(*i*) See *l'Apologie des Cenſures des deux Univerſitez*, publiſhed by Mr. Gery, in the year 1688.

againſt the LXXVI propoſitions was confirmed by Gregory XIII. It will be proved in the new edition of Baius, that this is falſe (11). II. He affirms, that the greateſt part of theſe LXXVI propoſitions was extracted from the books of Baius. The contrary of which will be proved in the new edition. III. He contents himſelf with ſaying, that the Bull of Pius V was publiſhed at Louvain the 17th and 19th of April 1570. But beſides that he ſhould have ſaid *the 16th of November*, he has fallen into ſeveral faults of omiſſion. He has not told us, that the Bull was publiſhed, not by order of the Pope, or by that of Cardinal Granvelle, but by that of the Duke of Alva, and of the Synod of Mechlen. This was an irregularity, ſince the Pope had commiſſioned Cardinal de Granvelle, to notify the Bull to the Divines of Louvain in the manner, which he thought moſt proper. However Valerius Andreas ſhould have told us who they were, that gave orders for publiſhing the Bull. He ſhould likewiſe have obſerved, that on the days, which he mentions, I mean the 17th and 19th of April, Michael Baius declared publicly what his opinion was upon the propoſitions condemned. The retractation, which was drawn from him, was extorted by ill methods. The new edition will treat of all thoſe particulars. IV. He relates, that perſons of credit told the Pope, that there were ſome Divines at Louvain, who were making an apology for the propoſitions condemned. It will appear from the teſtimony of Tolet, that they were impoſtors, who told thoſe reports to the Pope. V. He aſſerts, that Gregory XIII condemned again the ſame propoſitions. This will be ſhewed to be falſe. VI. He places the death of Baius on the 16th of December; it ſhould be placed on the 16th of September (12). I ſhall not repeat what I have already obſerved (13) relating to the falſe Chronology of his Printers. I ought not to add to it *the year* 1551, which he mentions as the firſt year of his being Regius Profeſſor in Divinity; he is not miſtaken; but the Epitaph of Baius was not formed on that date, ſince it makes that Profeſſorſhip continue forty years, two years longer than the calculation of Valerius Andreas requires. That, which might occaſion a great many perſons to multiply the Bulls againſt Michael Baius, is, that they imagine, there is no difference between condemning a doctrine, and cauſing the condemnation, which another had made of that doctrine, to be publiſhed. In that ſenſe it may truly be ſaid that Gregory XIII condemned the LXXVI propoſitions; for he not only iſſued out a Bull, in which he inſerted the conſtitution of Pius V, declaring that he had found it in the Regiſters of that Pope, and that an entire faith ought to be given to it; but likewiſe he commanded that his Bull ſhould be publiſhed ſolemnly at Louvain by the Jeſuit Tolet in the year 1580. Morillon, Great Vicar of Mechlen, notified that of Pius V to the Divines of Louvain in 1567. He notified it again to them with a little more formality in 1570.

(11) What I ſay here, as well as in the body of the Article, with reſpect to the new edition of Baius, is taken from a memorial which is fallen into my hands, and which comes from a good hand.

(12) He had done ſo in his *Bibliotheca Belgica*.

(13) In the quotation (*c*).

[*G*] *There was care taken of his honour in the Bull of Pius V.*] The Letter of Baius, which has been quoted (14), adds, *that after many long ſollicitations, which began from the Pontificate of Pius IV, they obtained at laſt of Pius V a Bull dated the 1ſt of October* 1567, *which condemned* 76 (15) *propoſitions* (16). It is true that he, who brought the Bull by commiſſion from Cardinal Granvelle, ſaid before every body in the Aſſembly of the Faculty of Divinity at Louvain, that the firſt LX of theſe propoſitions had been extracted from the writings of Baius (17); but at laſt the Bull did not name them, and beſides it ſoftened the note of the condemnation, ſince it intimated that part of thoſe propoſitions were capable of a favourable ſenſe. Cardinal Pallavicini informs us, that in order to treat Baius with the greateſt lenity, Pope Pius V contented himſelf with cauſing his Bull to be privately notified to the Univerſity of Louvain by the Archbiſhop of Mechlen; but as the evil did not ceaſe, Gregory XIII thought proper to publiſh it ſolemnly, and deputed for that purpoſe the Jeſuit Francis Tolet his Preacher, who did not oblige Baius to a public retractation, and leſt him without any ſcandal: *Hic ſtuduit Baium removere à pravis illis opinionibus, cohortatus, ut Sedis Apoſtolicæ judicio acquieſceret; & perpaucis colloquiis id obtinuit, privatâ illius retractatione contentus: atque hoc pacto Baius non ſolum illæſus perſtitit, ſed ipſius etiam nomini verba Diplomatis pepercere; quin per illud ejus errores manum tam mitem experti ſunt, ut vix viderentur errores, cum aliquæ ex proſcriptis poſitionibus, nullis certis in hac exceptione adnotatis, dicerentur poſſe ſuſtineri in aliquâ minus propriâ ſignificatione* (18). We have obſerved in another place (19), the inconveniency of cenſuring an heap of propoſitions in ſo general and uncertain a manner, that the word *reſpectivè* does not help us to diſtinguiſh them. The Bull of Pius V had this inconvenience; and beſides that, it threw people's minds into an uncertainty on another account; for without marking any particularly, it aſſured them, that among the propoſitions condemned there were ſome, which might be allowed in ſome ſort. This was the leaſt thing, that the Bull permitted, and there was no calling in queſtion that permiſſion; but it might be pretended that it permitted much more. The arrangement of the words occaſioned this perplexity; a comma was omitted; this omiſſion made the words capable of two very different ſenſes; and this was the ſource of prodigious diſputes. See the Latin, which I am going to quote, and admire the adventures and hazards of controverſies. *Quas quidem ſententias ſtricto coram nobis examine ponderatas, quanquam nonnullæ aliquo pacto ſuſtineri poſſint in rigore & proprio verborum ſenſu ab auctoribus intento hæreticas, erroneas, ſuſpectas, temerarias, ſcandaloſas, & in pias aures offenſionem immittentes, reſpectivè & præſentium autoritate damnamus* (20). That, which the Pagans called the Sports and Caprices of Fortune, is not excluded from this ſanctuary; the pretended infallible Oracle of Rome does not remedy the diſorder. After he has taken the greateſt pains in concerting every ſyllable of his anſwer, he may ſee that his Copier or Secretary by omitting a comma, will be the cauſe of the damnation of an infinite number of people. Nay further; the comma ſignifies nothing there; put it after the word *poſſint*, or not, the equivocation ſtill ſubſiſts. The cuſtom of Writers, or Printers, does not prove that a comma after *poſſint* connects what follows to the word *damnamus*. We may find in the moſt correct book a hundred thouſand comma's placed as that which ſhould be put after *poſſint*; and yet from ſuch a comma to the next point, the words do not relate to the word *poſſint*, or to ſuch another.

(14) Above in quotation (7).

(15) Pallavic. *Hiſt. Concil. Trident.* lib. 15. cap. 7. num. 12. ſays *Septuaginta novem Baii poſitiones*; that is, 79 *poſitions*.

(16) Gery, *Apologie des Cenſures*, pag. 43.

(17) Idem, ibid. pag. 44.

(18) Pallav. *Hiſt. Conc. Trid.* lib. 15. cap. 7. num. 12.

(19) In remark [*E*] of the Article (THOMAS) ANGLUS.

A BULL, in which the placing of the words, occaſioned an obſcurity, which was encreaſed by the omiſſion of a comma.

(20) *Journal de St. Amour*, P. 2. pag. 64. quoted in the *Bibliothèq. Univerſelle*, tom. 14. pag. 201. See likewiſe *Difficultez propoſées à* Mr. Steyaert, Part 9. pag. 180. and the new edition of the *Works of Baius*, Part 2. pag. 235, &c.

[*H*] *His Will was a proof of his great charity.*] The author of the Apology for the Cenſures of Louvain and Doway oppoſes this virtue of Michael Baius to the pretended miracles of Leſſius. *It is a great miracle*, ſays he (21), *to ſee ſo great an humility joined with ſo noble a genius and ſo profound a knowledge; which made even Tolet himſelf ſay this of him, which is ſtill preſerved at Louvain by a tradition*; MICHAELE BAIO NIHIL DOCTIUS, NIHIL HUMILIUS. *It is a great miracle to ſee ſuch a ſubmiſſion and patience, as appeared in him, notwithſtanding the uſage he received with regard to the Pope's Bull. It is a great miracle to ſee ſo holy a Prieſt as he was, whoſe ſtudies and whoſe infinite occupations did not abate of his piety, and who ſhed tears at the altar, being warmly affected with the ſacredneſs of our myſteries. In ſhort it is a great miracle to ſee ſo great a charity to the poor as he was poſſeſſed with, ſo that he would not have any other heirs to his eſtate than them, and with that reſolution extinguiſhed all the ſenti-*

(21) Gery, *Apologie des Cenſures*, pag. 37, 58.

his eſtate to the poor (*k*). He founded a College at Louvain, under the protection of St. Auguſtin (*l*). He died the 16th of September 1589, in the 77th year of his age, and was interred in the College of the Pope, of which he had been a long while Principal. JAMES BAIUS his nephew, a Doctor of Divinity, erected a Monument for him, with a fine inſcription (*m*). This nephew followed the ſteps of his uncle. He was promoted to the Degree of Doctor of Divinity in the year 1586 (*n*). He was frequently deputed for the affairs of the Univerſity of Louvain, and diſcharged thoſe commiſſions with great prudence and addreſs (*o*). He was Dean of St. Peter's in that city, and Regius Profeſſor of the Catechiſm (*p*). He publiſhed ſeveral treatiſes [*I*]. He gave all his eſtate for the uſe of the College [*K*], and died the 5th of October 1614 (*q*).

(*l*) Idem, ibid.

(*k*) Swert. *in Athenis Belgicis*, pag. 565.

(*m*) You will find it in Swertius, pag. 565.

(*n*) Valer. Andreas, *Bibl. Belg.* pag. 401.

(*o*) Swert. *in Athen. Belgicis*, pag. 355.

(*p*) Valer. Andreas, *Bibl. Belg.* pag. 401.

(*q*) Idem, ibid. Swertius ſays the 9th of October.

The new edition of *the Works of Baius*, which I ſpoke of as a thing to come, has been publiſhed ſince the firſt edition of this Dictionary [*L*], and been condemned at Rome by the Congregation of the *Index Expurgatorius*. It contains ſeveral inſtructive particulars, and

ments of Nepotiſm, how lawful ſoever they might have been in him. It is this will render Baius amiable to poſterity; whereas a reputation, which is only ſupported by an artificial report of miracles and wonders founded upon nothing, decays in a little time, and vaniſhes into ſmoak. Cardinal Pallavicini tells us, that Commendon, giving an account to the Cardinal of Mantua of the ſtate in which he found the Univerſity of Louvain in the year 1561, informed him that Michael Baius and John Heſſelius had taught ſome new doctrines concerning Free-Will, and that they were two perſons very commendable for their learning and exemplary life (22); that Ruard Tapper had taken umbrage at their union, and thought they valued their learning too much, tho' they were in other reſpects modeſt and virtuous. "But, *continues he*, every one "places his vanity in the art, which he profeſſes, and "eaſily bears other things." *Compertum ſibi eſſe Ruardum in theologicis diſciplinis præclarum, dum is in illâ Academiâ docens in his duobus adhuc ætate juvenili obſervaret infauſtam conjunctionem ingenii & audaciæ, ſolitum eſſe dicere ſe nonniſi ſchiſma ab illis expectare, & theologicam lauream diu ipſis diſtuliſſe; eos profecto videri ſcientiæ ſuæ nimis amantes, quamvis alioquin probos & modeſtos; & hæc ille verba ſapienter uſurpavit, digna quæ à nobis repetantur*; ſed cujuſque ſuperbia in eâ arte quam profitetur ſita eſt, cetera facile ſuffert (23).

(22) *Erant ambo & ſcientiâ & exemplo vitæ conſpicui.* Pallav. *Hiſt. Concil. Trident.* lib. 15. cap. 7. num. 7.

(23) Idem, ibid. num. 9.

[*I*] JAMES BAIUS . . . *publiſhed ſeveral Treatiſes.*] *A Panegyric upon the Arrival of Archduke Albert and the Infanta of Spain; a Catechiſm, ſive Inſtitutionum Chriſtianæ Religionis libri IV; & de venerabili Euchariſtiæ Sacramento & Sacrificio Miſſæ libri III* (24).

(24) *Ex* Valer. Andr. *Bibl. Belg.* pag. 401.

[*K*] *He gave all his eſtate for the uſe of a College.*] Swertius informs us, I. That James Baius left the adminiſtration of his eſtate to Giles Baius, his nephew, Doctor and Profeſſor of Divinity, and that he charged him to employ it wholly in the building of a college for young perſons of his country. II. That Giles Baius in execution of his uncle's Will, built a fine college, which is juſtly called BAIANUM. III. That this college had been built but a few years; he mentions the place where it ſtands. *Obſecutus patrui deſiderio, auguſtiſſimum* (collegium) *abhinc paucis annis exſtruxit è regione Pædagogii Falconis, &* BAIANUM *meritò indigitatur* (25). But Aubertus Miræus, who could not be ignorant of what Swertius writes above, contents himſelf with aſſuring us, that he had read, that James Baius had thoughts of building a college for the entertainment of Students in Divinity: *De altero collegio ſacrarum literarum ſtudioſis adoleſcentibus pariter alendis piè prudenterque cogitâſſe ſcriptum invenimus* (26). In this manner we ſpeak, when we can only praiſe a man for the good intentions, which an Author, whom we have read, aſcribes to him; for when we know that they have been put in execution, we mention it expreſly. So that it is plain, that Aubertus Miræus knew nothing of the building of the *Collegium Baianum*. Now this ignorance of ſo notorious a fact is ſomewhat prodigious, in ſuch a man as he, who knew ſo well his own country, the Spaniſh Netherlands.

(25) Swert. *Ath. Belg.* pag. 355. This book was printed in 1628.

(26) Mir. *de Scriptor. Sæculi* 16. pag. 134.

[*L*] *The new edition of* the Works of Baius . . . *has been publiſhed ſince the firſt edition of this Dictionary.*] The title is as follows: *Michaëlis Baii, celeberrimi in Lovanienſi Academia Theologi, Opera, cum Bullis Pontificum, & aliis ipſius cauſam ſpectantibus, jam primum ad Romanam Eccleſiam ab convitiis Proteſtantium, ſimul ac Arminianorum, cæterorumque hujuſce temporis Pelagianorum impoſturis vindicandam collecta, expurgata, & plurimis, quæ hactenus delituerant, Opuſculis aucta, ſtudio A. P. Theologi. Coloniæ Agrippinæ, ſumptibus Balthaſaris ab Egmont & Sociorum, MDCXCVI.* It is a thick volume in quarto, divided into two parts; the firſt of which contains beſides the writings of Baius, which had been already printed, ſix or ſeven pieces of that Author, which had never been printed before. The ſecond almoſt entirely conſiſts of writings, which were never publiſhed till then, and which relate to the cenſure of ſeveral propoſitions of Baius. One of theſe pieces is a chronological Narrative of the Proceedings in that cauſe, and was drawn up by the perſon, who had the care of that edition. We are informed by that Narrative, amongſt other things, that two reaſons engaged Michael Baius to form his method of teaching Divinity upon the Scriptures and the Fathers, and eſpecially St. Auguſtin (27). The firſt was, that the Proteſtants of the Low-Countries boaſted of having the Scriptures and the ancient Fathers on their ſide. The ſecond was, that ſeveral Catholic Writers (28), by abandoning the hypotheſis of St. Auguſtin, approached very near to the Pelagian ſchemes. Ruard Tapper and Tiletan, Profeſſors of Divinity at Louvain, diſapproved of this new method of Baius, when they took notice of it after their return from the Council in 1552; and we are aſſured that Ruard Tapper cried out one day, *What Devil has brought this doctrine into our ſchool, during our abſence?* This was the beginning of a furious ſtorm againſt Michael Baius: the Franciſcans chiefly fell upon him. The Guardian of Nivelle, and that of Aeth ſent eighteen articles to the Sorbonne at Paris in 1560, and deſired them to give their judgment upon them. The Sorbonne condemned all of them; three, as falſe and contrary to Scripture, and the reſt as heretical. Baius made remarks upon that cenſure, and had a mind to communicate them to ſome Doctor at Paris; but he quitted that deſign, when he ſaw, that it was impoſſible to procure a copy of that Decree of the Sorbonne (29). He communicated them to the Provincial of the Franciſcans. He ſhewed plainly that they had cenſured as heretical what was clearly contained in St. Auguſtin. The year following there was preſented to Cardinal Granvelle a liſt of propoſitions extracted from the writings of Baius, as was pretended; and yet ſome of theſe propoſitions were contrary to his ſentiments; and he had never diſputed either for or againſt ſeveral others; and almoſt all of them were drawn up with ſo much art, that the mere turn of expreſſions might render him ſuſpected either of falſity or hereſy (30). The Cardinal communicated them to Michael Baius who wrote an Anſwer to them, which is not to be found. The ſame Cardinal received orders to enjoin both parties ſilence; and by that means the conteſt was appeaſed: but it was revived in the year 1564; for Tiletan endeavoured to procure the Univerſities of Spain to cenſure the writings of Baius (31), and ſent Extracts to Pope Pius V in order to get them condemned. Other Extracts were added to theſe, and were ſent to Pius V, who iſſued out a Bull the firſt of October 1567, in which he condemns LXXVI propoſitions. This Bull was neither publiſhed nor fix'd up; it was only read to Baius, and to the Faculty of Divinity at Louvain the 29th of December 1567, by Maximilian Morillon, Vicar General to the Archbiſhop of Mechlen (32). This Vicar General

(27) *Oper.* Mich. Baii, Part 2. pag. 192.

(28) As Bartholomew Camerarius, Albert Pighius, Francis Horantius, a Spaniſh Franciſcan, Ruard Tapper.

(29) Baii Oper. Part 2. p. 193.

(30) Ibid. pag. 194.

(31) The cenſures of the Univerſities of Salamanca and Alcala were not made till after the death of Tiletan. *See* Baii *Oper.* Part 2. pag. 195.

(32) Baii *Oper.* Part 2. pag. 197.

and many things, which would afford a large ſcope to thoſe, who have a talent at reflections. The remark, which I ſhall give, concerning this edition, contains a good Supplement to this Article. The perſon, who procured it, was extremely ill treated by Father

neral being deſired to grant a copy of that Bull, refuſed to give it. He declared that he had an order to prohibit all the printed books, from which it was ſaid the greateſt part of the LXXVI propoſitions were extracted. The Dean of the Faculty repreſented, that for weighty reaſons it was very neceſſary, that the books of Michael Baius ſhould not be prohibited; ſo that they ſell not under that prohibition. This Doctor wrote to the Pope the 8th of January 1569, and ſent him an Apology, in which he ſhews, that he had not taught thoſe LXXVI propoſitions, and that moſt of them, in a certain ſenſe, were true and agreeable to St. Auſtin's doctrine. The Anſwer, which the Pope wrote to him the 3d of May the ſame year, contains an exhortation to ſubmit himſelf to the cenſure. Baius was extremely ſurprized, when he received that letter of Pius V, to ſee himſelf treated as a rebel, who had incurred the penalty of excommunication and irregularity. He deſired of Morillon to be abſolved from that penalty, and he could not obtain it but by abjuring the articles, which the Bull had condemned. *Summopere autem miratus eſt Baius ſecum agi ac ſi ſuas Vindicias & Apologiam ſcribendo Pontifici, in eum fuiſſet rebellis, ac excommunicationis & irregularitatis cenſuras incurriſſet; à quibus cum peteret abſolvi, Morillonus abſolutionis beneficium ei impertiri noluit, quin prius articulos per Bullam confixos ejuraverit* (33). From that time every body was permitted to caſt their invectives againſt that Doctor, as if he had really taught thoſe LXXVI articles. He was declaimed againſt both in Sermons and Lectures: he ſupported this misfortune without ſaying any thing; but there were three Biſhops, who adviſed him in 1570 to defend himſelf. He therefore explained his opinions in his Divinity-Auditory, and declared, that among thoſe LXXVI propoſitions, there were ſome, which deſerved to be condemned; but that he had never maintained them; that there were others, which were maliciouſly forged; that he did not admit them in the bad ſenſe, which they might be capable of, tho' otherwiſe they were ſuſceptible of a ſound interpretation. *Cæpit in Scholis Theologorum quid circa hujuſmodi Articulos ſentiret, cum multâ humilitate ac modeſtiâ aperire; declarans nonnullos ipſorum eſſe falſos ac jure confixos; ſed à ſe nunquam traditos; alios eſſe arte ac dolo confictos, qui prævum ſenſum pati poſſunt, quem nunquam tenuit, licet & in ſano intelligi quoque facile poſſent* (35). In the month of June the ſame year 1570 the Biſhops of the Low-Countries held a Council at Mechlen, where at the inſtance of the Duke of Alva they engaged to publiſh ſolemnly the Bull of Pius V at Louvain, and to have it ſigned by all the Profeſſors of Divinity. The commiſſion was given to Morillon, who executed it the 16th of November of the ſame year. He could not however procure the ſigning of the Formulary, by which he required the approbation of the cenſure of the LXXVI propoſitions. The Faculty of Divinity at Louvain imagined there was ſome ſnare under it; and though they were aſſured by letters from the Biſhop of Boiſle-duc, and the Biſhop of Ghent, that there was no deſign to ſurprize them, it does not appear that they ever agreed to ſign it; but the year following they made a Decree, declaring that the LXXVI propoſitions ſhould be conſidered as condemn'd; and that all the Members of the Faculty ſhould abſtain from teaching them; and that all the books, in which they were maintained, ſhould be taken away from the Students in Divinity (36). We may obſerve that Morillon did not deliver any copy of the Bull, which he notified ſolemnly. This gave occaſion to ſome to aſſert, that it was a falſe one, or that having been obtained by indirect methods, it would be recall'd. Others maintained the contrary with great warmth. Pope Gregory XIII, being ſollicited by the Spaniſh Embaſſador, in the name of his maſter, or by Father Tolet in the name of ſeveral Divines of Louvain, to apply a ſpeedy remedy to theſe diſputes, made a conſtitution the 28th of January 1579, in which he inſerted the Bull of Pius V, without approving or confirming it, and without condemning again the LXXVI propoſitions. He contented himſelf with ſaying, that he had found it in the Regiſters of his predeceſſors, and with ordering that credit ſhould be given to it. He ſent the ſame Father Tolet to Louvain in 1580. That Jeſuit ſolemlny notified there the conſtitution of Gregory XIII, and aſked Baius whether he condemned the LXXVI articles. Baius anſwered, *I condemn them according to the intention of the Bull* (27). All the Doctors, Licentiates, Batchelors, &c. declared that they ſubmitted to this Bull. Tolet, in ſeveral converſations, which he had with Baius, told him, that he was accuſed of teaching privately his Scholars the doctrines, which Pius V had condemned. Baius denied it, and ſubmited to all manner of puniſhments, if he ſhould be convicted legally of what he was accuſed of. No perſon attempting to prove it upon him, Tolet promiſed to give a good teſtimony of him at the Court of Rome, and declared that it was falſe, that the reading of Baius's writings was prohibited. He propoſed to him the ſigning of a Formulary, which was very ſevere; however Baius did not refuſe it, that he might procure himſelf ſome reſt. He was obliged to acknowledge in writing, that he had taught a great many of the LXXVI articles, which were condemned, and that they were condemned in the ſenſe, which he had taken them in. *Ei præſcripſit* (Toletus) *quandam confeſſionis formulam, in quâ fateri debuit multos ex damnatis 76 Articulis à ſe eſſe traditos, ac eo ſenſu proſcriptos, quo eos docuiſſet; cui formulæ optimus hic Doctor undique laceſſitus ac calumniis obrutus, ut tandem pace aliquâ frueretur, ſubſcripſit die vigeſimâ quartâ Martii hujus anni* 1580 (38). He wrote a letter to the Pope, in which he gave an account of the calumnies, which had been caſt upon him for twelve years paſt, on account of thoſe articles, and deſired a copy of the Bull of Pius V. This was granted him in June 1580. Father Horantius publiſhed a book againſt him the ſame year. He complained of two things; one was, that Baius had anſwered Philip de Marnix in too civil terms (39); *Conquerens, quod ejus Epiſtolæ Marnixio ſcriptæ nimis benignæ fuiſſent* (40), the other was, that Baius had ſaid agreeably to the doctrine of St. Auguſtin, that in order to judge of the Church, we ought only to conſult the Scripture: 2. *Quod Baius Auguſtinum ſecutus dixiſſet judicium de Eccleſiâ eſſe ex ſolâ Scriptura petendum* (41). Baius juſtified himſelf in a Letter, which he prefixed to his Apology againſt Philip de Marnix in 1581. He was diſquieted again in the year 1585, for his enemies complained of him to the Pope's Nuncio, and deſired that he might be interrogated upon ſeveral articles, which they had drawn up (42). It is not known whether he underwent that tryal.

The author of this Chronological Narrative takes a great deal of pains to inform us, that Mr. Leidecker, and ſome other Miniſters are in the wrong to conclude from this Bull of Pius V, that the Romiſh Communion condemned the doctrine of St. Auguſtin, and favoured the new Pelagians (43). He ſhews clearly enough, in my opinion, the invalidity of this Bull, the inſincerity of thoſe who made the extracts, the negligence of this Pope, and his raſhneſs in condemning the articles before he had examined the works, from which they were pretended to be taken, &c. This negligence appears alſo from this conſideration, that the rules of Grammar were not obſerved in that Bull (44). It may be alledged that Urban VIII in his Bull againſt Janſenius's book, publiſhed in 1642, confirmed the Bull of Pius V, and that of Gregory XIII; but the author anſwers, that Urban VIII did not confirm theſe Bulls but upon the ſuppoſition of facts, which were falſe; and ſo his confirmation was invalid. *Quandoquidem ergo Urbanus eas non confirmaverit, niſi ſupponendo quæ falſa ſunt, ex iſtâ confirmatione nullum robur accedit iſtis ſuorum prædeceſſorum conſtitutionibus; quod enim in ſuâ origine vitioſum ac nullius roboris eſt, rati-habitione non ſit validum, vel ut jura loquuntur* *, quod initio vitioſum eſt, non poteſt tractu temporis convaleſcere; nec firmatur tractu temporis, quod jure ab initio non ſubſiſtit (45). This Pope, being deceived by Francis Albizzi, Aſſeſſor of the Holy Office, and Penſionary of the Jeſuits, imagined that the Bull of Pius V had been confirmed by that of Gregory XIII. Theſe were two falſe

(27) *Damno ſecundum intentionem Bullæ, & ſicut Bulla eos damnat.* Baii *Oper.* Part 2. pag. 206.

(33) Ibid. pag. 199.

(34) Martin Richtovius, Biſhop of Ipres: Francis Sonnius Biſhop of Bolduc; and Cornelius Janſenius Biſhop of Ghent.

(35) Baii *Oper.* Part 2. pag. 200.

(36) Ibid. pag. 202, 203.

(38) Baii *Oper.* Part 2. p. 207.

(39) *Æquo animo ferre non potuit, quod Baius humaniori ſtilo ſuas ad Marnixium ſcripſiſſet Epiſtolas.* Baii *Oper.* Part 2. pag. 208.

(40) Ibid. Compare this man with the French Miniſter, who complained publickly in 1698 of the Letters of Mr. Jaquelot to the French Biſhops.

(41) Baii *Oper.* Part 2. pag. 208.

(42) Idem, ibid. pag. 209.

(43) Idem, ibid. pag. 210, *& ſeq.*

(44) Ibid. pag. 235.

* *ff. de Reg. Jur. & VI Decret. eod. Tit.*

(45) Baii *Oper.* Part 2. pag. 239, 240.

(r) *Quibus eam asserat Baii nuperus Editor.*

ther Dez a Jesuit, in a Work written expresly in defence of the Church of Rome against the reproaches of that Editor (*r*).

suppositions; for Pius V did not cause his Bull to be fixed up, nor published it solemnly at Rome; and with respect to that of Pope Gregory, he only says that he found it in the Registers of his predecessors. They made therefore Urban VIII assert a falsity, when they inserted in his Bull, that the articles condemned by Pius V had been censured again by Gregory XIII; and to conceal from the Public the knowledge of this imposture, they took care not to insert the constitution of Gregory XIII in the Bull of Urban VIII, though they inserted there the Bull of Pius V. *Animadvertendum est quod Urbanus VIII in Bullâ superius memoratâ enunciaverit quidem à Gregorio XIII confirmatam fuisse Pii V Constitutionem, Articulosque in eâ confixos denuò fuisse damnatos. Verum hæc Urbani VIII Bulla aperte falsi eâ saltem in parte convincitur, sicut & ab Joanne Sinnichio Lovanienſis Academiæ delegato Romæ convicta est, ex ipsomet Gregorii XIII diplomate, in quo nihil de ista confirmatione, aut de iterata hujusmodi articulorum disjunctione habetur. Ne autem id innotesceret, Albizzius, Jesuitarum stipendiarius, qui Bullam Urbani VIII conscripsit, in ea quidem Pii V Bullam integram inseruit, sed non Gregorii XIII constitutionem, ex qua singulis patuisset ejus mendacium, & quam falsè in Bulla Urbani dicatur Pii V Bulla à Gregorio XIII confirmata, proscriptique in ea articuli, iterum à Gregorio XIII prohibiti: cum Gregorius XIII duntaxat testificetur tenorem Bullæ, quam inserit, esse plane conformem tenori Bullæ, quam in Pii V regiſtro invenit; & isti tenori eam fidem adhibendam, quæ ipsius Bullæ protographo debetur* (46). All this is much more proper to shew the frauds, which are made use of in condemning books, than to refute Mr. Leidecker's reasoning; for in short, for one Roman Catholic, who believes Baius innocent, there are above a thousand, who believe him justly condemned; so that we may accuse the Church of Rome upon the most probable grounds, of holding the opinions of this Doctor to be heretical, which notwithstanding were the most agreeable to those of St. Augustin. This should make us pity the fate of some men. Tho' passion, irregularity, and injustice appear plainly in the proceedings against them, yet they are however in the wrong still, in the opinion of a great many. It is sufficient that there has been a judgment given against their doctrine, to oblige the Public to continue prejudiced against them. Their adversary will enjoy the fruit of his frauds and intrigues; and he will for ever take his advantage of the folly of the populace, who almost always presume in favour of the Tribunals.

(46) Ibid. pag. 242.

We are promised (47) a large work of Baius, if this new edition meets with a good sale. It will be his *Commentary upon the Master of the Sentences*, and his *Explication of the Psalms of David*.

(47) *In Præfat.*

☞ BAKER (THOMAS) an eminent Mathematician, and Author of the *Geometrical Key* [*A*], was son of James Baker of Ilton in Somersetshire, Steward to the family of the Strangways of Dorsetshire. He was born at Ilton, and became a batler of Magdalen Hall in the beginning of the year 1640, when he was about fifteen years of age. He was elected a Scholar of Wadham College on the 27th of April 1645, and did some service to King Charles I in the garrison at Oxford. He was admitted Bachelor of Arts April the 10th 1647, and left the College without compleating that Degree by Determination, and was neither Chaplain nor Fellow of that College. He was afterwards Minister of Bishops Nymphton in Devonshire, where he lived many years in a very retired and studious manner, and prosecuted his studies in the Mathematics. He died there June the 5th 1690, and was buried in his own Church. A little before his death the Members of the Royal Society sent him some mathematical queries; to which he returned so satisfactory an answer, that they gave him a Medal with an inscription which was very honourable to him (*a*).

(*a*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 850, 851. 2d edit. London 1721.

[*A*] *Author of the* Geometrical Key.] The title of it is as follows; *The Geometrical Key; or the Gate of Equations unlock'd, or a new Discovery of the Construction of all Equations, howsoever affected, not exceeding the fourth degree, viz. of Linears, Quadratics, Cubics, Biquadratics, and the finding of all their Roots, as well false as true, without the use of Mesolabe, Trisection of Angles, without Reduction, Depression, or any other previous preparations of Equations, by a Circle, and any (and that one only) Parabole, &c.* London 1684, 4to, in Latin and English. We have an account of this book in the *Philosophical Transactions*, Number 154, March the 20th 1683-4. T.

☞ BAKER (RICHARD), Author of *the Chronicle of the Kings of England* [*A*], was the son of John Baker of London Gentleman, and Katherine, daughter of Reynold Scot of Scots-Hall in Kent, Knight. His Grandfather, Sir John Baker, of Sissingherst in Kent, was Chancellor of the Exchequer, and one of the Privy Council to King Henry VIII. Our Author was born at Sissingherst, and entered a Commoner of Hart-Hall in Oxford in 1584, and matriculated in Michaelmas Term, being then in the 16th year of his age. Having prosecuted the studies of Logic and Philosophy about three years in that House, where he had for his Chamber-fellow the famous Sir Henry Wotton (*a*), he removed to one of the

(*a*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 623. 2d edit. London 1721.

[*A*] *Author of the* Chronicle of the Kings of England.] It was published at London in fol. 1641, with the title of a *Chronicle of the Kings of England from the time of the Roman Government unto the Death of King James, &c.* The Author tells us, that it *was collected with so great care and diligence, that if all of our Chronicles were lost, this only would be sufficient to inform posterity of all passages memorable or worthy to be known.* But Mr. Wood observes upon this (1), that "it being reduced to method, and not according to "time, purposely to please Gentlemen and Novices, "many chief things to be observed therein, as name, "time, &c. are egregiously false, and consequently "breed a great deal of confusion in the peruser, espe-"cially if he be curious or critical." There was another edition of it published in 1653, and another in 1658, and another in 1660; to which was added *The History of the Reign of King Charles I*; and *a Continuation from his death to* 1658, written by Mr. Edward Philips, nephew to Milton the Poet, and formerly a Student of Magdalen Hall. Afterwards in 1661 there was published another edition, in which was contained an addition of *The first thirteen years of King Charles II*, that is, from the Death of King Charles I, *to the Coronation of* King Charles II, *with the Occurrences of his Restoration by George late Duke of Albemarle, extracted from his Excellency's Papers, &c.* (2). Mr. Wood tells us (3). that he was informed, that these papers were the most part drawn up by Sir Thomas Clarges, whose sister the Duke of Albemarle had married, and who put them into the hands of Mr. Philips; who *attributing more to the Duke's glory than was true, he got the ill-will of him.* He added likewise to the reign of King James I. and King Charles I, the names of the Noblemen, whom

(1) *Athenæ Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 72.

(2) *See* Bishop Kennet's *Register* pag. 595. edit. London, fol. 1728.

(3) Col. 72, 73.

the Inns of Court, and afterwards travelled into foreign countries in order to compleat his Education. In 1594, after the celebration of a moſt ſolemn Act, he was, with other perſons of Quality, created Maſter of Arts, and May the 17th 1603 he received the honour of Knighthood from King James I at Theobalds. About this time he lived at Highgate near London, and was univerſally eſteemed a man of excellent genius and great learning; "the "benefit of which, as Mr. Wood obſerves (*b*), he reaped in his old age, when his conſi- "derable eſtate was, through ſuretiſhip, very much impaired." In 1620 he was High-Sheriff of Oxfordſhire, and in the Commiſſion of the Peace, and was Lord of the Mannor of Middle-Aſton (*c*). He wrote ſeveral books beſides his *Chronicle* [*B*]. The Hiſtorian quoted above tells us, that he was *a perſon tall and comely, of a good diſpoſition and admirable diſcourſe, religious, and well read in various faculties, eſpecially in Divinity and Hiſtory*, as appears from thoſe books, which he compoſed for the moſt part, when he was obliged to fly for ſhelter to his ſtudies and devotions. At laſt after a long ſeries of cares and anxieties, he departed this life in the Fleet-priſon in London on the 18th of February $164\frac{4}{5}$, and was

(*b*) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 72.

(*c*) Idem, ibid

whom they created, with ſeveral other particulars. There was likewiſe another edition of the *Chronicle* publiſhed by Mr. Philips in 1684 (4). Mr. Nicholſon in his *Engliſh Hiſtorical Library* (5) having obſerved, that the firſt edition of the *Chronicle* in 1641, and the ſecond in 1653 contained nothing but our Author's own work to the end of King James the Firſt's reign, tells us, that Mr. Philips in his *Continuation* of it to the Reſtoration of King Charles II, *having the peruſal of ſome of the Duke of Albemarle's papers, might have ſet that great revolution in its true light, had not ambition and flattery carried him beyond truth and his copy.* In the year 1672 was publiſhed at Oxford a little piece intitled, *Animadverſions upon Sir Richard Baker's Chronicle and its Continuation, wherein many errors are diſcovered, and ſome truths advanced*; by T. B. Eſq; The Author of it, Mr. Blount, tells us in his preface, "that ſince Chronicles are the public records of a "Nation, he wondered not a little to ſee Sir Richard "Baker's twice printed by itſelf, and three times "with a *Continuation*, and no perſon learned in our "Hiſtory of England, or concerned in the actions of "the late rebellion, or in the adulteration of his own, "or his anceſtor's name or title, ſhould impugn it, "being ſtuffed with ſo many contradictions and re- "petitions, ſo many miſtimings and miſtakings, as "of other things of moment, ſo eſpecially of the "pedigrees, names, and place of our antient Nobi- "lity, Biſhops, Baronets, Gentry, &c." He ſtiles the *Continuator a perſon of incompetent parts for ſo great an undertaking*; and obſerves, *that finding in all this time no ſtop put to ſo great a ſtream of error by any better hand*, he thought himſelf *obliged to lay theſe few* Animadverſions *in the way, leſt ſuch muddy waters ſhould at laſt totally overflow the Land of Truth.* However that he had not preſumed to meddle with the affairs of State and thoſe great revolutions in the reign of King Charles I, though he was *well aſſured the* Continuator *has in many paſſages neither done right to his ſacred Majeſty nor to thoſe of his ſubjects, who moſt faithfully ſerved him.* He allows, that with regard to the errors which ſlipped Sir Richard Baker's pen, ſome excuſes may be aſſigned, *as old age, and the confinement of a priſon, &c. (but none, for that his confident aſſertion,) upon which the* Continuator *builds much in his preface.* "That this great Chronicle was col- "lected with ſo great care and diligence, that if all "other Chronicles were loſt, &c. *Sir Richard*, continues Mr. Blount, *acknowledges his work to be a collection out of other Authors, wherein he took up ſome coin upon content, which was not ſterling; and that wherein he onely excelled, was the digeſting the whole into a better method. Yet he confeſſes ſome paſſages (he might have ſaid many) are omitted in the reign of King James, which was the tyme he liv'd in, and had bin fit for the* Continuator *to have ſupply'd; who inſtead thereof has fowel'd the Continuation into ſuch a bulk of indigeſted matter, as is not at all futable to the reſt of the Hiſtory.* Mr. Blount examines (6) Sir Richard Baker's *Catalogue of Writers both antient and modern, out of whom this Chronicle hath been collected*, and ſhews his *miſtakes* and *anachroniſms* in it, and obſerves (7), that our Author "thinking to give a greater reputation to his "book, has (not without much ſuſpicion of vanity) "prefixed a catalogue of ninety three Authors antient "and modern, ... of which number it may be juſtly "ſuſpected he never ſaw above the one half, other- "wiſe he could not, without great inadvertence, ſo "groſly have miſtaken what is here noted. Beſides "if his *Wine* had been good, it would not have need- "ed ſuch a *Buſh*." Mr. Nicholſon (8) tells us, that this ſpecimen, which Mr. Blount gave of the *many and groſs errors in the Chronicle, ought to have ſhaken its credit. And yet*, ſays he, *ſo little regard have we for truth, if a ſtory be but handſomly told, the* Chronicle *has been reprinted ſince that time, and ſells as well as ever, notwithſtanding that no notice is taken of the* Animadverſions, *but all the old faults remain uncorrected.* In 1730 there was publiſhed at London in fol. a new edition of this Chronicle, *with a continuation to the year* 1660, *by* E. Philips, and *a ſecond Continuation containing the reigns of King* Chartes II *from his Reſtoration, King* James II, *King* William III *and Queen* Mary II, *Queen* Anne, *and King* George I; *by an impartial Hand.* The Editor tells us in the preface, that this edition is very much altered from thoſe which had been publiſhed before; and that in the firſt place in Sir Richard Baker's part a great many miſtakes in the names of places and perſons have been corrected, which before were not only an *eye-ſore*, but ſometimes an *hindrance* to the reader. However that it was not poſſible to make theſe corrections in every place, becauſe the Author himſelf, being, as it ſhould ſeem, little acquainted with the modern Languages, has diſguiſed ſome foreign names in ſuch a manner, that it is not eaſy to know where to look to ſet them right. But that this happens very ſeldom, and where it does, it is upon occaſions of little importance. The Editor then obſerves, that the *Continuation* by Mr. Philips to the year 1660 has been contracted, though without any prejudice to the reader, ſince that Writer appears plainly not to have rightly underſtood the nature of the work which he was upon; ſo that he, quite contrary to the method which he ſhould have followed, inſerted many public pieces, liſts of names, and other things of little moment, at full length, when he ought to have given only the ſubſtance of them; and this he has done not only in matters of conſequence, but in ſuch as are not ſo. However that the account, which that Author has given of King Charles's reſtoration, tho' much more prolix than was neceſſary, being taken from the papers of Sir Thomas Clarges, who had a great part in theſe tranſactions, and alſo from thoſe of the Duke of Albemarle, is juſt left as it was: only ſome papers that were inſerted at length, and whoſe ſubſtance might as well be given in few words, have been omitted. Laſtly, that the book might contain an entire ſeries of Engliſh Hiſtory, a ſecond *Continuation* has been added of the Reigns of ſeveral Princes of our Country till the Death of King Gorge I. Mr. Nicholſon (9) paſſes a very ſevere judgment upon our Author; for tho' he allows, that *he was a perſon of thoſe accompliſhments in wit and language, that his Chronicle has been the beſt read and liked of any hitherto publiſhed*; yet he tells, that *his method is new, and ſeems to pleaſe the rabble; but learned men will be of another opinion; for it is the ſame with that of Suetonius, which is juſtly complained of by (k) Mr. Dodwell.*

(4) Idem, col. 1118.

(5) Part 1. pag. 196, 197.

(8) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 197. *See likewiſe* Wood, col. 73.

(9) *Hiſt. Litt.* pag. 196.

(6) *Animadverſions*, pag. 1, & *ſeq.*

(7) Pag. 10.

(*k*) *Prælection. Camden.* p. 36.

[*B*] *He wrote ſeveral Books beſides his Chronicle.*] I. *Cato variegatus*, or *Cato's moral Diſtichs varied.* London 1636. This is a Poem. II. *Meditations and Diſquiſitions on the Lord's Prayer.* London 1637 in 4to. The fourth edition was publiſh'd there 1640 in

was the day following interred in the South-Iſle of St. Bride's Church in Fleet-ſtreet. By his wife Margaret, daughter of Sir George Manwaring of Ightfield in Shropſhire, Knight, (for the payment of the debts of which family he was engaged,) he had iſſue Thomas, Arthur, Cecilia, Anne, Margaret, &c. (*d*).

(*d*) Idem, ibid. col. 72, 74.

4to. A copy of this book being ſent to his old chamber-fellow Sir Henry Wotton before it was ſent to the preſs, he returned this judgment of it: "I much admire the very character of your ſtile, which ſeemeth unto me to have not a little of the African idea of St. Auſtin's age, full of ſweet raptures, and of reſearching conceits; nothing borrowed, nothing vulgar, and yet all flowing from you (I know not how) with a certain equal facility." III. *Meditations and Diſquiſitions on the three laſt Pſalms of David*, London 1639. IV. *Meditations and Diſquiſitions on the L Pſalm*. London 1639. V. *Meditations and Diſquiſitions on the ſeven penitential Pſalms*. London 1639, in 4to. VI. *Meditations and Diſquiſitions on the firſt Pſalm*. London 1640, in 4to. VII. *Meditations and Diſquiſitions on the ſeven conſolatory Pſalms of David, namely the* 23, 27, 30, 34, 84, 103, *and* 116. London 1649 in 4to. VIII. *Meditations and Prayers upon the ſeven Days of the Week*. London 1640, in 16mo; which Mr. Wood (10) ſuppoſes to be the ſame with his *Motives of Prayer on the ſeven Days of the Week*. IX. *Apology for Laymen's writing in Divinity*. London 1641, in 12mo. X. *Short Meditation on the Fall of Lucifer*, printed with the *Apology*. XI. *A Soliloquy of the Soul, or a Pillar of Thoughts*, &c. London 1641, in 12mo. XII. Theatrum redivivum; *or the Theatre vindicated, in anſwer to Mr. Prynne's* Hiſtrio-maſtix, &c. London 1662, in 8vo. XIII. Theatrum triumphans, *or, a Diſcourſe of Plays*. London 1670, in 8vo. He likewiſe tranſlated from the Italian into Engliſh the Marquis Virgilio Malvezzi's *Diſcourſes upon Cornelius Tacitus*. London 1642, in fol. and from French into Engliſh the *Letters of Monſieur Balzac in IV Parts*. London 1638, in 8vo, and 1654, &c. with additions in 4to (11). There is alſo an edition at London in 1654 in 8vo under the following title: *Letters of Monſieur de Balzac, I, II, III, and IV Parts. Tranſlated out of French into Engliſh, by Sir Richard Baker Knight, and others. Now collected into one volume, with a methodical Table of all the Letters.* The firſt part is dedicated by Sir Richard Baker to the *honourable the Lord of Newburge, one of his Majeſty's moſt honourable Privie Councell, and Chancellor of the Dutchy of Lancaſter*. The three firſt parts of this tranſlation have our Author's name prefixed to him; but the laſt ſeems to be done by another hand; and the preface to it is ſigned F. B. Sir Richard Baker wrote his own Life, which he left in manuſcript behind him; but it was burnt or made waſte paper of by one Smith of Pater-Noſter-Row, who married one of his daughters (12). T.

(10) Col. 72.

(11) Idem, col. 74.

(12) Idem, ibid.

BALBUS. This word makes ſo great a figure in the ancient Roman Hiſtory, that it is ſtrange, that the Hiſtorical Dictionaries have done ſo little honour to it [*A*]. If I attempt to repair their fault, it is chiefly with regard to Lucius Cornelius Balbus, who was Conſul in the year of Rome 714, and who had a nephew, whom I ſhall ſpeak of occaſionally, either in the text or remarks. This Conſul was born at Cadiz. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his valour in the wars, which the Romans carried on in Spain againſt Sertorius, and againſt the Luſitanians; ſo that Pompey being extremely pleaſed with his great ſervices, declared him a Citizen of Rome. Lucius Gellius, and Cn. Cornelius, who were Conſuls a little after, made a law declaring, that all thoſe, whom Pompey had made Citizens of Rome, with the conſent of the Council of War, ſhould be confirmed as ſuch. By this means, Balbus entred fully into poſſeſſion of the privileges of a Roman Citizen (*a*). He aſſumed from one of theſe two Conſuls the prænomen of *Lucius*, and from the other the name of *Cornelius* [*B*]. He made himſelf ſo well eſteemed at Rome, that he gained the friendſhip of the greateſt men in the Commonwealth, Pompey, Craſſus, Ceſar, Cicero;

(*a*) *See* Cicero *in Oratione pro Cornelio Balbo, and* Manutius *and* Nicholaus Abramus *upon that paſſage.*

The Origin of the firname Balbus. Whether Charles Stephens has given it juſtly to the *Atilii*?

[*A*] *The Hiſtorical Dictionaries have done but little honour to this word.*] They are prodigiouſly barren upon the word *Balbus*. Charles Stephens obſerves that it was the firname of the *Atilii*, and that the firſt of that family, who was firnamed *Balbus*, was called ſo on account of his ſtammering; from whence his deſcendants retained that firname. It is very probable that this title began in this manner in divers families, as it is certain that it was for a like reaſon, that there are in all countries ſo many perſons, who are named *White*, *Black*, &c. And ſince there has been an Emperor of the Eaſt (1), and an Emperor of the Weſt (2), who had the firname of *Balbus* or the *Stammerer*, on account of an impediment in their ſpeech, why is it not credible, that in the time of the Roman Commonwealth, ſuch a defect might introduce this firname into divers noble families? This is not the point therefore, that Charles Stephens deſerves to be criticized in; but becauſe he has taken the *Atilii* for the *Accii* or *Atii*, and expreſſed himſelf in ſuch a manner, that he ſeems to ſay the Atilii had no other firname but this; and yet there were the Regulus's, the Serranus's, and the Calatinus's among them. Nay there was one C. Atilius Balbus, Conſul in the year of Rome 508 and 518, who perhaps was the occaſion of Charles Stephens's miſtake. It ſhould have ſatisfied Mr. Lloyd to have corrected this article; but he thought it more proper to ſuppreſs it entirely, in imitation of thoſe Chirurgeons, who inſtead of healing a wound, cut off the part, which is wounded; or of thoſe controverſial writers, who cut the knot of an objection, when they find themſelves in the ſame perplexity that Alexander was in with regard to the Gordian knot. Mr. Hofman has neither cured nor cut it off; he has retained this article juſt as he found it in Charles Stephens.

(1) Michael II who was Emperor of Conſtantinople from the year 820 to 826.

(2) Lewis III of that name, who was likewiſe King of France, and died in 879.

[*B*] *He aſſumed on account of theſe two Conſuls, the prænomen of* Lucius, *and the name of* Cornelius.] The Roman cuſtom was, that thoſe, who obtained the freedom of the city, took the name of him, who procured them that honour. It was upon this account that the Hiſtorian Theophanes and his poſterity bore the name of Pompey. It will be aſk'd then; *Why did not Cornelius Balbus take upon him likewiſe the name of Pompey?* I anſwer, becauſe he choſe rather to ground his right upon a Law, than upon the kindneſs of that General. The law, which I ſpeak of, is that which was made by the advice of the Senate by L. Gellius and Cn. Cornelius the Conſuls in the year of Rome 682. It declared that all thoſe, to whom Pompey with the conſent of the Council of War had given the freedom of the city of Rome, ſhould be accounted Roman Citizens. *Naſcitur, Judices, cauſa Cornelii ex eâ lege quam L. Gellius, Cn. Cornelius ex Senatus ſententia tulerunt; quâ lege videmus ſatis eſſe ſanctum, uti cives Romani ſint ii, quos Cn. Pompeius de conſilii ſententia ſingillatim civitate donaverit* (3). Balbus, conſidering theſe two Conſuls as the true authors of the honour, which he enjoyed, took from one of them the prænomen of *Lucius*, and from the other the name of *Cornelius*. This is much more probable than what Manutius ſays, *that tho' Balbus had been made a Roman Citizen by Pompey, yet he was obliged for that honour to Cornelius Lentulus, whoſe prænomen and name he aſſumed according to cuſtom* (4). He conjectures likewiſe, that this L. Cornelius Lentulus is the ſame, who was Conſul the

What name thoſe took upon them, who obtained the freedom of the City of Rome?

(3) Cicero *pro Balbo.*

(4) Manut. *in Argumento Orat. pro Cornel. Balbo.* See likewiſe the note upon the 9th book of *Cicero's Epiſtles to Atticus*, pag. 8. of Grævius's edition, where there ſeems to be an error of the preſs.

Cicero; and was adopted by one Theophanes (b), who was very particularly beloved and esteemed by Pompey. It was on account of this adoption that Capitolinus calls him, *Balbus Cornelius Theophanes* [C], when he tells us that the Emperor Balbinus affirmed that he was descended from him (c). The prosperity of Balbus raised him enemies, who began a law-suit against him with relation to his freedom of the City. Crassus, Pompey, and Cicero pleaded his cause (d), and carried it for him. He found himself very much perplexed during the war between Cesar and Pompey; he was under great obligations to both parties. It appears that he gave the preference to Cesar, but in such a manner as that he endeavoured to bring matters to a reconciliation (e). Velleius Paterculus remarks it as a great rashness, that Balbus ventured to go over to Pompey's cause, in order to confer with the Consul Lentulus, who was hesitating at what price he should sell himself (f). It was by this means, continues he, that Balbus, though a Spaniard, opened his way to a Triumph, the Pontificate, and the Consulship. Pliny in effect observes that Balbus was Consul, and the first of all the foreigners, who obtained that dignity (g); but with regard to the honour of a Triumph, he says it was another Cornelius Balbus, a nephew to this, who obtained the freedom of Rome, the first of all the foreigners (h). We shall see wherein the error of Paterculus lies [D]. These two Cornelius Balbus's were so rich, that the uncle at his death left 25 drachms to every Roman Citizen (i); and the nephew caused a new city (k) to be built at Cadiz (l). The uncle wrote *a History of Julius Cesar* in the manner of a *Journal* (m). This is he without doubt, who had such an intimate friendship with Pomponius Atticus [E]. Some

(b) Cicero, ibid. *and* Epistol. 7. *ad Attic.* lib. 7.

(c) Capitol. *in Balbino.*

(d) *See* Ciceron. *Oration. pro Cornel. Balbo.*

(e) See the remark [G].

(f) Velleius Paterculus, lib. 2. cap. 51.

(g) Plinius, lib. 7. cap. 43.

(h) Idem, lib. 5. cap. 5.

(i) Dio, lib. 48.

(k) Strabo, lib. 3. pag. 116.

(l) He was born there, as well as his uncle.

(m) Sidonius Apollinaris, lib. 9. Epist. 14.

the first year of the Civil War, that is, in the year of Rome 704. Besides this shews us, that Cardinal Baronius has made too long an enumeration of Titus's favours to Josephus, when he tells us particularly, that besides the right of the freedom of the city, Titus conferred on him the name of the family *Flavia* (5). For in the first place it was Vespasian, and not Titus, who made him a Citizen (6); and then again the name of Flavius came to him of course.

(5) Baronii *Annal. ad ann.* 36. num. 12.

(6) Joseph. *in Vitâ suâ.*

[C] *Capitolinus calls him* Balbus Cornelius Theophanes.] That author's words are as follow: *Familiæ vetustissimæ, ut ipse* (Balbinus) *dicebat, à Balbo Cornelio Theophane originem ducens, qui per Cn. Pompeium civitatem meruerat, quum esset suæ patriæ nobilissimus, idemque historiæ scriptor* (7). Casaubon imagines that this relates to the Historian Theophanes, who was born at Mitylene in the Isle of Lesbos (8). Vossius (9), Mr. de Tillemont (10), and a great many others are of the same opinion. I believe they are mistaken, and that it is better to understand this of the adopted son of Theophanes, than of the Father. Cornelius Balbus was son to Theophanes by adoption; it is to him, that the three titles, which Capitolinus makes use of, belong; and the last only agrees to Theophanes. If it be said that Balbus was not the most noble Gentleman of his country, I answer that Theophanes had not likewise the same rank of honour in Mitylene. It is true, Strabo assures us, that Theophanes had a share in the public offices, and that he made himself the most illustrious of all the Greeks (11); but this is not sufficient to confirm the words of Capitolinus; this does not ascribe to him an antiquity of birth and nobleness of blood, which raised him above all the rest of the Mitylenians; and this is the point in question in Capitolinus. The objection then signifies nothing, since it proves too much; and it is sufficient for me that Balbus's enemies did not deny but that he was born of a very honourable family. *Hunc in eâ civitate, in quâ sit natus, honestissimo loco natum esse concedis* (12). It is probable, they did not acknowledge all that he ascribed to himself in that point. There is another objection to be apprehended. Balbus was Consul, and Theophanes was not so; how comes it then that Capitolinus, who takes notice of his character as an Historian, forgot that of Consul, which was much more proper to raise the idea of Balbinus's nobility? I answer, that Capitolinus is not a writer, from whom we are to expect much exactness and judgment. The worst that can happen would be to say, that he applied the pretensions of Balbinus wrong, and imagined that Cornelius Balbus Theophanes, from whom this Emperor said he was descended, was the same Theophanes of the Isle of Lesbos, whose chief honour was that of an Historian. I would not absolutely reject this conjecture; writers of much greater abilities than Capitolinus might be imposed upon in this point; but I should choose rather to say, that he knew that Balbus of Cadiz was the author of an History.

(7) Capitol. *in Balbino*, p. 147.

(8) Casaubon. upon this passage of Capitolinus.

(9) Vossius, *de Hist. Græcis*, pag. 147.

(10) Tillemont, *Hist. des Empereurs*, tom. 3. pag. 439.

(11) Strabo, lib. 13. pag. 425.

(12) Cicero *pro Cornel. Balbo, non procul init.*

[D] *I shall shew wherein the error of Paterculus lies.*] Let us give his own words; *Tum Balbus Cornelius,* says he (13), *excedente humanam fidem temeritate ingressus castra hostium, sæpiusque cum Lentulo collocutus, Consule dubitante quanti se venderet, illis incrementis fecit viam quibus non Hispaniensis natus, sed Hispanus in Triumphum & Pontificatum assurgeret, fieretque ex privato consularis*; that is, "Then Balbus Cornelius, "with a rashness, that exceeds the belief of mankind, "going over to the enemy's camp, in order to draw "off Lentulus, whose particular friend he was, dis- "coursed several times with him, who deliberated "for some time at what price he should sell himself. "By this means Balbus opened himself a way to rise "by degrees to the highest dignities, so that tho' he was "not only born in Spain, as several Romans and "Italians were, but even of parents, who were na- "tives of that country (14), yet he raised himself at "Rome to the honour of a Triumph and the Ponti- "ficate, and from a private man as he was before, "was at last made Consul." I omit here to speak of this action of Balbus, concerning which we have great light from the passages of Cicero, which I quote in the margin (15). I shall only insist a little upon that of Paterculus. He either says nothing that is reasonable, or else he affirms that Balbus was raised to the Consulship, as well as to the honour of a Triumph, and the dignity of the Pontificate; and it would be to no purpose to deny it, under pretence that he does not say *& Consulatum*, as it would seem more naturally to signify that Balbus had been Consul. We have no right to regulate the expressions of so polite an author as this; he had his reasons for changing the turn of his phrase, when he had a mind to denote the Consulship. But he was mistaken in the fact itself, and confounded the honours of the uncle with those of the nephew. That Balbus, who negotiated with Lentulus at the beginning of the Civil Wars, was the nephew, as appears from the Letters of Cicero, which I quoted above. It was Balbus the nephew, who triumphed over the Garamantes, the first of the foreigners, who was honoured with a Triumph, as Pliny informs us (16); but it was Balbus the uncle, who had the honour of the Consulship, the first of all the foreigners as the same Pliny assures us (17). These two Balbus's were distinguished at Rome by the title of *Major*, which was given to the uncle, and that of *Minor* to the nephew. I am surprized that Salmasius, who has extremely well distinguished the honours of the one from those of the other (18), has left this error of Paterculus unobserved.

(13) Patercul. lib. 2. cap. 51.

(14) This explication of the difference, which Paterculus makes between *Hispaniensis* and *Hispanus*, (if his text said so), seems as just as that of Lipsius, who by *Hispaniensis* understands an inhabitant of Spain, and by *Hispanus*, a native Spaniard.

(15) Epist. 32. lib. 10. *ad Familiar. & Comment.* upon the 9th Epist. lib. 8. *ad Attic.*

(16) Plin. lib. 5. cap. 5.

(17) Idem, lib. 7. cap. 43.

(18) *In Solinum* cap. 9.

[E] *He had a very intimate friendship with Pomponius Atticus.*] This will appear unquestionable, when we consider that Atticus, having resolved to put an end to his life by abstaining from eating, sent for his son-in-law, and L. Cornelius Balbus, and Sextus Peduceus, to declare this last resolution of his to them (19). I think I have read in a Letter of Cicero's, that Balbus was one of those, who eat very frequently at Atticus's table (20). This will shew, that he was pleased with hearing good discourses read (21).

(19) Cornel. Nepos *in Vitâ Attici*, cap. 21.

(20) I cannot find the place; but I think it is in his Letters to Atticus.

(21) See above the remark [F] of the Article of ATTICUS.

Some authors have confounded Cornelius Balbus with Cornelius Gallus [F]. We ſhall ſhew that Voſſius was miſtaken in his cenſure of Savaro [G]; that Lloyd and Hofman deſerve a little cenſure [H]; that Paulus Manutius ought not to be entirely exempt from it [I]; that Glandorp has multiplied beings without neceſſity [K]; that the diſtinction of the greater and

[F] *Some authors have confounded Cornelius Balbus with Cornelius Gallus.* This is about a circumſtance, which does no honour to his memory. They tell us he died in the very act of venery (22). Without doubt the original of this miſtake was from an error of the preſs. Upon the authority of Pliny (23), Cornelius Gallus was ranked amongſt thoſe, who died in that manner; and the Printer by putting a B for a G, occaſioned ſeveral authors to miſtake one perſon for another. I find this error in ſeveral editions of the Commentary of Tiraquellus upon the Laws of Matrimony.

(22) Balthaſar Bonifacius, *Hiſt. Ludicra*, lib. 16. cap. 16. *ex* Tiraquello, *Leg. Connub.* 15. num. 27.

(23) Lib. 7. cap. 53.

[G] *Voſſius was miſtaken in his cenſure of Savaro.*] While he was endeavouring to ſhew an error, which he imagined he had found in Savaro's Commentary upon Sidonius Apollinaris, he was deceived himſelf (24). Savaro had affirmed, that Balbus, to whom Sidonius Apollinaris aſcribed the Journal of Julius Ceſar's Life (25), is the ſame with Balbus Cornelius Theophanes, of whom Julius Capitolinus ſays in the *Life of Balbinus*, that *he obtained the freedom of Rome by the favour of Pompey, and that he was beſides the moſt noble of his fellow Citizens, and an Hiſtorian.* Voſſius refutes this pretence of Savaro, I. Becauſe Balbus, the Author of the *Journal*, was an intimate friend of Julius Ceſar, as appears from Suetonius (26), and Aulus Gellius (27); whereas Theophanes was an intimate friend of Pompey's, and this was repreſented as a crime in his deſcendants, as Tacitus obſerves in the ſixth book of his *Annals*: II. Becauſe Theophanes being of Leſbos wrote in Greek, whereas Balbus lived at Rome, and wrote in Latin.

(24) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Græcis*, lib. 1. cap. 23. pag. 148.

(25) Sidon. Apollinar. Epiſt. 14. lib. 9.

(26) Sueton. *in Cæſar.* cap. 81. wrong quoted cap. 71. by Voſſius, *and* cap. 74. by Moreri.

(27) Aul. Gellius, lib. 17. cap. 9. where he ſays that Julius Cæſar and Balbus wrote to each other in cypher.

If I had a mind to be very critical, I might urge in oppoſition to theſe reaſons, I. That the ſame Balbus, who was one of the intimate friends of Ceſar, was likewiſe a good friend of Pompey's, and honoured with ſo great a ſhare of his confidence, that the other friends of Pompey were jealous of him (28). It is true, the union, which was then between Pompey and Ceſar, having permitted Balbus to cultivate the friendſhip of the latter, without violating his obligations to the former, he found at laſt that Ceſar's favours were ſuperior to thoſe of Pompey; and yet Balbus procured leave of Ceſar not to follow him againſt Pompey, and retired to Rome during the civil war (29). It is true likewiſe, that he was an agent of Ceſar's, and that in his attempt to bring matters to an agreement, he did not appear wholly free from partiality. But after all, it is not ſufficient, in order to form a juſt oppoſition between Balbus and Theophanes, to ſay on the one hand with Suetonius, that Balbus was an intimate friend of Julius Ceſar, and with Aulus Gellius that Balbus was at Rome as one of Ceſar's agents during his abſence; and to ſay on the other hand, with Tacitus, that Theophanes was an intimate friend of Pompey, and that Tiberius urged this as a crime in the deſcendants of Theophanes; for conſidering the cruel diſpoſition of that Emperor, he was capable of perſecuting a family, under pretence that they had obtained the freedom of Rome by Pompey's favour. Now this would be literally true with regard to Theophanes, though he ſhould be confounded with Cornelius Balbus; ſince it is certain, that Pompey not only gave him this freedom, but even pleaded for him when it was conteſted, and that he heaped a great many favours upon him. So that Voſſius's firſt reaſon is falſe. II. It may be urged in the ſecond place, that the Theophanes, whom Voſſius means, lived at Rome as well as Balbus; and ſince ſeveral Romans have written Hiſtories in Greek, it does not follow that Balbus is not Theophanes, becauſe Theophanes wrote in Greek. Beſides how do we know whether the Balbus in diſpute is not the Cornelius Balbus whoſe 18th book of the Ἐφημερικῶν is quoted by Macrobius (30)? Simler makes no manner of doubt of it (31).

(28) Cicero *ad Attic.* lib. 9. Epiſt. 13.

(29) Epiſt. *Balbi ad Ciceron.* lib. 9. *ad Attic.* p. 36. edit. Grævii.

(30) Macrob. *Saturnal.* lib. 3. cap. 6.

(31) Simler, *in Epitome Bibliotb. Geſneri.*

But not to amuſe myſelf with theſe diſputes which may be thought too minute and particular, here is the *Jugulum Cauſæ*, the deciſive point of the whole affair in three words. Voſſius imagined that Savaro had confounded Cornelius Balbus with Theophanes, who was born in the Iſle of Leſbos, and was the Author of an Hiſtory of the Mithridatic War. But this is not fact. He has only confounded him with the Theophanes, mentioned by Capitolinus, who is a different perſon from that of Leſbos, though he has this in common with the other, that he received the freedom of a Roman Citizen from Pompey. Now nothing is more reaſonable than to take the Theophanes of Capitolinus for the Cornelius Balbus of Suetonius, and for the Balbus of Sidonius Apollinaris; for it is certain that this ſame Cornelius Balbus, who was a native of Cadiz and received the honour of a Citizen of Rome from Pompey, was adopted at the recommendation of the ſame Pompey, by Theophanes of Leſbos (32); after which, according to cuſtom, he named himſelf Lucius Cornelius Balbus Theophanes, as Paulus Manutius and Corradus have obſerved; the former, in the ſummary of Cicero's Oration for the ſame Balbus; the latter, in his Notes upon Cicero's Epiſtles to Atticus; and both of them have taken this Balbus for the Hiſtorian Cornelius Balbus Theophanes, mentioned by Capitolinus. So that if there had been any thing to criticize upon in that paſſage, Voſſius ſhould have attacked thoſe two learned Italians, rather than Savaro, who came a long while after them.

(32) *Et adoptio Theophanis agitata eſt.* Cicero, pro Balbo. *Placet igitur etiam me expulſum & agrum Campanum petiiſſe, & adoptatum patricium a Plebeio, Gaditanum a Mitylenæo.* Cicero Epiſt. 7. *ad Atticum*, lib. 7.

[H] *Lloyd and Hofman deſerve a little cenſure.*] I ſay nothing of Charles Stephens; he has been a little too dry upon our Cornelius Balbus; but what he has touched upon is not ill choſen. Mr. Lloyd has cut off ſome words which were not ſuperfluous; as for inſtance, that we have ſtill an Oration of Cicero for this Balbus; for theſe are two very different facts, firſt, that Cicero pleaded ſuch a cauſe, and the other, that we have his pleading ſtill extant; and it is the latter of theſe two that the readers are moſt concerned in. Mr. Hofman has extended the Article (33), in order to acquaint us, that there was another Cornelius Balbus of Leſbos, ſirnamed Theophanes; that is, to acquaint us with a mere falſity. Lucius Cornelius Balbus Theophanes is no ways different from him of Cadiz, whom we are ſpeaking of in this Article.

(33) In the firſt vol. of his *Continuation*, he has given ſome good *Additions* with relation to Cornelius Balbus.

[I]..... *Paulus Manutius ought not to be wholly exempt from it.*] I have already touched upon ſome of his miſtakes; here are two more. One is in the Summary of Cicero's Oration for Cornelius Balbus, and in the Notes upon the paſſage of that Oration, where the adoption of this Balbus is mentioned. He ſays very falſely that Theophanes was a freedman of Pompey (34); for it was not liberty, but the freedom of Rome, that Pompey gave to Theophanes. *Quid magnus hic noſter*, ſays Cicero (35), *qui cum virtute fortunam adæquavit: nonne Theophanem Mitylenæum ſcriptorem rerum ſuarum in concione militum civitate donavit?* The other error of Manutius is, that he refers us with regard to the triumph of young Cornelius Balbus, the nephew of him whom we are ſpeaking of, among other authorities, to the ſeventh book of Pliny, ch. 43. (36); for Pliny ſpeaks only of the Conſulſhip of the Uncle in that paſſage. It is eaſy to miſtake in ſuch things as theſe: Father Hardouin, upon this paſſage of Pliny, refers us to a place in Paterculus (37), where he ſpeaks only of Balbus the nephew.

(34) He repeats it in his notes upon the 12th Epiſtle to *Atticus*, lib. 5.

(35) *Orat. pro Archia*: Valerius Maximus ſays as much, lib. 8. cap. 14.

(36) P. Manutius, *in Argument. Orat. Ciceron. pro Balbo*, where inſtead of quoting chap. 43 of the 7th book of Pliny, he quotes the 37th, and inſtead of chap. 29. of Solinus he quotes 42. This edition of Manutius is of Cologne, in 1582, in 8vo.

(37) Lib. 2. cap. 51.

[K] *Glandorp has multiplied beings without neceſſity.*] He ſhould not have produced three Conſuls, who were named L. Cornelius Balbus. This is multiplying beings without neceſſity. The firſt is, according to him, Balbus the Elder, whoſe Conſulſhip is placed in the year of Rome 713. The ſecond is Balbus the Younger, with regard to whoſe Conſulſhip he ſays nothing preciſely, repeating only the words of Paterculus. The third is one L. Cornelius Balbus, who he ſays, was made Conſul for ſome days, about the end of the year, by Auguſtus and Mark Anthony, and was ſo prodigiouſly rich, that he left by will twenty five drachms to every Citizen of Rome (38). Theſe three Conſuls in reality are to be reduced to one; for Balbus the uncle is not differeht from him, whoſe Conſulſhip was of ſo very ſhort a continuance. This appears from Dion Caſſius. Father Hardouin, to give us an idea of this Conſulſhip, ſays very ingeniouſly, that Balbus was Conſul under the Conſulſhip of Cn. Domitius

(38) Glandorp, *Onomaſtic. Roman.* pag. 277.

and leſſer Conſulſhip is chimerical [*L*]; and that Moreri has committed a great many errors [*M*], though his article of Balbus is very ſhort and very dry.

I ſhall ſay but little of ſome other Balbus's mentioned by ancient authors. Lucius Lucilius Balbus, Scholar to Mutius Scevola, and Preceptor to the famous Servius Sulpitius, was an excellent Lawyer. He flouriſhed about the year of Rome 670. Cicero ſays that Sulpitius ſurpaſſed his Maſter [*N*], who had joined to his learning a certain character of maturity, which rendered him a little ſlow, whereas his Scholar was lively and expeditious. The Writings of Balbus are loſt, to which perhaps his Scholar Sulpitius contributed not a little, by inſerting the greateſt part of them in his own (*n*). We muſt not confound this Balbus, as Glandorp has done, with Quintus Lucilius Balbus, a Stoic Philoſopher, one of the Interlocutors in his Cicero's books of the Nature of the Gods (*o*). Publius Octavius Balbus was contemporary with Cicero, who commends him for his knowledge of the Civil Law, for his genius, probity, and many other excellent qualities (*p*). Cicero gives no leſs praiſes to Lucius Octavius Balbus, who lived at the ſame time (*q*). One of theſe two Octavius Balbus's is plainly the ſame, that Valerius Maximus ſpeaks of, when he tells us, that having eſcaped through a back-door, during the rage of the Triumviri, and hearing that they killing his ſon in his houſe, he returned back again, and gave himſelf up to the aſſaſſins (*r*). Appian relates the ſame ſtory with a little difference in the circumſtances (*s*).

(*n*) Pomponius, lib. 2. *de Origine Juris.*

(*o*) Glandorp, *Onomaſtic.* p. 522. In p. 637. Glandorp takes the Interlocutor in the Treatiſe *de Natura Deorum*, and him, who is commended in the *Oration for Cluentius*, and him, who is praiſed in the 7th *Oration againſt Verres*, for the ſame perſon.

(*p*) Cicero, *Orat. pro Cluent.* fol. 114. C.

(*q*) Idem, in Verrem, *Orat.* 7. fol. 40. B.

(*r*) Val. Maxim. lib. 5. cap. 7.

(*s*) Appianus, *de Bello Civili*, lib. 4. pag. 601.

Calvinus and C. Aſinius Pollio, in the year of Rome 714. *Conſul hic fuit, quoniam ita neceſſe eſt dicere, Cn. Domitio Calvino ſecundum, C. Aſinio Pollione Coſs. anno Urbis DCCXIV* (39). To conclude, if Glandorp had known the leaſt of the paſſage of Pliny (40), where Balbus the Elder is called the uncle by the father's ſide, *Patruus*, to Balbus the Younger, he would not have had recourſe to a quotation from ſo bad an authority as that of Volaterranus, in order to inform us, that one of theſe Balbus's was brother's ſon to the other.

(39) Hard. *in Plin.* lib. 7. cap. 43. pag. 64. tom. 2.

(40) Lib. 5. cap. 5. pag. 545.

[*L*] *The diſtinction of the greater and leſſer Conſulſhip is chimerical.*] Let us ſee a little what irregularity of mind people are ſubject to. There are ſome Authors who upon occaſion of theſe words of Pliny, *fuit & Balbus Cornelius Major Conſul*, have run into a ſtrange chimera of two degrees of the Conſulſhip, and pretended that Balbus was the great Conſul, or firſt Conſul (41). It is very obvious, that *Major* in this paſſage is not to be referred to *Conſul*.

(41) *See* Salmaſ. *Exercitat.* Plin. pag. 383.

[*M*] *Moreri has committed a great many errors.*] I. It is only upon an *it is ſaid*, that he tells us Cornelius Balbus *wrote a Journal or Ephemerides of what happened every day to Cæſar*. If he had known that Sidonius Apollinaris ſpoke of this Journal as a book then extant, and that he even ſpoke of it with commendation (42), he would have rejected this *it is ſaid*. Some are of opinion that Symmachus ſpeaks of the ſame book, where he writes to his friend, *Si impar eſt deſiderio tuo Livius, ſume* EPHIMERIDEM *C. Cæſaris decerptam Bibliotheculæ meæ ut tibi muneri mitteretur. Hæc te origines, ſitus, pugnas, & quicquid fuit in moribus aut legibus Galliarum docebit* (43): that is; "If "Titus Livy is not ſufficient to gratify your inclina- "tion to know the Hiſtory of ancient Gaul, you may "take the Journal or Ephemerides of Cæſar, which I "have made you a preſent of, &c." But others pretend, that the author means only the Memoirs, which Ceſar wrote himſelf, and which we have ſtill extant under the title of *Commentaries of the War in Gaul* (44). It is true however, that he wrote other Memoirs under the title of *Ephemerides*, as we are informed by Servius. Why is it not probable then that Symmachus ſpoke of them? II. The advice *to take care not to confound, as Savaro and others have done, this author, with one of the ſame name, who was ſurnamed Theophanes, and was of Leſbos*, contains two errors. We have ſhewn the firſt by vindicating Savaro from the cenſure of Voſſius. The ſecond conſiſts in ſuppoſing, that there was an Hiſtorian, a native of the Iſle of Leſbos, who was named Cornelius Balbus Theophanes; whereas nothing is more falſe. Theophanes the Hiſtorian, born at Mitylene in the Iſle of Leſbos, was named Cn. Pompeius Theophanes, on account of Pompey's having conferred upon him the Freedom of the city of Rome; but he never added to the name of his family that of Balbus or Balbus Cornelius; and it is very ſtrange, that Voſſius ſhould ſay, that the Hiſtorian Cornelius Balbus Theophanes, mentioned by Julius Capitolinus, was the Theophanes of the Iſle of Leſbos, who wrote the *Mithridatic War* (45). III. But once more, why muſt we take care not to do as Savaro has done? It is becauſe Cornelius Balbus *lived at Rome*, and Theophanes *was of Leſbos*. Are not theſe two attributes incompatible in the ſame perſon; and can we deſire better proofs of a perſonal diſtinction? Thus we ſee how errors increaſe. Moreri having a mind to abridge the proof of Voſſius, has rendered it incomparably worſe than it was before. IV. *I think*, continues he, *that he is the firſt whom Cicero defended againſt thoſe, who accuſed him of having unjuſtly aſſumed the character of a Roman Citizen.* Beſides that the expreſſion is ſo obſcure (46), that it ſeems at firſt to intimate, that Cicero begun this kind of pleadings with the perſon whom we are ſpeaking of; which is not what he intended, nor what he ſhould have ſaid; there is this fault in theſe words, that this ſhould not have been mentioned as a doubtful fact; which it was very eaſy to ſatisfy himſelf of by reading the Summaries of Paulus Manutius, Father Abram, &c upon Cicero's Oration *pro L. Cornelio Balbo.*

(42) *Quis opera Suetonii, quis Juvenci, Martilis Hiſtoriam, quiſve ad extremum* Balbi Ephemeridem fando adæquaverit? Sidon. Apollinar. Epiſt. 14. lib. 9.

(43) Symmach. Epiſt. 17. lib. 2.

(44) Voſſius, *de Hiſtor. Latin.* pag. 64. where he aſcribes to Suetonius what belongs to Symmachus.

(45) See in the remark [*C*] Caſaubon and others who have committed the ſame error.

(46) If we were to remark the faults of this kind, which are in Moreri's ſtyle, we might reckon them by thouſands.

[*N*] *Cicero ſays that Sulpicius ſurpaſſed Balbus his maſter.*] The reader will much better comprehend Cicero's thought from his own words than from mine. Let him read then what follows: *Cum dicendi cauſâ duobus paritiſſimis operam dediſſet* (Servius) *L. Lucilio Balbo, C. Aquilio Gallo, Galli hominis acuti & exercitati promptam in agendo & in reſpondendo celeritatem ſubtilitate diligentiaque ſuperavit. Balbi docti & eruditi hominis in utraque re conſideratam tarditatem vicit, expediendis conficiendiſque rebus. Sic & habet quod uterque eorum habuit, & explevit quod utrique deſuit* (47).

(47) Cicero *in Bruto* cap. 42.

BALBUS, BALBI, or BALBO (JOHN) a Dominican Friar, flouriſhed in the XIIIth Century. He underſtood Greek, which was a very uncommon qualification in that age, and more Latin, than all his brother Monks together could boaſt of. He was no leſs eſteemed for his exemplary life, than for his learning; and there have been ſome perſons who have called him *Bleſſed* [*A*]. It was upon this account that his image was placed in St. Thomas's Church at Pavia. The title of his Works may be ſeen in Moreri, who, inſtead of referring us to Voſſius's book concerning the Latin Hiſtorians, would have done

[*A*] *There have been ſome perſons, who have called him Bleſſed.*] This will appear from the following paſſage: *Non vi hà mancato chi lo riponga nel numero de' Beati, e come tale ſi vede dipinto nel Tempio di S. Tomaſo di Pavia, in luogo eminente vicino al ſoffitato* (1).

(1) Alfonſo Fernandez, *apud* Michaelem Juſtinianum, *in Libro de gli Scrittori Liguri*, p. 312.

done right to obſerve, that John Balbus is incomparably better known by the name of *Joannes de Janua*, or *Joannes Januenſis*, than by any other title. We ſhall ſhew why he bore that name, and examine whether he is the ſame with *Jacobus de Voragine* [B]. We ſhall

[B] *We ſhall ſhew why he bore that name, ... and whether he was the ſame with Jacobus de Voragine.*] John Balbus, a noble Genoeſe, was called *Januenſis*, or *de Janua*, becauſe he was of Genoa. He ſays himſelf in his *Catholicon*, in the word *Janua*, that he was of a city called Janua; which is no other than that of Genoa. From the time of Luitprand it was rather called *Janua* than *Genua*; either that they had a mind to intimate more clearly that Janus was the founder of it; or that they had a regard to the reaſon alledged by Jo. de Janua, which was, that this city is the gate of Provence, Lombardy, and Tuſcany. He informs us himſelf, that he was called *Frater Johannes Januenſis de Balbis*, and that he had written ſeveral other books. At the end of the *Catholicon*, he acquaints us, that after many years intenſe application, he finiſh'd it the day of the nones of March, that is, on the 7th of March 1286.

WHETHER *John de Janua*, and *Jacobus de Voragine*, are one and the ſame Author.

Mr. Oudin, formerly a Monk of the Order of Premonſtratenſes, and at preſent joined to the Proteſtant Church to the prodigious ſatisfaction of the whole body, who have the greateſt reaſon to congratulate themſelves upon ſo noble a conqueſt, and who are in expectation of ſeveral fine pieces from his pen: this Gentleman, I ſay, aſſerts, that *Jacobus de Voragine* the author of *the Golden Legend*, and *Joannes de Janua* the author of the *Catholicon*, are one and the ſame perſon (2). He founds his opinion upon this, that it is agreed that they lived at the ſame time, that they both were Dominicans, both of Genoa, and upon that account both of them called *Januenſis*. It was an eaſy matter therefore for thoſe, who ſaw at the beginning of ſeveral manuſcripts the name *Januenſis*, preceded by the letter I, the initial letter of the Chriſtian names *Joannes* and *Jacobus*, to aſcribe them ſometimes to *Jacobus Januenſis*, and ſometimes to *Joannes Januenſis*, by which means they might make two authors of one.

(2) Oudin, *Supplem. de Scriptor. Eccleſiaſt.* p. 561.

But that Gentleman will give me leave to obſerve, that his conjecture receives a very ſevere ſhock from the Catalogue, which the author of the *Catholicon* has given of his works under the word *Janua*; for tho' the time when he finiſhed his *Catholicon*, might be very diſtant from that, when he finiſh'd the article of *Janua*, it is by no means probable, that if he had writen any books during the time, which paſt between his compoſing of that article, and the cloſing of his Dictionary, he would not have added them to the others in the ſame article. Thus it may be ſuppoſed, that the Catalogue, which he gives us in the word *Janua* is of the year 1286, in which he finiſh'd his *Catholicon*. Now it is certain that Jacobus de Voragine publiſh'd in 1270 an Italian Tranſlation of the Bible. What probability is there, that if at the end of ſixteen years he had mentioned the Books, which he had publiſh'd, he would have forgot a performance of his, which was ſo late, and in every reſpect ſo remarkable as his Tranſlation of the Scripture into the vulgar tongue? It is not therefore at all probable, that the author of the *Catholicon* was the ſame with Jacobus de Voragine. I ſhall wait for farther information upon this point from the learned, and eſpecially from Mr. Oudin. Dr. Cave ſtill continues in uncertainty about it (3).

(3) Cave, *de Script. Eccleſiaſt.* pag. 750.

This is the manner in which I ſpoke in my plan; but now I can ſpeak in a more deciſive tone againſt Father Oudin's conjecture. I ſhall proceed upon ſeveral good arguments, which have come to me very ſeaſonably (4). The following is an extract from a Memorial ſent from Dijon. "I believe that it may "be poſitively determined, that *Joannes de Janua* "ought not to be confounded with *Jacobus de Voragi-* "*ne*. The former, who is the author of a Dictio- "nary intitled *Catholicon*, has never been quoted by "the name of *Jacobus*. The latter, who is the au- "thor of the *Golden Legend*, has never been quoted by "the name of *Joannes*. The former is always cal- "led *Joannes de Janua*, or *Januenſis*, becauſe he was "in fact of Genoa, of the family of Balbi. The "latter, whoſe family is unknown, is almoſt univer- "ſally called *Jacobus de Voragine*, very ſeldom *Ja-* "*cobus Januenſis*; and then *Archiepiſcopus* is to be "underſtood, or elſe we muſt ſuppoſe that he was "ſtiled ſo on account of the nearneſs of the Borough "of Liguria, called *Voragine*, where he was born, to "the city of Genoa. The former was only a mere "Dominican Monk. The latter was raiſed to the "Archbiſhoprick of Genoa. All Authors, and the "Dominicans amongſt the reſt, have conſtantly diſ- "tinguiſhed the names, the country, and the works "of theſe two Writers. This has been particularly "obſerved by Leandro Alberti in his Deſcription *della* "*riviera di Genoua di Ponente*. James Bracelli, a "Genoeſe, who wrote in the year 1431, and of "whom we have a ſmall tract *de claris Genuenſibus*, "that is, *of the famous men of Genoa*, makes no men- "tion of Jacobus de Voragine, becauſe he was not of "Genoa; but he ſpeaks there with great commenda- "tion of the Author of the *Catholicon*, Joannes Balbus, "to whom he would undoubtedly have given the ti- "tle of Archbiſhop of Genoa, if he had ever had it, "as he muſt, according to the opinion of thoſe, who "confound him with Jacobus de Voragine."

(4) From the learned Mr. de la Monnoie.

A MULTIPLICATION of *Joannes de Janua* into ſeveral Authors.

Simler is ſo far from confounding two authors in one, in this caſe, that on the contrary of one he has made three; for he ſpeaks of Joannes de Janua, Joannes Januenſis, and Joannes Balbus, as three different authors (5). Beſides he is miſtaken in putting *Baldus* for *Balbus*; an error, which Quenſtedt has followed in his treatiſe of the Countries of illuſtrious Men (6). Martinius likewiſe has fallen into errors of multiplication. It is in the Catalogue of Dictionaries, which he made uſe of to form his own; in the beginning of his *Lexicon Philologicum*, printed at Bremen in 1623, and afterwards enlarged at Francfort in 1655, and reprinted at Utrecht in 1697. He cites the *Catholicon*, finiſh'd the day of the nones of March 1286, and quotes the very words at the end of the Dictionary of Joannes de Janua. Immediately after he cites a *Summa quæ vocatur Catholicon*, publiſhed by Friar John de Janua, and printed at Venice in 1487. It is plain that theſe are only two different editions of one and the ſame book, and that the former ought to be equally aſcribed to John de Janua with the latter. Martinius would not have fallen into this miſtake, if he had known what is in the article JANUA, in the *Catholicon* finiſh'd in 1286.

(5) *Epitome Bibliotb. Geſneri.*

(6) Pag. 307.

OF the book intitled *Catholicon*.

I find that it is not yet generally agreed, who was the author of the Dictionary, which was firſt intitled *Catholicon*. Mr. du Cange aſcribes it to our John de Janua, and affirms that neither Papias, nor Ugutio, who had made ſome compilations prior to it, had made uſe of that title (7); but Mr. Borrichius, who wrote after having read the Preface of Mr. du Cange, notwithſtanding affirms that Papias is the author of the *Catholicon*, and that he finiſh'd that work in the year 1286 (8). He had ſeen that it was aſſerted in that Preface, that Papias flouriſhed, not in 1200, as Trithemius aſſures us, but in 1053, as the Chronicle of Albericus proves; and yet he affirms it as a certain fact that Papias finiſhed his Dictionary in 1286. He ought either to have refuted Mr. du Cange, or at leaſt ſhewn, that he was miſtaken. This conduct, and this ſilence, ſerve only to perplex the reader. However, it is a ſtrong preſumption againſt Mr. Borrichius, that he has placed the concluſion of Papias's Dictionary preciſely in the ſame year 1286, in which Joannes de Janua finiſhed his *Catholicon*. The Memorial above mentioned aſſures me, that Papias did not compoſe the *Catholicon*, which was finiſhed in 1286, and that John Baldus was the firſt, who made uſe of the title of *Catholicon* in the front of a Dictionary.

(7) Du Cange, *Præfat. Gloſſarii Latin.*

(8) Borrich. *Append. de Lexicis Græcis & Lat.* at the end of his *Analecta ad Cogit. de Ling. Lat.* 1682.

THE age of Papias, according to Barthius.

It was a long while ago, that Barthius, without having conſulted the manuſcript Chronicle of Albericus, was of opinion that Papias was more ancient than he is repreſented to have been. Platina affirms it as an undoubted fact, that he lived under Pope Innocent III, that is, in the beginning of the thirteenth Century: but Barthius in the third chapter of the third book of his *Adverſaria*, places him under the Emperor Henry II (9), becauſe that author does not carry the liſt, which he gives under the word *ætas* of all the Princes of

(9) He died in the year 1024; ſo that Barthius's reaſon ſeems to prove too much.

ſhall make but one ſingle remark for all this, and whatever elſe may offer it ſelf upon this head.

of the paſt ages, any further, than Henry II, whom he calls *minorem*; which he would not have done, if there had been before above two Emperors of the name of Henry. It is true that Barthius raiſes a doubt, which is generally ſpeaking juſtified by the prodigious negligence of thoſe, who continue or enlarge any compilations; and that is, that perhaps Papias left the article *ætas* juſt as he found it in ſome old Dictionary, without carrying on the Catalogue to his time. Thus we find in the Chronicle of the Abbot of Urſperg, in one place, that the author was at Rome in the year 1102 (10); and in another, that he was very young, in *minore ætate*, in 1198; and in another, that he was choſen Abbot in 1215. If the Continuator had cleared thoſe things which related to his additions, the reader would not have met with ſuch a confuſion as this.

(10) *See* Voſſius *de Hiſt. Lat.* lib. 2. cap. 57. *and* Bellar. *de Script. Eccleſ.* pag. 335. falſely accuſed by Zeiler, *de Hiſt.* pag. 155. of having believed that the number 1102 was falſified.

THE negligence of the Continuators of Compilations.

BALDUS, a famous Lawyer in the XIVth Century, was ſon to Francis Ubaldus [*A*], a Phyſician of Perugia. He ſtudied under Bartolus, and when he was but fifteen years old, he propoſed to him ſuch a perplexing objection, that he was obliged to deſire time to conſider of it, and he did not give his anſwer to it till the next day. So that thoſe, who tell us that Baldus began his ſtudies very late, are extremely miſtaken [*B*]. A little after he was promoted to his Doctor's Degree, he maintained ſome Theſes, which Bartolus attacked for five hours ſucceſſively, without being able to gain the victory. He very frequently pleaded Cauſes againſt Bartolus, and there roſe between them ſuch an emulation, as ſoon degenerated into a mutual hatred. This appears unqueſtionable, when we conſider that Baldus endeavoured to eclipſe the reputation of his Maſter. As for what is ſaid, that the Pandects of Piſa having been conſulted upon occaſion of a diſpute, which they had about the reading of a Law, Baldus was convicted of ſeveral falſifications, and that he was puniſhed for it in a very ignominious manner, it ought to be conſidered as a mere fable [*C*].

He

[*A*] *He was ſon to Francis Ubaldus.*] We may obſerve therefore that *Baldus* is this Civilian's Chriſtian name, and *Ubaldus* his ſirname. Moreri calls him beſides *Peter*; which is confounding the elder brother with the younger. Petrus Ubaldus was the third ſon of the Phyſician Franciſcus Ubaldus, and was an excellent Civilian. Angelus Ubaldus his brother was likewiſe a great Lawyer. See Panzirolus Chap. LXX and the following of the ſecond Book *de claris Legum Interpretibus*.

[*B*] *Thoſe, who ſay, that Baldus began his ſtudies very late, are extremely miſtaken.*] It has been ſaid, that he was forty years old, when he began to ſtudy the Law, and that upon Bartolus's ſaying to him, *tarde veniſti, Balde*, that is, *You come late, Baldus*, he replied, *citius recedam*, that is, *I ſhall go away the ſooner* (1). La Mothe le Vayer adds ſomething to Bartolus's ſpeech to him, *You come late, Baldus; you will be an Advocate in the other world: Serò venis, Balde, eris Advocatus in alio ſæculo.* I do not think, that if Bartolus ſaid this, he made any alluſion to Cato's raillery. That cenſor, in ridicule of Iſocrates's ſchool, uſed to ſay, *That his ſcholars grew old there, that they might exerciſe their eloquence in hell, by pleading at the bar of Minos* (2). The ſtory in diſpute here is without foundation. Panzirolus proves that Baldus at fifteen years of age propoſed a very difficult objection to the famous Bartolus; that at the age of ſeventeen he read public Lectures; and that four years after he wrote a Book *de Pactis*, and another *de Conſtituto* (3). The words of that writer are as follow: *Opinioni Bartoli adeò argutè contradixit, ut ille argumenti acumine perterritus reſpondere non potuerit, commendatoque juvene tempus ad ſolvendum petiit, & ſequenti mane reſpondit. Deinde 17 annum ingreſſus, ſolenni interpretatione difficillimam legem publicè Baldus explicuit; unde fabuloſum eſt quod vulgo fertur, Baldum quadragenarium ad legum ſtudia acceſſiſſe* (4). Zaſius the Civilian relates the ſame ſtory upon the authority of Paul Citadin; but Tiraquellus rejects it as a mere fable (5). *Adducerem*, (ſays he (6), *quod de Baldo vulgo dicitur . . . niſi ſcirem hæc eſſe commentitia & prorſus fabuloſa, ut ex iis conſtat, quæ ſupra diximus.* Mr. Baillet obſerves that la Mothe le Vayer and Father Bartoli *ſeem to have adopted this opinion, as if the fact was well atteſted, and not a mere tale formed at random.* He refers them to *the Preſident Taraquellus*, and to the eighth chapter of the *Elogia* of Paulus Jovius (7). He quotes la Mothe le Vayer Letter XXXII p. 420, and Bartoli Car. Hom. lit. p. 248. I never read that Tiraquellus was Preſident. Paulus Jovius obſerves that Baldus was a perſon of a very forward genius, and which continued in its vigour a long time; *Præcoci ingenio pene puer, non ad optimam modo frugem, ſed rariſſimo etiam naturæ dono ad longam ſenectutem pervenit* (8).

(1) Panzirol. *de claris Leg. Interp.* lib. 2. cap. 70. pag. 201.

(2) Plutarch. *in Catone*, pag. 350.

(3) Panzirol. *de claris Legum Interpret.* p. 203.

(4) Ibid. pag. 200, 201.

(5) Zazius *apud* Tiraquil. *de Jure Primigenior. Præf.* num. 206.

(6) Tiraq. *de Jure Primig. Præf.* num. 206.

(7) Baillet, *Enf. celebr.* pag. 420.

(8) He lived till he was 76 years old.

[*C*] *As for what is ſaid . . . . that he was convicted of ſeveral falſifications . . . . it ought to be conſidered as a mere fable* (α).] Some tell us, that the diſgrace, which he fell under, obliged him to baniſh himſelf, and to ſay, as Scipio Africanus did, that he would not ſuffer his ungrateful country to bury him. *Publicè traductum patriâ exceſſiſſe ferunt, & abeuntem Scipionis Africani verba protuliſſe*, ingrata patria, ne oſſa quidem mea habebis, *ac in voluntario exilio ſenem defunctum fuiſſe* (9). Others ſay, that he was condemned to be ſtigmatized with an hot iron in the fore-head, and that Bartolus protected him. Jaſon had this by hear-ſay; but he did very wrong to perpetuate ſuch a report upon hear-ſay in his works. We ought never to do ſuch an honour to reports of that kind but in two caſes; one is, when they are very probable; the other, when we have a mind to brand them with a note of reprobation, that is, to confute and explode them. In the latter caſe it is very uſeful to relate ſuch kinds of traditions, becauſe nothing is more proper to raiſe a diſtruſt againſt the reports of common fame, than to ſhew the age we live in the abſurd and ridiculous credulity of the former. To prove demonſtrably that the hear-ſay of Jaſon is a fiction, we want no other reaſon but this. Jaſon knew nothing of this but by hear-ſay; if the thing had been true, he would have read of it in an hundred places. Baldus lived a very long time in the greateſt glory; he wrote books; he confuted whatever he thought proper; he had very formidable antagoniſts and enemies. We may take it for granted, that if ſuch a reproach and infamy could have been caſt upon him, it would have been done in more books than one. From thence Jaſon and all the world would have learned that diſgrace of Baldus. This is the misfortune of men of learning, who diſtinguiſh themſelves much, and write a great deal; the moſt inconſiderable errors of their youth are ſooner or later publickly objected to them. They raiſe themſelves enemies amongſt authors; this is ſufficient; they muſt expect ſatyrical romances againſt themſelves, rather than any mercy from their adverſary. In this manner Panzirolus ſhould have made an apology for Baldus; he ſhould expreſly and in plain terms have made uſe of ſuch a remark, and not have ſatisfied himſelf with ſaying, *Quæ omnia falſa eſſe & alii potius eveniſſe non dubito, cum nulla de hoc certa extet auctoritas, & eum Ticini deceſſiſſe conſtet* (10); that is, "I do not queſtion that all this is falſe, or that it "happened to ſome other perſon, ſince we have no "good authority for it, and it is certain that he died "at Pavia.

(9) Panzirol, *de claris Legum interpretib.* p. 201.

IN what manner an Author ought to relate an *Hear-ſay*.

(10) Panzirol. *de claris Legum Interpret.* p. 202.

§ (α). The falſification, which Baldus was accuſed of, related to the Law *Creditor*, the firſt in the Digeſt *de diſtractione pignorum*, in which, it is ſaid, he was convicted of having ſuppreſſed an *n*. Bartolus took upon

He taught at Perugia, where he had for one of his Scholars Cardinal Beaufort, who was afterwards Pope Gregory XI. He was ſent for to Padua about the year 1378; but he quitted that Univerſity, when Galeazzo Viſconti having a deſign to reſtore that of Pavia, drew by very ample penſions the ableſt Profeſſors he could meet with to ſettle there. A quick repartee, which Baldus made, the firſt time he appeared in the College of Pavia, made him admired [*D*]. He had there a formidable Collegue, whoſe name was Philip Caſſolus. He was a man, who had an excellent memory joined to a very great genius; but the conceit, which he had of his own abilities, having tempted him to make a challenge, he failed in the attempt, and his glory was ſacrificed to that of Baldus [*E*]. The death of this Philip did not deliver his antagoniſt from trouble, for there was ſo warm an emulation between the Profeſſor, who ſucceeded him, and Baldus, that they introduced the ſhameful and pernicious cuſtom of bribing the auditors by ſupplications. Baldus gained a very large fortune [*F*]. He wrote a great many books, and there is no manner of probability that he ſtudied but two hours a day [*G*]. He is not an Author who can be propoſed as an inſtance of one without faults: had he only had that of contradicting himſelf, he would be very far from perfection; but he had a great many others [*H*]. The excuſes, which he made uſe of to palliate his contradictions, deſerve to be conſidered [*I*]. He died the 28th of April 1400.

upon him the defence of Baldus, not by denying the fact, but by alledging in favour of the perſon accuſed the Law *Ad beſtias* 31 in the Digeſt *de pœnis*, which imports, that when the guilty perſon is in other reſpects a man of great merit, or one, who has extraordinary talents in his art, the rigour of the laws is to be mitigated in his favour. See John Niveſan, l. 5. n. 25 of his *Forêt Nuptiale*. CRIT. REM.]

[*D*] *A quick repartee of Baldus .... made him admired.*] He was very ſhort in ſtature, ſo that when they ſaw him in the auditory, they cried out, *Minuit præſentia famam*. i. e. "His preſence leſſens his reputation." He replied without any concern, *augebit cætera virtus*; i. e. "Virtue ſhall raiſe the value of every thing that belongs to me." Panzirolus adds, *Quo dicto omnibus ſui admirationem injecit* (11); i. e. "By which expreſſion he made every perſon admire him prodigiouſly."

(11) Ibid. pag. 203.

[*E*] *The glory of Caſſolus was ſacrificed to that of Baldus.*] Caſſolus had engaged to anſwer upon the ſpot every thing that could be aſked him concerning the laſt wills. The day and hour were fixed to try whether he had reaſon for his boaſts. The Aſſembly was numerous; Baldus roſe up, and propoſed a queſtion, which the other could not anſwer, ſo that he was obliged himſelf to quote the law which he aſked for. We may judge how prodigiouſly the challenger was mortified. *Philippus, qui, ut memoriâ cæteris antecellebat, ſe ex omnibus ultimarum voluntatum quæſtionibus ex tempore reſponſurum profeſſus eſt. Statutâ ad dicendum die, cum in magnâ expectatione eſſet, ſurgens Baldus interrogavit, ubi in jure cautum reperiretur, parem non eſſe ejus, qui non vult, ei, qui non poteſt, conditionem. Ad primam interrogationem hæſitante Philippo, cum Baldus de præpoſitâ quæſtione legem oſtendiſſet, magnam gloriam retulit* (12).

(12) Idem, ibid.

[*F*] *Baldus gained a large fortune.*] The counſels which he gave only upon the ſubject of ſubſtitutions were worth to him above 15000 crowns. He was poſſeſſed of ſeveral lands. *De Jure reſpondendo immenſam pecuniam coegit, qui ex ſolis ſubſtitutionum ſpeciebus plus quindecim millia aureorum lucratus fuiſſe traditur. Aliunde præterea ex innumeris aliarum ſucceſſionum criminumque cauſis & contractibus peramplas opes accumulavit* (13). He lived in a pleaſant country-houſe near Pavia, from whence he came upon a mule to the Auditory. *Domus*, continues Panzirolus (14), *vetuſtate vitiata adhuc hodie pro re memoranda oſtentatur*; that is, "The houſe, though decayed by length of time, is ſtill ſhewn as a remarkable curioſity.

(13) Panzirol. *de clar. Leg. Interpret.* pag. 204.
(14) Ibid. pag. 203.

[*G*] *There is no manner of probability that he ſtudied but two hours a day.*] Panzirolus, confuting this, ſays among other things, that Balbus going a journey, which hindered him from ſpending the time in reading, which he uſed to dedicate to that employment, ſaid, "Every ſtep that my horſe makes, ſo many laws ſlip out of my memory." *Quot gradus equus ambulabat, tot leges ſibi excidere querebatur* (15). This ſhews, that he had acquired and kept his learning by much reading.

(15) Idem, ibid.

[*H*] *He had a great many faults.*] He advances a thouſand things, which are ſingular, and contrary to the ſentiments of other Civilians, and he advances them without quoting any law. Theſe are mere fancies of his own. He quotes laws, which are nothing to the point in queſtion; he treats of many things out of their proper place; he is too dry upon neceſſary occaſions, and too prolix, where there is none. He anſwers queſtions which no perſon ever ſtarted; and he ſays nothing to what every body wants an anſwer to: he confounds himſelf by his own ſubtilties, and he gives himſelf too great a liberty. The vivacity of his genius is the cauſe of the want of uniformity in his opinions; *Cum parum ſibi conſtans ſæpenumero contrarius reperiatur, id tamen non levitate, ſed ingenii ſubtilitate eveniſſe Paulus Caſtrenſis autumat* (16). Thoſe, who have a lively imagination, have generally a ſhort memory; and this makes them forget, when they conſider a queſtion on one ſide, that they formerly maintained it in a contrary ſenſe. They contradict themſelves without being ſenſible of it. Add to this, that a ſubtle genius eaſily invents methods of proving and refuting the ſame things. But it is a great defect not to be able to ſuſpend the defects of this ſubtilty, till one can fix his mind in a ſteady manner.

(16) Idem, ibid.

[*I*] *The excuſes which he made uſe of to palliate his contradictions, deſerve to be conſidered.*] He ſaid that our underſtanding changes, ſo that it reaſons one day in one manner, and another day in another. I believe that *in petto* he reſerved to himſelf the privilege, which he aſcribed to Legiſlators. The Biſhop of Pavia aſked one day why the Laws were ſo changeable: Baldus anſwered him, that the ſame thing became lawful or unlawful according to the times. That is allowed in war which is prohibited in peace; upon which account juſtice turns upon every thing, which becomes proper to the times. Such a conduct is agreeable to the preſent conjuncture of affairs; therefore it is juſt. Thoſe, who make Laws, imitate Phyſicians; who permit, order, and forbid the ſame things according to the times and ſeaſons; and it is the time, which they regard. *Ipſe quoque ſe excuſat, quod intellectus, qui ratiocinatur, non ſemper ſit idem, ſed varius; & Epiſcopo Ticinenſi ſæpe interroganti, cur toties leges mutarentur, reſpondit, flagrante bello permittitur, quod pacis tempore non licet; id ita juſtum eſſe, quod cuique ſuo tempore expedit, exemplo enim medicorum tempora à legum latoribus dicebat obſervari* (17). This was the anſwer of Baldus; and here we have either implicitly or explicitly the principle, upon which thoſe Authors reaſon, who confute themſelves, when they are to diſpute againſt two ſorts of enemies. *This propoſition is true and juſt, to day, while I am diſputing againſt Pelagius; a year hence it will not be ſo, if I ſhall diſpute againſt Calvin.* See what has been ſaid above (18) relating to the contradictions of advocates, and the apology which Cicero made. I remember to have read, that certain controverſial writers, not being able to deny that the church commanded ſome things, which did not appear conformable either to the Scripture, or the primitive Church, maintained that they were notwithſtanding juſt and true, becauſe the Holy Ghoſt, who guides the church, inſpires it in every age with ſuch interpretations, as are moſt proper for the ſalvation of ſouls. *Scripturas eſſe ad tempus adaptatas & variè intellectas, ità ut uno tempore ſecundum*

(17) *Apud* Panzirol. ibid.

(18) In the remarks [*B*] and [*C*] of the Article (MARK) ANTHONY the Orator.

1400 [*K*]. The manner of his death was ſhocking; he was extremely fond of a little dog, which he very often careſſed and kiſſed. He was bit on the lip by the dog while he was playing with him in that manner; and as the creature was mad at that time, the ſubtile poiſon diſperſed it ſelf over Baldus's whole body; and though it had no ſenſible effect for a long time, yet at laſt it produced in him the fear of water, and occaſioned an incurable diſeaſe (*a*). Baldus lived 76 years (*b*), and left two ſons, who were excellent Civilians (*c*). Zenobius the elder of them was Biſhop of Tipherno (*d*).

(*a*) Panzirol. *de clar. Leg. Interpretib.* lib. 2. cap. 70. p. 201, *& ſeq.*

(*b*) Paul. Jovius *Elog.* cap. 8. pag. 27.
(*c*) Panzirol. *de clar. Leg. Inter.* pag. 203.
(*d*) Idem, ibid.

dum currentem univerſalem ritum exponerentur, mutato ritu iterum ſententia mutaretur (19). *Non eſt mirum ſi praxis Eccleſiæ non tempore interpretatur Scripturam uno modo, alio tempore alio; nam intellectus currit cum praxi* (20). I love ſuch ſincerity as this.

(19) Nicolaus Cuſanus, Epiſt. 2. *ad Bohemos.*

(20) Idem, Epiſt. 7.

[*K*] *He died the 28th of April* 1400.] His epitaph aſſures us of this. Bellarmin is therefore miſtaken in placing Baldus's death in the year 1420 (21). Trithemius, who has placed it in 1423, has committed an error; but Moreri, who ſaid that according to Trithemius the death of Baldus ought to be placed in the year 1423, was not in the wrong. The Dutch edition ſhould not have changed 1423 into 1403.

(21) Bellarmin. *de Script. Eccleſiaſt.* pag. 382.

BALDUS (JAMES), one of the beſt Latin Poets that Germany produced in the XVIIth Century, was born at Enſiſheim in 1603. He turned Jeſuit in the year 1624. He taught Rhetoric and polite learning for ſix years: he was a preacher for many years, and preached even at the Elector of Bavaria's Court, and raiſed himſelf a prodigious reputation by his *Poems*. Even the Proteſtants themſelves commended him in a ſingular manner [*A*]. One of his laſt Works was his *Urania victrix, ſeu Animæ Chriſtianæ certamina adverſus illecebras quinque ſenſuum corporis ſui*. Pope Alexander VII was ſo pleaſed with it, that he ſent his gold medal to the Author. Father Baldus conſecrated it to the Holy Virgin [*B*]. Several Senators of Nuremberg diſputed who ſhould have his pen [*C*]; and it is ſaid that he, to whom it fell, kept it in a ſilver caſe. This Poet died at Neubourg the 9th of Auguſt 1668. His Poems are of different kinds. They conſiſt of *Panegyrics*, and *Treatiſes of Morality*, *Theatrical* [*D*], and *Devotional Pieces*, *Miſcellanies*, *Odes*, &c. (*a*).

(*a*) Sotuel, *Bibliotb. Script. Soc. Jeſu*, p. 356.

[*A*] *The Proteſtants . . . . have commended his Poems in a ſingular manner.*] Father Southwel expreſſes himſelf in theſe terms: *Ipſis Acatholicis etiam adeò placuerunt, ut publico typo eum* Horatium Germanum *nominare non dubitarint*. That is, *His Poetry pleaſed even thoſe, who were not Catholics, ſo much, that they did not ſcruple to call him in print the* Horace of Germany. If I am not miſtaken, this is founded upon a Letter of Barlæus. Father Baldus having ſeen the verſes, which Barlæus wrote in praiſe of the Duke of Bavaria, he wrote him a very obliging letter, and ſent him a volume of his poems. Barlæus returned him thanks with prodigious compliments, and wrote to him among other things, *Reſtituiſti nobis lyram neglectam diu & intermiſſam, ut jam meritò vocari poſſis lyricorum ſcriptor, aut potius Bojorum fidicen lyræ, ut ad Horatii verba alludam* (1). That is, "You have reſtored to us "the long neglected lyre, ſo that you may with the "greateſt reaſon be ſtiled a Lyric Writer, or rather "the Prince of the Bavarian Lyre, to allude to the "words of Horace. This letter was written the firſt of March 1644. The Jeſuit was then Rector of the College of Munich (2).

(1) See the 467th Letter of Barlæus, p. 911. See likewiſe the 487th Letter, which is written to the ſame Baldus.
(2) See the Table of Barlæus's Letters.

[*B*] *He conſecrated a Medal of Alexander VII to the Holy Virgin.*] This is what Southwel ſays: *Hanc verò Jacobus Deiparæ Virgini anathema appendit, ut palam faceret cui Palladi ipſe ſuos labores conſecraret* (3).

(3) Sotuel, *Bibliotb. Societ. Jeſu*, pag. 356.

[*C*] *Several Senators of Nuremberg diſputed who ſhould have his pen.*] I cannot tell, ſays Mr. Baillet (4), whether he, who *kept it in a ſilver caſe made on purpoſe for it*, "did not commit a kind of Sacrilege; be- "cauſe it ſeems to me that Father Baldus had conſe- "crated it to the Holy Virgin; and that his inten- "tion was that it ſhould be affixed to one of her ima- "ges, or altars, as Lipſius did before upon the impulſe "of ſuch like devotion."

(4) *Jugem. ſur les Poet.* tom. 5. num. 1507. pag. 42.

[*D*] *His Poems conſiſt of Theatrical Pieces, &c.*] There is one with this title; *Poeſis Oſca, ſive Drama Georgicum de Belli malis & Pacis bonis, carmine antiquo, Atellano, Oſco, Caſco* (5). How ruſtic ſoever this piece was with the Oſcan and Caſcan Jargon, in which it was compoſed, I do not queſtion but it coſt the author more time and wit, than a ſerious piece in good Latin. We muſt take care therefore not to ſuppoſe that it was printed at Munich in 1617, as Father Southwel aſſures us; ſince James Baldus, at fourteen years of age, was not capable of executing ſuch a deſign as this.

(5) Compare this with the *Dialogue* of *(Mariangelus) Accurſius*, which I mentioned in the remark [*F*] of his article.

BALDUS (*a*) (BERNARDIN) Abbot of Guaſtalla, born at Urbino in the year 1553, was one of the moſt learned men of his time. He made ſo great a progreſs under his firſt maſters, that he was able to tranſlate the *Phænomena of Aratus* into Italian verſe, while he was but a young ſcholar. His father finding by theſe eſſays that his ſon was capable of proceeding a great way in learning, ſent him to Padua in the year 1573 [*A*]. Bernardin ſtudied Homer there under Emanuel Margunius (*b*), and in private almoſt all the Greek Poets, and gained a very accurate knowledge of them. He compoſed at Padua a book concerning *the Engines of War* (*c*), which ſpread his name beyond the Alps; and this gave him an inclination to learn French and High Dutch; for he thought it was a point of civility to underſtand the language of thoſe, whoſe affection he had gained. He learned theſe two languages with a prodigious facility. The Plague obliged him to leave Padua, and returning to Urbino, he applied himſelf for five years to Frederic Commandin, an excellent Profeſſor of the Mathematics, of whom he learned all the branches of that ſcience. He felt an extreme regret upon the death of that ingenious man: and having

(*a*) His great great grandfather left the name of *Cantagallina*, a noble family of Perugia, which he was deſcended from, and aſſumed this. *Fabr. Scharloncin.* See below quotation (*e*).

(*b*) He was a native of Crete, and Profeſſor of Greek at Padua.
(*c*) *De Tormentis Bellicis & eorum Inventoribus.*

[*A*] *His father finding his capacity by theſe Eſſays, ſent him to Padua.*] We may correct by this an error of Nicius Erythræus. I am well aſſured that he had no intention to leſſen in any point the glory of our Baldus; and yet he has extremely leſſen'd it; this was for want of reflection, and regard to the order of time. He ſays that it was after the Lectures of Margunius (1), that Baldus thought himſelf able to tranſlate Greek Poems into his mother-tongue. *Apud quem tantum profecit, ut eo duce & cereum quodammodo lucente obſcuriſſima Græcorum quorundam poetarum loca penetraverit. . . . . Quamobrem ea eſt incenſus animi alacritate atque fiduciâ, ut auſus ſit poemata Græca in noſtrum ſermonem convertere* (2). He had tranſlated a Poem of Aratus, before he went to Padua.

(1) It ſhould be written ſo, and not *Margranius*, as it is in Erythræus.

(2) Nic. Erythr. Pinac. 1. p. 4.

ing undertaken to write his life, he was induced by that means to attempt the lives of all the *Mathematicians*. He laboured at this Work for twelve years. The *Commentaries*, which he publiſhed in the year 1582 *upon the Mechanics of Ariſtotle*, ſhew his capacity in that kind of knowledge. To relax his mind from theſe painful ſtudies, he wrote a *Poem* in his mother tongue of *the Art of Navigation*. Ferdinand de Gonzaga, Prince of Molfetta, and Lord of Guaſtalla, having a great reſpect for Mathematicians, engaged our Baldus to live with him. It was at his Court that Baldus began to write upon Vitruvius, and compoſed his book *de Verborum Vitruvianorum ſignificatione*. Being hindred by ſickneſs from taking a voyage into Spain with his patron, he employed the leiſure, that Ferdinand de Gonzaga's abſence gave him, in writing a very methodical treatiſe *of the Court* (*d*), and ſeveral other Works [*B*]. He was made Abbot of Guaſtalla in the year 1586, without having ever aſked for it; and from that time he applied himſelf entirely to the ſtudy of Canon Law, to the Fathers and Councils, and to the Oriental Languages, without even excepting the Arabic [*C*]. Having compoſed in the year 1595 five books *de nova Gnomonice*, he tranſlated the year following *the Chaldee Paraphraſe of the Pentateuch*, and illuſtrated it with a Commentary; after which he tranſlated from the Hebrew *the Book of Job*, and *the Lamentations of Jeremiah*, and added Notes to them. He ſpent ſome hours in explaining a plate, which is at Eugubio [*D*], and which contains ſome inſcriptions in the old Tuſcan Language. He began very late a prodigious Work in the year 1603, I mean *a Deſcription of the World*. His plan was no leſs hiſtorical than geographical, and extended even to the ſmalleſt boroughs, which modern Writers have made any mention of. He finiſhed this Work with regard to the matter [*E*]; but he reduced only part of it to its proper order. He died Oct. 12, 1617, after a great defluxion of Rheum, that had continued upon

(*d*) *Libros ſex de Aulâ eruditiſſimos methodo analyticâ conſcripſit.* Scharloncinus. See the following quotation.

[*B*] *He wrote ſeveral works.*] This remark will contain only the titles of ſome of the writings of our Baldus. I mean thoſe, which are not mentioned in the text of this article, whether the author compoſed them during his patron's voyage, or at any other time. I ſay then, that he tranſlated *Hero de Automatis & Baliſtis*, the *Paralipomena of Quintus Calaber*, and *the Poem of Muſæus*; and that he wrote a book of *Mathematical Paradoxes*, another *de Scamillis imparibus Vitruvii*, another *de Firmamento & Aquis*, another upon *the Deſcription of the Temple*, which Ezechiel has left us, another *de Hiſtoriæ ſcribendæ Legibus*, another of *the Antiquities of Guaſtalla*, *the Life of Frederic*, and that of *Guy Ubaldus*, *Dukes of Urbino*, *Oeconomia Tropologica in S. Matthæum*; ſeveral Poems, ſome in Latin, others in Italian, among which that intitled *Deiphobus* is an imitation of the Caſſandra of Lycophron. The following remarks will give the title of ſome other of his books. I ſhall obſerve here that Nicius Erythræus had reaſon to ſay, that the Deſcription of the Temple is a very difficult ſubject; but he was miſtaken in taking Jeremiah for Ezechiel: *Ferosolymitani*, ſays he (3), *Templi . . . . deſcriptionem per Hieremiam literis conſignatam & traditam, rem involutam & multis difficultatibus obſeſſam evolvit, illuſtravit, atque hominum intelligentiæ aperuit.*

(3) Idem, ibid.

[*C*] *He applied himſelf to the ſtudy of the Oriental Languages, without even excepting the Arabic.*] He ſtudied it at Rome with John Baptiſta Raimondi, and applied himſelf in ſuch a manner to it, and to the Sclavonian Tongue, that he enquired after ſcarce any news: *Romæ dum viveret ferè neſcivit quid gereretur in Aulis: Arabicæ enim Linguæ cum Jo. Baptiſta Raimundo diligentiſſimè ſtuduit, & arcana induſtria Sclavonicæ, quam perfectè callebat* (4). He tranſlated from the Arabic the *Geographical Garden* of an anonymous Author, and compoſed a Dictionary of that language. He believed that this anonymous Author lived about the end of the tenth Century. If Marcus Velſerus had not died, he would have cauſed the tranſlation of that geographical work and the other writings of Baldus to be printed (5).

(4) Fabritius Scharloncinus, *in ejus Vitâ.*

(5) Idem, ibid.

[*D*] *He laboured upon the explanation of a plate, which is at Eugubio.*] Schoockius remembring in a confuſed manner ſomething of this work of Bernardin Baldus, aſcribes to him another, which does not belong to him. "E ſterquilinio Anniano Bernardinus Baldus "nuper collegit Antiquitates Ethruſcas anno 1637, "Florentiæ evulgando volumen typis perquam ele"gantibus, cujus hæc inſcriptio: *Ethruſcarum Anti"quitatum Fragmenta, quibus urbis Romæ aliarumque "gentium primordia, mores, & res geſtæ indicantur, "à Curtio Inghiramio reperta Scornelli prope Vulter"ram, anno Salutis* M.D.C.XXXVII; *Ethruſco verò* "CIↃ CIↃ CIↃ CCCCXCV" (6). That is, "Bernardin "Baldus has lately collected from Annius Viterbo the "Etruſcan Antiquities in the year 1637, and publiſhed at Florence a book in a very beautiful character, "intitled; *Fragments of the Ethruſcan Antiquities, in "which the origin, manners, and hiſtory of the city of "Rome, and other nations are ſhewn, found at Scor"nelli near Vulterra, in the year of the Chriſtian Æra* "M.D.C.XXXVII; *and of the Etruſcan* CIↃ CIↃ CIↃ "CCCCXCV." Could any perſon, who knew that Baldus died in the year 1617, commit ſuch an error as this? What is moſt ſurprizing is, that the ſame Schoockius, after he has ſpoken in this manner in pag. 67, ſpeaks as he ought in page 217; *Simili ratione egit Bernardinus Baldus, vir cæteroquin longe doctiſſimus, annis abhinc fermè quinquaginta evulgando ſuam quaſi divinationem in tabulam æneam Eugubinam linguâ Etruſcâ veteri perſcriptam, ſimul abutendo operâ Marci Velſeri viri cæteroquin judicioſiſſimi* (7). That is: "In "like manner acted Bernardin Baldus, a man in other "reſpects of very great learning, who about fifty years "ago publiſhed his Conjectures upon a braſs plate at "Eugubio, which had an inſcription in the antient "Tuſcan Language, and likewiſe induced Marcus "Velſerus, a man otherwiſe of great judgment, to "join with him in that abſurd work." Why then did not he correct his former miſtake? He forgot it perhaps, as it too often happens to thoſe, who value themſelves upon writing a great deal. They cannot ſupport this character without copying haſtily whatever they find in all kinds of Books. This is what Scharloncinus ſays of this work of Baldus: *Tabulam Etruſcam Eugubinam interpretatus fuit: in eâ autem divinatione, ut aiebat, ſubciſivas unius menſis horas conſumpſit.* That is: "He explained the Etruſcan Table at Eu"gubio; in which, as he ſaid, he ſpent his leiſure "hours for one month." Our Baldus has been mentioned in the new edition of the *Eponymologium* of Magirus, as having publiſhed a book in the year 1637, the ſame that Schoockius aſcribes to him. Does not this ſhew a great deal of judgment?

(6) Schoockius, *de Fabulâ Hamelenſi*, pag. 67.

(7) Idem, ibid. pag. 217.

[*E*] *He finiſhed his Deſcription of the World, with regard to the matter.*] What his Hiſtorian tells us of this is as follows: *Totum opus ad umbilicum perduxit; non digeſſit tamen univerſum, quatuor, aut ni fallor quinque tantum tomi fuerunt ordine alphabetico diſpoſiti; ſupereſſent ſeptem aut octo diſponendi, quantum ex chartarum & faſciculorum mole conjicere licet.* That is: "He finiſh'd the work; but he did not digeſt the "whole of it: there were but four or five volumes "diſpoſed in an alphabetical order: and ſeven or "eight volumes remained to be diſpoſed in that man"ner, as well as could be conjectured from the pa"pers which he left." I do not believe, that Fabritius Scharloncinus has given us a defective liſt of Baldus's works; but according to the bad cuſtom of moſt perſons, who give us ſuch kinds of liſts, he does not diſtinguiſh the books, which have been printed from thoſe, which have not (8). I have not copied his whole Catalogue.

(8) See above the beginning of the remark [*E*] of the article AUREOLUS.

upon him for forty days (e) [F]. He was prodigiously laborious [G], without ambition, or vain glory always ready to excuse the faults of others, and grounding his conduct in that point upon a very good reason [H]; extremely devout, not only for a Mathematician, but even for an Ecclesiastic [I].

(e) Taken from a letter of Fabritius Scharloncinus *ad illustrissimum Dominum Lælium Ruinum Episcopum Balneoregiensem, exnuntium Apostolicum ad Poloniæ Regem.* See likewise Nicius Erythræus, *Pinacoth.* 2. p. 4. and the *Funeral Oration of Baldus* by Mark Anthony Virgilius, printed not in 1607, as Mr. Teissier says in *Catalogo Biblioth.* p. 229, but in the year 1617.

[F] *He died . . . . . after a great rheum, which had continued upon him for forty days.*] It is thus I think I may translate the words of Scharloncinus, *Posteaquam dies* 40 *vehementi distillatione vexatus fuisset.* Vossius understood by *Distillatio* a *Catarrh*, and he was not mistaken in pretending that these two words are synonymous. That of rheum seems to me most proper; for generally catarrhs do not last forty days. Moreri out of a prodigious mistake found here an apoplexy of forty days.

[G] *He was extremely laborious.*] He rose at midnight to his studies, and read even while he was eating. *In studiis sic assiduus fuit, ut sæpè & legeret & comederet. S. Augustini de civitate Dei ter inter prandium evolvit; statim à noctis meridie, dum ei vires firmiores essent, ad lucubrandum surgebat* (9). He considered Euclid translated into Arabic as one of his books of diversion. *A prandio Euclidem Arabicè editum, vel libellum aliquem Germanicum, aut Gallicum, in manus sumebat* (10). Happy those, who can study with such application without prejudice to their health:

(9) Scharloncin. *in Vitâ Baldi.*

(10) Scharloncinus, ibid.

Felices quibus ista licent, miramur & illos,
Et nostri miseremur.

"Thrice happy those,
"Who have this pow'r: their fortune we admire,
"And pity our own severer lot."

A Reflection upon secret faults.

[H] *He was always ready to excuse the faults of others, and grounded his conduct in that point upon a very good reason.*] "If we were to see those without disguise, *said he*, whom we take for the best of men, "we should find not one of them, who did not de-"serve to be chastised." *Facile parcendum esse dicebat iis maximè, qui in re levi impegissent, quoniam si quos censemus optimos, nudos conspiceremus, nullum eorum non judicaremus multis dignum verberibus* (11). This may be carried too far: it will be better perhaps to keep to Cardinal Mazarin's maxim. He used to say, that *the most able men were like victims, which, tho' ever so carefully chosen, had always something bad, when their entrails were examined* (12). I remember to this purpose a passage in Father Rapin, which seemed to me very sensible the first time I read it. It is a thought, which he makes use of as an Apology for Cicero: *There are*, says he (13), *in the bottom of the greatest men's souls some things, which if they could be seen, they would be found to be as weak as others; . . . and that frequently the reputation of Heroes does not rise so much from the address, with which they shew their good qualities, as from that, with which they conceal their bad ones, and do not suffer themselves to be penetrated.*

(11) Idem, ibid.

(12) See the Preface to the *Memoires* of Mr. Chanut.

(13) In his *Comparison between Demosthenes and Cicero.*

[I] *He was extremely devout, not only for a Mathematician, but even for an Ecclesiastic.*] He fasted twice a week; he communicated every holy-day (14), and he was very charitable to the poor. His mother said, that when he was but a year old he look'd upon the altars and images not only with joy, but even with veneration (15). *With joy*, I do not doubt; for it is common with infants to start at the sight of gildings, and ornaments, and images; but as for *Veneration*, that is another point: they have at most but mere machinal motions, to which they are accustomed. Our Baldus died well fortified with all the Sacraments of the Church, and in the arms of the Monks. *Spiritum Deo reddidit Sacramentis Ecclesiæ omnibus rite munitus* (16). *Quemadmodum sanctissime vixerat, ita etiam sanctissime in complexu cucullatorum patrum extremum vitæ spiritum edidit* (17).

(14) Thus I translate *Diebus festis omnibus sacrum faciebat:* Words which perhaps mean only that he officiated every Holy-Day. But there is no doubt that what I say is contained in the Latin of *Scharloncinus.*

(15) Scharloncinus *in ejus Vitâ.*

(16) Idem, ibid.

(17) Nic. Erythræus, *Pinacoth.* 1. pag. 7.

☞ BALE (JOHN) in Latin *Balæus*, an eminent English Bishop and Historian in the XVIth Century, was born at Covie about five miles from Dunwich in Suffolk Nov. the 21st 1495. His father's name was Henry, and his mother's Margaret (*a*). His parents having a very numerous family of children, our Author at twelve years of age was entered into the Convent of Carmelite Friars at Norwich (*b*). He was likewise a Scholar at Jesus College in the University of Cambridge (*c*); and was converted from Popery, as he informs us himself (*d*), by the procurement of Thomas Lord Wentworth [*A*]. Soon after this he married; and met with a great variety of persecutions at York under Archbishop Lee, and at London under Bishop Stokesley; but the Lord Cromwell, who had a great interest with King Henry VIII, always secured him from any danger. But after the death of that Nobleman, Bale retired from the rigours of the Bishops to the Low-Countries, where he continued eight years, and wrote several books in the English Language (*e*). He was recalled by King Edward VI, and consecrated Bishop of Ossory in Ireland at Dublin February 2d 1552; in which See he had not sat six months, when Queen Mary's accession to the Crown obliged him to fly, and conceal himself for some time at Dublin; from whence he embarked about Michaelmas 1553, but was taken by the Pirates, and sold. However being ransomed afterwards he went to Basil (*f*), where he published a new edition of

(*a*) Balæus, *Script. illustr. Majoris Brytanniæ*, Cent. 8. pag. 628 and 702. edit. Basil. 1557.

(*b*) Idem, ibid. cap. 100. p. 702.

(*c*) Nicholson's *English Historical Library*, Part 2. pag. 228. edit. London 1697 in 8vo.

(*d*) Pag. 702..

(*e*) Idem, ibid.

(*f*) Jac. Waræus, *de Script. Hibern.* pag. 135. *apud* Pope-Blount, *Censur. Celebrior. Authorum*, pag. 683. edit. Genevæ 1694. in 4to.

[A] *Was converted from Popery, as he informs us himself, by the procurement of Thomas Lord Wentworth.*] He tells us, that he was involved in the most profound ignorance of all true learning and the greatest blindness of mind, while he continued at Norwich and Cambridge, without any tutor or patron, till the Word of God began to appear in its proper lustre, and the Churches were brought back to the pure fountains of all true Divinity. That the instrument of his conversion was not a Monk or a Priest, but the most noble Lord Wentworth (1); by whose means he was induced to leave the monstrous corruptions of Popery, and to embrace the purity of the Gospel. *In omni literarum barbarie ac mentis cæcitate illic* (Nordovici) *& Cantabrigiæ pervagabar, nullum habens tutorem aut Mecænatem, donec lucente Dei verbo, ecclesiæ revocari cæpissent ad veræ theologiæ purissimos fontes. In eo autem splendore ortus novæ Hierusalem, non à monacho aut sacrifico vocatus, sed illustri Domino Vuenfordo, tanquam à centurione illo, qui ab Christum Dei Filium esse dicebat, serò excitatus, deformitatem meam quam primum vidi & agnovi. Protinusque divinâ bonitate ab arido monte in floridam ac fæcundam Evangelii vallem transferebar; ubi omnia reperi non in arenâ, sed suprà solidam petram ædificata* (2). He observes then, that he immediately divested himself of the characteristic of Antichrist, and cast off all the yokes of that impostor, that he might gain *the liberty of the sons of God.* In short, that he might be no longer a slave to that detestable beast, he married his wife Dorothy, a woman zealous for the true Religion, in obedience to St. Paul's direction, that he, who has not the gift of continency, should marry. *Unde scelestissimi Antichristi characterem ilico obrasi, jugaque ejus omnia à me longè projeci, ut essem in sortem & libertatem datus filiorum Dei. Et ne deinceps in aliquo essem tam execrabilis Bestiæ creatura, uxorem accepi Dorotheam fidelem, divinæ huic voci auscultans, Qui non continet, nubat* (3). Mr. Nicholson in his *English Historical Library* (4) has a very invidious reflection upon this occasion, without mentioning the least ground for it. "He was (as he says) converted from Popery by "the procurement of Thomas Lord Wentworth, tho' "(in truth) his wife Dorothy seems to have had as "great hand in that happy work."

(1) Thus Mr. Fuller in his *Worthies in Suffolk*, pag. 60, 61. and Mr. Nicholson, *Hist. Library*, Part 2. pag. 228. translate *Dominus Vuenford.*

(2) Balæus, *Script. Illustr. Maj. Brytanniæ Catal.* Cent. 8. cap. 100. p. 702. edit. Basileæ 1557.

(3) Idem, ibid.

(4) Part 2. pag. 228.

of his *Centuries of the illuſtrious Britiſh Writers* [*B*]. He returned from his exile in the reign of Queen Elizabeth, but did not think proper to return any more to Ireland, contenting himſelf with a Prebend of Canterbury, where he died in November 1563, being ſixty

[*B*] *Where he publiſhed a new edition of Centuries of the illuſtrious Britiſh Writers.*] He had before publiſhed *Summarium illuſtrium majoris Britanniæ Scriptorum*, printed in 4to *Ipſw.* and *Weſal.* 1549, which contained only five centuries of writers, and which was firſt preſented to King Edward VI (5). But in 1557 he publiſh'd his *Scriptorum illuſtrium majoris Brytanniæ, quam nunc Angliam & Scotiam vocant, Catalogus, à Japheto per* 3618 *annos uſque ad annum hunc Domini* 1557, *ex Beroſo, Gennadio, Beda, Honorio, Boſtone Burienſi, Frumentario, Capgravo, Boſtio, Burello, Triſiâ, Tritemio, Geſnero, Joanne Lelando, atque aliis authoribus collectus, & IX Centurias continens.* i. e. "A Catalogue of the "illuſtrious Writers of Great Britain, now called "England and Scotland, from Japhet for the ſpace of "3618 years to the preſent year of our Lord 1557, "collected from Beroſus, Gennadius, Beda, Honorius, Boſton of Bury, Frumentarius, Capgrave, Boſtius, Burellus, Triſſa, Trithemius, Geſner, John "Leland, and other authors; and containing IX "Centuries." There is a picture of the author prefixed to it with a Latin Diſtich by Ægidius Synegorus, and a Tetraſtich by another hand. This work is dedicated by Bale to Otho Henry Prince Palatine of the Rhine, Duke of both the Bavaria's, and Elector of the Roman Empire; and the Epiſtle Dedicatory is dated from Baſil in September 1557. In that Epiſtle he endeavours to juſtify the acrimony of ſtyle, which he makes uſe of, and obſerves, that this was not the effect of any intemperance of tongue or ill nature in him, but that he thought himſelf obliged to exhort mankind to virtue with zeal and ſpirit, to remonſtrate againſt vice with aſperity, to commend perſons of merit very fully, and to reproach bad men with ſharpneſs. And he was of opinion, that a writer ought not to pay ſo much regard to his readers, as to the ſubject itſelf and to truth, which by no means ſhould be in the leaſt violated. That the language of truth is ſimple and plain, expreſſing every thing in its proper terms, without any deference to the delicate ears of mankind, or adapting itſelf to their cuſtoms and vices. *Si qui vero ſint, qui meam in accuſando acerbitatem reprehendent, ii hoc reſponſi à me ferant, non ex linguæ petulantiâ, aut naturæ morbo id proficiſci. Sed hæc eſt ratio mea, & ſic animum induco meum, ad virtutem oportere cohortari ardenter, vitia notare acriter, laudare ampliè, vituperare improbos aſpere; & ſcriptorem non tam auditorum aut lectorum rationem habere, quam rei ipſius & veritatis debere, à quâ nullo modo vel latum unguem eſt recedendum. Simplex veritatis & aperta oratio, ſuis quamque rem terminis circumſcribit, ſuis meritis ornat, non auribus ſerviens, nec hominum vitiis ac moribus ſe accommodans.* He obſerves afterwards, that he generally makes uſe of the very words of thoſe authors, whom he quotes, in order to give not only the greater ſanction, but likewiſe the greater grace and ornament to his work; ſince he was conſcious to himſelf, that he wanted the advantages of politeneſs and eloquence, having been engaged from his earlieſt youth in the ſtudy of things and in a diligent ſearch after books, in ſuch a manner, that he had no opportunity of forming his ſtyle to any degree of elegance. *Quanquam pleriſque in locis authorum, quorum fide nitor, ipſa verba refero, non mea; quo plus non authoritatis ſolum & fidei, ſed ſplendoris etiam & gratiæ orationi meæ accederet. Quam enim hæc doctrinarum adjumenta & præſidia eloquentiæ me deficiant, jamdudum ſentio & agnoſco; quippe qui ſemper ab ineunte ætate in perveſtigatione rerum atque librorum verſatus, nunquam ſatis ſedulò ac ſeriò ad poliendam orationem, comparandamve ſtyli elegantiam animum meum adjecerim.* After this Dedication follows an Epiſtle to the reader by Cælius Secundus Curio, who recommends Bale for the great perſpecuity of his ſtyle, his integrity, and indefatigable diligence. *Magna eſt orationis perſpicuitas, par fides, indefeſſa diligentia.* In February 1559 Bale publiſhed *Scriptorum illuſtrium majoris Brytanniæ poſterior pars, quinque continens centurias ultimas, quas author Joannes Baleus Sudovolgius Anglus, ex Lelando Antiquario, aliiſque probis authoribus, non parvo labore collegit.* i. e. "The latter part of the illuſtrious Writers of Great "Britain, containing the five laſt Centuries, which "the author John Bale of Suffolk collected with great "pains from Leland the Antiquary, and other valuable authors." He dedicates this volume to Count Zkradin, and Dr. Paul Scalichius of Lika; and in his Epiſtle Dedicatory ſhews what his deſign was in that work. He obſerves, that having ſeen a great number of books of different authors in the Monaſteries and Convents of England, which were not publiſhed or commonly known, he reſolved to write down the titles and beginnings of thoſe books, and to prevent them from falling into oblivion, and being deſtroyed. To theſe he added an account of the more celebrated Engliſh Writers, who had been publiſhed; without omitting thoſe of the loweſt claſs, who, notwithſtanding their obſcurity and barbarity, yet contain ſome things of value and importance. He tells us, that he had collected thoſe accounts with the utmoſt labour from Leland and other authors. *Quos ergo licuit, velut diſjectas tabulas ac laceras è naufragio eripui, & ab oblivione vindicavi. Atque his impreſſos etiam Anglicos Scriptores illuſtrioresque celebrioreſque adnexui; ex quibus hoc opus noſtrum & conflatum eſt hucuſque & amplificatum. Rem verò nunc ad gregarios perduximus, pervenimuſque ad infimæ claſſis homines, qui in poſtremis merito numerari & collocari queant. Non rarò tamen hi quoque licet obſcuri nonnulli ſint & barbari, res cognitu dignas acri ingenio chartis mandârunt. Hos ego ex Lelando noſtro Antiquario aliiſque ſcriptoribus, quanto maximo potui ſtudio, collegi.* Theſe five laſt Centuries are an Appendix to the eight preceding ones, which he publiſh'd before. He has prefixed to them an Account of the Writers before the Flood and the Incarnation of our Saviour, with a Deſcription of England from Paulus Jovius, George Lilly, Leland, Andrew Althamerus, and others. He dedicates the thirteenth Century to Conrade Geſner, Conrade Lycoſthenes, and Joſias Simler; the fourteenth Century concerning the Scots Writers to Alexander Ales and John Knox; and the fifteenth Century concerning the Writers of Ireland to Mr. William Williams. Geſner in his *Bibliotheca* gives him the title of a man of great diligence, *vir diligentiſſimus*; and Biſhop Godwin ſtiles him a very laborious enquirer into the antiquities of Britain. *Antiquitatum Britannicarum diligentiſſimus perſcrutator* (6). Laurence Humphrey, afterwards Preſident of Magdalen College in Oxford, repreſents him as an invincible adverſary to the Church of Rome, and tells us in his *Vaticinium de Româ*, that Luther and Platina had diſcovered many things, and Vergerius ſome, but that Bale has detected them all.

Plurima Lutherus patefecit, Platina multa,
Quædam Vergerius, cuncta Balæus habet (7).

Valentine Henry Vogler in his *Introduct. Univerſal. in Notit. Scriptor.* (8) tells us, that our Author's zeal againſt the Papal tyranny is not ſo much ſurprizing, if we conſider that England ſuffered more from it than other countries, and therefore he excuſes the vehemence of his ſtyle in his preface to his *Acta Romanorum Pontificum*; and obſerves that tho' he is extremely hated by the Papiſts, yet they are obliged to commend his catalogue of the Engliſh Writers. But Pitſeus treats him with the utmoſt ſeverity imaginable, and tells us, that Bale did not ſo much enlarge the catalogue of Leland, as corrupt it in a moſt prodigious manner; and that he has filled his work with the moſt ſcandalous lies and calumnies, and deſtroyed all the beauty of Leland's ſtyle with his own barbarous expreſſion. In ſhort, that he has given us a great many particulars worthy the mind and mouth of an Heretic, but abſolutely void of all civility and moral honeſty, and ſome things even unworthy of a Chriſtian ear. *Hic Lelandi catalogum non tam prolixè auxit, quam prodigioſè depravavit. Omnia namque fœdiſſimus Scurra mendaciis & calumniis replevit, & opus Lelandi politiſſimum pollutiſſimo ſtylo turpitèr conſpurcavit. Multa habet ille digna quidem hæretico ſpiritu & ore, ſed ab omni urbanitate, & morali honeſtate prorſus aliena, & Chriſtianis auribus nonnulla plane indigna* (9). He informs us afterwards, that beſides his ſlanders

(5) Nicholſon, pag. 228.

(6) *De Converſ. Britan. ad Chriſtian. Relig. apud* Pope-Blount, *Cenſur. Celebrior. Authorum*, pag. 683. edit. Genevæ 1694, in 4to.

(7) *See* Pope-Blount, *ubi ſupra.*

(8) Cap. 22. *apud* Pope-Blount, ibid.

(9) Joan. Pitſei *Relation. Hiſtor. de Rebus Anglic.* tom. 1. pag. 53. edit. Pariſ. 1619, in 4to.

sixty eight years of age. He was interred in that Cathedral (*g*). We shall give his character in the Note [*C*]. He published a great number of books both in the Latin and English tongues, of which he gives us a catalogue in his *Scriptorum illustrium majoris Britanniæ Catalogus* (*b*). Several of them were written before he left the Popish Religion; and many of his Works were composed in English verse. His account of the condemnation of Sir John Oldcastle was published at London in 8vo 1729, under the following title; *A brefe Chronycle concerning the Examinacyon and Death of the blessed Martyr Syr Johan Oldecastell the Lorde Cobham, collected togyther by Johan Bale. To which is added, An Appendix of original Instruments.* This was first printed at London 1544, vi. die Augusti. The editor of the last edition tells us in his preface, that Bale has written this narrative *with all the warmth of one that had escaped the flames.*

(g) Idem, ibid.

(b) Cap. 100. p. 703, 704.

slanders against men, and his blaspemies against God and the Saints, there was nothing of his own, which deserved any notice. *Nam ille miser homuncio præter calumnias in homines, & blasphemias in Deum & sanctos, nihil habet suum, quod notatu dignum judico* (10). He gives us afterwards some instances of the severity of Bale's style; and observes, that besides the enormous crimes, which he objects to a great many writers, he treats the Bishops, Monks, and all the Priests of Learning with great scurrility, and accuses them of hypocrisy, superstition, error, and other vices (11). He stigmatizes our Author by the name of *Bal* or *Baal*, and styles him an apostate Carmelite Monk, and a married Priest. *Idolum apud simpliciores Anglos Joannes Bal, qui se Latinè Balæum cognominat, fuit hæreticus Anglus; ab ordine Carmelitarum apostata Monachus, & sacerdos (salvâ lectoris reverentiâ) maritatus.* Valerius Andreas likewise in the preface to his *Bibliotheca Belgica* calls him *an impious man*, and *an infamous Apostate*. But the reader need not be told how little regard is to be paid to zealous Papists, when they declaim against a Protestant Writer, who has treated of the History of their Religion with a peculiar warmth and asperity. However we find, that even some Protestant Writers represent him as a man of too much acrimony in his writings. Bishop Mountague in his *Apparatus Prim.* (12) censures him for the intemperance of his zeal in general, though he owns that he ought not to be rejected in a great many cases. *Impotentis linguæ & calami plerumque Scriptor, sed in multis non rejectitius.* Vossius in his book *de Historic. Latin.* (13) tells us, that our Author is not to be depended upon in his account of the most antient Writers; and that this is likewise the case of Pitseus, whose custom it is to transcribe Bale, except where the point turns upon the difference of religion, in which it is no wonder that they disagree extremely. *Unum scio, in priorum seculorum scriptoribus non rarò* Balæi *fidem claudicare. Idem de* Joanne Pitsæo *dictum velim, qui exscribere* Balæum *solet, præterquam in iis, quæ ad dissidium in sacro religionis negotio pertinent; ubi nihil mirum, si pugnantissima hi duo habeant.* We may observe here, that Vossius asserts, that Pitsæus generally transcribes our Author, though he speaks of him with the utmost contempt, and tells us, that tho' he had read Bale over in hopes to find some jewel amidst his dunghil, yet he was disappointed. *Nam in illo sterquilinico sperabam saltem aliquam antiquitatis gemmam me inventurum. Sed Æsopico Gallo infortunatior spe meâ frustratus sum* (14). Mr. Wharton in the preface to his *Anglia Sacra* (15) assures us, that Bale had little regard for truth, if he could but enlarge the number of the enemies of the church of Rome. *Veritas Balæo parum curæ erat, dummodo Romanæ Ecclesiæ inimicorum numerum augere posset.* And he observes in another place (16), that he generally had his eyes shut, when he fixed the ages of the English Writers. *Clausis plerumque oculis Scriptorum Anglicorum ætates definivit.* Mr. Nicholson likewise (17) having remarked, that the ground plot of his work was borrowed from Leland, tells, that *the chief of his own superstructure is malicious and bitter invectives against the Papists*; and that *the character which Mr.* Wharton *gives of him and his writings, is too just.* "Some "have thought, *continues he*, his making (*b*) "*Books* of some little *Saxon Epistles* excuseable, "and what would admit of an apology; but if "we mark him well, he is continually multiply- "ing the writings of all his Authors at a very un- "sufferable and unjustifiable rate." The same Author likewise remarks in another place (18), that it is Bale's *way to give accounts of men and their labours at random*. Mr. James Harington of Christ Church Oxon, in his preface to the first volume of Wood's *Athenæ Oxonienses* has passed a severe sentence upon our Author; for having observed, that *all good Antiquaries, men of enlarged souls and of an even temper, however of divers professions, have always been of the same principle, and that they all equally sacrificed to truth and learning, and suffered not their private opinions to put a bias on their History*; he tells us, that *whoever will compare the* Cento's *of* Bale *and* Pits *with the excellent works of* Leland *and* Camden, *must necessarily discern how near an alliance there is between zeal and ignorance, and between learning and moderation.* The same Gentleman likewise in his *Introduction* to the second volume of the *Athenæ Oxonienses*, having remarked, that Leland, *by the command of King Henry VIII, undertook to survey and perpetuate books of the antient monasteries, after the dissolution thereof*; assures us, that "he compleated *that work* with so great "exactness, that BALE and PITS, who have since "attempted the same, have only made use herein of "the *Gorgon's* common eye, and have reflected that "single light only upon posterity." Our Author's books are particularly prohibited by the Church of Rome; and the *Index* published in folio at Madrid in 1667, stiles him a most impudent and slanderous Writer against the See of Rome, the Mass, and the Eucharist, perpetually breathing out his poisonous malice; upon which account it orders, that no part of his writings shall be suffered. *Scriptor fuit impudentissimus ac maledicentissimus adversus Romanam Sedem, Missam, & Eucharistiam, virus nunquam non spirans; nihil propterea ex ejus operibus unquam permittendum.*

(10) Idem, ibid.

(11) Idem, pag. 58.

(12) Sect. 83. *apud* Pope-Blount, pag. 684.

(13) Lib. 2. cap. 16.

(14) Pitseus, *ubi supra*, pag. 53.

(15) Vol. 1. p. 31. *apud* Nicholson, *ubi supra*, pag. 229.

(16) Ibid. p. 47.

(17) *Ubi supra*, pag. 228, 229.

(b) H. Spelm. *Concil.* tom. 1. pag. 210.

(18) *Hist. Library*, Part 1. pag. 177.

[*C*] *We shall give his character in the Note.*] We have represented in the preceding note the different judgments passed upon him as a Writer, and therefore we shall now consider the other parts of his character. Sir James Ware in his book *de Scriptor. Hibern.* (19) tells us, that he was a man of Learning, a frequent Preacher, and one who made very curious researches into Antiquity, though he owns that he took an unbounded liberty in his Writings. *Vir doctus fuit, in concionibus assiduus, & antiquitatis studiosissimus; in Scriptis vero (ut alibi dixi) effrænatâ usus libertate.* Dr. Fuller in his *Worthies* (20) observes, that it appears a little wonderful, that a man of his learning, who had suffered so much for the Protestant Religion, should not have been raised to some considerable preferment under Queen Elizabeth, when men of abilities were wanting to fill the vacant Bishopricks. But that it is probable, that our Author was a person more *learned* than *discreet*, and fitter to *write* than *govern*, being unable to command his own passion; and that *Biliosus Balæus* passes for his true character. T.

(19) Pag. 135, 136. *apud* Pope-Blount, p. 683.

(20) In Suffolk.

BALESDENS (JOHN) Advocate in the Parliament of Paris and in the Council, was born at Paris. He was received into the French Academy about the year 1647 in the room of Malleville; and if he had not given up his pretensions to Mr. Corneille [*A*], he would have

[*A*] *He gave up his pretensions to Mr. Corneille.*] This is what the Author of the History of the Academy tells "us: Mr. Corneille was afterwards received in the "room of Mr. Mainard. Mr. de Balesdens had been "proposed likewise; and as he had the honour to "belong to the Chancellor, the Academy had such a "regard

have ſucceeded Mainard, who died before Malleville. He had the Chancellor Seguier for his Mecænas (*a*). He publiſhed divers Works, which he was not the author of [*B*]. He lived I think till about the year 1676 (*b*). I do not find his name in the *Requeſt of the Dictionaries*; yet it ought to have been there, according to the *Menagiana* [*C*]. He had lived in the College of Harcour [*D*].

(*a*) See *l'Hiſtoire de l'Academie Françoiſe*, pag. 230 and 258.

(*b*) *L'Etat de la France* in 1680, in the liſt of the members of the Academy, places Baleſdens between Conrart and des Marets. Conrart died in Sept. 1675.

" regard for their Protector, that they deputed five of " their members to wait upon him, to know whether " theſe two propoſitions were equally agreeable to " him. The Chancellor aſſured them, that he left " the Academy entirely to their liberty; but when " they began to conſider that matter, the Abbé de " Ceriſy preſented a Letter from Mr. de Baleſdens, " full of compliments to them and Mr. Corneille, " whom he deſired the Academy to give the preference " to before himſelf, proteſting that he reſigned that " honour to him, as due to him upon all accounts. " The letter was read, and commended by the Aſ- " ſembly; and afterwards he (1) was received upon " the firſt vacancy, which was that of Mr. de Malle- " ville; but I do not find on what day; for from " that time the long and frequent indiſpoſitions of the " Secretary of the Academy occaſioned a conſiderable " blank in the regiſters (2).

(1) Mr. Baleſdens.

(2) Peliſſon, *Hiſtoire de l'Academie Franç.* p. 229, 230. edit. of 1672, in 12°.

(3) Ibid. p. 358.

[*B*] *He publiſhed divers works, which he was not the author of himſelf.*] Mr. Peliſſon has given us a liſt of all that Baleſdens publiſhed (3), which is as follows. " He tranſlated the book intitled *Le Miroir du Pecheur* " *Pénitent*, and publiſhed the following manuſcripts out " of many others, which he collected. *Cartiludium Logi-* " *cæ, ſeu Logica memorativa, vel poetica, R. Patris Tho-* " *mæ Murner, cum Notis & Conjecturis. Rudimenta* " *cognitionis Dei & ſui, Petri Segulierii Præſidis infu-* " *lati. Elogia clarorum virorum Joannis Papirii Maſ-* " *ſonis*, in two volumes. *Gregorii Turonenſis Opera* " *pia, cum vitis patrum ſui temporis*, in two volumes. " *The Acts of the Conveyance of Dauphiné made over* " *to the Crown of France. A Treatiſe of Aqua Vitæ,* " *by M. John Bronaut, Phyſician to the King.* He pub- " liſhed likewiſe *the Fables of Eſop in French, corrected* " *by himſelf*, for the inſtruction of the King, with " *Political and Moral Maxims.*" Mr. de Marolles relates, that Baleſdens gave him *divers Letters written in a figurative ſtyle, without mentioning a great number of others, of which he propoſed to make ſeveral volumes, the number of them was ſo prodigious* (4).

(4) In his *Denombrement de ceux, qui lui avoient donnè de leurs Livres.*

[*C*] *His name ought to have been in the Requeſt of the Dictionaries, according to the* Menagiana.] We find theſe words there: *The firſt verſes, which I made*, (it is Mr. Menage who ſpeaks) *were the* Requeſt of the Dictionaries. *I was looking for Rhimes to finiſh it. Mr. Du Puy ſent me* Claquedent, *to rhime to* Baleſdent (5). Mr. Menage had the happieſt memory in the world; but notwithſtanding he ſometimes miſtook one thing for another even in matters, which perſonally regarded himſelf. I do not think, that he aſked for the rhime in queſtion to finiſh his *Requeſt of the Dictionaries*; for that incomparable Satyr was finiſhed before Baleſdens was admitted into the Academy. He was not received till the year 1647 or 1648; and that *Requeſt* was finiſhed about the year 1642. I prove this from *the Hiſtory of the Academy*. Mr. Peliſſon relates, that Mr. Menage ſuppreſſed this Requeſt *after he wrote it: it continued*, adds he, *above ten years concealed among his papers, till a perſon, who had the cuſtody of them, ſuffered himſelf to be robbed of it by one, whom we know, and who immediately gave out ſeveral copies of it* (6). Mr. Peliſſon had ſaid in the ſame page, that *a Printer had lately publiſhed that* Requeſt *in a ſmall form, with a great many errors*, and that *it was printed more correctly in quarto*. Without doubt by this more correct edition he means that of the *Miſcellanea* of Mr. Menage, which was publiſhed in 1652. However the year 1652 is the Epocha of Mr. Peliſſon's book; and conſequently the *Requeſt of the Dictionaries* was finiſhed in 1642 (7). It may be ſaid, that when Mr. Menage was weary with keeping that piece ſuppreſſed, and reſolved to publiſh it himſelf among his other Poems, he had a mind to enlarge it, and introduce the new Members of the Academy; and if we do not find Baleſdens there, it is becauſe the rhime ſent him by Mr. du Puy did not pleaſe him, or was too difficult to be placed there. Upon that foot, Baleſdens was obliged to his name for not receiving a dreadful blow in the *Requeſt of the Dictionaries*; and this name, which was ſo intractable with reſpect to rhimes, produced a much more favourable effect, than that of Tuticanus (8), and that of Earinus (9); but I do not think we ought to have recourſe to that ſuppoſition; for the Requeſt printed in the year 1652 does not contain the name of any Member of the Academy, who was admitted after the year 1640. And yet amongſt thoſe who were admitted after that year, there were ſome, who were expoſed to Mr. Menage as much as he could deſire. Was Mr. du Rier a Tranſlator without reproach?

(5) *Menagiana*, pag. 190. of the edition of Holland.

(6) Peliſſon, *Hiſt. de l'Acad. Franç.* pag. 72.

(7) Concerning this *Requeſt of the Dictionaries* ſee ſeveral curious facts in the *Anti-Baillet*, tom. 1. ch. 82.

(8) *Quod minus in noſtris ponaris, amice, libellis, Nominis efficitur conditione tui. Lex pedis officio, fortunaque nominis obſtat, Quaque meos adeas eſt via nulla modos.* Ovid. *de Ponto*, lib. 4. Eleg. 12.

(9) *Nomen nobile, molle, delicatum, Verſu dicere non rudi volebam. Sed tu ſyllaba contumax repugnas.* Martial, Epig. 12. lib. 9.

[*D*] *He had lived in the College of Harcour.*] Mr. de Marolles, who informs me of this, adds, that the landlord of Baleſdens was *a good man, whoſe name was le Landez, afterwards Doctor of Divinity, and uncle to the two Mazures, Curates of St. Paul ſucceſſively* (10). He ſays that *Baleſdens was at that time of a gay temper, and diverting converſation.*

(10) *Memoires de Marolles*, p. 32. under the year 1616.

☞ BALEY or BAILEY (WALTER), ſon of Henry Baley of Warnwell in Dorſetſhire, was born at Portſham in that county, and educated at Wincheſter School. He was admitted perpetual Fellow of New College in Oxford, after he had ſerved two years of probation in 1550, and took the Degrees of Bachelor and Maſter of Arts. He afterwards entered upon the Phyſic Line, and was admitted to practiſe in that faculty, while he was Proctor of the Univerſity in the year 1558; and about that time was made Prebendary of Dultingcote or Dulcot in the Church of Wells, which he reſigned in 1579. In 1561 he was made the Queen's Profeſſor of Phyſic at Oxford, and took his Degree of Doctor of that faculty two years after, and at laſt was appointed Phyſician to her Majeſty. He was very eminent for his ſkill in phyſic, and was prodigiouſly reſorted to for his practice. He wrote ſeveral treatiſes [*A*]. He died March 3d 159$\frac{2}{3}$, being 63 years of age, and was interred in the inner Chapel of New College (*a*).

(*a*) Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 255. 2d edit. London 1721.

[*A*] *He wrote ſeveral Treatiſes.*] I. *A Diſcourſe of three kinds of Pepper in common uſe.* This piece was printed in 1558 in 8vo, and dedicated to Sir John Horſey. II. *A brief Treatiſe of the Preſervation of the Eye-ſight*; printed in the reign of Queen Elizabeth in 12mo, and at Oxford in 1616 and 1654 in 8vo. In the edition of 1616 is added another *Treatiſe of the Eye-ſight*, collected from Fernelius and Riolanus; but by whom, is not known. They both paſs under the name of our author. III. *Directions for health, natural and artificial, with medicines for all diſeaſes of the eye*, in 4to 1626. IV. *Explicatio Galeni de potu convaleſcentium, & ſonum, & præcipue de noſtræ alæ & biriæ paratione, &c.* i. e. " An Explication upon Galen concerning " the proper drink for perſons, who have been ſick, " and thoſe in years; and particularly concerning the " preparation of the Engliſh ale and beer, &c." This piece, as Mr. Wood informs us (1), was in MS. in 4to in the Library of Robert Earl of Ayleſbury. T.

(1) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 255.

☞ BALIOL (JOHN) King of Scotland, was by his mother's ſide great-grandſon of David Earl of Huntington, grandſon of King David I, the brother of King William,

by his father's ſide. He was deſcended of an ancient and noble Family [*A*]. Alexander III dying in 1285, was to be ſucceeded by Margaret, commonly called the Maiden of Norway, who was the daughter of Eric King of Norway, and of Margaret Alexander's daughter; and a marriage was concluded between the young Princeſs, and Edward the ſon of King Edward I of England. By this marriage the two Kingdoms were to be united, and the articles of it ſhew (*a*), that the Scots were very cautious, and did as much as lay in their power, to hinder their country from being any way ſubjected to England [*B*]. Yet this union was not acceptable to all the Scots, and ſoon occaſioned a formidable party, headed by Robert Bruce, who declared themſelves open enemies to the union or contract of marriage, as appears from a letter, which the Biſhop of St. Andrews wrote to King Edward

(*a*) Tyrrel, vol. 3. pag. 61. *apud* Abercromby's *Martial Atchiev. of the Scots Nation.* vol. 1. pag. 461.

[*A*] *Baliol was by his father's ſide of an ancient and noble family.*] He was deſcended of Guy de Baliol, a Norman Lord, who in the reign of William Rufus the Conqueror's ſon, came over to England, and was infeoffed of the Barony of Biwel in Northumberland; for which lands his ſon Bernard de Baliol did homage to David I King of Scotland, then in poſſeſſion of that country. But being, together with Robert Bruce, ſent to that Prince, who had invaded England, and penetrated as far as the river Teiſe, to perſuade him to retreat; and his overtures of peace being rejected, he renounced his fealty, returned to the Engliſh camp, and ſhared in the glory of the victory obtained over the Scots near Northallerton. He was alſo one of thoſe that afterwards ſurprized King William at Alnwick; and having very much enlarged his paternal eſtate, in the North of England, is ſaid to have founded the ſtrong fortreſs, called from his name Bernard-Caſtle, on the bank of the Teiſe. He was ſucceeded by his ſon Euſtace; and he again by Hugh de Baliol, whoſe eldeſt ſon John married Dervegild, the daughter of Alan Lord of Galloway, and of Margaret the eldeſt daughter of David (1) Earl of Huntington, in whoſe right he was poſſeſſed of Galloway in Scotland, and of Thorkeſey, Gernemuth, and Luddingland in England. Beſides which, upon the death of Chriſtian, Counteſs of Albemarle, ſiſter to Dervegild his wife, he was aſſigned to her part of Chriſtian's inheritance, in the counties of Northampton and Lincoln. He had alſo a large eſtate in France. But as he was great by his Royal Match, and the conſiderable lands he poſſeſſed; he was no leſs ſo by his perſonal merit. He did moſt eminent Services to both his Sovereigns; I mean Alexander III of Scotland, and Henry III of England. In obedience to them he bravely withſtood the illegal ordinances and prevailing power of the rebellious Barons, inſomuch that when all the reſt of England, nay King Henry himſelf, were forced to ſubmit to the arbitrary uſurpation of the Earl of Leiceſter, he by the orders of King Alexander kept the North fixed in its allegiance to the captivated Sovereign (2). It is he who founded Baliol College in Oxford (3); and not his ſon King John Baliol, as Leſley (4), and after him Mr. de Rapin (5) erroneouſly aſſert. He died in the year 1269 (6).

(1) Son of King Alexander III.

(2) Patric Abercromby, *Martial Atchievements of the Scots Nation*, vol. 1. pag. 477.

(3) *Chronic. de Mailros, in Rer. Angl. Script. Vet.* tom. 1. pag. 241.

(4) *De Reb. Geſt. Scotor.* lib. 6. pag. 235.

(5) *Hiſt. d'Angl.* tom. 3. liv. 9. pag. 58. See alſo Mr. Tindal's notes upon that paſſage, where he confutes Mr. de Rapin.

(6) *Chron. de Mailros, ubi ſupra.*

(7) Vol. 2. p. 60.

(8) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 460.

(9) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 25.

[*B*] *The Scots did as much as lay in their power to hinder their country from being ſubjected to England.*] As there is ſome difference between theſe articles of marriage, as we find them in Mr. Rapin, and as they are related by Mr. Abercromby, and as the latter has made ſome obſervations upon them, we think the reader will not be diſpleaſed to find ſome of theſe articles with that Writer's obſervations here. It was ſtipulated I, That the rights, laws, liberties, and cuſtoms of Scotland ſhall for ever remain entire and unalterable, and the Kingdom continue ſeparate, divided, and free in itſelf from the Kingdom of England, without any ſubjection, by its true bounds and limits, as it has been before. *This was granted*, ſays Mr. Tyrrel (7), *yet with a ſaving to the King's right, which he had before this.* Upon which Mr. Abercromby obſerves (8), that Mr. Tyrrel ſhould have ſaid, *Saving the right of the King of England, and of any other perſon, which before this agreement was, or ſhall afterwards in juſtice be competent, to any lands upon the borders or elſewhere.* "Deluſive words indeed, *adds the Hiſtorian*, and however diſguiſed, yet ſo far plain, as to ſhew, that "King Edward kept ſomething *in petto*, as a reſerve "for an after-game." Mr. de Rapin makes a ſeparate article of this *ſalvo* related by Mr. Abercromby; whereas it is plain that it was only an inſinuation of King Edward, by which he probably intended to claim at a proper time a right over the whole Kingdom of Scotland, as being a fief of the Crown of England. II. It was agreed, that if Edward and Margaret ſhall die without iſſue of the body of Margaret, the Kingdom ſhall revert entire, free, abſolute and *independent*, to the next immediate heir. III. That no perſon, either eccleſiaſtic or laic, ſhall be compelled to go out of the Kingdom, to aſk leave either to elect, or to preſent their elects, nor to do their homage, fealty, and ſervices, nor to proſecute law-ſuits, nor, in a word, to perform any thing uſually performed in Scotland. IV. That the Kingdom of Scotland ſhall have its Chancellor, Officers of State, Courts of Judicature, &c. as before; and that a new Seal ſhall be made and kept by the Chancellor, but with the ordinary arms of Scotland, and the name of none but the Queen of Scotland engraven upon it. V. That Parliaments, when called to treat of matters concerning the State or inhabitants of Scotland, ſhall be held within the bounds of the Kingdom. "And by the by, *ſays Mr. Abercromby*, this is the firſt "time, for ought I know, that the word Parliament "was uſed among us." VI. That no duties, taxes, levies of men, &c. ſhall be exacted in Scotland, but ſuch, as being uſual in former times, ſhall be conſiſtent with the common intereſt and good of the Nation. VII. That the King of Scotland ſhall oblige himſelf and his heirs in a bond of a hundred thouſand pounds ſterling, payable to the Church of Rome, in aid of the Holy Land, to make reſtitution of the Kingdom in the caſes aforeſaid; and that he ſhall conſent, that the Pope may reſtrain him and his heirs, by excommunicating them, and interdicting their Kingdom, both to the aforeſaid reſtriction, and payment of the ſaid ſum of money, if he or they do not ſtand to the premiſes. It appears plainly from theſe articles, that the Scots were at that time very far from thinking, that the Kingdom of Scotland was a fief of England, as Mr. de Rapin very well obſerves (10). They alſo evince, according to Mr. Abercromby (11), "That the Scots "were not at all thoſe rude, illiterate, and unpoliſhed "people, they have been repreſented; that on the "contrary, they very well knew both their public and "private intereſt; and that the ends and arts of Go"vernment were by them perhaps better underſtood, "in thoſe earlier and thought barbarous Ages, than at "any time ſince. This was the firſt ſcheme of an "union condeſcended upon between the two King"doms; and it was a ſcheme ſo very reaſonable, that "had it taken effect, both Nations had been long ere "now (what even the preſent Age can ſcarcely hope "to ſee them) united in their joint intereſt, mutual "inclinations, and uniform Religion. Yet, as ho"nourable and advantageous, as the then concluded "union appears to have been, it is certain that all "thoſe of the Nation were not pleaſed with it. Per"haps the Diſſenters had by-ends of their own; or "they were loth to loſe the preſence of their Sove"reign, and the warm influence of a Royal Court; "or, they did not entirely confide in the fair pro"miſes of King Edward. They knew his deceitful "temper; and tho' the *ſalvo*, added to the firſt arti"cle, did relate more to that King's pretences, than "to thoſe of any other perſon, and tho' by it no new "right could be acquired; nay, altho' by that very "*ſalvo* he in a great meaſure diſclaimed all title to "the whole, and only ſuppoſed, that it was poſſible, "he or ſome body elſe might lay ſome claim to lands "upon the borders or ſomewhere elſe in Scotland; "yet they did not like thoſe inſidious reſerves, "and juſtly feared, that as ſoon as he ſhould by the "treaty be put in poſſeſſion of the Kingdom, though "only in the name of his daughter-in-law, he ſhould "find in the *ſalvo* abundance of reaſon and juſtice to "keep it. The event has ſhewn that theſe fears were "but too well grounded, tho' they vaniſhed for a lit"tle time, upon the death of the young Queen Mar"garet."

(10) *Hiſt. d'Ang. ubi ſupra*, p. 25.

(11) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 461.

Edward [C], not long after the concluſion of the treaty. This Prelate, and John Baliol with his party, were for the union and in King Edward's intereſt; the former becauſe he was careſſed by him, and preferred to be one of his Chaplains; the latter becauſe he was aſſured of, or at leaſt made to hope for, more than ordinary favours (b) [D]; and it was probably hinted to him, that if Margaret ſhould die without iſſue, Edward would ſupport his pretenſions to the Crown of Scotland (c). Margaret dying ſoon after the concluſion of her marriage, there happened a great conteſt about the ſucceſſion to the Crown. The chief pretenders were John Baliol, and Robert Bruce, whoſe different titles to the Crown were by no precedent nor poſitive law to be determined [E], and between whom by reaſon of their numerous alliances, and vaſt poſſeſſions both at home and abroad, the whole Kingdom was divided. Beſides theſe two irreconcileable enemies, and juſtly contending rivals, eight other perſons either acted by their own ambition, or, as is more probable, wrought upon by the clandeſtine practices of King Edward [F], did at the ſame time aſpire to what one only could obtain (d). The Barons or Freeholders of the Kingdom were then, as it was afterwards declared they ought to be, the proper judges of a controverſy, in which none were concerned but themſelves, and the competitors. But by reaſon of the great power of thoſe, who pretended to the Crown, as alſo of the plauſible grounds of their pretenſions, the Barons could not agree amongſt themſelves, nor were the competitors like to ſubmit to their determination. Therefore, according to moſt authors, they unanimouſly reſolved

(b) Abercromby, ibid. p. 461, 462.

(c) See the remark [D].

(d) Abercromby ibid. pag. 463.

[C] *The Biſhop of St. Andrew's wrote a Letter to King Edward.*] " He gives his Majeſty thanks (12), in " the name of the Convention of the Nobles at Perth, " for the many good offices he had done them; then " he tells him, that they were juſt ſetting out, together " with the Engliſh Embaſſadors, in order to wait on, " and receive their Queen in Orkney, when, to the " unexpreſſible terror and grief of the Nation, an uncertain report of her being dead was ſpread abroad. " That upon this news, Robert Bruce, and thoſe of his " party, had, contrary to expectation, come to the Aſſembly; but what he meant to do, was not yet " known. That the Earls of Athole and Mar were " drawing their men together, and the whole Nation " was divided in factions; and that a war was inevitable, if not prevented in time, by the goodneſs of " God and his Majeſty's endeavours. He therefore " intreats, that if the Queen ſhall chance to die, he " will inſtantly come to the borders, in order to awe the " contending parties by his preſence, to prevent effuſion of blood, and to enable loyal ſubjects to keep " their oaths to the rightful heir, whoever he be, " provided the heir ſhall be willing to acquieſce in his " Majeſty's determination. He had a little before recommended John Baliol to the King's favour, and " in the beginning of his letter deſigned himſelf his " Chaplain." " It is a pity, *adds Mr. Abercromby*, that " only this one letter has been found upon record, to " guide us through the Cimmerian darkneſs, which by " obſcuring the myſterious tranſactions, and hidden " contrivances of thoſe times, has hitherto led all " authors into almoſt as many miſtakes, if not " downright falſities, as they have periods, I may almoſt ſay words, upon the ſubject." The conſequences that may be inferred from this letter, we refer to the following remark.

(12) Rymer's *Fœdera*, tom. 2. p. 1090, 1091, *ad ann.* 1290. *apud* Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 461, 462.

[D] *John Baliol was made to hope for more than ordinary favours.*] This is one of the inferences which Mr. Abercromby draws from the letter we have mentioned. He alſo obſerves (13), " That Robert Bruce " and his friends were againſt the Union; elſe why " ſhould they not have been preſent at an Aſſembly, " deſigned for nothing elſe, but to welcome home " their Queen, and countenance her marriage. That " in caſe the treaty of marriage and union ſhould, by " the death of the Queen, be rendered ineffectual, " there was a previous concert between King Edward, and the Scots Unioners agreed upon, by vertue of which the firſt was by his power to awe and " bear down the oppoſite faction; and theſe laſt, to " give him the power of nominating a ſucceſſor, and " that John Baliol was pointed out as the man. That " upon the certainty of the rumour that was ſpread " of the Queen's death, the animoſities of parties " muſt needs be heightened, and the Nation be thereby neceſſitated, or, to undergo all the calamities of " a civil, and at the ſame time probably of a foreign " war, (for it was not to be ſuppoſed, that a neighbour of the character and power of King Edward " would ſtand by an idle ſpectator) or, to ſubmit their " differences to the determination of a Prince, who, " had they declined his arbitration, was, together " with the party he had among themſelves, able to " force it upon them.

(13) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 462.

[E] *Their titles to the Crown were by no precedent nor poſitive law to be determined.*] They were both deſcended from David Earl of Huntington, the brother of King William, whoſe branch now failed. David left three daughters. Margaret, the eldeſt of the three, was the mother of Dervegild, who was married to John Baliol, by whom ſhe had a ſon, the ſame John Baliol who now pretended to the Crown, and was by his mother's ſide great grandſon of Earl David. That Earl's ſecond daughter was Iſabel, who being married to Robert Bruce, had by him this Robert, who diſputed the Crown with John Baliol. This latter founded his right on his being the grandſon of David's eldeſt daughter; and Robert Bruce grounded his pretenſions, not only upon his being nearer by one degree to the Earl David, whoſe grandſon he was, but alſo upon his being the firſt male deſcended from him; pretending that in the ſame degree of relation, a male was to be preferred to a female; and therefore he was to be preferred before Dervegild, in whoſe right only John Baliol could claim the Crown (14).

(14) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 464. *and* Rapin, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 27.

[F] *Wrought upon by the clandeſtine practices of King Edward.*] Buchanan tells us, that Edward conſulted ſecretly with a few perſons, how he might ſubject the Kingdom of Scotland to himſelf. This was not thought difficult, the Kingdom being then divided into two powerful factions. But to render the accompliſhment of his deſign more eaſy, and at the ſame time to hide his intentions, he engaged eight other perſons, beſides Baliol and Bruce, to claim a right to the Crown; that out of ſo great a number he might draw one or more over to his intereſt and party. Buchanan's words are; *Secreto, & inter paucos agitabatur, quomodo Scotiam ſuæ ditionis faceret. Id cum facile exiſtimaretur, Regno in duas factiones diviſo, tamen, quo res eſſet expeditior, & fraus occultior, præter Bruticum & Baliolum, octo alios competitores excitavit, ut e majore numero facilius unum aut etiam plures in ſuas partes traduceret* (15). Upon which Mr. de Rapin obſerves (16), that this is very probable, becauſe of all the competitors, none but John Baliol (and Robert Bruce) had the leaſt right to the Crown, if we ſuppoſe, as there is reaſon to do, that they were deſcended from baſtards. Yet, when John Haſtings, who was the ſon of the youngeſt of Earl David's three daughters, pleaded that the Kingdom of Scotland, ſince holden of the Crown of England, was like all other lands, tenements, &c. diviſible, and that therefore it ought to be divided between John Baliol, Robert Bruce, and himſelf; Edward would not conſent to it. Upon which, Mr. Abercromby obſerves (17), " I very much wonder, that King Edward did " not aſſent to the favourable overture, and lay hold, " as he might have done, on the opportunity to tear " the Scots Monarchy into pieces. He meant to reign " over the whole; and the maxim is, *divide ut regnes* (18). It was in all probability an eaſier taſk to " keep three Lords, though very great ones, under " ſubjection

(15) Buchan. *Rer. Scotic.* lib. 8. p. m. 254.

(16) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 35.

(17) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 474.

(18) Or rather, *Divide, & impera.*

reſolved to refer the whole matter to the arbitration of Edward King of England [G], who readily accepted it, and took hold of this opportunity, to make the Scots acknowledge his pretended right over that Kingdom. The States of Scotland were convened at Norham upon the borders of the two Kingdoms [H]; King Edward came thither with an army, and in the aſſembly held the tenth of May * he declared, that as he was ſuperior and direct Lord of the Kingdom of Scotland, ſo he hoped they would willingly acknowledge him to be ſuch [I]. This unexpected declaration ſtruck the Scots with amazement [K]; they told him that they knew nothing of any ſuperiority belonging to him; that they could not anſwer

* *Anno* 1291.

" ſubjection, than one King. But Providence order-
" ed it otherwiſe: the iniquity had been too viſible;
" and he deſigned to name ſuch a King, as by his birth
" had a very good title to be ſuch, and by his na-
" ture was diſpoſed to continue, what he profeſſed him-
" ſelf, a ſubject."

[G] *They reſolved to refer the whole matter to the arbitration of King Edward.*] He was thought, ſays Boetius (19), the moſt proper perſon to determine the diſpute, not only as he was a very powerful King, but alſo becauſe being their neighbour he was at hand to aſſiſt them in caſe of diſtreſs. Buchanan ſays (20), that the Scots did not diſtruſt him, becauſe he was born of a father, whom the late King always found a very loving father-in-law, and a very equitable and juſt guardian. Beſides Edward had lately received from the Scots a very noble proof of their good-will towards him, in the readineſs with which they conſented to the marriage of their Queen with Edward's ſon. King Edward, ſays Mr. Abercromby (21), was a wiſe man, and upon account of his relation to the Scots, and the innumerable obligations, and thoſe as yet freſh in his memory, he had received from them, bound to be juſt; and who could diſtruſt him, ſince he was equally unconcerned with all the competitors? His father Henry III and the Barons of England had in the like manner referred their differences to the determination of a foreign Prince, St. Lewis of France. But Edward was not, like Lewis, a Saint; he had views of his own, which none, even of the great party which he had gained over to an entire confidence in his friendſhip, could penetrate.

(19) *Scotor. Hiſt.* lib. 14. fol. m. 292 *verſo.*

(20) *Ubi ſupra.*

(21) *Ubi ſupra,* pag. 464.

[H] *The States of Scotland were convened at Norham upon the borders of the two Kingdoms.*] We uſe this general expreſſion, becauſe Authors do not agree, whether the Scots Nobility aſſembled of their own accord, or, whether they were called together by King Edward. Boetius ſays (22), that the Scots having ſent Embaſſadors to King Edward, he received them very graciouſly, and told them that he would be in a few days at Berwick, where he ordered them to aſſemble. *Ut ibi concilium præſto eſſet edixit.* Buchanan ſays (23), that Edward being arrived at Berwick, wrote to the Regents of Scotland, and to the Deputies of the States to come and meet him. *Edwardus, cum primum Bervicum venit, eò Rectores Scotiæ, & Ordinum Legatos per literas evocat.* Boetius does not mention the Aſſembly of Norham, and ſeems to have confounded it with that which was afterwards held at Berwick, not by the States, but by the Commiſſioners appointed to hear the petitions of the Commiſſioners. Buchanan indeed mentions the Aſſembly of Norham, which met, ſays he, the year after Edward had ſummoned the States to meet at Berwick. And, according to Mr. Abercromby, " Edward to keep all parties in the dark,
" with regard to his private deſigns, and to remove
" all manner of jealouſy concerning his after intenti-
" ons, invited and earneſtly entreated, that the Pre-
" lates and the great men of Scotland would meet him
" at Norham, on the confines of both Kingdoms, to
" which place he himſelf declares that they came at
" his earneſt requeſt (24). So falſe it is, what by his
" public Notary he afterwards aſſerted, that as ſupe-
" rior and direct Lord of Scotland he had called a
" Parliament of the Scots Nation at Norham: for in
" no record extant is any ſuch thing ſo much as inſi-
" nuated. Nay, that one, I have juſt now cited, to
" me is a plain proof of the contrary. Nor did the
" Scots know that he deſigned to take any ſuch title
" or authority upon him, till he had, by the moſt
" plauſible pretences imaginable, decoy'd them, tho'
" not quite out of the Kingdom, yet to ſuch a place,
" in which he very well knew they neither could nor
" durſt withſtand his commands." The Engliſh Writers, *ſays Mr. de Rapin* (25), don't agree to this; they maintain that King Edward ſummoned the States of Scotland to meet at Norham, not as a friend or an arbitrator, but by virtue of his right, as ſovereign Lord of Scotland. They add, that the ſituation of Norham, which is a town of England, ſhews that Edward exerted an Act of Sovereignty, when he ſummoned the States of Scotland to meet in his own Kingdom. To this the Scots reply, that this argument is of no force at all, becauſe on this very occaſion King Edward granted to the Scots a Charter, by which he declared, that their coming over Tweed into England ſhould be of no pernicious conſequence to the Nation, and that for the future they ſhould not be obliged, for any affairs whatſoever, to paſs that river in order to treat with him. Mr. de Rapin obſerves in another place (26), that it cannot well be determined, whether that Aſſembly was ſummoned by Edward's own authority, or at the entreaties of the Scots.

(22) *Ubi ſupra.*

(23) *Ubi ſupra.*

(24) *Fœdera Anglic.* tom. 2. pag. 528.

(25) *Ubi ſupra,* pag. 28.

(26) *Abregé Hiſtor. des Actes publics d'Angl.* tom. 1. p. m. 172.

[I] *He hoped they would willingly acknowledge him to be ſuch.*] He firſt ſhewed a great concern for the miſerable condition in which the Scots then were. His Juſticiary told them (27), " That his Majeſty did
" moſt ſincerely commiſerate the diſtempered ſtate of
" the Scots nation; that he had ever a ſingular regard
" for Scotland, and all its inhabitants, *whoſe ſafety*
" *and protection was well known to belong to him*; that
" he had come and called them thither in order to
" diſcharge his duty; that he would do impartial ju-
" ſtice to the competitors for the Crown, and would
" not at all uſurp or encroach upon the liberties of
" the ſubject; but that as he was ſuperior and direct
" Lord of the Kingdom of Scotland, ſo he hoped,
" they would willingly recognize and acknowledge
" him to be ſuch; and that if any of them ſcrupled
" the thing, he was willing to evidence his title from
" undoubted chronicles and monuments, every where
" to be found in the monaſteries of England. That by
" this means a ſolid and laſting peace would be eſta-
" bliſhed between the two nations, and he would not
" fail in the nomination of a King of Scotland, as
" in every thing elſe concerning that Kingdom, to aſk
" the advice of the preſent Aſſembly.

(27) Prynne's *Collect.* tom. 3. pag. 488, &c. Tyrrel. vol. 3. pag. 62, 63. Echard, p. 310, &c. *apud* Abercromby, *ubi ſupra.* p. 465.

[K] *This Declaration ſtruck the Scots with amazement.*] Let us hear what Mr. Abercromby ſays upon this ſubject. " This unexpected harangue, ſays
" he (28), ſtruck the Scots with amazement, indig-
" nation, and terror; and no wonder; ſuch another
" piece of *Supercherie* is, I believe, no where to be found
" in hiſtory. An honeſt Heathen would have been a-
" ſhamed to venture upon it; and it is ſurpriſing,
" that Chriſtian Authors ſhould yet relate it, without
" ſtigmatizing the memory of a Prince, that was ca-
" pable to act a part ſo derogatory to the character
" of a man of honour. Had he ever before, (and this
" was the nineteenth year of his reign,) laid claim to
" the ſuperiority of Scotland; nay, had he not of-
" ten diſclaimed it, as I have ſhewed; or had he
" only fomented the diviſions of the Kingdom, and
" laid hold on the opportunity to invade it openly,
" and appeared, what he was, an enemy above board;
" he had done, but what has been, by ungenerous
" Princes, practiſed in all ages. But for one, who in
" a great meaſure owed his grandeur to the repeated
" aſſiſtances he had received from Scotland; who had
" ſo often, and ſo ſolemnly owned its independency;
" who had expreſſed ſo much gratitude, ſuch for-
" ward zeal for its honour and welfare, thus to entrap
" its Nobles, upon the faireſt and moſt plauſible pre-
" tences imaginable, and then, and never till then to
" tell them (the ſpeech I have related, and all his
" after-conduct implied no leſs) that now he had them
" in his hands, and they muſt reſolve to lay down
" their lives, or to give up their liberties; as
" it was unprecedented before, ſo I know not if it
" has ſince been imitated. Not but that Princes and
" their

(28) *Ubi ſupra,* pag. 466.

anſwer ſuch things without a head and King, whoſe buſineſs it was to inquire into theſe matters; and that as for their part, they were bound by an oath, which they had made to one another after the death of King Alexander, to own no Sovereign but his legal heir; and that they were to obſerve that oath under pain of excommunication. Upon which the King ſaid, that he would give them time to think on it, and ſo adjourned the meeting till next day, the eleventh of May, when according to appointment they went over to the pariſh church of Norham, and entreated that a longer time might be allowed them, to conſult with their abſent countrymen, concerning a matter that was wholly new to them, and yet of ſuch importance, as was not to be raſhly determined. The King, for his own intereſt [L], was willing to prorogue the Aſſembly (e) for three weeks (f) [M]. Accordingly they met the ſecond of June following; but it does not appear that they alledged any thing againſt the King's pretenſions (g), who thereupon took his Sovereignty for granted, and obliged the Competitors, and the Guardians of the Kingdom, together with a great many Prelates and Barons, who called themſelves the Community of Scotland, to recognize and acknowledge him, as their ſuperior and direct Lord (b). John Baliol was not at this Aſſembly, and his abſence is by Mr. de Rapin conſidered as a piece of policy. He acknowledged indeed the King's Sovereignty the next day; but his deſign was, that if he aſcended the Throne, he could not be charged with having been one of the moſt forward in

(f) Rapin, *Hiſt. d'Ang.* tom. 3. liv. 9. pag. 29, 30.

(g) See the note [M].

(b) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, p. 469.

(e) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 465, &c.

" their Councils may have been ſufficiently diſpoſed " to reach the ſcandalous part; but all the Grandees " of a Nation have never been ſo mad as to afford " the like opportunity. The Scots Nobility ſaw their " error, when it was too late, and ſome write (28), " that as great as their ſurpriſal was, they courageouſly aſſerted the independency of their country, " and abſolutely refuſed to acknowledge any ſuperior " but God, above him, that ſhould be found to be heir " of their crown. Robert Wiſhart Biſhop of Glaſgow is ſaid to have taken upon him to maintain " that argument, and to have done it, as indeed it was " eaſy, beyond the poſſibility of a reply. Yet ſince " Engliſh Authors and Records, whom I more incline " to follow than Scots or Foreigners, are ſilent upon the " matter, I ſhall be ſo too. This is certain, they " ſeemed very much diſſatisfied, and not at all inclinable to comply with the King's demands; and " he was thereby ſo far incenſed, that he ſwore by St. " Edward, the greateſt oath he ever uſed, that he " would loſe his life in the proſecution of his juſt right."

(28) Pere d'Orleans, pag. 467. Dr. Mackenzie's *Life of John Blair*, vol. 1. pag. 250.

[L] *The King for his own intereſt was willing to prorogue the Aſſembly.*] He had a mind to palliate, in ſome meaſure, by this condeſcenſion, the violence which he had offered, and which he was determined to proſecute. He knew very well that in ſo ſhort a time they could neither meet, nor conſult with their friends; much leſs raiſe an army, put the country in a poſture of defence, make up their domeſtic quarrels, and agree upon a Head, capable to unite and protect them. By theſe means they might yet have warded off the threatned miſchief. But ſuch means were then impracticable. And King Edward, to divert their thoughts from any attempt of that kind, and to engage them to return to a ſecond conference, gave them the Charter we have mentioned above (29), by which he declared, amongſt other things, that they might return with honour and ſafety. And to perſuade them, that after all he had no intention to invade their liberty by force, but only to aſſert his own right, in caſe it ſhould appear that he had any, he deſired them (30) to make ſearch for any writings, evidences, or antiquities, that might exclude him from the right and exerciſe of his ſuperiority and direct dominion, and overthrow his reaſons and arguments for it; proteſting that he was ready to grant, what law and juſtice had eſtabliſhed. And that they might the better underſtand his title, and make their objections againſt it, he appointed the Biſhop of Durham to ſet it forth to all preſent. The Prelate obeyed, and was himſelf, or ſome others for him, at the greateſt pains imaginable to overturn his Maſter's cauſe, by ſupporting it with diſingenuity, fiction and calumny. He begins with the exploded fables of Brutus, Albanactus, Camber, and the like imaginary founders of old Britain, Albany and Wales; nor does he forget the equally ridiculous Legend of St. John of Beverly, nor the Pageantry of King Edgar, and his Royal Sailors. The acknowledg'd ſubjection of William King of Scotland to Henry II of England he tells pretty fairly; but then, he has not a word of the authentic acquittance granted by King Richard, by which alone it would have appeared, how vain and frivolous the claim had ever been, and then was. Mr. de Rapin makes ſeveral very good obſervations upon the reaſons and arguments alledged in King Edward's favour. He aſks, among other things, Why did not the King produce authentic inſtances of the homage paid by the ancient Kings of Scotland to the Kings of England, as he produced that which King William paid to Henry II? If the queſtion had been only to prove, that homage had been paid for the County of Huntington, he would not have been obliged to ſearch the Hiſtorians; he would have found ſufficient proofs of this in the Records of England. How then came it to paſs that no record could be found of the homage paid for Scotland? Was it more difficult to preſerve theſe than the former (31)? Since then there was no record extant of the homage paid for Scotland, ſave only that of King William, which was reverſed, it is a ſtrong proof in favour of the Scots, that their Kingdom was not ſubject to England.

(29) In the note [H].

(30) Prynne, Tyrrel, *and* Echard, *ubi ſupra.*

(31) Rapin, *Hiſt. d'Angl.* tom. 3. liv. 9. pag. 42.

[M] *For three weeks.*] Mr. Abercromby ſays (32), till the ſecond of June next coming. But, according to Mr. de Rapin (33), the King granted them a delay of three weeks to begin from the tenth of March. It is true they met the ſecond of June, but it does not appear that on that day they treated of King Edward's ſovereignty over Scotland. For the Biſhop of Bath and Wells, Chancellor of England, who ſpoke for the King, having ſummed up what had been done in the foregoing meeting, added, that ſince the three weeks, which the King had granted to the States to anſwer his reaſons, were paſſed, and they had not been able to produce or alledge any thing that was capable to overthrow the King's right, he was reſolved to exert his *acknowledged* ſovereignty over Scotland. This is taken from a Journal or *Diary* extant in Rymer's *Fœdera* §, and Mr. de Rapin obſerves, that how good ſoever an opinion we may have of King Edward's ſincerity, and of the honeſty of the Notary, who drew up this Journal, yet we muſt obſerve that there is ſomething inaccurate or wanting here. In the two preceding meetings Edward produces his pretenſions to the ſovereignty over Scotland; the States far from acknowledging immediately this pretended Sovereignty, aſk ſome time to conſult together upon ſo nice a ſubject. The King grants them three weeks, which being expired, in the firſt ſeſſion, which the Journal mentions, the Chancellor ſpeaks firſt, and ſays, that the States have alledged nothing againſt the King's pretenſions. He ſhould, it ſeems, have firſt required the States to produce their anſwer, which ought to have been mentioned in the Journal, either by relating their objections, or their conſent, or at leaſt it ought to have been there obſerved, that they had nothing to anſwer; in this caſe the Chancellor's diſcourſe would have been ſeaſonable and to the purpoſe; whereas he begins with declaring, that ſince the States have oppoſed nothing againſt the King's pretenſions, his Majeſty is determined to make uſe of his right. This muſt needs make us ſuſpect, either that the account of what paſſed that day is curtailed, or that the day before the States produced their reaſons and arguments, of which the

(32) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 467.

(33) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 30.

§ Tom. 2. pag. 542, &c.

in ſubmitting to Edward, and that he might plead in his defence, that he only did what had already been done by all his competitors, and even by the moſt eminent men of the Nation (*i*). Boetius (*k*) and Buchanan (*l*) ſay, that Robert Bruce refuſed to recognize King Edward's Sovereignty, though he is upon record found to be the firſt man, who being interrogated, whether in claiming his right to the Scots Crown, he would demand and receive juſtice before the King of England, as ſuperior and direct Lord of the Kingdom of Scotland, publickly, expreſly, and without contradiction, anſwered, that he would, and actually did (*m*); yet this ſeeming inconſiſtency can be accounted for in a very probable manner [*N*], as we ſhall ſhew hereafter. Thus King Edward, without drawing his ſword, and perhaps

(*i*) *See* Rapin, *ubi ſupra*, p. 49.

(*k*) *Scotor. Hiſt.* lib. 14. fol. 293.
(*l*) *Rer. Scotic.* lib. 8. p. m. 255.

(*m*) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 469.

the author of the Journal did not think fit to take any notice. And indeed, according to the delay granted by the King for three weeks (35), there ought to have been a meeting the firſt of June; but I give this only as a conjecture, upon which I don't pretend to lay any ſtreſs. The greateſt difficulty is, that it ſeems ſurprizing, that after three weeks deliberation and conſulting, the States of Scotland ſhould not have found any argument or reaſon to anſwer the King's pretenſions. It is certain that till then the ſovereignty of the Crown of England over Scotland had never been ſo generally acknowledged, nor ſo evidently known as to ſilence all the members of the State. Witneſs the articles of marriage we have mentioned above (36), in which the Scots took ſo many precautions to maintain their independency. Secondly, the time they required to conſult upon the King's pretenſions ſhews, that they were not perſuaded of his right. Laſtly, this very precaution of Edward, who requires this acknowledgment from them, is a proof that his right was at leaſt doubtful. It is not the cuſtom to act in ſuch a manner, when one's right is unqueſtionable and generally acknowledged. If then it be true that the States anſwered nothing to the King's pretenſions, we muſt believe, either that they were awed by his power, or that the two chief pretenders to the Crown agreed together, and caballed amongſt the members of the States, to prevent their oppoſing the pretenſions of the King of England. They were in all likelihood afraid, that this difficulty would retard the deciſion of the principal buſineſs, in which they were more nearly concerned.

(35) Beginning the tenth of May.

(36) In the note [*B*].

[*N*] *This inconſiſtency can be accounted for in a very probable manner.*] Let us firſt hear how Boetius and Buchanan relate the matter. The former tells us, that Edward knowing that Robert Bruce was a man of great merit, who was extremely beloved by his country-men, on account of his noble ſpirit, and other virtues, firſt attempted to gain him, by promiſing him the crown, if, when he ſhould be King, he would acknowledge himſelf a Vaſſal of England: but that Robert, zealous for his own liberty and for that of the Kingdom, anſwered, that he would not ſubject to the yoke of England a country, which till then had been free from all ſubjection. Boetius's words are; *Quoniam Robertum virum fortem, ac apud ſuos propter ingenii magnanimitatem cæteraſque virtutes carum acceptumque cognoverat, eum prius tentare aggreditur* [Edvardus], *ut ſi accepto Regno in verba jurare ipſius vellet, eum præferret. . . . . Verum Robertus libertatem & ſuam & Regni turpitudine & ſervitute pluris habens, reſpondit, ſe nolle patriam ſuam, hactenus ab omni ſervitio immunem, in ſervitutem Anglis dedere* (37). Buchanan's account is as follows: When the Scots were aſſembled at Norham, Edward firſt gently tried, whether he could not engage them willingly to ſubmit to him, as their anceſtors had often done, as he pretended. But finding that they all conſtantly refuſed it, he called to him thoſe pretenders to the crown, whom he had himſelf ſet on, and by mighty promiſes engaged them to acknowledge his title: he alſo engaged the Aſſembly of Norham to remove to Berwick, as to a more proper place. When they were there, he choſe twelve Judges or Arbiters, whom he ſhut up by themſelves in a church, commanding that no perſon be admitted to them; and there he charged them to deliberate upon the matter in diſpute. But finding that they proceeded very ſlowly, he went in himſelf now and then, and by ſpeaking to ſeveral of them privately, he found, that according to the majority, John Baliol had the beſt right, but that his party and friends were not ſo numerous as thoſe of Robert Bruce. Thereupon he ſpoke to the latter, thinking, that as his right was not ſo evident and clear, he would eaſily be prevailed upon to enter into his views; he promiſed him the Kingdom of Scotland, if he would acknowledge it a fief of England. But Bruce anſwered, that he was not ſo fond of a crown, as to give up the liberty of his country to obtain it. Here follow Buchanan's own words, of which we have given the ſenſe. *Ibi* (Norami) *Eduardus per homines idoneos leniter Scotorum animos pertentat, num ſponte in ditionem ejus vellent concedere; quod ab eorum majoribus ſæpe factum fuiſſe contendebat. Id cum conſtanter omnes abnuerent, Competitoribus Regni, quos ipſe excitaverat, convocatis, promiſſis ingentibus ab eis exprimit, ut ipſi in verba ejus jurent; cæteris perſuadet, ut Conventus Bervicum in locum magis idoneum transferatur. Ibi viginti quatuor Judices illos ſelectos, in templum ſine arbitris incluſos, de controverſia cognoſcere jubet; vetito interea ne quiſquam ad eos propius accedat. Cum lentius res procederet, ipſe ſolus identidem ingrediebatur, & alios atque alios compellando, cum comperiſſet pluribus videri, jure priorem eſſe Ballıolum, gratiâ & factione inferiorem, Bruſſio prius convento, quem, quod jure eſſet inferior, facilius ſuis rationibus aſſenſurum putabat, Regnum ei Scotorum pollicetur, ſi ſe in Regum Anglorum clientelâ, eorumque ditioni ſubditum profiteri vellet. Ad hæc Bruſſius ingenue reſpondit, ſe non ita cupidum regnandi, ut eâ de cauſâ libertatem, à majoribus relictam, imminueret* (38). We might make ſeveral obſervations upon this account, which is very unaccurate, as may eaſily be underſtood by what we have already related in this article. But for brevity's ſake, we ſhall omit our own reflections, and only relate what we find in other authors, concerning this anſwer of Robert Bruce, to reconcile it with what has been ſaid of him in the text of this article. Let us hear again Mr. Abercromby; whoſe words are theſe (39), after he had obſerved that Robert Bruce acknowledg'd King Edward's ſuperiority over Scotland, he adds; "To ſay the truth, I cannot but "own in this place, that I am heartily ſorry, to find "myſelf obliged to ſcore Robert Bruce out of the liſt "of Scots Heroes, and that I cannot ſay of him, "what all the Scots writers have hitherto tenaciouſly "aſſerted, *viz.* that the King of England called him "aſide, cloſeted him, and offered to prefer him to the "crown of Scotland, if he would promiſe to hold it "of that of England; but that the noble Bruce was "proof againſt the glittering temptation, and that "with a ſcornful diſdain he replied; *No; I value the "dignity of a King at a very high rate, but my honour "I value yet more; nor will I betray my country to "reign over it.* A noble anſwer indeed; and I wiſh "he, or any of the competitors, had expreſſed ſuch "a greatneſs of ſoul. But as much convinced as I am "of the diſingenuity of King Edward, and the falſe "repreſentations given to the world of this tranſacti-"on, by him, his Council, and Hiſtoriographers; "nay, even by the public Notary he commanded "to draw up the Inſtrument, from whence we have "theſe accounts; yet I cannot offer to diſprove a deed "ſo authentic and public as this; which, if falſe, "thouſands of witneſſes had, during the courſe of "the enſuing war, atteſted the calumny. Nor did "the after-conduct of this ſame Robert Bruce, the "grandfather of the afterwards moſt heroic Scots "King of that name, prove contradictory to his in-"glorious ſubmiſſion. It is true, that from the begin-"ning he had been an obſtinate ſtickler in oppoſition "to the Engliſh intereſt, and that he had been an ene-"my to the Queen's match, and the union of the "Kingdoms. He very well knew that John Baliol "had more intereſt at the Court of England than "himſelf; and it is not improbable, but *that at firſt "he may*, conſequentially to his former behaviour, "*have rejected ſuch terms, as were derogatory to the "royal dignity he aimed at:* But it ſeems, that upon "ſecond

(37) Boetius, *ubi ſupra*, fol. 293.

(38) Buchanan, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 255.

(39) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 469.

perhaps without ſo much as an objection made, or a proteſtation entered againſt his title, procured himſelf to be acknowledged, and began in all his writings, to take upon him the deſignation of ſuperior and direct Lord of the Kingdom of Scotland [O] (n). It was now time to come to the principal affair, then in agitation; I mean the determination of the claim of the ſeveral pretenders to the Crown. It was agreed between them, that John Baliol, and John Cumin, Lord of Badenock, who was alſo one of the competitors, ſhould chooſe forty perſons, and that Robert Bruce ſhould name forty others, who all together ſhould examine the different pretenſions of the competitors. It was alſo agreed, that to theſe eighty Commiſſioners the King might add, if he pleaſed, twenty four more; and after a due enquiry they were to make their report to the King. The ſecond day of Auguſt, in the year 1292, was appointed for the meeting of theſe Commiſſioners. They met accordingly that day at Berwick upon Tweed, and King Edward, conſidering that this affair would take up ſo much time, as might be prejudicial to his private intereſt, propoſed to begin with examining the right of John Baliol and Robert Bruce; which was agreed to by the Commiſſioners, without prejudice to the other pretenders, whoſe reaſons were to be examined afterwards. The firſt queſtion that was propoſed to them was, what laws and cuſtoms were to be followed in this affair? The Commiſſioners could not agree amongſt themſelves upon the anſwer they were to make; ſo that Edward thought fit to grant them a longer term to conſider upon this, and prorogued the Aſſembly to the fourteenth of October

(n) Idem, ibid. pag. 470.

" ſecond thoughts, he altered his meaſures, and find- " ing it impoſſible to obtain what he judged his right, " without ſubmiſſion, he reſolved not to loſe it for a " punctilio of honour, which the poſſeſſion of the " crown would enable him to retrieve. William the " Lion had made the like ſubmiſſion before, and as " William the Lion did, ſo he hoped to fall upon " means of getting free of it." It ſeems then that Robert Bruce refuſed at firſt to accept the crown upon King Edward's terms; but that finding how this would be prejudicial to his pretenſions, he was at laſt prevailed upon to comply with the King's demands, tho' he did not gain much by it; for his reſiſtance made a deeper impreſſion upon King Edward's mind, than his ſubmiſſion could do afterwards (40). However this is ſufficient to ſhew, that Boetius's and Buchanan's account, with regard to this particular, is not inconſiſtent with what is found in the Record, quoted by Mr. Abercromby.

(40) Rapin, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 49.

[O] *He began in all his writings to take upon him the deſignation of ſuperior and direct Lord of Scotland.*] He did more; for he even acted as an abſolute Sovereign of the Kingdom. No ſooner had the competitors to the crown acknowledged his title, but his Chancellor read aloud the following Declaration, which the King repeated word for word; " That tho' the King of " England acted on this occaſion as ſovereign Lord of " Scotland, yet he did not intend to give up the heredi- " tary right, which he might claim to the crown of that " Kingdom, nor renounce the property of it. But " that he expreſly reſerved to himſelf the liberty of " proſecuting his right, in what manner and when he " ſhould think it proper (41)." It ſeems, by this Declaration, that King Edward deſigned to make himſelf abſolute maſter of Scotland; nor do I ſee why he let the opportunity ſlip, which offered immediately after. For having repreſented to the competitors, that it would be needleſs for him to adjudge by his ſentence the crown to any of them, if he were not in a condition to ſee his ſentence performed, he required, that they would put him in poſſeſſion of the Kingdom, that he might deliver it up to the perſon, who ſhould be declared King. This was granted (42). The competitors, ſtill jealous of one another, and all made to believe, that he who ſhould firſt comply, ſhould be firſt preferred, did not at all ſcruple to ſubſcribe a paper, importing, " That in order to impower King Edward " to put his ſentence in execution, they had freely " and without compulſion given to him, as ſovereign " Lord, the actual poſſeſſion or ſeaſine of all the lands " and ſtrength of Scotland; upon condition that he " ſhould reſtore all things as he found them, within " two months after he ſhould have determined the " right of ſucceſſion; ſaving to the crown of England " the homage of him, that ſhould be King." This done, it is not to be doubted, but detachments were immediately ſent from the Engliſh army that lay ſtill in the neighbourhood, to ſeize upon and garriſon all the caſtles and fortreſſes in Scotland. But it ſeems they got not an eaſy acceſs to all of them; their own Governors and Proprietors were not at all willing to yield their places to ſtrangers, according to Mr. Abercromby (43).

(41) Idem, ibid. pag. 32.

(42) Idem, ibid.

(43) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 470.

But Mr. de Rapin ſays the contrary; he tells us (44), " That tho' whatever had been done till then in fa- " vour of King Edward, might be look'd upon only " as the acts of ſome private men; yet, ſince Bruce " and Baliol were amongſt them, whoſe parties divid- " ed the whole Kingdom of Scotland, their approba- " tion was in a manner that of the whole State. In " theſe times of anarchy and confuſion the Regents had " but very little authority, and durſt not even do any " thing which might diſoblige the King, or either of " the two competitors, who was to be their Maſter. " As for the States, Edward did not conſult them any " more, ſince he had found that they were little diſ- " poſed to ſupport his pretenſions. They were aſſem- " bled without the borders of Scotland, and in the " King's power, ſo that they were not at liberty to " take ſuch meaſures as they could have wiſhed. So " that the King found little or no oppoſition from the " Governors of caſtles, or other ſtrong places, when " he put himſelf in poſſeſſion of the Kingdom." Only Gilbert de Umfraville, who commanded in the caſtles of Dundee and Forfar, made a difficulty of parting with them, becauſe, ſaid he, they were intruſted to him, not by the King, but by the Community of Scotland, to whom he was obliged to reſtore them. But his plea was repelled, in regard that the Community, that is the Convention of Barons, had no power to give them, if there had been a King at the time; and that now, altho' there was no King, yet ſome one of the competitors muſt needs be King in a ſhort time; and conſequently, ſince he was warranted by all the competitors, to give up theſe caſtles, he was warranted by the King (45). Yet this was not enough to ſatisfy the Earl; he look'd upon the Act we have mentioned above, as a very irregular piece, nor could he be determined, upon ſuch a warrant, to deliver up the places which had been committed to his care, neither by the King of England, nor by the pretenders to the crown. He required therefore that they, and the Regent, and even the King himſelf, ſhould bind themſelves by an Act, to indemnify him, in caſe he ſhould ever be called to an account afterwards (46). King Edward now fairly, as he thought, acknowledg'd Superior of Scotland, and as ſuch put in poſſeſſion of the Kingdom, concluded that henceforth he ſhould meet with no manner of oppoſition, in the proſecution of his further deſigns. He therefore went boldly on, and declared himſelf by a public Deed (47) ſovereign Lord of Scotland; yet was graciouſly pleaſed to promiſe, that he would decide the controverſy in hand within the bounds of the Kingdom contended for (48). This he did at the requeſt of the Regents, who had petitioned for it; the King look'd upon this ſtep of the Regents as a kind of acknowledgment of his Sovereignty, becauſe the petition was expreſſed in ſuch a manner, as not to oppoſe it; and therefore he readily condeſcended to grant them his Letters-patents according to their requeſt (49). He afterwards made a progreſs through moſt of the Low-Countries of Scotland, receiving every where the acknowledgments and oaths of the Nobility, Clergy, and Burghers, who were now evidently enſlaved (50).

(44) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 32.

(45) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 470.

(46) Rapin, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 33.

(47) *Fœdera Angl.* tom. 2. pag. 532.

(48) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 471.

(49) Rapin, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 33.

(50) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*.

ber following. The Commiſſioners being met that day, Edward added to the former queſtion the two following: "What rule they were to follow, in caſe the cuſtoms of England "and Scotland happened to be either uncertain, or oppoſite to one another? Whether a "different judgment ought to be paſſed concerning the Kingdom of Scotland, than what is "cuſtomary with regard to Counties, Baronies, and other Fiefs held of the Crown of Eng-"land?" The delay, which Edward had granted to the Commiſſioners procured them a knowledge, which they wanted before. They who in Auguſt could not agree amongſt themſelves concerning the firſt queſtion, were in October following all of the ſame opinion concerning all the three queſtions. They anſwered upon the firſt, that if there were unqueſtionable laws or cuſtoms in the King's dominions, they were to ſerve as a rule in the preſent caſe. Upon the ſecond, they ſaid, that if there were no ſuch laws, the King could make a new one. Upon the third, they decided, that the ſame judgment was to be paſſed concerning the Kingdom of Scotland, as concerning all other indiviſible fiefs. It is plain by theſe anſwers, that the preliminary queſtions had been propoſed with no other view, than to eſtabliſh the King's Sovereignty over Scotland. Edward having received theſe determinations ſent for Bruce and Baliol, and aſked them whether they had any thing to add to the reaſons they had alledged in the petitions, which they had laid before the Commiſſioners. They both ſaid, that they had ſome other arguments to offer, which they did accordingly [P] (o). Then the King propoſed to the Commiſſioners the following queſtion, as if the force of all the arguments had been ſummed up in it; *Whether the more remote, by one degree in ſucceſſion, coming from the eldeſt ſiſter, ought, according to the laws of both Kingdoms, to exclude the nearer by one degree, coming from the ſecond ſiſter?* Or, *Whether the nearer by one degree, coming from the ſecond ſiſter, ought to exclude the more remote by one degree, coming from the eldeſt ſiſter?* By this King Edward's partiality for John Baliol was viſible, as will appear to any one, who will examine Robert Bruce's reaſons (p). But his arguments met with no regard nor conſideration; the Aſſembly was obliged to anſwer preciſely to the queſtion, as King Edward had ſtated it, and their anſwer was ſuch as he deſired, in favour of him, who, though more remote by one degree, was deſcended from the eldeſt ſiſter; that is, in favour of John Baliol (q). We may obſerve here, that according to Buchanan, Edward conſulted the Civilians of France upon this controverſy [Q], though neither Mr. Abercromby, nor Mr. de Rapin take any notice of this. The Aſſembly

(o) Rapin, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 44-46.

(p) See the note [P].

(q) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 473.

[P] *They had ſome other arguments to offer, which they did accordingly.*] Robert Bruce ſpoke firſt, and alledged the four following reaſons. I. That the ſucceſſion to a Crown muſt be regulated by the Law of Nature, by which King's reign, and not by thoſe Laws, which are in uſe with regard to the ſubjects; and that by the Law of Nature the neareſt ought to ſucceed. II. That for the ſame reaſon, though the inheritance of private men, be partible, and the eldeſt ſons uſed to have ſome advantage above the others by the Laws obſerved between the ſubjects, yet it was not ſo with regard to a Kingdom, where the neareſt heir ought to ſucceed without any partition. III. He maintained that even in Scotland the Crown had often been adjudged to a collateral branch, preferably to the direct line, and that the ſucceſſion was not ſo well eſtabliſhed in the family of the eldeſt children, as to prejudice his right, ſince he could produce ſeveral inſtances of brothers, who had been preferred before the ſons, even in that ſame Kingdom of Scotland. IV. He took it for granted, that though he was in the ſame degree with Dervegild, yet he was to ſucceed, becauſe he was the neareſt heir male. John Baliol ſpoke afterwards, and having firſt eſtabliſhed his right upon his being deſcended from the eldeſt daughter, he undertook to anſwer the reaſons alledged by his competitor. He ſaid, that according to the common Law of England, as well as of Scotland, one, who was deſcended from the eldeſt daughter, though more remote, was always preferred to one, who though nearer, was deſcended from a younger daughter. With regard to what Bruce had alledged concerning the Law of Nature, and the right of Kings, the ſubſtance of his anſwer was, that the King of England was to determine this point, as the Sovereign Lord, who time out of mind had held the Kingdom of Scotland as dependent from his Crown. As to the inſtances which Bruce had produced of brothers, who had been preferred before the ſons, he maintained that it never happened in Scotland, but by uſurpation and force of arms; that even when ſuch a caſe had happened, the Kings of England, as Sovereigns, had reformed that abuſe, by reſtoring the ſons to the throne; to prove which, he quoted the inſtance of Edgar, whom William Rufus put in poſſeſſion of the Crown which had been uſurped by Donald. Laſtly, he maintained, that though what Bruce had alledged ſhould be beyond contradiction, yet he could not infer from thence any thing in his favour. It appeared indeed that ſometimes the neareſt heir had been excluded, and the remoter placed upon the throne, ſince it is certain that a brother is more remote than a ſon (51); but theſe inſtances could not have the force of a Law.

(51) Rapin, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 45, 46.

[Q] *According to Buchanan, Edward conſulted the Civilians of France upon this controverſy.*] Neither Mr. Abercromby, nor Mr. de Rapin take any notice of this particular; and yet what Buchanan ſays is very probable. He tells us, that the King, being willing to ſhew that he did not act raſhly in an affair ſo great and ſo weighty, reſolved to conſult thoſe men in France, who were eſteemed the moſt pious and wiſe, and to have the greateſt knowledge in the law. And as this ſort of men are never of the ſame opinion, he did not doubt but that ſome of them would give ſuch an anſwer as would ſuit with his deſign. An Engliſhman therefore, who had the whole management of this affair in France, propoſed the queſtion to the French Civilians in this captious manner; "A certain King, who is neither crown-"ed nor anointed, but only placed in a certain ſeat, "and proclaimed King; and yet is not ſo independent "as not to be under the protection of another King, "whoſe feudatory he acknowledges himſelf to be, "died without children. Two relations, deſcended from "Sempronius, the late King's great uncle, claim the "inheritance: namely, Titius great grandſon of Sem-"pronius's eldeſt daughter, and Sejus, grandſon of "the younger daughter. Which of them two is to "be preferred to an inheritance which cannot be di-"vided?" The queſtion having been propoſed in this manner, moſt of the Civilians anſwered, that if there was any Law or Cuſtom concerning this in the Kingdom which was claimed, it ought to be obſerved; if not, it was uſual to follow the cuſtom of that Kingdom, of which the other was a fief. That in determining queſtions relating to fiefs, the cuſtom did not aſcend, but deſcend; that is, that the cuſtom of the ſuperior ought to be a Law to the inferior. It would be too long to relate all the opinions of the Civilians; but to ſum up all in a word, almoſt all of them diſputing concerning the right, gave undetermined and contradictory anſwers; agreeing only in this, that they all allowed Edward a ſovereign power to determine the matter,

bly having thus given their anſwer, it was determined that Robert Bruce's pretenſions were ill grounded, and that according to law he had not the leaſt right to the Crown of Scotland (*r*). Yet the affair was not finiſhed by this ſentence, for there were not only other pretenders to the Crown [*R*], but even Robert Bruce, together with John Haſtings, put in another claim [*S*]. However this new difficulty was ſoon removed, and on the 19th of November 1292, the King of England, as ſuperior and direct Lord of Scotland, having repelled all objections to the contrary, decided, That John Baliol ſhould have ſeiſin and poſſeſſion of the Kingdom of Scotland, with all its appurtenances, upon condition that he ſhould juſtly and rightly govern the people ſubject to him, that none might have occaſion to complain of injuſtice, nor the King of England, as ſuperior Lord of the Kingdom, be obliged to interpoſe his authority; *always reſerving the right of the King of England, and his heirs in ſuch caſes, when he would make uſe of it* (*s*); or, as Mr. de Rapin expreſſes it (*t*), *reſerving to himſelf and his ſucceſſors the right of proſecuting their pretenſions upon the ſame Kingdom, whenever they ſhould think fit.* On theſe conditional and ſervile terms did John Baliol

(*r*) Idem, ibid. and Rapin, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 46.

(*s*) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 475.

(*t*) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 47.

matter, being impoſed upon by the falſe light, in which the queſtion had been put to them. Let the reader judge, whether we have given the true ſenſe of Buchanan's words. *Ne tanta res*, ſays he (49), *temere acta videretur, conſultatio eis eſt propoſita, qui in Gallia pietate, prudentiâ, & juris ſcientiâ tum primi habebantur. Neque dubitabat* (Rex Eduardus) *(ut eſt id genus hominum nunquam inter ſe ſatis concors) aliquod ſe reſponſum, quod in rem ſuam faceret, relaturum . . . . Juris peritis vero ab Anglo, qui totius negotii apud eos auctor & moderator erat, falſa ſpecies in hunc modum eſt propoſita.* " *Rex quidam, nec coronari, nec inungi ſolitus, ſed in ſede quadam a ſuis collocari, ac Rex denunciari, neque tamen ita libere Rex, ut non in Clientelâ ſit Regis alterius, cujus ſe Beneficiarium fateatur, ſine liberis deceſſit. Duo propinqui e* Sempronio, *magno Regis defuncti patruo, prognati, hæreditatem petunt,* Titius *videlicet, ex majore* Sempronii *filia pronepos,* Seius *ex minori filiâ nepos. Uter, in hæreditate impartibili adeundâ, alteri præferendus?*" *Hac conſultatione, his fere verbis propoſitâ, prope omnes reſponderunt, ſi qua lex vel conſuetudo ea de re, in regno, quod petitur, eſſet, ei ſtandum; ſin minus, verum eſſe, conſuetudinem ſequi ejus, in cujus tutela ſunt; quod in Feudis dijudicandis conſuetudo deſcendat, non autem aſcendat; hoc eſt, Conſuetudo ſuperioris inferiori pro lege habenda eſt, non contra. Longum eſſet omnium ſententias ſigillatim referre; ſed ut paucis colligam, prope univerſi, de jure litigantium, incerta & controverſa reſponderunt; poteſtatem vero judicandi ſummam, juxta falſam ſpeciem propoſitam, Eduardo tribuerunt.*

(49) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 254, 255. *See alſo* Boethius *ubi ſupra*, fol. 293, where he tells us, that moſt part of the Civilians adjudged the Crown to Robert Bruce, not only on account of his great and generous ſoul, but alſo becauſe he was an heir-male.

[*R*] *There were other pretenders to the Crown.*] They were the following. Florence Earl of Holland, who pretended to the Crown of Scotland in right of his mother Ada, the eldeſt lawful ſiſter of William, who was formerly King; as did Robert de Pynkney in right alſo of his grandmother Marjory, ſecond ſiſter of the ſame King William. Patrick Galightly was the ſon of Henry Galightly, a baſtard of King William. William de Ros was deſcended of Iſabel; Patrick Earl of March, of Ilda or Ada; and William de Veſcy, of Marjory; all three daughters, though unluckily for their offspring, only natural daughters, of the ſame King William. Roger de Mandevil did the like, and had much the ſame reaſon, being, as well as the former, deſcended of Aufrick, a baſtard daughter of the ſaid King. Nicholas de Soules's right, if baſtardy could give right, was nearer to the lateſt Kings; for his grandmother Marjory, the wife of Alan de Huſer, was a natural daughter of Alexander II, and conſequently the ſiſter of Alexander III. John Cumine Lord of Badenock derived his title from a remoter ſource, viz. from Donald Bane, who had uſurped the Crown about two hundred years before this time; but he was willing to lay by his pretenſions in favour of John Baliol; he might alſo have added, of Robert Bruce and John Haſtings; for, to ſay the truth, none but theſe three had colourable pretenſions; nay that of Haſtings was ſcarcely ſuch, when in competition with that of Bruce, ſince tho' both were the immediate ſons of Earl David's immediate lawful daughters; yet Ada, the mother of Haſtings, was the younger ſiſter, who muſt therefore yield to Iſabel, the mother of Bruce (50). When the ſentence againſt Robert Bruce had been pronounced, the other competitors, amongſt whom Eric King of Norway had of late appeared by his Procurators, and as heir to his daughter Queen Margaret, had put in his claim for the Kingdom, did not think fit to inſiſt upon thoſe feeble pretenſions, they had probably never mentioned, had not King Edward, to raiſe diviſion, ſet them upon the bold attempt (51). So that when on the 17th of November, the Commiſſioners being met, the King had called them in, and aſked, what they had to offer to ſupport their claim, they anſwered, that they did not intend to proſecute it any farther, and withdrew their petitions; whereupon the King declared, that they had no right to the Crown of Scotland (52).

(50) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 463, 464.

(51) Idem, ibid. pag. 473.

(52) Rapin, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 47.

[*S*] *Robert Bruce and John Haſtings put in another claim.*] John Haſtings began firſt. He pleaded, that the Kingdom of Scotland, ſince holden of the Crown of England, was, like all other lands, tenements, &c. diviſible, and ought therefore to be divided between John Baliol, Robert Bruce, and himſelf, as heirs to the three daughters. Robert Bruce, already diſappointed of his claim to the whole, ſtruck in with Haſtings, and, being ſeemingly at leaſt, content with his third part, requeſted of King Edward, that judgment might be given according to the common law of England. This plea, tho' mean in the competitors, (for here again I muſt own, that Robert Bruce did not ſhew himſelf to be that diſintereſted Heroe, which the Scots authors have made him) was nevertheleſs as plauſible as could be, upon the ſuppoſition of Scotland's being but a fee depending on the Engliſh Crown. For whatever the Law of England might have been at that time, I am ſure, that by the then Law of Scotland, lands (I don't ſay honours) held of the Crown, were partible; as appears from the Lordſhip of Galloway, which upon the death of Alan, Great Conſtable of Scotland, was divided among his three daughters, in ſpite of the oppoſition made by the baſtard Macdualan. Nor does it appear, that the law was then otherwiſe in England, as Mr. Tyrrel (53) would make us believe; becauſe, ſays he, upon the deceaſe of John Scot Earl of Cheſter, without iſſue of his own body, the Earldom with the County devolved to the Crown; and his ſiſters had no part of it allowed them. This is true; but then it is plain, that State-policy prevailed in this caſe over the laws of the Land. The Earldom of Cheſter was a Palatinate, and the Earls of it were petty Sovereigns. The laſt in poſſeſſion was a Scots Prince, the ſon of David Earl of Huntington and Garioch; and upon his death, either his eldeſt ſiſter Margaret, the ſame in whoſe right John Baliol her grand-child now claimed the Crown of Scotland, ſhould have ſucceeded; or the lands ſhould have been divided between that Lady and her two ſiſters, Iſabel and Ada, the mothers of the two other competitors, Robert Bruce and John Haſtings. But the Kings of England found it inconvenient to have little Sovereignties erected or continued in England, and therefore could never be eaſy, till they had prevailed with the Kings of Scotland to accept an equivalent for their Principality in Cumberland, Earldom of Northumberland, &c. And for the ſame reaſon it was, that the common-law did not take place, in the caſe of the three ſiſters abovementioned. But then an equivalent was likewiſe given to them; and John Baliol, the ſon-in-law of Margaret the eldeſt ſiſter, had in her right, and in that of her daughter Dervegild an aſſignation of the Manors of Thorkeſey, Gernemuth and Luddingland, till the King ſhould make them a reaſonable exchange of other lands in ſatisfaction of her part of the Earldom of Cheſter (54). The Earldom of Cheſter was then partible by the Engliſh Law, and the Lordſhip of Galloway by the

(53) Vol. 3. pag. 70.

(54) Dugdale, *Baronage of England*, tom. 2. pag. 524.

Baliol accept of the abſolute and independent Crown of Scotland. We ſhall make ſome obſervations upon King Edward's conduct in this affair in the note [T]. On the 20th of November 1292 John Baliol ſwore fealty to King Edward at Norham, and acknowledged his Sovereignty over Scotland in the moſt clear and ſubmiſſive words imaginable, and had an authentic Record of this tranſaction drawn up (u). Then he went into Scotland, and there in purſuance of the Writs iſſued out by his acknowledged Lord, and directed to the ſeveral Caſtellans, or Governors of Caſtles, he was on the Feaſt of St. Andrew, Patron of the Kingdom, placed on the Royal Throne at Scoon, and crowned King. He had not leiſure to receive the congratulations and ſubmiſſions of his party; I ſay of his party *; for as all ſhould have done, ſo ſome, particularly the Bruces, father, ſon, and grandſon, together with John Earl of Caithneſs, William Douglas, &c. refuſed to acknowledge him. He was ſoon

(u) Rapin, ibid.

* *Fœder. Angl.* tom. 2. pag. 604.

the Scots. Conſequently the Kingdom of Scotland, if holden of the Crown of England, as it was then pretended, was alſo partible by the Laws of both Nations (55). Yet it was not judged to be ſo. King Edward propoſed the two following queſtions to be examined. 1. Whether the Kingdom of Scotland was a partible fief? 2. If not, Whether the acquiſitions made by the Kings of Scotland ought to follow the Common-Law of ordinary inheritances? The unanimous opinion of the King's Council and of the Commiſſioners was, that the Kingdom of Scotland was an indiviſible fief; and that the new acquiſitions, made by the King within the Kingdom, ceaſe to be diviſible, as ſoon as they are in the King's poſſeſſion (56). It ſeems by this laſt queſtion, as tho' Robert Bruce and John Haſtings, or perhaps ſome other of the pretenders, had claimed ſome lands, belonging to the Crown of Scotland; and which formerly had been in the poſſeſſion of ſome private perſons; otherwiſe it does not appear to what purpoſe the ſecond queſtion had been examined.

(55) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 463, 464.

(56) Rapin, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 47.

[T] *Some obſervations upon King Edward's conduct in this affair.*] "All theſe tranſactions, *ſays Mr. Tyrrel* (57), ſtill remaining upon Record in the Tower "of London, may ſerve as a ſufficient juſtification of "the ſincerity of King Edward's proceedings in this "great affair, and that all things were tranſacted in "the face of the world, and by the common conſent of "the major part of the auditors, ... and confirmed by "that of the Clergy, Nobility, and Commonalty of "Scotland; and therefore Hector Boetius, and thoſe o-"ther Hiſtorians are by no means to be credited, who "relate that the King uſed violence to obtain their "votes. ..." He afterwards adds, "That he will not "juſtify all that the King did, in the beginning of "this affair, in ſo ſtrictly inſiſting upon his ſupreme "dominion over all Scotland, which the States of that "Kingdom, and the competitors for the Crown, either "could not, or durſt not contradict." I wiſh, ſays Mr. Abercromby upon this, that Mr. Tyrrel had been a little more conſiſtent with himſelf in the obſervations he makes upon thoſe tranſactions, that have been controverted by all Scots and Engliſh Writers, and by moſt of them either ignorantly or maliciouſly repreſented. He is indeed by far more candid and fair, than even thoſe, who having his Hiſtory before their eyes, while they compoſed their own, are for their unrelenting partiality inexcuſable. He does juſtice to the Scots on many occaſions, but ..., in ſome meaſure divided between prejudice and truth, he often falls into obſervations contrary to matters of fact, related by himſelf. Hence it is, that according to him the ſincerity of King Edward's proceedings is juſtifiable, becauſe he acted in the face of the world; yet not juſtifiable in the beginning, becauſe he ſo ſtrictly inſiſted upon the ſupreme dominion of an independent Kingdom. And again, thoſe authors are not to be credited, who ſay that he uſed violence, yet he owns that the Competitors and Eſtates of Scotland, as he calls them, *either could not or durſt not contradict him*. And the reaſon is plain; he took advantage of their implacable diviſions, cheated them out of their country, and having firſt by an armed force awed them into a ſubmiſſion to his unjuſt commands, continued to the laſt to purſue the ſame meaſures, by ſeizing all the fortreſſes of Scotland into his own hands, filling the Kingdom with Engliſh ſoldiers, cajolling and bribing ſome of the Nobles into a ſurrender of their rights, and obliging others, particularly the Chieftains of the Highlands, as Alexander of Argyle Lord of Lorn, and Alexander and Donald of the Iſles, to be anſwerable for the compliance and ſubmiſſion of their reſpective vaſſals and countries. If this was not to uſe violence, and if it was not a continued tract of violence, that laſted from the beginning of the controverſy, till at leaſt two months after its deciſion, when the Engliſh forces evacuated the Caſtles they had garriſoned in Scotland, I know not what it is. Sure I am no people were ever more ſhamefully abuſed, nor even by conqueſt more irreſiſtibly commanded (58). It appears, ſays Mr. de Rapin (59), by King Edward's whole conduct, that at firſt his intention was not to make himſelf maſter of the Kingdom of Scotland, as Buchanan charges him, but only to render that Kingdom dependent of England. This he had in common with moſt of his predeceſſors; for, not to mention the Saxon and firſt Norman Kings, no ſooner had Henry II King William in his power, but he reſolved to take advantage of that Prince's misfortune, and obliged him to pay him homage for his Kingdom; and Henry III, Edward's father, pretended to require the ſame of Alexander III, but could not ſucceed in that attempt. We cannot therefore conclude, from King Edward's firſt ſtep, that he had formed a deſign of making himſelf abſolute maſter of the Kingdom of Scotland, ſince he only claimed the direct Sovereignty of it, without ever pretending to the property of it, concerning which he contented himſelf with entering his proteſtation. If he had that deſign, he might eaſily have found plauſible pretences, to put Engliſh Garriſons, and Governors entirely devoted to him, in the places that were ſurrendered to him. He might have ſaid, that all the Scots having already declared for one or other of the Competitors, he could not commit the Caſtles of the Kingdom to their cuſtody, without expoſing it to the danger of a civil war. But inſtead of putting himſelf by that means in poſſeſſion of the Kingdom, he confirmed the ancient Governors, only requiring them to take the oath to him; a precaution, which ſo wiſe a Prince as he was, could not but look upon as very precarious. Thus far Mr. de Rapin; upon which we may obſerve, firſt, that it is very probable he put Engliſh garriſons in the caſtles of Scotland (60); for how elſe is it to be conceived that the Kingdom was delivered up to him, as he expreſly required, according to Mr. de Rapin himſelf (61)? Secondly, the caſe of Gilbert de Umfraville (62), which Mr. de Rapin himſelf relates, ſeems plainly to inſinuate, that the Governors were obliged to ſurrender the place, committed to their own care, and that other Governors were put in their ſtead. However that be, Mr. de Rapin adds (63), that it muſt be owned, that King Edward was very willing to take hold of the opportunity to eſtabliſh his direct Sovereignty over Scotland, and thus to accompliſh the deſign which his anceſtors had often formed, but could never well execute. It is not eaſy to determine, whether he was himſelf perſuaded of the lawfulneſs of his right, or whether conſidering the diſtreſſed condition, in which Scotland then was, he reſolved to take advantage of it in order to eſtabliſh a new dominion. This is more likely, though it happens but too often, that men eaſily ſuffer themſelves to be prepoſſeſſed in favour of what is to their profit. And indeed, to borrow proofs from Engliſh Hiſtorians, in order to ſhew that Scotland is dependent on the Crown of England, was as much as if he had owned that he had no better arguments to ſupport his pretended right. Certainly ſuch an homage as that which he claimed from the Scots, ought to have been proved by the moſt unqueſtionable and moſt authentick records. One cannot eaſily be perſuaded that if the Kings of Scotland had conſtantly paid homage to thoſe of England, one inſtance only of it ſhould have been

(57) Vol. 3. pag. 73. *apud* Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 465, &c.

(58) Abercromby, ibid.

(59) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 50.

(60) See remark [O] under the quotation (40).

(61) See ibid. quotation (42).

(62) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 51.

(63) Ibid.

ſoon obliged to return again into England, in order to attend his Liege-Lord, who was pleaſed to keep his Chriſtmas at Newcaſtle; where on St. Stephen's day he again renewed his homage [*V*]. This was no ſooner done, but he perceived under what ſlavery he had put himſelf, ſeveral cauſes, which ought to have been judged in Scotland, having been brought before King Edward [*W*]; upon which ſome Prelates and Noblemen of Scotland repreſented to the King of England, that he had but lately promiſed, that the laws and cuſtoms of Scotland ſhould remain entire, and that pleas of things done there, ſhould not be drawn out of it. But in vain; for they were told both by King Edward himſelf, and by Robert Brabanſon, Chief Juſtice of his Bench, "That if he had made ſuch tempora-"ry promiſes, when there was no King in Scotland, he had performed them; that now "they had a King, he was to be bound by no ſuch obligations; that his proteſtations re-"mained in force; that he would admit and hear all complaints whatſoever, and all other "affairs relative to the Kingdom of Scotland and its inhabitants, when and where he pleaſ-"ed; and that he would uſe and exerciſe his ſuperiority and direct dominion, which he "had, and of right ought to have, over the kingdom of Scotland, as his progenitors in "their times had, ſo far as to call the King of Scotland himſelf to appear before him in "his Kingdom of England." This was plain language, and he could not be miſunderſtood; yet that none might be ignorant of his deſign to enſlave the Nation, two days after a paper was preſented to King John, importing, "That John King of Scotland "acquitted him, King Edward, of all promiſes, bargains, agreements, and obligations "he had made, or entered into, to the guardians and others of the Kingdom, while, by "reaſon of the ſuperiority of his dominion, he held it in his hands." This releaſe or acquittance was ſealed with the ſeal of that unhappy Prince, and confirmed with thoſe of all his ſubjects about him. King John was before this time in no great eſteem with his ſubjects at home; many of them did not acquieſce in his title, and all were ſatisfied, or ought to have been ſo, that though his title had been indiſputable, he was not their King when he owned a Superior above him. But they were, for the moſt part, willing to bear with him, in hopes that the title of King, and poſſeſſion of the Kingdom, would inſpire him with ſentiments becoming his dignity; and the rather, becauſe after all it was plain, that what he had hitherto done, was the effect of compulſion and force, and that he could not avoid ſubmitting, as he did, without forfeiting, if not his life, at leaſt his pretenſions to the Crown. But now he was on the Throne, and yet continued a ſubject, people became more variouſly affected toward him, than they had formerly been; the braveſt and beſt ſet themſelves to find out means of freeing him and themſelves from their bondage; while others, either out of a deſign to urge him to a reſentment, or, as it is uſual, to ingratiate themſelves with the ſuperior powers, appealed from the legal ſentences given by their own King and his Judges in Scotland, to the King and Parliament of England. That a great many did ſo, and that they were always encouraged in their inſolence, and careſſed for it, appears from ſeveral places of Rymer's Collections; we ſhall give ſome inſtances of it in Note [*X*]. Theſe were not the only injuries done to King John, and indeed to the whole Scots

been found upon record. It is therefore probable, that King Edward, without being himſelf well ſatisfied of his right, reſolved to eſtabliſh it by taking advantage of the opportunity, which the ſituation of the affairs of Scotland afforded him. For he knew very well that no body was in a condition to oppoſe him, ſince the heads of the moſt conſiderable parties had ſuch ſtrong reaſons to have a great regard for him, and to take care not to offend him. But I doubt whether the conſent of the Scots was ſufficient to acquire him a new right. This I leave to the conſideration of thoſe who are better acquainted than myſelf in theſe matters. However it ſeems that this Prince cannot be well acquitted, ſince by his unbounded ambition he kindled a moſt cruel war between the two nations, who inhabit Great Britain. And if the event may ſometimes be looked upon as a determination from heaven of the juſtice or injuſtice of any cauſe, it appears from hiſtory, that though God ſuffered at firſt King Edward to ſucceed in his deſign, yet he afterwards permitted all the mighty projects of the Engliſh to vaniſh away.

[*V*] *He renewed his homage.*] The form of it was thus. "My Lord Edward King of England, and ſu-"perior Lord of the Kingdom of Scotland, I John of "Scotland become your liege-man, for the whole "Kingdom of Scotland, with its appurtenances, "which Kingdom I claim and hold, and ought of "right to hold, for me and my heirs Kings of Scot-"land, hereditarily of you, and your heirs, Kings of "England; and ſhall bear faith to you and your "heirs Kings of England of life and limbs, and ter-"rene honours, againſt all men that may live and die." This form is very different from thoſe formerly uſed by the Kings of Scotland, when they did homage for their Engliſh Territories; and plainly ſhews, that till then (except the extorted homage paid by King William) they had never done homage for Scotland: elſe they had certainly done it in terms no leſs expreſs, than thoſe I have tranſcribed (63). We may add another proof of this. When John Baliol did homage to the King of England, the Lord Chamberlain either aſked too much for his fee, or did not know what he was to aſk; whereupon King Edward himſelf fixed that fee at twenty pounds, which is double the ſum an Earl uſed to pay (64).

(63) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 475.

(64) *Fœder. Angl.* tom. 2. pag. 600. *apud* Rapin's *Extracts of them*, tom. 1. p. m. 179.

[*W*] *Several cauſes, which ought to have been judged in Scotland, were brought before King Edward.*] Here follows an inſtance of it. One Roger Bartholomew, a Burgeſs of Berwick, which was then owned a town within the borders of Scotland, and belonging to it, had the unprecedented inſolence to offer a complaint to King Edward againſt ſome Officers or Judges appointed by King John, that is, againſt King John himſelf. He was no doubt purpoſely ſet on to begin the affair; ſo that it is no wonder if he was favourably heard, and juſtice was ordered to be done according to the Laws and Cuſtoms of England. It will be owned, that a greater affront than this could not be put upon the King and Kingdom of Scotland; nor could there be any thing more unjuſt in itſelf, than to judge Scots men by Engliſh Laws, which they had never been liable to, nor acquainted with (65).

(65) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 479.

[*X*] *Some inſtances of appeals brought by King John's ſubjects before the King and Parliament of Scotland.*] A Merchant of Gaſcogne preſented a petition to King Edward, ſetting forth, that Alexander III, the late King of Scotland, owed him a certain ſum of money, which had not yet been paid, notwithſtanding all his ſollicitations. That therefore he addreſſed himſelf to him as Sovereign of the King of Scotland, to demand that

Scots Nation. The Parliament of England, in which the King was obliged to plead his own cauſe, againſt one of his ſubjects, decreed ſuch things, as diveſted the King of Scotland of almoſt all his authority [Y]. Yet all theſe affronts were not at firſt capable to rouſe the timorous ſpirit of Baliol; perhaps becauſe he was not yet in a condition to oppoſe his haughty Sovereign. For a war breaking out about the year 1294 between King Edward

that juſtice might be done to him: Edward eagerly embraced this opportunity to exert his right, and ſummoned the King of Scotland to appear before him the day after Aſcenſion day, in order to anſwer in perſon, the complaints brought againſt him by the Merchant. This ſummons is dated March the 8th 1293, about two months after Edward had left Newcaſtle. A week after Baliol was again ſummoned on the following occaſion. While Edward was at Berwick, he commanded the Guardians of Scotland to put Macduff Earl of Fife in poſſeſſion of certain lands, which he claimed as belonging to him. This order had been put in execution before Baliol's coronation, and whilſt Edward was ſtill Maſter of Scotland. In the firſt Parliament which the new King held at Scone, the Earl of Fife was charged with having unjuſtly taken poſſeſſion of theſe lands, the cuſtody of which belonged to the King. This was properly accuſing him of an affected and too great precipitation, in having addreſſed himſelf to the King of England, without waiting till there was a King on the Throne of Scotland. The Parliament ſentenced the Earl to be impriſoned (66). The Earl having been ſet free ſome time after, and thinking himſelf injured in that law-ſuit, which had been intended at the inſtance of the Abernethies, the mortal enemies of his family, went to England, and complained, that King Edward having reſtored him to the lands and tenements in debate, King John had notwithſtanding diſ-ſeized him of the ſame, and cauſed an unjuſt ſentence to paſs againſt him, to his great damage, and in contempt of the King of England the ſuperior Lord of Scotland. Edward immediately directed his Writ to the King of Scotland, ſummoning him to appear at his court, wherever he ſhould be in England, on the day after the Feaſt of the Holy Trinity, to anſwer to what Macduff had to ſay againſt him (67). He was a third time ſummoned on the 15th of June following, and a few months after again, and finally he was cited for the fifth time the next year, every time for different, but very trifling ſubjects. This made him ſenſible, that he was a ſlave rather than a vaſſal to the King of England (68). But the Scots, ſtill divided among themſelves, terrified by the Engliſh power, which was never greater than at that time, and miſerably diſpirited for want of that ſoul in their King, by which every particular ſhould have been animated, had not yet concerted meaſures towards reſiſting: for which reaſons their unprincely Sovereign was obliged to anſwer his Summons. He did it, and had, at his firſt entrance into the Engliſh Parliament, the honours, which the Kings of Scotland his predeceſſors, when they as Princes of Cumberland appeared at the Engliſh Court, ever had received, to ſit by the King of England, on an equal elevation above the reſt of the Aſſembly. But when his own cauſe came to be tried, which was that of Macduff, he was neither allowed Procurators, as all the Scots Hiſtorians aſſert, nor permitted to plead in his own ſeat, but was obliged to riſe and deſcend to the uſual place of pleading. A cruel uſage, which even Baliol could not bear with; his indignation appeared by the anſwer he made. For he ſaid, that as he was King of Scotland, he durſt not anſwer to Macduff's complaint, nor to any thing concerning his Kingdom, without the advice of his ſubjects. Upon this Macduff demanded judgment againſt him; and King Edward told him plainly, that he was his liege-man and homager, even for the Kingdom of Scotland; that as ſuch he had ſummoned him thither to anſwer; and that he muſt anſwer accordingly, or ſhew cauſe to the contrary. He replied as before, and being told, that he might require another day, he ſaid, that he would require none. Had he ſtood to this reſolution, he had acted like a King, and regained both the love and eſteem of his ſubjects. But then, beſides that he knew not, what violence might have been done to his perſon, he muſt neceſſarily have involved his ſubjects in a war, for which they were not prepared. For it was inſtantly determined, that ſince he had made no defence, nor would require a day, nor ſhew cauſe why he would not, three of his principal caſtles ſhould be ſeized into the hands of King Edward, till he had given full ſatisfaction. But before the ſentence was pronounced, he ſubmitted anew, re-acknowledged the ſuperiority of the King of England, and, upon aſſurance given, that he would anſwer at King Edward's Parliament after Eaſter next, and behave towards him as he ought to do, he was permitted to return and adviſe with his own Nation. This we find in the public Inſtrument preſerved in the Tower of London; but to acknowledge the truth, I know not how far each particular, contained in thoſe Inſtruments drawn up by King Edward's Notaries, ought to be credited. That King John was adviſed to make amends for his pretended obſtinacy, and to do it according to the form ſet down in the Record, I do not at all doubt. But if what an Engliſh Monk of St. Alban's, who lived at that time (69), has left us in manuſcript be true, I am apt to think, that he adhered to what he firſt ſaid, *viz.* That he durſt not anſwer to any thing concerning his Kingdom, nor conſequently take any new obligations upon him, without conſulting his ſubjects. And the reaſon is, becauſe that author ſays, that juſt before he came to the Parliament at London, *the Scotiſh Nobility had choſen twelve Peers to govern in his abſence*. To them, it ſeems, he promiſed to account for his actions; and therefore not daring to do any thing without their advice, *he withdrew privately, without taking leave of the King*; *which*, continues that author, *ſo incenſed King Edward, that he cauſed all Baliol's eſtate in England to be ſeized into his hands*. If this was ſo, King Edward was a great gainer by his retreat; for beſides thoſe ample poſſeſſions King John inherited from the Baliols his anceſtors, he was alſo, as King of Scotland (70), veſted and ſeized not only in the lands of Penrith, and others in the Northern Counties, amounting to twelve hundred pound land, granted by Henry III to Alexander II, as an equivalent for his pretenſions to Northumberland, Cumberland, &c. but alſo in the honour of Huntington, and the lands of Tyndale. Whether all theſe were upon this occaſion loſt to the Kings of Scotland, I ſhall not determine. It is certain they afterwards were; nor were the Scots Kings henceforth deſirous to be repoſſeſſed of an invidious, though rich vaſſallage, which had adminiſtred ſo many occaſions to the Kings of England of pretending to the ſuperiority over Scotland itſelf (71). We may obſerve here, that according to Buchanan (72), it was by chance only, that the King of Scotland happened to be preſent at the Parliament we have mentioned. But this is not at all probable; how can it be imagined that the new King would have ſo ſoon left his Kingdom, to put himſelf into the power of a Sovereign, from whom he had no great favours to expect; and this at a time when a cauſe was to be tried, in which complaint was made againſt him by one of his ſubjects? It is much more likely, that being awed into compliance, he appeared there to obey his ſummons.

(66) Rapin, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 53.

(67) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 479, 480.

(68) Rapin, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 54.

(69) Tyrrel, vol. 3. pag. 76.

(70) Mr. Anderſon's *Eſſays*, pag. 234, 235.

(71) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 480, 481.

(72) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 256.

[Y] *The Parliament of England decreed ſuch things, as diveſted the King of Scotland of almoſt all his authority.*] It was decreed (73), I. "In caſe the King of "Scotland, being cited to appear upon any account whatever, before his ſuperior Lord the King of England, "ſhould fail to do it at the time appointed, that he "ſhall be bound to come the next day, and to purge "himſelf of the crime of contumacy and diſobedience; "which if he do not, he ſhall loſe the cognizance of "the cauſe in debate, and be at the mercy and diſcretion of his ſuperior Lord. II. If upon his appearance it ſhall be found, that the complainer, in caſe "of an appeal from him, ſhall be found to have been "prejudged by the ſaid King, or the Judge ordinary "under him, that the ſaid complainer ſhall, by ſentence of the Engliſh Court, recover both his right "and expences, and that the ſaid King ſhall for his "injuſtice be at the mercy and diſcretion of his ſuperior Lord. III. That the ſaid complainer ſhall "henceforth

(73) Prynne's *Collect.* tom. 3. pag. 551, 552. *apud* Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 481, 482.

Edward, and Philip King of France, Baliol is ſaid to have behaved, outwardly at leaſt, as a dutiful ſubject to his ſuperior Lord, and even to have been preſent at a great Council, which Edward had aſſembled at London in 1294, and to have granted the revenue of all his eſtates in England for three years, towards carrying on the war with France (*w*). However the next year he entered into an alliance with King Philip againſt Edward [Z]. But though this negotiation was carried on with great ſecrecy at Paris, Edward got the hint of it; and to prevent the deſigns of the King of Scotland, he demanded of him the caſtles of Berwick, Roxburgh, and Jedburgh, to be put as a caution into his hands, while the war ſhould laſt, which when over, he obliged himſelf by his letters of the eighth of October, to reſtore theſe caſtles (*x*). But this was refuſed; and the King of Scotland, to ſhew that he was now reſolved to be no longer ſubject to the Engliſh authority or influence, baniſhed all thoſe of that Nation, even the Eccleſiaſtics, out of his dominions, and would permit none

(*w*) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 478-784.

(*x*) Idem, ibid: pag. 489. *and* Rapin, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 55.

" henceforth do the ſame homage and ſervices to the " ſuperior Lord for the lands recovered, as is ſaid, " which he was wont to do and perform to the King of " Scotland, ſo that the ſaid King ſhall never after- " wards have any authority, power, or juriſdiction, " over the ſaid complainer, his perſon, lands, tene- " ments, &c. IV. That all ſuch, as ſhall bring their " complaints from the Judicatories of Scotland to thoſe " of England, ſhall if they deſire it, be allowed a Guar- " dian during the dependence of their plea, to protect " their perſons, families, lands, tenements, revenues, " &c. And if any hurt or damage ſhall in the mean " time be done to the ſaid guardian, the ſaid King of " Scotland, and his heirs, ſhall forfeit all their right " and title, to the homage, fealty, and ſervice of the " ſaid complainers, who henceforth ſhall become and " remain the immediate Vaſſals of the King of Eng- " land, and his heirs for ever; and the King of Scot- " land ſhall be, as in the caſes before mentioned, at " the mercy and diſcretion of his ſuperior Lord." This was certainly a moſt compendious, eaſy, and infallible way of doing buſineſs; and at this rate it is plain the King of Scotland was not ſo much a King in his Kingdom, as the meaneſt Baron is, and ever was in his own Court. This is Mr. Abercromby's reflection, which every reader will certainly find perfectly well grounded.

[Z] *He entered into an alliance with the King of France againſt Edward.*] " The French King, *ſays* " *Mr. Prynne* (70), by his private ſollicitations, letters " and promiſes, procured John Baliol, King of Scots, " with all the Prelates, Nobles and Commonalty, to " enter into a moſt perfidious, clandeſtine league, and " an offenſive and defenſive war with him, againſt their " ſovereign Lord . . contrary to their late ſolemn oaths " and homages, under their reſpective hands and ſeals." Upon which Mr. Abercromby obſerves (71): " The " truth is, none of thoſe ungrateful, perfidious, and " rebellious Kings of Scotland, nor the perfidious Scots " under their command (ſo he is pleaſed to miſ-call " them) did think themſelves, nor were they, bound " to keep oaths, or to perform obligations violently " extorted, or from a King, that was only ſuch in " name, or from ſubjects firſt deluded, then compelled " into a ſurrender of liberties and rights, which be- " ing tranſmitted to them by their independing ance- " ſtors, belonged more to their poſterity than to them- " ſelves. This they conſcientiouſly repreſented to the " acknowledg'd Judge of the like controverſies in thoſe " times, Pope Celeſtin, and he (miſinformed by their " falſe ſuggeſtions, ſays Mr. Echard (72), by a par- " ticular Bull abſolved them from their oaths and " homage; his ſucceſſor Boniface VIII did afterwards " the ſame: and how far either of theſe two Pontiffs " was by falſe ſuggeſtions miſinformed, the letter of " this laſt, which we'll mention afterwards, will let " the reader know." As the King of England had made a powerful confederacy againſt the King of France, " the latter was, no doubt, for his own in- " tereſt very deſirous to counter-balance it by another " againſt King Edward, and he had reaſons to think, " that the Scots, ſtated as they then were, with re- " ference to England, could not be ſo far wanting to " themſelves, as to decline his amity and aſſiſtance, if " offered; yet we do no where find that he made the " firſt advances (73). But if we may credit the Engliſh " Hiſtorians, the Scots were highly diſſatisfied, that " the King of England had impoſed a King upon " them; ſome of them did in ſome meaſure reclaim, " others privately murmured againſt the thing; and " finding that the King they had got was a ſimple and " eaſy man, they deſpiſed his authority, and having " entered into a combination together, they ſeized his " perſon; (*This*, ſays Mr. Abercromby in a paren- " theſis, *I believe is falſe, nor do I any where elſe read,* " *that violence was uſed*) carried him to the inland " country, ſhut him up in a ſtrong caſtle on all ſides, " environ'd with mountains almoſt inacceſſible, and " appointed ſoldiers to guard him. This done, a " Parliament was called to meet at Scone, where in " imitation of the Conſtitution of France, they elected " twelve Peers, four Biſhops, four Earls, and four " Barons, by whoſe advice the King was to govern. " They cauſed alſo a publick Seal to be made for " the Community of Scotland, as they were called, " and the Peers prevailed upon the King to conſent " to their intended treaſon, that is, to ſend Embaſ- " ſadors to the King of France, with a procuratory " power, and letters, to which the King's Seal and " that of the Community were appended. The Em- " baſſadors were William Biſhop of St. Andrews, " the ſame who formerly had been in favour with " King Edward (74), Matthew Biſhop of Dunkeld, " Sir John Soules, and Sir Ingeram Umfraville. " Theſe Gentlemen having procured their letters of " Credence, and plenipotentiary powers, dated at " Stirling the fifth of July 1295, were moſt honour- " ably and kindly received at the Court of France, " and they were ſo ſucceſsful in their negotiations, " that on the twenty third of October the treaty pro- " poſed by King John was finally agreed to by " King Philip; the ſubſtance of it was as follows. " I. That Edward King John's ſon ſhall marry the " daughter of Charles of Valois Earl of Anjou, the " King of France's brother. II. That King John " and his ſucceſſors ſhall with all their power by ſea " and land, be aſſiſting to King Philip and his ſuc- " ceſſors in the proſecution of the preſent war againſt " the King of England and his Allies, &c: and that " he ſhall at his own charge invade England in order " to make a powerful diverſion in favour of France, " whenever attacked by the ſaid King of England, " or his Allies. III. That King John ſhall prevail " with the Prelates, Earls, Barons, Noblemen, and " the Community of all the Cities in Scotland, ſo " far as of right they may, to teſtify their aſſent to " this agreement, by tranſmitting their Letters Pa- " tents under their Seals to France. IV. That in the " like manner, if the King of England ſhall invade " Scotland, the King of France ſhall make war upon " him in other parts, by way of diverſion, and if " required, ſhall ſend auxiliary forces at his own " charge, till they come thither. V. That they ſhall " not make peace on either ſide, without the conſent " of each other. In the authentic writs we have " concerning this league, there are three things ob- " ſervable. For as King John in his letters to King " Philip begins thus, *To the moſt excellent Prince his* " *Lord*, (to be ſure, becauſe of the lands he held of " him in Normandy) *and friend if he pleaſes, Philip*; " ſo King Philip in his anſwer to King John ſtiles " him, *his ſpecial friend*; both which laſt expreſſions " ſeem to relate to the antient league or friendſhip " between the two Nations, which by King John's " late ſubmiſſion to England had been in ſome mea- " ſure broken. But what puts the matter out of all " doubt, is the ratification of this ſame treaty made " by King John, which plainly narrates their con- " ſtant, ſincere, and inviolable attachment to one " another (75)."

(70) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 601.

(71) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 484, 485.

(72) Book 2. pag. 315.

(73) Yet, Mezeray, *Abregé de l'Hiſt. de France*, tom. 2. p. 782, ſays, that Philip induced King John, already half perſuaded by the Scots, who could not bear to be ſubject to the Engliſh, to break the treaty he had made with King Edward, and to enter into an alliance with France.

(74) See above, note [C].

(75) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 485, 486.

none of them to ſtay, but ſuch as took an oath to aſſiſt him againſt their own King and countrymen [*AA*]. He ſoon after ſhook off entirely the yoke of the Engliſh, and gave notice of it by a letter to King Edward [*BB*], who was then upon the point of ſending his forces againſt the French; but fearing leſt the Scots ſhould make a dangerous diverſion, he altered his mind, and reſolved to attack and ſubdue them, before he went beyond ſea. Baliol had at firſt ſome advantage over King Edward; and depending upon his ally the King of France, he was in hopes of being powerfully aſſiſted. In the mean time he put himſelf at the head of a numerous army, and went to meet King Edward, who had already made himſelf maſter of Berwick, and was marching towards Dumbar. King John was reſolved to determine by a deciſive battle, whether he ſhould live in ſlavery, or be free. But the event was not favourable for him; his army was routed [*CC*], and not only fled before Edward, but even diſbanded and left the field. So that the King of England at the head of his triumphant army, which by freſh recruits from Wales and Ireland grew every day ſtronger and more formidable, had nothing elſe to do, but to receive the ſubmiſſion of thoſe on his road. The weak and cowardly King John, and the diſpirited few, that continued to attend him, retired immediately upon the loſs of the battle of Dumbar, and left all the South and North, as far as the country of Angus, open to the prevailing power, which they had neither heads nor hearts to oppoſe; tho' they might poſſibly have found ſome means to retrieve their affairs [*DD*]. But King John was perſuaded, either by his own fear, or by thoſe about him, as mean ſpirited as himſelf, or, as Boethius ſays (*y*), "by the fair deluding promiſes of King Edward, to come on the ſeventh of "July to that Prince, then at a place called Strowkathiack, without any ſtate, only "mounted upon a little nag, with a white rod in his hand, according to the cuſtom of "ſurrenderers, and, as was previouſly agreed, to implore the mercy of his ſuperior Lord, "and to renounce the unlawful confederacies (*ſo he was pleaſed to expreſs himſelf*) he had "made "ſelves, and all the inhabitants of our Kingdom, as "well for the lands we held of you in your King-"dom, as for your pretended government over us "us (77)." This declaration did extremely provoke the Engliſh; King Edward cauſed it to be recorded for preſervation, and thoſe about him inſulted and abuſed the bearer moſt ſcurrilouſly; inſomuch, that according to Buchanan (78), he hardly eſcaped home with his life, and owed his ſafety more to the contempt they ſhewed to his perſon, than to the reſpect that was due to his quality of a meſſenger, or to his character of a Prieſt, for none but a church-man durſt go on ſo dangerous a meſſage.

(*y*) *Ubi ſupra*, fol. 294.

[*AA*] *But ſuch as took an oath to aſſiſt him againſt their own King and countrymen.*] "This, ſays Mr. Tyr-"rel (74), was fooliſhly contrived; for how could a "forced oath oblige others, when the Scots themſelves "had broke their oath of fealty to King Edward, on "pretence that it was impoſed upon them againſt their "conſents?" Mr. Abercromby ſays upon this (75), "I am much of the ſame opinion, and am very apt "to think, that no Government ever was, or can be "ſecured by impoſition of oaths. All ſubjects are by "the law of God and nature obliged to be loyal, and "as a man of honour and conſcience will be ſo, whe-"ther he has ſworn to it or not; ſo thoſe of no prin-"ciples, that dare to rebel, will dare to be perjured: "Wherefore ſince it is plain, that an unlawful oath "binds no body, and lawful ones no ill man, it fol-"lows that no body is bound by oaths." But with that Gentleman's leave, we may obſerve that his enumeration is not complete. I own, that oaths are not neceſſary for men of a ſtrict conſcience, nor for men of no conſcience at all. But do theſe two claſſes take up all mankind? How many men are there, who do not ſcruple to do an unlawful action, which they would not do for the world, if they were bound by an oath? And in this claſs we may rank the greateſt part of mankind; whence it follows, that oaths are binding upon the greateſt part of mankind.

(74) Vol. 3. pag. 92.

(75) Vol. 3. pag. 92.

(76) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 489.

[*BB*] *King John's Letter to King Edward.*] It is as follows: "To the Magnificent Prince Edward, by the "grace of God, King of England, John by the ſame "grace, King of Scotland. Whereas you, and others "of your Kingdom, have purpoſely, knowingly, no-"toriouſly and frequently done, by your violent power, "intolerable injuries, grievous contempts, and enor-"mous damages to us, and the liberties of our King-"dom, againſt God and juſtice, citing us at your plea-"ſure, upon every ſlight ſuggeſtion, out of our King-"dom, unduly vexing us, ſeizing our caſtles, lands, "and poſſeſſions unjuſtly, and for no fault of ours, "taking the goods of our ſubjects, as well by ſea, as "by land, and carried them into your Kingdom, "killing our Merchants, deſtroying their trade, and "taking away and impriſoning our ſubjects: for the "reformation of which things, though we ſent our "meſſengers to you, yet they remain not only unre-"dreſſed, but there is every day an addition of worſe; "for now you are come with a great army upon our "borders, to diſinherit us, and the inhabitants of our "Kingdom, and proceeding forwards have inhumanly "committed many ſlaughters, burnings, and inſults by "land and ſea; we therefore, unable to bear theſe "injuries, grievances and damages, or to remain in "your fealty and homage extorted by your violent "oppreſſion, do hereby return them to you for our

(77) Abercromby. *ubi ſupra*, pag. 492.

(78) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 257.

[*CC*] *His army was routed.*] This diſaſter was owing, ſay the Scots Authors, to the revolt of the Bruces. They not only acted above board in conjunction with the invaders, who had their private friends every where over the Kingdom, eſpecially at Court, and in the Army; who believing that the only way to ſet the Crown upon the head of Robert Bruce Earl of Carrick, (the ſon of him, who was one of John Baliol's competitors, and who was now dead) was to ſerve King Edward, and to betray King John, put this laſt and his Council upon wrong meaſures, and when they came to action, to deſerted, or lay by idle and inglorious ſpectators, of their own diſgrace, and their country's ſubjection. But treaſon is ſeldom rewarded, but, as it deſerves, with ſcorn and diſappointment. When upon the repeated overthrow of his countrymen, Robert Bruce, now ſure that King Edward would carry all before him, deſired he would be pleaſed to perform his promiſe, and make him King, he received this mortifying anſwer, by which all his hopes were defeated. *What*, ſaid King Edward in French, the language he beſt liked, and generally uſed, *do you think, that I have nothing elſe to do, but to conquer Kingdoms for you?* There is ſomething in theſe expreſſions ſo ſevere, that neither of the Bruces could ever forget them; and the time came, when the younger had the double pleaſure of ſatiated revenge and ſatisfied ambition (79), as we ſhall ſee in another place.

(79) Idem, ibid. pag. 493, 494.

[*DD*] *They might poſſibly have found ſome means to retrieve their affairs.*] The Nobility and Gentry were not all cut off, as appeared by their frequent meeting afterwards at Berwick; and there were ſtill a great many ſtrong holds in the different parts of the Kingdom, which had they been garriſoned, might have ſtopped the enemy's progreſs, and ſpun out the campaign. Beſides had the *fiery Croſs* been ſet about, as was ordinary in thoſe days, it is not to be ſuppoſed, but that in leſs than a fortnight the High-lands alone, being as yet in the hands of the Government, might have ſent to the field an army capable, if well commanded, to diſpute paſſes, lay ambuſcades, cut off parties, fall upon

" made with the King of France, in his own name, and in that of his ſon, and ſubjects, " againſt his due homage, and the fealty he had ſworn to the King of England." It ſeems, he believed this was all the atonement, which would be required of him, and that by ſubmitting again to the yoke, which he had ſo unſucceſsfully endeavoured to caſt off, he ſhould be continued what he was before, a vaſſal King. But he was miſtaken, for three weeks after he was commanded to attend King Edward at Brechin, where death being threaten'd, ſays Boethius (z), or a total ſurrender of his Crown and Dignity, he choſe to do the laſt; for what elſe could be expected of his ſervile mind, ſo long accuſtomed to ſubmiſſion?" On July 10, 1296 (*aa*), he made a ſolemn, and as he was forced to call it, a *willing* reſignation [*EE*] of himſelf, his whole Kingdom of Scotland, his Royal Dignity, with all homages, right, and appurtenances thereto belonging, as alſo of all his lands, poſſeſſions, and goods, moveable and immoveable, into the hands of Anthony, Biſhop of Durham, who received them for and in the name of King Edward. He was now no more called King, nor conſidered as ſuch, at leaſt by King Edward, who ſent him and his ſon Edward to the Tower of London, where, notwithſtanding the violent ſtruggles, and unexampled efforts, made afterwards in their favour, they lived at the diſcretion of the Conqueror, ſubmiſſive to his pleaſure, and for ought we know, unconcerned, and perhaps unacquainted with what was doing either for or againſt them [*FF*]. The Pope (*bb*) and the King of France did exert themſelves in order to have King John reſtored to his Kingdom [*GG*], but to no purpoſe; at laſt the Pope being infinitely deſirous to have the honour of eſtabliſhing a ſolid and laſting peace between England and France, he and King Philip thought themſelves in honour and conſcience obliged, not to abandon altogether the perſon of John Baliol, and the intereſt of Scotland. Wherefore a ſort of peace was agreed to at Monſtreuil in the month of June 1299, and in purſuance of it, the Lady Margaret, ſiſter to the King of France, was conducted to England, and married to King Edward, and King John was releaſed from his confinement, and delivered to the Biſhop of Vicenza the Pope's Nuncio, upon condition, that the

(z) Ibid.

(aa) Prynne's *Collect.* p. 647.

(bb) Boniface VIII.

on ſtraglers, intercept convoys, and by continually harraſſing the grand army, tho' ever ſo numerous, to have given them work for more than one ſummer. At leaſt they ſhould have made ſome attempts of this kind, and when all endeavours had failed, the King, had he deſerved to be ſuch, would have lurked in the mountains, retreated beyond ſeas, died, or done any thing rather than what he did (79).

(79) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 494.

[*EE*] *He made a ſolemn reſignation.*] The reaſons alledged in the paper, to which King John ſet his ſeal, for this ſurrender, were the following. " Be " cauſe by evil counſel and his own ſimplicity he had " greatly offended and provoked his Lord the King of " England; had allyed himſelf, contrary to his faith " and homage, to the King of France; had aſſiſted " the latter by war and otherwiſe, defied the former, " put himſelf out of his faith and homage, and ſent " an army into England to burn, ſpoil, plunder, kill " and commit other miſchiefs; fortifying the King- " dom of Scotland, King Edward's own fee or ſeig- " nority againſt him; putting garriſons into the " towns and caſtles, &c. For all which tranſgreſſi- " ons his Lord the King of England, having entered " Scotland by force, as he had a right to do, as Lord " of the Fee, had conquered and taken it, notwith- " ſtanding all he, King John, could do againſt him." To this Act the great Seal of Scotland was put; which being of no further uſe in the opinion of the Engliſh, was forthwith broken, and a new Seal was contrived for the purpoſes in hand (80).

(80) Idem, ibid. pag. 495.

[*FF*] *What was doing either for or againſt them.*] It ſeems however by ſome Bulls of the Pope, not only that he owned King John notwithſtanding his impriſonment and abdication; but alſo that that Prince, as inſenſible as he was of reputation and honour, kept ſtill ſome correſpondence abroad, and continued as far as he could to act as a King. If ſo, what is confidently aſſerted by ſome authors, may be true; *viz.* that Sir William Wallace was by King John's Commiſſion, as well as by the election of the Community of Scotland, made Regent or Guardian of the Kingdom under him (81). This great man at firſt commanded in chief thoſe of the Scots, who had not yet ſubmitted to King Edward. But diviſions and parties ariſing among the Nobility, and ſeveral falling off, or lying by quiet and unconcerned, they all became an eaſy prey to the King of England, who on the 22d of July 1296, routed their forces at Falkirk. The conſequence of this battle was as unlucky as the battle itſelf; for Sir William Wallace, under whoſe conduct the Scots, if united among themſelves, had been unconquerable, laid down his Command. Yet ſtill he kept up a party of brave men, who would never part with him, nor ceaſe to do all the miſchief they could (and they did a great deal) both to the Engliſh, as ſuch of the Scots as acted by Engliſh influence. Neither did the generality of the Nation ſubmit on this occaſion; on the contrary they reſolved upon death or liberty, modelled themſelves into a regular Government, and made Sir John Cumine, ſirnamed the *Red*, Lord of Badenoch, their Governor; a brave man, of high birth and a great eſtate, and a good Officer (82). Another proof that the Scots did not entirely forget their unfortunate Prince, is that when in the year 1300 they came to treat about a peace with King Edward, they required that he would permit John Baliol and his ſon to reign over them, and reſtore them to their own eſtates (83). This ſhews, that theſe unfortunate Princes had yet friends left, who were deſirous to have them reſtored, though they themſelves perhaps had not a ſoul great enough to be affected with it.

(81) Ibid. pag. 502.

(82) Ibid. pag. 504.

(83) Ibid. pag. 507.

[*GG*] *The Pope did exert himſelf in order to have King John reſtored.*] He directed a monitory Bull to him, in which he repreſented, that " Scotland never was nor is " a Fee of England; that both himſelf and his Fa- " ther Henry III had owned this. His father, becauſe " by his Letters-patent he ratified, that he had receiv- " ed auxiliary troops from his ſon-in-law Alexander " III, not as an aſſiſtance any way due to him, but " by as a ſpecial favour; himſelf, becauſe when he en- " treated the ſame King Alexander to be preſent at his " coronation, he declared alſo by his Letters, that he " aſk'd it as a ſpecial favour, to which King Alexander " was no ways obliged. That when the King of the " Scots did the uſual homage to him for his Engliſh poſ- " ſeſſion of Tyndale and Penrith, he publicly proteſt- " ed that as King of Scotland he was independent, " and that he held his Crown of God alone, to which " King Edward himſelf did agree. That when Alex- " ander died, leaving only a grandchild behind him, " as heireſs of the Crown, King Edward did ſollicit a " marriage between her and his own ſon Prince Ed- " ward by all methods imaginable; whereas had he been " Liege Lord of Scotland, he would have had the ward- " ſhip of the young Lady, and might have given her " in marriage to whom he pleaſed; but that on the " contrary there were Guardians of the Kingdom at " that time, tho' not appointed, yet owned by him." He then ſhews by the articles of marriage, that were agreed to by King Edward, that the Kingdom of Scotland was then by himſelf acknowledged to be independent. He proved the ſame by the manner in which he had accepted to be arbitrator between the competitors to the Kingdom. Then he adds, " That when the

the * Pope might direct and order what he pleaſed concerning his perſon, and the eſtate he had in England, ſaving to King Edward and his heirs, their title to the Kingdom of Scotland, its inhabitants, appurtenances, &c. [*HH*]. This releaſing of John Baliol, and the freedom granted to him, did not in the leaſt alter or influence the affairs of Scotland, nor reſtore the unhappy Prince to his Throne; for though ſome of the Scots ſeemed ſtill to follow his party (*cc*), yet the greateſt part of the Nation deſpiſed him, as a weak man, who had neither genius nor courage, which he had ſufficiently ſhewn by ſtooping twice to kneel down before the King of England, ſo that being entirely abandoned, he retired into France, probably upon the eſtate he had there, and lived the remaining part of his days in a private manner (*dd*). He died in the year 1314 (*ee*). We ſhall give his character in the Note [*II*].

* *Fœder. Angl.* tom. 2. p. 840, 847, &c.

(*cc*) Abercromby, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 495-507.

(*dd*) Mezeray, *Hiſt. de France*, tom. 2. p. 796.

(*ee*) *Fœder. Angl.* tom. 3. p. 506. *apud* Abercromby, tom. 2. pag. 2.

" Legates were ſent into England by the Apoſtolick " See, to exerciſe their functions, they could not upon " that pretence proceed to do the ſame in Scotland; " nor was ever a Legate admitted, or ought to be ad- " mitted into that Kingdom, unleſs he brought ſpe- " cial Letters from the Pope to the King of Scotland, " which had been needleſs, if Scotland had been a Fee " of England, or the King of Scots ſubject to the King " of England. . . . In fine he abſolutely condemns the " deſign and intention of the King of England to ſub- " due Scotland, eſpecially at a time when it wanted a " Head, and admoniſhed him ſharply to withdraw his " arms from thence and to leave the Scots to their own " liberties and laws. Adding withal, that if he had " any equitable plea to alledge for himſelf, he ſhould " appear before him by his Embaſſadors within ſix " months, and that he would take care to do juſtice to " both parties (84)." This Bull was delivered to King Edward the 25th of Auguſt 1300, that is above four years after he had King John in his power, and tho' the Pope does not require of him directly to reſtore that King; yet he inſinuates it enough, ſince he ſharply admoniſhes him to withdraw his forces out of Scotland, and to let the Scots enjoy their liberty.

(84) Ibid. pag. 508-510.

[*HH*] *Saving to King Edward and his heirs their title to the Kingdom of Scotland &c.*] The reaſon given for this *ſalvo* was, becauſe he, John Baliol, for Edward would not give him the title of King, had committed many inhuman treſpaſſes and treaſons againſt his ſovereign Lord, contrary to his homage and fealty; and afterwards had abdicated and renounced all the right and title he ever had to the Kingdom. He might have added, that but three years before, he had declared by a writing under his hand and ſeal, that when he was upon the Throne, he had found ſuch malice, fraud, treaſon and deceit in the Scots, who deſigned to have made away with his perſon, that he would never have any more to do with them. " What is it, *ſays here-* " *upon Mr. Abercromby* (85), one of his daſtardly tem- " per would not, when a priſoner, and in continual " apprehenſions of death, be perſuaded to declare?"

(85) Ibid. pag. 505.

[*II*] *We ſhall give his character in the Note.*] When a ſubject, he was ſo to no leſs than three different Sovereigns; to the King of France for the great eſtate that had been delivered down to him by his Norman anceſtors; to the King of England on account of the many Baronies he ſucceeded to in that Kingdom; to the King of Scotland, by reaſon of his Lordſhip of Galloway, from whence he was moſt commonly deſigned. Happy if he had continued in that elevated tho' private ſtate; but it was his misfortune and that of Scotland that he came to be King. His head was not fitted to wear a Crown, nor had he hands capable of ſwaying a Scepter. King Edward, a penetrating and deſigning Prince, beyond any perhaps at that time in the world, eaſily diſcovered his foible, and it is probable that the greateſt merit he ſaw in him, was that he had none at all (86). And if he really ſigned the Declaration, which we have mention'd above (87), voluntarily, of his own accord, and without the privity of King Edward, he was not only the moſt weak, but the moſt ungrateful man in the world. To ſpeak properly, he never was a King, becauſe as ſuch, he owned himſelf a Vaſſal. Yet the Scots, though not all, had received him, and done what they could to make him a King in earneſt, by freeing him from ſubjection. He and they were defeated in the attempt, probably by his fault. He had given a proof of his incapacity and raſhneſs, and perhaps of his cowardice and faint heartedneſs, when he ſuffered himſelf to be drawn into a meeting with King Edward; whereas he ſhould by all means have kept out of the way, and either died or preſerved himſelf free, till a more favourable opportunity ſhould offer. He had certainly found one in the courage and loyalty of his ſubjects, who, tho' he had proceeded to make a baſe ſurrender of himſelf and them, and was actually a priſoner in the Tower of London, yet ſtood up for him, and acted in his name all thoſe things, which their poſterity muſt neceſſarily be proud of, as long as they ſhall laſt (88). In a word, he was a weak man, but not a wicked man, as appears by his whole conduct. P.

(86) Ibid. pag. 477, 478.

(87) Note [*HH*].

(88) Idem, ibid. pag. 506.

☞ BALL (JOHN), Author of ſeveral Treatiſes in Divinity [*A*], was born at Caſſington or Cherſington near Woodſtock in Oxfordſhire in the beginning of October 1585. He was educated in grammar learning at a private ſchool under the Vicar of Yarnton near Caſſington. He was entered a Student at Brazen Noſe College in Oxford in 1602, where he continued under a ſevere Diſcipline and Tutor about five years, in the condition of a Servitor; from whence he removed to St. Mary Hall, where he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1608. He was invited ſoon after into Cheſhire, to be Tutor to the children of the Lady Cholmondely, where he ſtaid for ſome time, and contracted an acquaintance with ſeveral ſtrict Puritans, who gained ſo far upon his affections, that they brought him over to their party. He afterwards went up to London, where he procured

[*A*] *Author of ſeveral treatiſes in Divinity.*] I. *A ſhort Treatiſe containing all the principal grounds of Chriſtian Religion, &c.* There were fourteen editions of this piece publiſhed before the year 1632. It was tranſlated into the Turkiſh language by Mr. William Seaman, an Engliſh Traveller. II. *A Treatiſe of Faith, in two parts. The firſt ſhewing the Nature, the ſecond the Life of Faith &c.* London 1631, in 4to, and 1637 in 4to, the third edition. There is a Preface before this work in commendation of it by Mr. Rich. Sibbes. III. *Friendly Trial of the Grounds tending to Separation, in a plain and modeſt diſpute touching the Unlawfulneſs of ſtinted Liturgy and ſet Form of Common-Prayer; Communion in mixt Aſſemblies, and the primitive Subject and firſt Receptacle of the Power of the Keys, &c.* Cambridge 1640 in 4to. The imperfect draught of this book was firſt made for the ſatisfaction of Mr. Richard Knightley, which by the importunity of ſeveral Miniſters and others was afterwards enlarged into this Treatiſe. IV. *An Anſwer to two Treatiſes of Mr. John Can, the Leader of the Engliſh Browniſts in Amſterdam.* The former is called, *A Neceſſity of Separation from the Church of England proved by the Nonconformiſts principles.* And the other, *A Stay againſt ſtraying; wherein, in oppoſition to Mr. John Robinſon, he undertakes to prove the Unlawfulneſs of hearing the Miniſters of the Church of England.* Mr. Ball's book was publiſhed by Mr. Simeon Aſh at London 1642 in 4to. After our author had finiſhed this Treatiſe, he undertook a large work upon the Church, in which he propoſed

cured himſelf to be ordained a Miniſter by an Iriſh Biſhop, without ſubſcription. He removed then to Staffordſhire, and was appointed Curate of Whitmore, a Chapel of eaſe near Stoke, where he lived in a very mean manner, in an obſcure village, upon an allowance of 20 *l. per annum*. He taught ſchool likewiſe, in order the better to ſupport himſelf. Mr. Baxter tells us (*a*), that *he deſerved as high eſteem and honour as the beſt Biſhop in England, yet looking after no higher things, but living comfortably and proſperouſly with theſe.* He was accounted a learned and pious man, who had done great ſervice to the public; and though he was a little diſaffected to the Ceremonies and Diſcipline of the Church of England, yet he wrote againſt thoſe, who imagined that this was any juſt ground for a ſeparation. He died the 20th of October 1640, and was buried in the Chapel of Whitmore (*b*).

(*a*) See his book intitled, *An unſavoury Volume of Mr. John Crandon's anatomiz'd*, London 1654, Sect. 1. pag. 6.

(*b*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 1. Col. 636, 637, 638. 2d edit. London 1721.

poſed to examine into the Nature of Schiſm, and to treat of the principal controverſies concerning the Eſſence and principal Government of the viſible Church. He left fifty ſheets of this work finiſhed. He was cenſured by ſome perſons on account of his *Anſwer to Mr. John Can* and his *Friendly Trial*, for receding in ſome meaſure from his former inconformity to the Church, and for deſerting the cauſe of the Nonconformiſts. However they aſſert, that he refuſed to comply with ſome things, which were excepted to in the Church of England; ſo that tho' he argued in theſe pieces againſt aggravating and multiplying the objections of corruptions, and that theſe were not a ſufficient reaſon for affirming ſet forms to be unlawful, and ſeparating from the public worſhip of the Church; yet he acknowledged ſome things to be exceptionable in the Engliſh Liturgy. But, as Mr. Wood obſerves (1), he died fully ſatisfied in the juſtneſs of that cauſe, which he ſo well defended againſt Separation. V. *Trial of the new Church-way in New-England and Old &c.* London, 1644, in 4to. VI. *Treatiſe of the Covenant of Grace.* London, 1645 in 4to, publiſhed by Mr. Simeon Aſh. VII. *Of the Power of Godlineſs, both doctrinally and practically handled &c.* To this work he added ſeveral Treatiſes, as 1. *Of the Affections.* 2. *Of the ſpiritual Combate.* 3. *Of the Government of the Tongue.* 4. *Of Prayer, with an Expoſition on the Lord's Prayer*, &c. London 1657 in fol. Publiſhed by Mr. Simeon Aſh, Chaplain to the Lord Brook, and afterwards to the Earl of Mancheſter. T.

(1) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 638.

☞ BALLANDEN (*a*) (Sir JOHN), a learned man of the XVIth Century, was deſcended from an antient and honourable family. His father, Mr. Thomas Ballanden of Auchinoul, was Director of the Chancery in 1540, and Clerk Regiſter in 1541. Our author having finiſhed the courſe of his ſtudies entered into holy Orders, and was made Archdean of Murray, Canon of Roſs, and Doctor of Divinity; and in the minority of King James V was appointed Clerk-Regiſter, though he afterwards loſt that honourable poſt through the factions of the times. In the reign of Queen Mary, the daughter and ſucceſſor of that King, he was again made Clerk-Regiſter and one of the Lords of the Seſſion (*b*). He died at Rome in the year 1550, according to Dempſter (*c*), who tells us likewiſe (*d*), that by incredible ſtudy and application he attained a complete knowledge of all the ſciences. He tranſlated and wrote ſeveral Works [*A*]. George Con in his book *De duplici ſtatu Religionis apud Scotos* ſays (*e*), that he was honoured with the degree of Doctor by

(*a*) Mr. Nicholſon in his *Scotiſh Hiſtorical Library*, pag. 10. edit. London 1702, calls him *Bellenden.*

(*b*) Dr. George Mackenzie's *Lives and Characters of the moſt eminent Writers of the Scots Nation*, vol. 2. pag. 595. edit. Endinburgh 1711.

(*c*) Lib. 1. pag. 10. *apud* Mackenzie, p. 596.

(*d*) *See* Mackenzie, pag. 599.

(*e*) Lib. 2. pag. 167. *ap.* Mackenzie, pag. 600.

[*A*] *He tranſlated and wrote ſeveral works.*] At the command of King James V he tranſlated into the Scots language Hector Boethius's Hiſtory, which was printed at Edinburgh 1536 in folio, under this title, *The Hiſtory and Chronicles of Scotland; compilit, and newly correctit and amendit be the Reverend and Noble Clerk Mr. Hector Boeis, Chanon of Aberdene, tranſlated lately be Mr. John Ballenden, Archdene of Murray, and Chanon of Roſſe, at command of James the Fyfte, King of Scottis; imprintet in Edenburgh be Thomas Davidſon, dwelling fornens the Fryere-Wynde.* It is printed in the old black letter. He likewiſe tranſlated Boethius's Deſcription of Scotland, to which he prefixed a Poem of his own compoſition, intitled, *The Proem to his Coſmography*; and another Poem addreſſed to King James V, which he calls *The Probem to his Hiſtory* (1). Dempſter likewiſe tells us (2), that he publiſh'd *Albaniæ Deſcriptio*, which Dr. Mackenzie (3) ſuppoſes to be the ſame with his tranſlation of Boethius's *Deſcription of Scotland*; *Letters to King James V*, none of which are now thought to be extant (4); *Of Virtue and Pleaſure, a Dream*; which Dr. Mackenzie ſays is certainly the Proem to the Coſmography, wherein virtue and pleaſure are introduced thus entertaining King James with a Dialogue:

Ane ſilver Fontane ſprang of Watter cleir
Into that place, quhare I approachit neir;
Qu hare I did ſone eſpy ane fellown reird
Of courtly Gallandis in their beſt Maneir,
Rejoyſing them in ſeaſon of the Zeir.
As it had bene of Mayis Day the feird.
Thair gudlie Havingis maid me nocht affeird
With thaym I ſaw an crownit King appeir
With tender Downis riſing on his Beird.
Thir courtly Gallandis ſettand their Intentis
To ſing and play on divers Inſtrumentis,
According to this Princis Appetit.
Two pleſand Ladyis come pranſand oure the Bertis,
Thair coſtlie Cleithin ſchew thair mychty Rentis.
Qukat Hart mycht wis, thay wantit nochtan Myte.
The Rhubies ſhone upon their Fingaris quhite.
And finallie I knew be thair conſentis
This ane Virtue, that other hecht Delite.
Their Goddeſſes arrayit in this wyſe,
As Reverence and Honoure liſt deviſe,
Afore this Prince fell down upon thair Kneis.
Syne dreſſit thaym in thair beſt Avyſe,
(So far as Wiſdome in thair Power lyis)
To do the thing, that mycht him beſt appleis,
Quhare rejoyſit in his Hevenly Gleis,
An him deſyrit for his hie Empryis
Ane of thaym two unto his Lady cheis
And firſt Delite unto this Prince ſaid thus, &c.

(1) Dr. Mackenzie's *Lives and Characters, &c.* vol. 2. p. 596.

(2) *Apud* Mackenzie, pag. 599.

(3) Pag. 596.

(4) Idem, ibid.

He wrote likewiſe *miſcellaneous Poems*, and a Life of Pythagoras the Philoſopher. Mr. Nicholſon in his *Scotiſh Library* (5) mentioning Ballanden's Tranſlation of Boethius's Hiſtory, tells us, that it was *haſtily put into Engliſh* by William Harriſon, and printed in the firſt volume of Holinſhead's Chronicle; but that *neither of theſe have exactly kept to their text, the former abridging the original, and the latter new modelling even the Tranſlation.* And Harriſon ſpeaks thus of his own performance at the end of the thirteenth chapter: "Hitherto have I tranſlated Hector's *Deſcription of Scotland* out of the Scotiſh into the Engliſh Tongue, "being not a little aided therein by the Latin; from "whence the Tranſlator ſometimes ſwerveth not a "little, as I have done alſo from him, now and then "following the Latin, and now and then gathering "ſuch ſenſe out of both as moſt did ſtand with my "purpoſed brevity. Now will I ſet down the De-"ſcription of an ancient Pict, as I have gathered it "out of Herodian and others; and then I will give "over not only to write more at this preſent, but for "ever

(5) Pag. 10. edit. London 1702.

of the Sorbonne, and that he was a ſtrenuous oppoſer of the Reformation both by his writings and diſputes; and that Dr. Laing and he concurred in that point.

" ever hereafter of hiſtorical matters; ſith I ſee that
" this honeſt kind of recreation is denied me, and all
" time ſpent about the ſame in theſe days utterly con-
" demned, as vain and ſavouring of negligence and
" Heatheniſh impiety."
T.

BALMIS (ABRAHAM de) a Jewiſh Phyſician, born at Lecci [*A*] in the Kingdom of Naples, flouriſhed at Venice in the beginning of the XVIth Century. He wrote an *Hebrew Grammar* [*B*], which was printed in Hebrew and Latin at Venice by Daniel Bomberg, in the year 1523. He tranſlated into Latin ſeveral *Commentaries of Averroes upon Ariſtotle*, and ſome *Writings of Aven Pace*, and wrote himſelf a book *De Demonſtratione*, and another *De Subſtantiâ Orbis*. See the *Bibliotheca* of Geſner, and the *Bibliotheca Rabbinica* of Bartolocci. I muſt not omit to mention, that he taught in the Univerſity of Padua (*a*), and that he took much more pleaſure in confuting what others had ſaid, than in eſtabliſhing any thing as certain [*C*].

(*a*) Simon, *Hiſtoire Critique du Vieux Teſtament*, p. 536.

[*A*] *He was born at Lecci.*] You will find theſe words in the *Bibliotheca* of Geſner: *Ibidem* (1) *hic Author natum ſe ſcribit in Litio civitate agri Salentini, quæ à Brunduſio Hydrunto & Graia Gallipoli 24 miliaribus diſtat, eodem in loco ſitâ, ubi olim Rudiæ patria Enuii, ex reliquiis Rudiarum nacta originem* (2). I am ſurprized that neither Toppi, nor Leonard Nicodemo make any mention of him in the *Biblioteca Napolitana*.

(1) That is, in the preface to his tranſlation of the *Commentaries of Averroes in Analytica, Topica, &c. Ariſtotelis*, printed at Venice in 1523.

(2) Geſner *in Bibliotb.* fol. 1 *verſo.*

[*B*] *He wrote an* Hebrew Grammar.] He intitled it *Mikne Abram*, that is, *The Poſſeſſion of Abraham*. Father Bartholocci is miſtaken, when he ſays that Daniel Bomberg tranſlated it into Latin (3). If he had conſulted the Preface, he would have ſeen that Daniel Bomberg cauſed it to be tranſlated by others. In the firſt place he made uſe of the Author himſelf, and deſired him to tranſlate it word for word. This exactneſs was obſerved for ſome time: the Author afterwards gave himſelf a greater liberty for the ſake of elegance; after his death, Calonymos, who finiſh'd the tranſlation, took infinitely more freedom, which Bomberg did not at all oppoſe (4). This ſhews that de Balmis was not living in the year 1523. Mr. Simon ſays that the tranſlation of this Grammar *is word for word, and very barbarous* (5); that there is really but little method in this Author, but that he ſhews in other reſpects a great deal of learning, and that he detects in an infinite number of places the errors of the Grammarians, who wrote before him (6). Mr. Huet relates very faithfully what regards the Latin Tranſlation (7). He ſays that Balmis began it, and that Calos Calonymos finiſh'd it; and that the former made it barbarous and more obſcure than the original: but that the latter, by endeavouring to avoid the faults of the other, run into the contrary extreme.

(3) Julius Bartolocius, *Bibliotb. magna Rabbin.* tom. 1. pag. 34.

(4) See in *Bibliotb. Geſner.* fol. 1. a fragment of the preface, which informs us of this.

(5) Simon, *Hiſt. Critique du Vieux Teſtament*, pag. 536.

(6) Ibid. p. 278.

(7) Huet. *de claris Interpretibus*, pag. 186, 187. Mr. Baillet, *Jugemens des Savans*, tom. 1. num. 724. pag. 206. makes him ſay that this tranſlation was done by an Anonymous perſon.

[*C*] *He took much more pleaſure in confuting . . . than in eſtabliſhing any thing as certain.*] Munſter caſts this reproach upon him. *Abraham de Balmis*, ſays he (8), *nihil aliud agere mihi viſus eſt quam veterum doctrinam perpetuò convellere atque impugnare, magis infectando occupatus, quàm in docendo. At in dubium tantum vocare priſcorum præceptiones, cum interim nihil certe ſtatuas, non dicere eſt, ſed ridere.*

(8) Munſter *in Præf. Grammat. Eliæ, apud* Spizelii *Felicem Literatum*, pag. 958.

BALTHASAR (CHRISTOPHER) was a man of great learning and merit in the XVIIth Century. He applied himſelf chiefly to the ſtudy of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory, and it was this application, that gave him a great diſguſt to the Romiſh Religion, and a great deſire to embrace that of the Proteſtants. He had a conſiderable poſt in the Preſidial of Auxerre (*a*); and as he muſt either reſolve to abandon it, or not change his Religion, he was ſome time perplexed with this alternative; but at laſt his conſcience gained the aſcendant, and obliged him to leave Auxerre, his eſtate, his poſt, his relations, and friends, and go to Charenton, where he publickly joined himſelf to the Reformed Church. He continued in it till his death, and edified his brethren both by his exemplary life, and his diſcourſes. The expence, which he was obliged to be at in Paris, being too great for his circumſtances, and his converſion rendering him too obnoxious in ſuch a city as that, he thought that it was beſt to retire into ſome province; and was extremely pleaſed to find himſelf invited to Caſtres by a rich young Counſellor of the *Bipartite Court of the Edict* (*b*), who gave him a lodging in his houſe, and a proper penſion. This Counſellor thought himſelf happy to have with him a man of learning, who by his inſtructions and converſation might teach him a thouſand uſeful points of knowledge. But as Mr. Balthaſar had an inclination to labour for the public, he wiſhed to have all his time at his own diſpoſal, and for that reaſon took his leave of the Counſellor. His deſign was favoured by the National Synod of Loudun in the year 1659; for that Aſſembly granted him a penſion of 750 livres to be paid by all the Churches of France, according to the repartition that was made of them (*c*). He had prepared before that Synod was held, a conſiderable number of diſſertations upon important ſubjects, againſt Cardinal Baronius (*d*). He put four or five into the hands of a Miniſter of Caſtres, who was one of the Deputies of the Province of Upper Languedoc, and Upper Guienne. They were preſented to Mr. Daillé, Moderator of that National Synod, and one, who of all the Miniſters was the beſt able to judge of the merit of thoſe pieces. Mr. Daillé was extremely pleaſed with them, and gave a very advantageous character of them to the whole aſſembly. He carried them to Paris, where it was hoped they would be printed; for they were judged to be worth the publiſhing. But the event ſhewed, that proper meaſures were not taken, or could not be taken, for that purpoſe. The author, who was very old, and troubled with the ſtone, died. Mr. Daillé died too; and after that the Church of Caſtres ſent repeated letters to recover thoſe diſſertations, but could not even diſcover what became of them. Mr. Balthaſar left others, which were not finiſhed, and a great many collections, which conſiſted the greateſt part of them of ſeparate pieces of paper, in which he had noted down the authorities and teſtimonies, which he deſigned to make uſe of againſt Cardinal Baronius. It is a pity, that all this ſhould remain

(*a*) It was that of the King's Advocate.

(*b*) His name was Mr. de Faur.

(*c*) It was at the requeſt and upon the good teſtimony of the Synod of Upper Languedoc and Upper Guienne. He enjoyed before a penſion of 300 Livres. See the *Acts of the National Synod of Loudun* in the *Synodicon* of Mr. Quick, tom. 2. pag. 572.

(*d*) He gave them the title of *Diatribæ*. His work was in Latin.

remain in a cheſt in the poſſeſſion of I know not who (e). Mr. Balthaſar wrote well in Latin: his *Panegyric of Mr. Fouquet* is in a fine ſtyle. I have ſeen nothing but that of his, and I cannot tell whether he publiſhed any thing elſe. If he had been leſs ſcrupulous about the language, he might have made a greater progreſs in his criticiſm upon Baronius. I am of opinion however that there is ſomething of the hyperbole in what is reported of his ſcrupuloſity about the Latin [A]. I think that is more probable, which is related concerning his credulity with regard to Witchcraft [B].

(e) Taken from a Memorial communicated by Mr. de la Deveze, formerly Miniſter of Caſtres, and at preſent of the Hague.

[A] *There is ſomething of the hyperbole in what is reported of his ſcrupuloſity about the Latin.*] Among ſeveral pieces which the Abbe de Marolles publiſhed in the latter part of his life, there is one that contains *the names of thoſe who had given him their books, or who had honoured him extraordinarily with their civilities.* It is there that we find what follows. "Chriſtopher Balthaſar, who had written ſo many collections with his own hand for divers hiſtorical manuſcript Treatiſes. He deſigned to make Animadverſions upon the Annals of Baronius; but he began too late, and had not yet formed his ſtyle, intending beſides to give it too elegant a turn, ſo that he could not write above one entire page of his book in a day, though he was then above ſixty three years of age." If the Abbe de Marolles had mentioned the time which he had in view, we ſhould have known at what age Mr. Balthaſar procured his penſion from the Synod of Loudun.

[B] *What is related concerning his credulity with regard to witchcraft.*] The ſame Abbot of Marolles ſupplies me with the whole commentary upon this text. The paſſage is pretty long, yet I ſhall not abridge it: what will not ſerve for one thing will ſerve for another. "Let us return now to our cabinet, where in a company of learned men, there happened one day to be Mr. Balthaſar preſent, who is ſo well verſed in the knowledge of Hiſtory, and Mr. de Sorbieres, whoſe affability and learning likewiſe deſerve much commendation; the one, who of a Catholick eſpouſed the pretended reformed Religion (1), and the other, who of a Proteſtant returned to the Catholick Church. Upon which the former being attacked, becauſe it was difficult to comprehend the motives of his change, conſidering his great knowledge and genius, he ſaid, that he was induced to it by the perſuaſion, which he had conceived, that in the other Communion there was more purity and ſimplicity than in ours; that they had reſtored the holy liberty of the Goſpel, under the mild yoke of the faith of our Lord's promiſes; and that they had removed abuſes and ſuperſtition, and placed in the room of them a worſhip conformable to the uſage of the primitive church. The ſeveral parts of his anſwer were conteſted with him; but this proving to no purpoſe, other points were diſcourſed of; and from the ſubject of miracles, the debate came to that of a great many ſtories, which are told about Sorcerers, and various apparitions, which are ſcarce believed even by children. By which it appeared that he, who had teſtified his averſion to ſuperſtition, admitted it in ſome meaſure out of a great credulity with regard to ſuch things as theſe. Beſides having explained himſelf upon the idle conjectures of Aſtrologers, he ſhewed that he paid too great a regard to them, as well as to the predictions of Noſtradamus in his Centuries, than which there is nothing imaginable ſo barbarous. This was the judgment of the whole company, in which were preſent the Abbe Talman (2), who has ſo fine a genius, Mr. Bandelot (3) Abbe de Maiſſai, and the Abbe de Verdus, who are ſo free from popular errors, with Mr. de la Herpiniere of Blois, who is ſo judicious in all his ſentiments, Monſieur de Marſay le Boſſu, Governor of Gien, who knows ſo many good things, and delivers them in ſo noble a manner, and ſome other perſons, whereof one only attempted to maintain the opinion which had been exploded (4)."

(1) The *Memoires de l'Abbe de Marolles* were printed off the 5th of January 1656. So that Mr. Balthaſar muſt have made his abjuration in 1655 at fartheſt.

(2) He ſhould have ſaid *Tallemant.*

(3) He ſhould have ſaid *Bourdelot.*

(4) L'Abbe de Marolles, *Memoires*, p. 276.

☞BALUZE (STEPHEN) was born at Tulles in the year 1631. He ſhewed when he was very young the ſigns of a very lively genius, and which at the ſame time was capable of proſecuting thoſe ſtudies, that are leaſt agreeable, with an unwearied application. After he had begun his ſtudies at Tulles, he went to Toulouſe to continue them, where he obtain'd an allowance in the College of St. Martial (a). He began then to compoſe ſome of his Works, which afterwards raiſed him a great reputation [A]. In 1656 Mr. de Marca Archbiſhop of Toulouſe invited him to Paris (b); which invitation Mr. Baluze conſidered as a mark of diſtinction, and thought that nothing could be more advantageous to himſelf than to engage in the ſervice of a Prelate of ſuch diſtinguiſhed merit and ſo great intereſt at Court as Mr. de Marca. The

(a) Niceron, *Memoires pour ſervir à l'Hiſt. des Hommes Illuſtres*, tom. 1. pag. 194. edit. de Paris 1727.

(b) Du Pin, *Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccleſ.* tom. 19. pag. 1. edit. Amſterd. 1715.

[A] *Began then to compoſe ſome of his works, which afterwards raiſed him a great reputation.*] We ſhall give here a Catalogue of his works. I. *Antifrizonius:* printed at Toulouſe 1652 in 12mo. This piece is a critique upon the errors of Peter Frizon, a Doctor of Sorbonne, in a work of his intitled, *Gallia purpurata*, publiſh'd in 1638 (1). II. *Diſſertation ſur le temps &c.* That is, "A Diſſertation concerning the time when S. Sadroc (in Latin *Sacerdos*), Biſhop of Limoges lived." Tulles 1655 in 12mo. III. *Diſſertatio de Sanctis Claro, Laudo, Ulfardo, Baumado, quorum ſacræ reliquiæ ſervantur in Cathedrali Eccleſia Tutelenſi apud Lemovices:* i. e. "A Diſſertation concerning the Relicks of St. Clair, St. Lo, St. Ulfard, and St. Baumade, which are preſerved in the Cathedral of Tulles in the Dioceſe of Limoges:" Tulles 1656 in 8vo, IV. *Petri de Marca de Concordia Sacerdotii & Imperii; ſeu de Libertatibus Eccleſiæ Gallicanæ Libri VIII, à Stephano Baluzio emendati:* i. e. "Peter de Marca's eight books concerning the Agreement of the Empire and Prieſthood corrected by Stephen Baluze." Paris 1663, 1669, and 1704 in fol. The laſt edition contains ſeveral curious remarks of Mr. Baluze in anſwer to thoſe Writers, who had attacked the ſentiments of Mr. la Marca (2). V. *Salviani Maſſilienſis & Vincentii Lirinenſis opera cum Notis:* i. e. "The Works of Salvian of Marſeilles and Vincentius Lirinenſis, with Notes:" Paris 1669 and 1684 in 8vo. The laſt edition is the beſt. VI. *Servati Lupi Preſbyteri & Abbatis Ferrarienſis Opera:* i. e. "The Works of Servatus Lupus Prieſt and Abbot of Ferrieres:" Paris 1664 in 8vo. The difficult paſſages in this Author are explained by the judicious Notes of Mr. Baluze. VII. *S. Agobardi Archiepiſcopi Lugdunenſis Opera.* Item, *Epiſtolæ & Opuſcula Leidradi & Amulonis Arch. Lugd. Notis illuſtrata:* i. e. "The Works of St. Agobard Archbiſhop of Lyons; and the Epiſtles and Tracts of Leidradus and Amulo Archbiſhops of Lyons; illuſtrated with Notes:" Paris 1666, two volumes in 8vo. VIII. *Concilia Galliæ Narbonenſis cum Notis:* i. e. "The Councils of Gallia Narbonenſis with Notes: Paris 1668 in 8vo. IX. *S. Cæſarii Arelatenſis Epiſcopi Homiliæ 14, Notis illuſtratæ:* i. e. "Fourteen Homilies of St. Ceſarius Biſhop of Arles, illuſtrated with Notes:" Paris 1669 in 8vo. X. *Reginonis Abbatis Prumienſis libri duo de Eccleſiaſticis Diſciplinis & Religione Chriſtianâ. Acceſſit Rhabani Archiep. Moguntini Epiſtola ad Heribaldum Epiſc. Antiſſiodorenſem, cum Notis.* Paris 1672 in 8vo. This piece contains the Abbot Regino's two Books concerning Eccleſiaſtical Diſcipline and the Chriſtian Religion; and the Letter of Rabanus Archbiſhop of Mentz to Heribaldus, with Mr. Baluze's Notes. XI. *Ant. Auguſtini Archiep. Tarraconenſis Dialogorum libri duo,*

(1) Niceron, *ubi ſupra*, pag. 200. *and* Du Pin, *Biblioth.* tom. 19. pag. 1.

(2) Niceron, p. 200, 201.

The Archbiſhop had the greateſt eſteem for and confidence in him imaginable. But upon his death, which happen'd June 29, 1662, Mr. Baluze was oblig'd to ſeek for another patron. He was agreeably prevented by Mr. le Tellier, afterwards Chancellor of France, who having a deſign to engage him in the ſervice of his ſon the Abbé le Tellier, who was afterwards Archbiſhop of Rheims, made him ſeveral noble preſents, which he always mentioned with the utmoſt gratitude. But divers particular incidents in the mean while preventing the ſucceſs of this affair, Mr. Colbert took the opportunity of Mr. Baluze's want of an employment, and made him his Library-keeper, after he had obtained Mr. le Tellier's leave to accept of that place; in which he continued till Mr. Colbert's death; when not finding the ſame ſatisfaction under the Archbiſhop of Roan, to whom that Library fell, he left that employment. It was to his care and advice, that we owe the excellent collection of Manuſcripts and other Books, which are to be found in that Library (*c*). In 1670 he was appointed Profeſſor of Canon Law in the Royal College; which Profeſſorſhip was founded by the King upon his account (*d*). The Abbé Faget in 1668 had publiſhed ſeveral Works of the Archbiſhop de Marca, to whom he was related, and prefixed to them the life of that Prelate, in which he ſaid, that the Archbiſhop at his death had ordered Mr. Baluze to put all his papers into the hands of the Preſident de Marca his ſon. This paſſage raiſed the reſentments of Mr. Baluze, who vindicated himſelf in ſeveral ſevere letters, which he wrote againſt the Abbé Faget. The Abbé's anſwers to them were equally paſſionate, and full of perſonal reflections, that did no honour to either party. Theſe letters were printed in the edition of the Diſſertations publiſhed by the Abbé Faget, and reprinted in Holland in 1669. The public was the more ſurprized at this piece of conduct in Mr. Baluze, becauſe he was remarkable for an eaſy and humane temper, and a very agreeable and polite converſation. He reſolved to continue down to poſterity the memory of his diſpute with the Abbé, by inſerting it into his life of Mr. de Marca, prefixed to his new edition of that Prelate's book *De Concordia Sacerdotii & Imperii*. In the year 1693 he publiſhed *The Lives of the Popes of Avignon*; on account of which the King gave him a penſion, and appointed him Director of the Royal College. But he did not long enjoy theſe favours from the Court; for having attached himſelf for ſome time to the Cardinal Bouillon, who had engaged him to write

(c) Niceron, p. 195, 196.

(d) Du Pin, p. 3, 2.

du, de emendatione Gratiani, cum Notis: i. e. "Two "Books of Ant. Auguſtinus Archbiſhop of Tarragon "concerning the Correction of Gratian with Notes:" Paris 1672 in 8vo. XII. *Petri Caſtellani Magni Franciæ Eleemoſynarii Vita, Auctore Petro Gallandio, &c.* i. e. "The Life of Peter Caſtellanus, Grand "Almoner of France, by Peter Gallandius, now firſt "publiſhed with Notes by Stephen Baluze, who has "added two Sermons of Caſtellanus upon the Fune-"ral of King Francis I." Paris 1674 in 8vo. XIII. *Marii Mercatoris Opera cum Notis:* i. e. "The Works "of Marius Mercator with Notes." Paris 1684 in 8vo. This work and the preceding are accurately reviſed by the MSS. and illuſtrated with Notes, which ſhew Mr. Baluze's prodigious knowledge in Hiſtory, eſpecially that of the middle Age. XIV. *Miſcellanea, hoc eſt, Collectio veterum monumentorum, quæ hactenus latuerunt, in variis codicibus ac bibliothecis:* i. e. "Miſ-"cellanies, that is, a Collection of the ancient pieces, "which have hitherto lain concealed in divers Manu-"ſcripts and Libraries:" Paris, ſeven volumes in 8vo. The firſt was publiſhed in 1678, the ſecond in 1679, the third in 1680, the fourth in 1683, the fifth in 1700, the ſixth in 1713, and the ſeventh in 1715. This Collection is very much eſteemed, and contains ſeveral curious pieces. XV. *Capitularia Regum Francorum. Additæ ſunt Marculfi Monachi & aliorum formulæ veteres & notæ doctiſſimorum virorum:* i. e. "The Capitularies of the Kings of France; to which "are added the old Formularies of Marculfus the "Monk and others, with the Notes of ſeveral learn-"ed men:" Paris 1677, fol. in two volumes (3). This Collection contains ſeveral capitularies never publiſh'd before. Mr. Baluze has corrected them with great accuracy, and has given us an account in his Preface of the original and authority of the ſeveral collections of the Capitularies. The Kings of France held anciently every year a large aſſembly, in which all the public affairs were treated. It was compoſed of all the conſiderable perſons among the Clergy and Laity, Biſhops, Abbots, and Counts. It was in the preſence and by the advice of this Aſſembly, that the Kings made their Conſtitutions, which were read aloud; and after the Aſſembly had given their conſent, every perſon ſubſcribed. Theſe Conſtitutions being abridg'd and reduced under proper heads were called *Capitula* or *Chapters*, and a Collection of ſeveral articles was ſtiled a *Capitulary*. They may be diſtinguiſh'd into three kinds, according to the ſubjects of them. Thoſe, which treat of eccleſiaſtical affairs were generally taken from the Canons, and had the ſanction of the Biſhop's authority, and therefore might be conſidered of the ſame force as the Canons. Thoſe, which contained general regulations in civil affairs, had properly the real force of laws. And thoſe, which related only to certain perſons and certain occaſions, were only to be conſidered as particular regulations. The authority of theſe Capitularies was always very great. They were conſtantly obſerved in the moſt exact manner in all the Empire of the Francs, that is, in almoſt all Europe during the reigns of Charlemagne, Lewis the Debonnaire, and his ſons. The Biſhops tranſcribed them in their Councils, and even the Popes were ambitious to follow them, as appears by a Letter of Leo IV to the Emperor Lotharius, mentioned by Yvo of Chartres and Gratian. They were for a long time in force in Germany as well as in France, and the uſe of them was not interrupted till the beginning of the third race of the Kings of France. Mr. Baluze has added to theſe Capitularies the ancient Formularies of Marculfus; thoſe of an anonymous author; thoſe publiſhed by Father Sirmond and Mr. Bignon; a new Collection of Formularies extracted from divers old Manuſcripts; and thoſe of the promotion of Biſhops publiſh'd by Father Sirmond in the ſecond volume of the Councils of France (4). XVI. *Lucii Cæcilii Firmiani Lactantii Liber ad Donatum Confeſſorem de Mortibus perſecutorum; nunc primum prodit opera & ſtudio Stephani Baluzii, cum Notis.* i. e. "Lucius Cæcilius Firmianus "Lactantius's Treatiſe addreſſed to Donatus the Con-"feſſor concerning the Deaths of the perſecutors; "now firſt publiſhed by Stephen Baluze with Notes." Paris 1680 in 8vo. The ſecond edition with Notes *Variorum*, and reviſed by Paul Bauldri, was printed at Utrecht 1692 in 8vo. XVII. *Epiſtolarum Innocentii III Pontificis Romani Libri XI. Accedunt Geſta ejuſdem Innocentii &c.* i. e. "The Epiſtles of Pope "Innocent III in eleven Books; to which are ad-"ded the Acts of the ſame Pope &c." Paris 1682 in fol. two volumes. This edition is far from being a complete collection of that Pope's Letters; ſince they contain nineteen Books. But Mr. Baluze was refuſed at Rome the communication of thoſe Letters, which are preſerved in the Vatican Library (5). XVIII. *Nova Collectio Conciliorum, cum Notis:* i. e. "A new "Collection of the Councils, with Notes." Paris 1683 in fol. This Collection contains theſe pieces, which were wanting or defective in Father Labbe's Collection

(3) Idem, pag. 201-203.

(4) Du Pin, p. 2.

(5) Idem, ibid. and Niceron, pag. 203.

write the Hiſtory of his Family, he was involved in his diſgrace, and received a letter *de Cachet* to retire to Lyons. All that he could obtain in his favour was not to be removed to ſuch a diſtance; ſo that he was ſent firſt to Roan, then to Tours, and afterwards to Orleans. He was recalled upon the peace, but he never could recover his penſion or his Profeſſorſhip and place of Director of the Royal College. Though he lived at a diſtance from Paris, and was then above eighty years of age, yet nothing could interrupt his application to his ſtudies. He was engaged in publiſhing St. Cyprian's Works, an edition of which he had been preparing while he was in baniſhment, when he was ſeized by death the 28th of July 1718, in the 88th year of his age (*e*). Though we have very little of Mr. Baluze's own compoſition, yet there are few writers, who have done the public greater ſervice than he by collecting from all parts the antient manuſcripts, and publiſhing them with learned notes. Mr. Du Pin obſerves (*f*), that he was admirably well ſkilled in manuſcripts, titles, and printed books of all kinds; that he wrote well in Latin, and underſtood eccleſiaſtical and profane Hiſtory, and antient and modern Canon Law, and was extremely converſant in the Fathers. The editions which he publiſhed of ſeveral important Works, were corrected by him from a great number of manuſcripts, with prodigious accuracy and application (*g*). And Mr. de Roque tells us (*h*), that his notes ſhew a great knowledge in him of the authors of the middle age; and that he explains not only the moſt difficult paſſages and obſcure terms, but likewiſe the moſt conſiderable points of Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory and Antiquity. Mr. Sallo likewiſe affirms (*i*), that he was maſter of a great deal of ſagacity and judgment in the reſtoring the text of authors, and of vaſt penetration and learning in clearing up their difficulties. He kept a correſpondence with all the men of letters in France and other Countries. His converſation was eaſy and agreeable; and old age abated nothing of his vivacity. Though he was born with a very delicate conſtitution, he preſerved an uninterrupted courſe of health by his temperance and regular manner of life. He ſhewed ſomething of caprice in his laſt Will, by making a woman, who was no relation to him, his Executrix, and leaving ſcarce any thing to his family and ſervants (*k*).

(*e*) Niceron, p. 190-198. *See likewiſe* the note upon Baillet's *Jugem. des Savans*, tom. 2. num. 575. pag. 264. edit. Amſterdam 1725, in 4to.

(*f*) Pag. 2.

(*g*) *Journal des Savans, du 24 Avril* 1677. *apud* Baillet, *ubi ſupra.*

(*h*) *Apud* Baillet, ibid.

(*i*) *Journal des Savans du 12 Fevrier* 1665.

(*k*) Niceron, p. 198, 199.

BALZAC

tion of Councils. This Collection was to have contained ſeveral volumes; but there was only the firſt publiſh'd; which Mr. Bonardi aſcribes to the bad ſale of it. But we find a more plauſible reaſon in the Notes upon Mr. Arnaud's Letters. We are informed there, that Mr. Colbert having an intention to reward Mr. Martin, who was Tutor to his ſons, procured him a penſion of two thouſand livres upon the Biſhopric of Auxerre; and that this honeſt Eccleſiaſtic refuſing this penſion, becauſe, as he told his patron, he had never done any ſervice to the Dioceſe of Auxerre, and therefore thought he had no right to enjoy ſuch a portion of the revenues of that See, much leſs to receive it as a reward for his temporal ſervices. Mr. Colbert upon this gave half of this penſion to Mr. Baluze; who having occaſion for the aſſiſtance of the See of Rome in that affair, abandoned the deſign, which he had of publiſhing the Acts of the Council of Baſil at large, which had been the particular motive of his undertaking a new Collection of Councils. And thus he left his ſcheme imperfect (5). XIX. *Marca Hiſpanica, ſive Limes Hiſpanicus, hoc eſt, Geographica & Hiſtorica Deſcriptio Catalauniæ, Barcinonis, & circumjacentium populorum. Auctore. ill. V. Petro de Marca:* i. e. "The "March or Limits of Spain, containing a geographi- "cal and hiſtorical Deſcription of Catalonia, Rouſ- "fillon, and the neighbouring people, by the illuſtrious "Peter de Marca." Paris 1688 in fol. De Marca's death having prevented him from finiſhing the impreſſion of this work, Mr. Baluze out of gratitude to his firſt patron undertook to perfect the edition, and added a fourth book to it, which contains ſeveral very curious things. XX. *Petri de Marca Archiepiſcopi Pariſienſis opuſcula nunc primum in lucem edita.* i. e. "Tracts "written by Peter de Marca Archbiſhop of Paris, now "firſt publiſhed at Paris 1681 in 8vo." Mr. Baluze had reprinted in the year 1669 ſeveral Diſſertations of that Prelate, which had been publiſhed during his life; but theſe Tracts were never printed before. XXI. *Vitæ Paparum Avenionenſium:* i. e. "The Lives of the Popes "of Avignon. Paris 1693 in 4to, two vol. This is one of the moſt conſiderable and valuable works, which he publiſhed. In his Preface he attacks theſe authors, who have compared the time of the Reſidence of the Popes at Avignon to the Captivity at Babylon; and he affirms, that the Popes have a right to fix their See where they think proper. He remarks likewiſe, that if the City of Rome has occaſion to complain, that the Popes continued ſo long at Avignon, becauſe that abſence reduced it to the greateſt ſolitude and poverty, the French did not receive any conſiderable advantage from the reſidence of the Popes in their country, ſince the Italians changed their frugality into luxury, and corrupted their innocence and ſimplicity of manners by vices till then unknown to them (6). This paſſage might be one reaſon for putting this book under the cenſure of the *Index Expurgatorius* (7). XXII. *Hiſtoire Genealogique de la Maiſon d'Auvergne &c.* i. e. "A Genealogical Hiſtory of the Family of Auvergne, "confirmed by ancient Charters, Titles, Hiſtories, "and other authentic Proofs:" Paris 1708 in fol. two volumes. This work is full of very curious reſearches (8). The Preface to it was publiſhed ſeparately in 4to the ſame year (9). XXIII. *Lettre pour ſervir de Réponſe à divers Ecrits &c.* i. e. "A Letter in an- "ſwer to divers pieces diſperſed at Paris and at Court "againſt ſome ancient titles, which prove that the "family of Bouillon is deſcended in a direct and male "line from the old Dukes of Guyenne and the Counts "of Auvergne:" Paris 1698 in fol. XXIV. *Hiſtoriæ Tutelenſis Libri tres:* i. e. "The Hiſtory of Tul- "les in three books:" Paris 1717 in 4to. XXV. *Lettres au S. Tournemine ſur l'Edition de S. Cyprien, qu'il prepare:* i. e. "A Letter to Father Tournemine "concerning the Edition of St. Cyprian, which he "was preparing." This Letter is inſerted in the *Memoirs of Trevoux* September 1714, and March 1715. XXVI. *Epiſtola ad V. C. Euſebium Renodotum de Vita & Morte Car. du Freſne du Cange:* "A Letter to Mr. "Euſebius Renaudot concerning the Life and Death "of Mr. Charles du Freſne du Cange." XXVII. *S. Cæcilii Cypriani Epiſcopi Carthaginenſis & Martyris Opera ad MSS. Codices recognita & illuſtrata ſtudio & labore Steph. Baluzii. Abſolvit poſt Baluzium ac Præfationem & vitam S. Cypriani adornavit unus ex Monachis Cong. S. Mauri:* i. e. "The Works of St. Cy- "prian Biſhop of Carthage and Martyr reviſed by the "MSS. and illuſtrated by Stephen Baluze; whoſe e- "dition is compleated with a Preface and Life written "by a Monk of the Congregation of St. Maur:" Paris 1726 in fol. Dom Prudent Maran was the editor. XXVIII. In the ſixth volume of the *Memoirs* of Father des Molets is publiſhed *Carmen in Laudem Joan. B. Broſſard, Canonici & Officialis Tutelenſis:* i. e. "A "Poem in praiſe of J. B. Broſſard, Canon and Official "of Tulles;" by Mr. Baluze. It is a mere piece of imagination, without any fixt object; and Mr. de la Monnoye has written an ingenious Commentary upon it (10). XXIX. John George Schelhorn has inſerted in his *Amœnitates Literariæ, Tom.* 8. *p.* 622. two Letters of Mr. Baluze, one to Frederic Benedict Carpzovius, dated January 1ſt 1680, and the other to John Schilter on the 13th of December 1684. They are very curious, and contain divers particulars relating to learning (11).

T.

(5) Niceron, tom. 10. Part 1. pag. 17. edit. de Paris 1730.

(6) Du Pin, pag. 4.

(7) Niceron, tom. 1. p. 205.

(8) Idem, ibid.

(9) Idem, tom. 10. Part 1. pag. 17.

(10) Idem, ibid. pag. 18.

(11) Idem, tom. 10. Part 2. pag. 290.

BALZAC, a little country-ſeat in Angoumois upon the river Charante, is famous for having given its name, and been a long time the retirement of one of the moſt eloquent Writers of the ſeventeenth Century [*A*], the illuſtrious Monſr. De Balzac. His name was John Lewis Guez, and he was the ſon of William Guez, a Gentleman of Languedoc [*B*], of great merit, who having at firſt attach'd himſelf to Roger de Bellegarde, Mareſchal of France, and Governor of the Marquiſate of Saluces, managed ſeveral affairs with great addreſs. He was not ſix and twenty years old, when he was ſent to the Court of Philibert Emanuel Duke of Savoy, upon important negotiations, in which he ſucceeded extremely well, and gained the eſteem of that Prince. Some time after he was made Governor to the Mareſchal de Bellegarde's ſon. This young Lord was killed in the battle of Coutras in the year 1587 (*a*). His father died in 1579 (*b*). So that William Guez having left his two patrons, applied himſelf to the Duke of Epernon, who deſired to have him near himſelf. He did him great ſervices upon ſeveral dangerous occaſions. Henry IV having obſerved the addreſs, probity and firmneſs, which that Gentleman ſhewed in the affairs, for which he was ſent by the Duke of Epernon to Court, would have engaged him in his ſervice (*c*); but he found him more inclined to a country life, than to that of a court, which his virtue would not eaſily accommodate itſelf to. This worthy Gentleman ſettled in Angoumois, and died there the 20th of September 1650, aged an hundred years [*C*]. He married a young Lady of the family of Neſmond, with whom he lived ſixty four years in perfect concord (*d*). He had among other children the famous Monſr. de Balzac, whom I am going to ſpeak of. See the Latin Elogium of William Guez written by Monſr. de Girac, and printed at the end of the *Socrate Chrêtien*. I have extracted from thence what I have given above, to which I add, I, That William Guez reſembled Father Narni ſo much in his perſon, that the firſt time Monſr. de Balzac ſaw that famous Preacher, *he thought his father had diſguiſed himſelf like a Capuchin* (*e*). II, That Dom Peter de St. Romuald, among many other virtues of William Guez, commends the magnificence, which he ſhewed in building the caſtle of Balzac, and his houſe at Angouleme (*f*). This houſe was *adorn'd and enriched with ſuch exquiſite curioſities, particularly paintings and other ornaments*, that the Queen Mother, Mary de Medicis, would lodge no where but there during her ſtay at Angouleme. III, That one of his other ſons was called Monſr. de Rouſſines (*g*): IV, That he had a daughter, whom Monſr. de Balzac mentions often [*D*].

(*a*) Father Anſelme, *Hiſt. des grans Offic.* pag. 194.

(*b*) Ibid.

(*c*) See the *Lettres choiſies de Balzac*, p. 364. edit. of Holland.

(*d*) She lived to the year 1653. See the 12th Letter of Balzac to Conrart, lib. 3.

(*e*) Balzac, *Lettre* 27 *a Chapelain*, liv. 3.

(*f*) St. Romuald, *Threſor Chronol. ad ann.* 1627.

(*g*) Mr. de Balzac wrote to him the 40th Letter of the 8th book.

BALZAC

[*A*] *It is famous for having given its name . . . . . to one of the moſt eloquent Writers of the ſeventeenth Century.*] I cannot tell what grounds Moreri had to ſay, that thoſe of the family of Guez bore the name of the Lordſhip of Balſac. I. Firſt, He ſhould have known that it ought to be written *Balzac*, when we ſpeak of this village; and *Balſac*, when we ſpeak of the antient family of Balſac d'Entragues (1). He has done quite the contrary. II. Secondly, there was only John Lewis Guez, who had the name of Balzac; his father always bore the name of the family (2); and if after the death of John Lewis, any one of his relations aſſumed the name of Balzac, I do not think it came to Moreri's knowledge. As for what ſome perſons have ſaid, *that if Mr. de Balzac had not taken the name of his Lordſhip, his family-name being put before his works would not have had ſuch great ſucceſs in the world; and that if they had been intitled* the Letters of Monſieur Guez, *people would not have conceived ſo advantageous a notion of them; and that it is ſuppoſed, that the name of Balzac being taken for that of a noble and antient family ſufficiently known, gave him the greater authority* (3); this, I ſay, is partly probable, and partly very falſe. It is probable that a name ſo ſimple as that of Guez would have been a prejudice to an Author in the title of a book (4); but it is very falſe that John Lewis Guez put the name of Balzac in the title of his books, in order to avoid ſuch an inconvenience, and to give occaſion to think that they came from ſome great Lord; this is preciſely what Sorel intended by his confuſed and embaraſs'd expreſſions. Once more this is falſe; for John Lewis Guez had taken the name of Balzac before he thought of printing his Letters. I cannot imagine how it came that Mr. Menage, who publiſhed the Poems and Latin Letters of that Author, where we find in the title page, and at the top of every page the name of *Joannis Ludovici Guezii Balzacii*, ſaid that we there find that of *Joannis Ludovici Gueſæi Balzacii* (5). I ſhould have ſaid, that the Printer of the *Anti-Baillet* put *Gueſæi* inſtead of *Gueſii*, if I had not ſeen the ſame error in a very correct edition of Mr. Menage's Poems (6).

(1) Sorel, *Connoiſſ. des bons Livres*, pag. 28. edition of Holland, *and* Menage, *Anti-Baillet*, tom. 1. pag. 4. have obſerved it.

(2) *Anti-Baillet*, tom. 1. pag. 4.

(3) Sorel, *Connoiſſ. des bons Livres*, pag. 28. quoted in the *Jugem. des Savans*, tom. 1. pag. 484.

(4) See the preface to the *Nouvelles Lettres contre le Calviniſme de Maimbourg*, and in the 22d Letter, pag. 764. a paſſage of the *Mercure Galant* upon the *Lettres du Cheval. d'Her...*

(5) Menage, *Anti-Baillet*, tom. 1. pag. 4.

(6) In the Index: this edition is that of Wetſtein at Amſterdam in 1687.

[*B*] *Balzac . . . . . was ſon to William Guez, a Gentleman of Languedoc.*] Mr. de Balzac ſometimes repreſents his extraction in a manner, that gives us an high idea of it. He ſays, *that thoſe, to whom he had the honour to be related, had founded monaſteries in divers parts of the Kingdom, and that Angouleme and Thoulouſe are proud of the marks which their piety left there* (7). He tells us in another place, that the great grandfather of his great great grandfather had three pariſhes in Languedoc preſented to him by the Counteſs Alix (8). Theophile gives us a quite different notion of Mr. de Balzac's family.

(7) Balzac, *Oeuvres diverſes*, Diſc. 14.

(8) *Lettres choiſies*, pag. 367.

[*C*] . . . . . *died aged an hundred years.*] I make uſe of a round number after Mr. de Girac, whom I have quoted; but I ought to rectify that point a little by means of a letter of Mr. Guez to his ſon, ſigned *Guez*, and dated the 20th of November 1642 (9). *He was then entered into the eighty ninth year of his age*; ſo that he was not an hundred years old the 20th of September 1650, which was the day of his death. This Letter is a preſſing exhortation to publiſh ſome of his manuſcripts, eſpecially his Apologies againſt Phyllarchus.

(9) It is in pag. 365 of the *Lettres choiſies de Balzac*, edition of Holland.

[*D*] . . . . . *He had a daughter, whom Mr. de Balzac mentions often.*] She was married to Mr. de Campagnolle, who died a Captain of the Guards at the ſiege of Montauban, and was brother of a brave man, whom Thuanus ſometimes mentions (10). This Captain of the Guards left a ſon, who was killed at the ſiege of Lions (11), and a daughter, who is Madam de CAMPAGNOLLE, mentioned ſometimes in the Letters of Mr. de Balzac (12). He teſtifies a great deal of love for this niece, and gives very good advice concerning her education. See his *Lettres choiſies*, pag. 157, and his 46th, 47th and 48th Letters of the 7th book in the folio edition. I have found in a Letter of Mr. Coſtar a paſſage which relates to Madam de Campagnolle. *At Balzac*, ſays he (13), *you will ſee a niece, who is beautiful and witty, who diſtinguiſhes extremely well between true gallantry and falſe, and to whom nothing is wanting for you, but to love her a little more.* This is what he wrote to Voiture. I have ſeen another book, where there is ſomething which may regard that Lady. We are told there that Langlade (14), one of thoſe whom Cardinal Mazarin *employed moſt in ſecret negotiations, had been in love in his own country, before he came to Court, with a Lady of Quality,*

(10) See the *Latin Poems* of Balzac, pag. 112. edit. in 12°.

(11) See the volume of his *Letters to Conrart*, lib. 5. Letter 3.

(12) See the 67th Letter of the 6th book, and the 42d of the 9th.

(13) See the 29th Letter in the *Entretiens de Voiture & de Coſtar*, pag. 249.

(14) *Galanteries des Rois de France*, tom. 2. pag. 239. Bruſſels edition, in 1694.

BALZAC (JOHN LEWIS GUEZ DE) was born at Angoulême in the year 1595 [*A*]. He gained an extraordinary reputation very early. He had such a prodigious fire of imagination, so much eloquence, and so many uncommon thoughts in the letters which he wrote in his younger years, that those who had seen them were charmed with them, and extolled them every where; by which means, as he was in the service of the Cardinal de la Valette (*a*), he was soon known to advantage at Court, and so highly esteemed, that Cardinal Richelieu, to whom he wrote several times, did him the honour of answering him in a very obliging manner. This answer was printed with the *Letters of Balzac*, the first edition of which is in the year 1624. He imagined himself in the ready way to a very great fortune [*B*]; his Letters had so quick a sale, that several editions of them were published. He was extolled beyond measure, but not with the unanimous consent of all his readers. There rose some persons of a contradictory spirit to oppose him, either out of envy, as it is very probable, or because they discovered the defects in Balzac's writings. These dissensions, after having reigned for some time in companies, became a publick war in 1627, nay one of the most furious wars that ever was seen in that kind. It was opened by a young Monk, who wrote a little book intitled, *The Conformity of Mr. de Balzac's eloquence with that of the greatest men in the past and present times.* Though this piece was not made publick, yet it passed from hand to hand, as much as if it had been printed; and every body knew that a *Feuillant*, whose name was

(*a*) Sorel, *Bibliath. Franç.* pag. 121 of the 2d edit.

lity, who was called Mademoiselle de Campagnol (15). "He did not dare to propose to marry her, but he "had got a promise from her not to marry, assuring "her, that he would acquaint her, when his fortune "would permit him, to make her happy. He entrusted Gourville with his promise to that Lady, "and told him with some regret, that he did not "think he had a sufficient estate to pretend to that "marriage, as he had not in all above forty thousand "crowns. Gourville told him, that this ought not "to trouble him, and that he might go with full assurance, and conclude his marriage, promising to "give him as much more. Langlade went upon "this assurance, and gave a great deal of joy to Mademoiselle de Campagnolle, by shewing her that "he had not forgot her. They were married, and "Langlade returned to Paris with his new spouse, "where they found that Gourville had prepared a "fine house for them, and richly furnished it. He "gave Langlade this valuable furniture, with a great "deal of plate and jewels for his spouse, besides the "forty thousand crowns; and Madam de Parville "(16) took care to shew this country Lady all the "people of figure. This new married couple lived a "long while very happily together."

(15) Ibid. pag. 242.

(16) She was a Mistress of Gourville's.

[*A*] *He was born at Angoulême in the year* 1595.] I have not found this in any book, but here is the way which I infer it from two Letters of Balzac. He makes mention in one of these two Letters (1) of the thanks, which he had given to Mr. Spanheim in 1649 for the fine speech, which he had received, and *which had restored to him a passion, which* 53 *years had taken from him.* This speech was without doubt the funeral oration for Frederic Henry Prince of Orange: we may suppose, that he received it in the year 1648; for he was not quick in answering it. He was therefore 53 years old in 1648, and consequently born in 1595. In another Letter dated the 15th of October 1637 (2), he speaks of a piece which he wrote when he was seventeen years of age, and says that it was full five and twenty years since he wrote it. So that he was two and forty years old when he wrote that Letter, and consequently he was born in 1595. St. Romuald places his birth in the year 1598; *for he was* 28 *years old*, says he, *in the year* 1626 (3); but he forgot to prove that argument. I must not conceal, that I have found a passage, which proves that Balzac was born in 1596. I shall quote it in the remark [*B*].

(1) It is the 14th of the 1st book to Conrart: the thanks to Mr. Spanheim is the 19th of the 5th book.

(2) It is the 10th of the 3d book of his *Letters to Chapelain.*

(3) St. Romuald, *Abrege Chron. ad ann.* 1598.

A PIECE published by Balzac at 17 years of age.

The little piece, which he composed at the age of seventeen, is well worth a digression. He acknowledges that in making it he committed an error and a folly, and excuses himself in the best manner he can from his youth, and from his *having composed it in Holland, without any design to have it published in print* (4). He was very much displeased that Heinsius revived that fault of his (5). I have before observed, that this is an inconvenience, to which authors, who are a little famous, are very much exposed: it happens that they have some literary dispute, and this occasions their antagonist to search out very carefully the least errors of their youth, in order to reproach them publickly with them. I am not surprized, that some have thought that Balzac at that time would not have refused to make his fortune in Holland in the profession of an Huguenot. I imagined before I read the piece in dispute, that this was a rash judgment; but I have changed my opinion, since Mr. Minutoli was so kind as to send me a copy of it (6). He has a printed copy from the edition, which Heinsius caused to be published at Leyden in 1638. The title of it is, *A Political Discourse upon the State of the United Provinces of the Low-Countries, by J. L. D. B. a Gentleman of France.* It is a pamphlet of four or five pages: we find it at the end subscribed, *John Lewis de Balzac.* The piece is very fine, full of spirit and fine sentiments; but I am very sure that Baudius, who was in a public post at Leyden, and had a pension from Holland, could not have determined so strongly for the justice, with which the States threw off the Government of Philip II, nor have invented such refined compliments to Holland, or such keen invectives against the Spanish Government, or in short such elaborate arguments for liberty of conscience. It is excusable therefore to suspect that the French Gentleman had a mind to sound the affair by this pamphlet; and if the Commonwealth struck with admiration for so fine and well affected a pen, had offered him a good post, the author of 17 years of age would have preferred it to his own Country and the Catholic Religion.

(4) The 10th Letter to *Chapelain*, lib. 3.

(5) See above the end of the remark [*C*] of the article of BALDUS.

(6) He is furnished with a prodigious number of pieces of that kind, which he has always been collecting and preserving with great care.

Mr. de Balzac took his voyage to Holland in the year 1612, with Theophile, *to whom*, if we believe Father Goulu, *he did a very ill turn* (7), which occasioned the misunderstanding between that Poet and Balzac. The terrible letter, which Theophile published against his fellow-traveller, reproaches him with two or three adventures, which were very shocking. *I do not mention*, says he, *your plundering of authors; Dr. Baudius's son-in-law accuses you of another kind of theft. . . . . I do not repent that I formerly took the sword to revenge you for having been beaten.*

(7) *Lettres de Phyllarque*, Part 1. pag. 257.

[*B*] *He thought himself in the ready way to a very great fortune.*] It is a very diverting thing to hear him relate himself the grounds of his great hopes. We may read therefore the second History in his *Entretiens* (8); it is his own. We find there among other things the proof of what I have said relating to the commendations which were given to his Letters, before they were printed. He tells us that the Bishop of Luçon, being recall'd from his exile (9), *caressed him prodigiously, and called him an illustrious person, an uncommon genius, an extraordinary man; and that having invited him one day to dine with him, he said to several Persons of Quality at table*, See there is a man, *(he was not then above twenty two years of age,)* whom we must serve, when it is in our power, and we must begin with an Abbey of ten thousand livres a year. *Is it not true that we can scarce make a more promising beginning than this? At Rome they would have lent him money, and laid wagers upon the future advancement of his fortune. And yet matters continued where they were at*

(8) Entret. 8. pag. 132. edit. in 12°.

(9) This happened in the year 1618.

was *Brother André*, was the Author of it [C]. Mr. de Balzac wiſhed to have it publickly refuted, which was done in the *Apology*, which Ogier publiſhed in 1627 [D]: The General of the *Feuillants*, whoſe name at that time was Father Goulu, undertook the cauſe of Brother André, and under the name of Phyllarchus (*b*), wrote two volumes of Letters againſt Balzac in a very paſſionate ſtile, as I ſhall relate in his Article. This diſpute gave occaſion to a great number of books (*c*), and it was a ſtorm, which ſeemed to threaten deſtruction to Mr. de Balzac, as well from the artifices of his enemies, as becauſe he had given ſome advantage to their cenſures by ſome of his hyperboles, which were extremely inſipid, by his ſallies of vanity, and by ſome particular propoſitions, which were a little dangerous. He let this ſtorm paſs without anſwering his adverſary [E], who

(*b*) That is to ſay the *Prince of Leaves*, in alluſion to his quality of General of the Feuillants.

(*c*) *Biblioth. Franç. de Sorel*, pag. 121. See the article of JAVERSAC.

at firſt. Cardinal Richelieu did not remember what the Biſhop of Luçon had ſaid. This puts me in mind of the following paſſage in the *Menagiana:* "Monſr. "de Balzac firſt aſpired to a Biſhoprick. He lowered "his pretenſions then to an Abbey; but he ſucceeded "in neither of thoſe deſigns. Nay he wrote in one "of his works, that he ſhould never be an Abbot, "unleſs he founded the Abbey (10)."

(10) *Menagiana*, pag. 190.

[C] *There was publiſhed againſt him a little book . . of which a Feuillant, whoſe name was* Brother André, *was the Author.*] He was of Mans, and afterwards was reconciled to Mr. de Balzac, and went to ſee him at Engoulême (11). Mr. de Balzac treated him very magnificently, and contracted a cordial friendſhip for him, which continued as long he lived (12). He wrote to him ſeveral letters, in which he ſtiles him *the Reverend Father Dom André de St. Denys.* See particularly one of the Diſſertations printed with the *Socrate Chretien*, the firſt *Entretien*, and among his Latin Letters the Poem entitled *Iter Speratum*, before which is a Letter, wherein Balzac gives an account with great ſatisfaction of the change of this Feuillant, and makes uſe of that fine exclamation of Virgil (13) by way of Parody,

(11) St. Romuald, *Continuat. Chronici Ademari, ad ann.* 1627.

(12) See his care for Father Andrew's Intereſts in the 17th and 18th Letters of the 4th book to *Conrart*, written in 1653.

(13) Virgil. *Æneid.* lib. 12. verſ. 503.

O Superi! tanton' placuit concurrere motu
Æterna poſthac mentes in pace futuras?

"Could Jove be pleas'd to ſee ſuch wars as theſe
"'Twixt Nations, that muſt join in laſting peace?

(14) Pag. 268.

Another Latin Letter, which is before that (14), informs us that Brother André, who according to Voiture's expreſſion, had been the Helena of this war, having heard that Mr. de Balzac was dead, had expreſſed a great deal of ſorrow for it, and extolled him highly. Now ſince after he found that news was falſe, he became a good friend to the Gentleman ſuppoſed to be deceaſed, he ſhewed that he was not of the ſame temper of mind that Horace expreſſes:

Virtutem incolumem odimus,
Sublatam ex oculis quærimus invidi (15).

(15) Horat. Od. 24. lib. 3.

——— "With envious eyes we view
"Merit, when preſent, but lament too late
"The bleſſing when remov'd."

We muſt not forget this circumſtance, that as ſoon as this Monk, who was then Prior of the Convent of St. Mémin near Orleans, heard of the dangerous ſickneſs of Mr. de Balzac, he called all his Monks together, that they might pray with him to God for his recovery (16). The latter being recovered gave to the altar of their church a perfuming-pan of four hundred livres value, and a yearly revenue to ſupply it continually with perfumes. If Moreri had mentioned the evident tokens, which Mr. de Balzac gave of his ſincerity, in his Reconciliation with Brother André and Father Garaſſe, we ſhould not have found the following paſſage of his Dictionary ſo void of judgment. *He was conſidered at firſt as one of the moſt eloquent men in France. This reputation raiſed the envy of ſome perſons againſt him, and the diſpute is well known, which he had about the year* 1627 *with Father Goulu General of the Feuillants and others. Notwithſtanding this the world is ſufficiently perſuaded of the ſincerity and generoſity of Mr. de Balzac, who died in a very Chriſtian manner as he had lived.* What a ſtrange tranſition is here from 1627 to 1654 in ſo few lines? And then, to what purpoſe *does he mention his ſincerity and generoſity, which all the world was notwithſtanding perſuaded of?* Was

(16) Preface to *Oeuvres de Balzac*, and *Relation de ſa Mort.*

that the point in hand? The buſineſs was to know whether Balzac was a good, eloquent, and orthodox Writer.

[D] . . . . *This piece was refuted . . . in the Apology, which Ogier publiſhed in* 1627.] There are different accounts of the true Author of that work. Some have thought that he, who fathered it, was really the Author of it; others, that he only lent his name to a work, which was written by Mr. Balzac himſelf. Mr. Menage ſpeaks of it as follows: *The Prior Oger* (α) *anſwered theſe books of Father Goulu againſt Mr. de Balzac, in a book intitled,* THE APOLOGY OF MR. DE BALZAC (17), *which is written with ſome learning and elegance; but Mr. Oger furniſhed only the learning of it. All the elegance is due to Mr. de Balzac. I have been told this ſeveral times by Mr. de Racan, and Mr. de Comberville, who ſaw Mr. de Balzac employed in that work; and I have read likewiſe, that Mr. de Balzac ſpeaking of that work, ſaid that he was the Father, and Oger only the God-Father; that he had furniſh'd the ſilk, and Oger only the Canvas* (18). It is probable, that becauſe it was reported thus publicly, the Sieur de la Motte-Aigron was apprehenſive of the ſame fate; and endeavoured to prevent it by declaring in the Preface to his Anſwer to Phillarchus, that the account, which he had received from divers parts, that they would give his book a maſter, obliged him to acquaint all his readers, that *there was no Roger there, who fought under the arms of Leo*; that he had not the complaiſance of thoſe, who ſuffer others to provide them children; that he could not bear that others ſhould write his books for him; and that with reſpect to the compoſition of his work, his friends were as much ſtrangers to him, as thoſe who lived in the furtheſt parts of the world. He tells us in the ſame place, that his Preface to Balzac's Letters, had been falſly aſcribed to others beſides himſelf. We ſhall ſee this at large in his article (19).

(17) I ſhall ſhew in the remark [F] of the article of Father GOULU, that Mr. Menage is miſtaken in ſaying that the *Apology* publiſhed by the Prior Oger, was an anſwer to the books of Father Goulu.

(18) Menage, *Remarques ſur la Vie de P. Ayrault*, pag. 252.

(19) See the remark [D] of the article MOTTE-AIGRON.

§ (α). It ſhould be *Ogier*. He was brother to Charles Ogier, who ſhall be mentioned hereafter; and he wrote *Actions Publiques* in two volumes, *The Apology of Mr. de Balzac*, and *a Funeral Oration* for Philip IV, King of Spain. This piece is an excellent one, according to Sorel in his *Bibliotheque Françoiſe*. Coſtar, Vol. II. pag. 48 of his Letters, addreſſes his ſeventeenth Letter to *the Abbot Oger*. He ſhould have ſaid *Ogier*. CRIT. REM.]

[E] *He let the ſtorm, which was raiſed againſt him by Father Goulu, paſs, without anſwering his adverſary.*] I own that he took his pen in hand at that time to compoſe his *Relation to Menander*; but that work was not printed till a long while after. We find the reaſon of that conduct in the following words of the XXIIId Conference of Balzac. *You may remember the cruel perſecution, which was raiſed againſt me above twenty years ago. At that time, an Angel from Heaven would not have been heard, if he had come down to plead my cauſe. The cabal was too ſtrong and too paſſionate, to wait for a right judgment from the Public. But thanks to Heaven, the ſtorm ceaſed, and a calm ſucceeded the tempeſt. Things having changed their appearance, it is to be hoped that right will alſo reſume its proper place.* The Author being then ſollicited again to publiſh his Defence, he agreed to it. Menander, to whom he addreſſed his Relation, is Mainard (20). Tho' this Relation is accompanied with a Defence of ſome of the paſſages, which Father Goulu had criticized, yet it is rather a general anſwer, than a continued and compleat confutation of the two volumes of Phyllarchus. Balzac juſtifies likewiſe ſome paſſages, which a Doctor

(20) Menage, *Remarques ſur Ayrault*, p. 252.

who dying in the beginning of the year 1629 reſtored to him a ſtate of tranquillity. The public began to recover from the prejudices, which they had received againſt Mr. de Balzac; who taking advantage of his diſgrace, and much more for the little ſucceſs of his *Prince* [*F*], ſettled himſelf at his country-ſeat, where he not only refined his genius and ſtyle, but even his heart, and preſerved there, by his correſpondence by letters [*G*], and by the writings, which he publiſhed from time to time, the reputation of a perſon of very great merit, and the fineſt writer in France. However it muſt be owned, his ſtyle is too much laboured, and the turn of his ſentiments is ſometimes too affected, and ſcarce ever natural enough; but though his letters have not that eaſy air, and happy ſprightlineſs, which ſhines through thoſe of Voiture, yet they have a great many charms, and a certain lively and ſerious Gaiety, which is almoſt inimitable [*H*]. We ſee likewiſe in all his writings ſeveral ſtrokes of learning well choſen and well applied. In ſhort, we cannot ſufficiently admire, conſidering the ſtate, in which he found the French tongue, how

Doctor of Louvain, and a Doctor of Bezancon has criticiz'd (21). I find ſomething wrong in his calculation. It appears from his *XXVIIth Conference*, that he did not determine to publiſh his Apologies till above twenty years after the perſecution, which Phyllarchus raiſed againſt him. And yet it is very certain, that the volume of his *Oeuvres diverſes*, of which his Diſcourſe to Menander is a conſiderable part, was printed in 1645; and that his Bookſeller acquaints us there, that the Author could not refuſe the publication of them, upon the repeated inſtances of his father, who was then 91 years old. If we compare with this Advertiſement to the Reader the Letter of Mr. Guez, which I mentioned in the remark [*C*] of the preceding article, we ſhall find that the reſolution of printing the Apologies againſt Phyllarchus was taken in the year 1644: How can this be reconciled with the *XXVIIth Conference*?

(21) See the pieces which are after the *Socrate Chretien*.

[*F*] *He took the advantage of the little ſucceſs of his Prince.*] The Author's friends had promiſed that work as a maſter-piece, which would ſilence all the Critics, and eſpecially thoſe, who accuſed Mr. Balzac of being able to write nothing but Letters. The event was not anſwerable to theſe expectations: the book was of no advantage either to the reputation or fortune of Balzac, and raiſed him trouble from the Sorbonne. Tho' the Marquis of Aytona cauſed it to be burnt at Bruſſels (22), yet it was mentioned with the utmoſt contempt in an anſwer of the Abbé de St. Germain, and repreſented as a book, *which had been ſuppreſſed by the cenſure of the Doctors, and the ſentence of the Judges a month after its birth*. Mr. Peliſſon relates, that in 1638 Balzac read to the French Academy *ſome part of his Prince, which he then called the Miniſter of State* (23). This would ſeem to intimate, that at firſt he had only a deſign to write an Elogium upon the Cardinal. But it appears that Mr. Peliſſon was miſtaken. The *Prince* was printed in 1631. It was to have been followed by two other books, the latter of which was called the *Miniſter of State*. Some are of opinion that in his *Prince* he has been more profuſe of his compliments to the Cardinal than to the King; (ſee page 37 of the XVth volume of the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*;) but this is a miſtake. We find in the VIIIth book of his Letters that, which the Sorbonne wrote to him, to acquaint him, that they were ſatisfied with his offers to alter himſelf what they had found worthy of cenſure. The Latin Letter, which he wrote to a Father of the *Chriſtian Doctrine*, concerning theſe proceedings of the Sorbonne, is an admirable one. It is in page 187 of his *Epiſtolæ Selectæ*, in the Paris edition in 1651 in 12mo. We may obſerve, that ſome perſons have affirmed this work to be one of the beſt of that Author's writings. *It is thus, Sir, that you have practis'd it in your Prince, and in your relations to Menander, which are the two great miracles of your art, and the utmoſt efforts of heroic eloquence.* Thus Coſtar ſpeaks in his Defence of Voiture. Mr. Richelet, in his Remarks upon Letters, ſays that *the Prince and Ariſtippus are the two moſt elegant pieces of Balzac* (24). If we may judge of the merit of Balzac's *Prince* by the number of editions, we cannot but form an advantageous judgment of it; "At firſt there were two e-"ditions in 4to, which were publiſhed at the ſame "time; there was another of the ſame form, but in "a ſmaller character, and full of errors, printed, I "think, at Niort or Poitiers. After this, there was "one in 8vo, which was pretty good, tho' pirated. "Then came out that of Bouillerot, in 8vo too, but "corrected; and at laſt the edition of Courbé in "12mo." This is taken from a Letter, which Mr. du Rondel did me the honour to write to me the 10th of May 1698. I ſhall give another extract from it. *I bought a little while ago*, ſays he, *the firſt edition of the* PRINCE, *where I found with inexpreſſible pleaſure what Mr. Balzac wrote, which was afterwards alter'd and retrenched; and this was the firſt time that I conceived what Scaliger meant by his* DETRAHENDO FECIT AUCTIOREM. *Balzac by cutting off five or ſix places, has removed the languidneſs, and inſpirited the weakneſs, which appeared before; he has added new ſtrength to his performance, and ſeized the attention of the reader, which was going to relax.* I make uſe of an edition in 4to of the year 1632: the place where it was printed is not marked, but without doubt it is that of Roan. I have ſeen one in ſmall *octavo*, printed at Paris, by Touſſaint du Bray in 1632. I find in the title-page, *the ſecond edition corrected*. Mr. Perrault, who has ſo highly extolled *the Ariſtippus of Balzac* (25), has ſaid nothing in commendation of *the Prince*. He ſays only that this work was publiſhed after his *Oeuvres diverſes*. He will not be diſpleaſed, I am ſure, with my obſerving that he is miſtaken. The *Oeuvres diverſes* did not appear till a long while after the *Prince* (26). I ſhall conclude with a paſſage of Gabriel Naudæus: *Quibus omnibus velut coronidem acceſſiſſe ferunt Balſaci, Viri Clariſſimi, Principem, Gallicâ modo pumice diligenter expolitum. Verum enim vero, quoniam ipſe liber poſt meum è Galliâ diſceſſum typis fuit demandatus, ut propterea nondum in manus meas pervenerit; variâque, ut audio, & prorſus ancipiti judiciorum aleâ fuit exceptus; hoc ſolum de illo pronunciare poſſum, quod fuit ab antiquis in ſimili occaſione ex formulâ uſurpatum, Non liquet* (27).

(22) Balzac, Lett. 43. lib. 8. Entret. 13. pag. 182.

(23) *Hiſt. de l'Academ. Franç.* pag. 221. and 167.

(24) Richelet. *Lettres, &c.* pag. 97.

(25) Perrault, *Hommes Illuſtres*, pag. 176.

(26) The privilege for printing the *Prince* is dated the 18th of September 1631, and the Approbation is dated the 3d of October following. The *Oeuvres diverſes* were printed in the year 1645.

(27) Naudæus, *Bibliograph. Polit.* pag. 47.

[*G*] *His correſpondence by Letters.*] This correſpondence of his was ſo very extenſive, that Mr. de Balzac was overburdened by it; for beſides that he wrote with prodigious pains, he knew that his Letters would be ſhewed, and ſo there was a neceſſity for their being very perfect. Here is the manner, in which he deſcribed his condition in that reſpect. *He is the But of all the bad compliments in Chriſtendom, to ſay nothing of the good ones, which give him ſtill more trouble. He is perſecuted, he is tired out with the civilities, which come to him from the four quarters of the world, and he had laſt night upon the table in his chamber fifty letters, which required anſwers, nay and eloquent anſwers too, ſuch anſwers, as are fit to be ſhewn, to be copied, to be printed . . . .* (28). *At this time that I am ſpeaking to you*, ſays he in another place, (29), *there are upon my table a century of letters, which wait for anſwers; I owe ſome even to crowned Heads.* As he was the firſt in France, who raiſed himſelf a great name for this kind of writing, he obtained the title of *the Great Epiſtolizer*, and he ſometimes aſſumed it himſelf; *Sciat ſe dignum fuiſſe invidia magni Franciæ Epiſtolarii* (30). The firſt Letters, which he publiſhed, are not near ſo valuable as thoſe, which he wrote after his retirement; and yet the latter had not a quarter the ſale of the others. Sorel had reaſon to make this remark (31); and the Critic upon Maimbourg was not wrong in repeating it (32). We may judge from thence of the caprice and humour of the Public.

(28) Balzac. *Entret.* 7.

(29) Letter 7 of the 5th book in the vol. to *Conrart*. See likewiſe his *Lettres choiſies*, pag. 15. and his *Letters to Chapelain*, p. 81. of the Dutch edition.

(30) *Epiſt. ſelect.* pag. 288.

(31) Sorel, *Biblioth. Franc.* pag. 135.

(32) Preface to the *Nouvelles Lettres ſur le Calviniſme de Maimbourg*.

[*H*] *His Letters . . . . . have . . . a certain, lively and ſerious gaiety, which is almoſt inimitable.*] Let us hear what Richelet ſays. *Balzac*, ſays he (33), *does*

(33) Richelet, *Lettres*, pag. 81, 82.

how he could trace out ſo noble a path to neatneſs of ſtyle. We muſt not think it ſtrange, that his writings ſavour of labour. Elevation and grandeur were his principal character; which cannot be attained without meditation. It is very probable that future ages will do him juſtice for the diſcredit in which ſome criticks have kept his works for a long time; and yet even this has not prevented a great many excellent judges from perſiſting ſtill in their firſt admiration (*d*). He was a good Latin Poet, and his *Latin Letters* ſhew that he wrote in that language with a great deal of delicacy. If he had a great many enemies, who wrote againſt him [*I*], he had on the other hand a very great number of friends and admirers (*e*); and there were but few perſons of merit, either French or foreigners, who travelled through France without doing themſelves the pleaſure of going to ſee him [*K*]. He was one of the forty members of the French Academy [*L*]. Cardinal Mazarin endeavoured to bring him back to Court (*f*). Queen Chriſtina was very kind to him, and deſired to have letters from him (*g*). The greateſt Noblemen of the Kingdom gave him in his Deſert (*h*) many tokens of their eſteem (*i*). That, which was moſt excellent in him was, that he lived in his retirement, and died there not only as a good Chriſtian.

(*d*) See what Mr. Menage ſays of Mr. de Balzac's *Eloquence*, *Menagiana*, pag. 112, 113, 114. See likewiſe Mr. Perrault in the Elogium of Mr. de Balzac.

(*e*) The great Des Cartes had a prodigious affection and eſteem for him. See his *Life* by Mr. Baillet, tom. 1. pag. 139, & *ſeq.*

(*f*) See the 1ſt Letter of Balzac to that Cardinal, in his volume of *Letters to Conrart*.

(*g*) See the 11th Letter to Conrart, lib. 3. and ſeveral others in that volume.

(*h*) Thus he was pleaſed to call the place of his reſidence.

(*i*) This appears from an hundred paſſages of his Letters.

does not make even a complaint, which has not in it ſomething ingenious, new and eloquent.... He had an agreeable and ingenious melancholy: it appears in his Letters, and he never ſpeaks without touching the heart with pleaſure, and infuſing joy. There is a certain melancholy in him, which is full of charms, and which is preferable to all the gaiety in the world.

[*I*] *He had a great many enemies, who wrote againſt him.*] The Chancellor Seguier, having refuſed to permit the publication of a book written againſt Balzac in 1636, received a little after a letter from this Author (34), in which we find theſe words: *As long as there are none but theſe pen-gladiators, who beg the ſeal of your authority, be not ſparing of the favours of the King, and relax a little of your uſual rigour. If it were a new thing, perhaps I ſhould be contented to have the firſt libel, which branded me with reproaches, ſuppreſſed; but ſince there is now a pretty Library of them, I am well pleaſed that it ſhould be enlarged, and take delight to raiſe myſelf a monument of thoſe ſtones, which envy has thrown at me, without doing me any harm.* We may reckon among thoſe, who wrote againſt him, beſides thoſe whom I have mentioned, Daniel Heinſius, who replied to Balzac's Criticiſm upon his *Herodes Infanticida* with ſomething of warmth and aſperity. See upon this ſubject Balzac's XXXVth *Conference*, and the XXVth *Letter* of his firſt Book to Chapelain, and the XXth of the ſecond Book. Salmaſius, an enemy of Heinſius, and a friend of Balzac, wrote upon that diſpute, and adjudged the victory to his friend; but a Miniſter of Languedoc, whoſe name was Croi (35), attacked Balzac in defence of Heinſius; and yet a little after he wrote very ſeverely againſt Heinſius; it is true it was upon different ſubjects. We may likewiſe reckon Nicholas Borbon of the French Academy. See what the Author of *the Hiſtory of the Academy* ſays upon that point (36). We muſt not omit Coſtar, who imagining that Balzac had out of jealouſy engaged Mr. de Girac to criticize upon Voiture, addreſſed to him his Defence of Voiture, and filled it with a great many keen railleries. The blow was felt, and the affair broke out afterwards into an open war. Coſtar threw off the maſk entirely. See the reproaches of Mr. Girard againſt him in the Preface to the *Entretiens* of Balzac. We find in the *Menagiana* ſome facts which may be introduced here very properly. *Mr. de Balzac, after he had obliged Mr. de Girac to write in Latin againſt Voiture's Letters, engaged likewiſe Mr. Coſtar to undertake the Defence of Voiture, and to write againſt Mr. de Girac: this was with a deſign to draw the praiſes of both parties upon himſelf. I paſſed thro' Mans in my return to Paris at the time when the* DEFENCE *was finiſhed. Mr. Coſtar gave me two copies of it, one to be ſent to Mr. du Pincheſne nephew to Mr. du Voiture, and the other to Mr. Conrart. He told me, that he would readily ſubmit to all the alterations, which ſhould be made in it, either by adding, or retrenching. One of the copies was communicated to Mr. Balzac, who ſent ſome corrections; in the mean while the work was printed. And becauſe his corrections came when the impreſſion was finiſhed, he had word ſent him, that they were come too late; and the book was publiſhed without them, with which he was a little diſpleaſed* (37). I omit the ſevere expreſſions, which are uſed concerning Balzac in the *Hexameron ruſtique*. See the Complaint of Mr. Menage, on account of his being introduced as ſpeaking againſt Mr. Balzac (38). I omit alſo what paſſed between Mr. du Moulin and him; but that was only a light ſkirmiſh of controverſy, in which both parties were complimented. There were other diſputes proceeded from it, which were more violent (39); but as far as I can remember, Balzac only received this little blow in it; *Vir ingenio compto & Gallicæ eloquentiæ laude clarus Balzacus, ſed in religionis negotio pluſquam infans.* That is, "Balzac, a man of a polite genius, and famous for "his eloquence in the French language; but in points "of Religion more ignorant than a child." It was Mr. du Moulin, who ſays this of him, in his preliminary epiſtle to his anſwer to *Petra-ſancta*. This inſult of his was pretended not to be taken notice of; ſee the XIth Letter of the IId Book to Chapelain. I ſhould be too prolix, if I were to mention one de Vaux (40), and all the other adverſaries of Balzac.

(34) It is the 43d of the 3d book of the 2d part of his *Lettres choiſies*.

(35) It is he, who is the Author of the anonymous Anſwer to Balzac's Letter and Diſcourſe upon Heinſius's Tragedy intitled *Herodes Infanticida*, which anſwer was printed at Geneva (tho' the title does not mention it) in 1642.

(36) Pag. 269. edit. of 1672. See likewiſe the 28th and 36th Letter of the 2d book to *Chapelain*.

(37) *Menagiana*, pag. 166, 167.

(38) Ibid. pag. 323.

(39) The Jeſuit Silveſter à Petra-Sancta, having written very ſeverely againſt du Moulin's anſwer to Balzac, he was treated in the ſame manner by du Moulin and Rivet.

[*K*] *There were but few perſons.... who... did not do themſelves the pleaſure of going to ſee him.*] This was a trouble to him, as appears from theſe words of his ſeventh *Conference*: *There come hither troubleſome perſons ſometimes from above an hundred leagues diſtance, on purpoſe, if they may be believed; who give him a death's wound, by telling him for their firſt compliment, that his great reputation, and the glory which he gives to the place, where he reſides, obliged them to come and ſee a perſon ſo well known, and a village ſo renowned; and that he muſt not take it amiſs that they have indulged ſo juſt and obliging a curioſity as that. One of theſe curious Gentlemen began a few days ago his ſpeech with,* the reſpect and veneration which he always had for him, and for the Gentlemen [Meſſieurs] his books. *There is nothing more true than this, and you may perceive from it how far the ſtyle of compliments may be carried.* They were not only Men of Letters who went to ſee him, but Noblemen likewiſe; and if I am not miſtaken, the Count de Pigneranda did him that honour, when he paſſed through that country in his return to Spain. Mr. Balzac tells us with pleaſure, that this Count reproached him for the warm zeal which he ſhewed in his writing in defence of the honour of France. He informs us of this in a Letter, in which he confutes a rumour that was ſpread about, that he had written a manifeſto for the Prince of Condé in 1651 (41).

(40) He publiſhed the *Tombeau de l'Orateur François*.

(41) It is printed at the end of the *Socrate Chrétien*.

[*L*] *He was one of the forty members of the French Academy.*] Mr. Peliſſon having ſaid agreeably to the Regiſters of the Academy, that on the 13th day of May 1634 Mr. Boiſrobert ſhewed a letter, which he wrote of his own motion to Mr. Balzac, to let him know, that if he would acquaint the Society by letter that he deſired to be admitted a Member, they would readily grant it him; Mr. Peliſſon, I ſay, having ſaid this, adds, *that he did not find in the Regiſter what followed; but that without doubt Mr. Balzac upon his anſwer was admitted a little while after into the Academy* (42). Mr. Balzac did not find that Mr. Peliſſon was a *faithful Hiſtorian* in this; he owns that Mr. Boiſrobert had adviſed him ſeveral times to pay a compliment in writing to the Academy, and even threatned him from the Cardinal, if that compliment was not ſent; but he affirms, that he never gave any anſwer, and that about five or ſix months after he was informed that he was made a Member of the Academy, and that his name was ſeen in the Sun of honeſt

(42) *Hiſt. de l'Acad.* pag. 221.

Chriſtian. *He ſet apart even in his life-time eight thouſand crowns of his eſtate, to be diſtributed to pious uſes* (*k*). He ordered two chambers to be built for him in the Convent of Capuchins at Angoulême (*M*], and very often lodg'd there (*l*). It was there that he wrote his *Chriſtian Socrates*. *He ſaid a great many fine things upon his death-bed, and ordered by his laſt Will, that he ſhould be interred at Angoulême in the hoſpital of Notre Dame des Anges, at the feet of the poor, who were buried there* (*m*). He bequeathed twelve thouſand livres to this Hoſpital, and left an eſtate of an hundred francs *per annum*, to be employed every two years for a prize to him, who in the judgment of the French Academy ſhould write the beſt diſcourſes upon a ſubject of religion (*n*). He died the 18th of February 1654 [*N*]. The Sieur Moriſcet, Canon of Angoulême, made his Funeral Oration; and another Moriſcet, brother to the former, and Advocate in the Preſidial of the ſame city, publiſhed a diſcourſe in praiſe of the deceaſed (*o*). An edition of all Mr. Balzac's works was publiſhed at Paris in 1665 in two volumes in folio, with a preface of the Abbé Caſſagnes of the French Academy. See the *Hommes Illuſtres* of Mr. Perrault, where you will find the elogium of John Lewis Guez.

(*k*) Epiſtle Preliminary of the *Entretiens de Balzac*.

(*l*) Moriſcet's Relation concerning his death.

(*m*) Saint Romuald, *Abregé Chronol. ad ann.* 1654.

(*n*) This was not begun to be put in execution till the year 1675. See *Hiſt. de l'Academie Franc.* 2d edit. p. 555.

(*o*) Saint Romuald, *Abrege Chronol. ad ann.* 1654.

honeſt Mr. la Peyre (43). From whence he concludes, that if a letter was preſented to the Academy in his name, it was a forged one. This is what he wrote to Mr. Conrart the 22d of September 1653. We cannot tell what explanation he received upon that point; but we find by a letter of the third of November the ſame year, that this explanation had undeceived him. One would almoſt ſuſpect that Mr. Conrart wrote to him, that he had ſeen the original of his compliment; from whence we may conclude that even the greateſt genius's ſometimes forget the Letters, which they wrote ſome years before. What is certain is, that Mr. Balzac conſidered himſelf as a good and true Member of the Academy; for the Regiſter of the 14th of April 1636 teſtifies that he read to the Academy *ſome part of his Prince* (44), and it has been proved from his printed Letters, that *he ſent to Monſr. du Chatelet ſeveral of his works, deſiring him to read them to the Academy, and to accompany them with ſome of his expreſſions, which would ſerve (he ſaid) not only inſtead of the thanks, but likewiſe of the ſpeech which he owed them* (45). He had juſt before ſaid, *that the honour which the Academy had done him in admitting him into their Body, without obliging him* to go to Paris, *were two ſingular favours which he had received of them at the ſame time*. I recollect two paſſages in his Letters, in which he acknowledges the Gentlemen of the Academy for his brethren. The firſt is in page 16 of his *Lettres Choiſies*, and the latter in page 95 of his Letters to *Chapelain*.

(43) La Peyre dedicated in the year 1635 his book *de l'Eclairciſſement des Tems* to the Academy with this title, *To the Eminent*. He added there the Cardinal's picture, with a crown of Rays round it, each of which was marked with the name of a Member of the Academy. *Hiſt. de l'Acad.* pag. 195.

(44) *Hiſt. de l'Acad.* p. 221.

(45) Ibid. pag. 106.

[*M*] *He built for himſelf two chambers in the Convent of the Capuchins at Angoulême.*] I have read no where but in the *Menagiana*, that he had a deſign to take the habit of that Order. "Mr. Bal- "zac was engaged ſo deeply in devotion, that he en- "tered into a Convent of Capuchins, where he had a "mind to take upon him the habit. However he "did not die there (46)." Perhaps he deſired like a great many other perſons to die in the habit of St. Francis.

(46) *Menagiana*, pag. 238.

[*N*] *He died the 18th of February* 1654.] The liſt of the Members of the Academy, printed at the end of the ſecond edition of the Hiſtory of the Academy, makes Mr. Balzac live till the year 1657, ſince that year it mentions Hardouin de Peréfixe, Archbiſhop of Paris, for his ſucceſſor. On the contrary the liſt of the Members who were deceaſed, printed at the end of *The State of France* in 1680, makes Mr. Balzac die a conſiderable time before the year 1654, ſince it places him before Baro and Baudouin, who died before the year 1651. If Mr. Peliſſon had had the care of the ſecond edition of the Hiſtory of the Academy, we ſhould not have found in the liſt the two errors, which I have mentioned; one of which regards the time, when Mr. Balzac died, the other the perſon, who ſucceeded him, who was not Mr. Perefixe. Beſides Mr. Perefixe was not Archbiſhop of Paris in the year 1657. But Mr. Peliſſon had no concern in all this. Mr. Baillet, who without doubt believed the contrary, is very excuſeable in imagining, that upon ſuch an authority he might place Mr. Balzac's death in the year 1657 (47). With reſpect to the day of his death, it was the 28th of February, according to Moreri, St. Romuald (48), Henningus de Witte (49), Mr. Perrault, and ſeveral others. But the perſons whom I have conſulted have anſwered me, that it was the 19th of February, according to the contract made with the French Academy concerning the eſtate, which Balzac had left, and according to a manuſcript letter of the Sieur Moriſcet. In ſhort it was the 18th of February, if we regard theſe two things; one is, that in the preface to Balzac's works we are aſſured that the relation of his death was written the day following; the other is, that this relation is dated the 19th of February 1654.

(47) Baillet, *Jugem. ſur les Poetes*, tom. 4. num. 1487.

(48) In the index of his *Journal Chronol.* printed in 1664; for he ſays nothing of Balzac under the 28th of February.

(49) Diar. *Biograph. ad ann.* 1654.

BANCK (LAURENCE) born at Norcopin in Sweden, was Profeſſor of Civil Law in the Univerſity of Franeker for fifteen years (*a*). While he lived there as a ſcholar he had raiſed himſelf a conſiderable character; ſo that upon his return from his travels in France, Italy, Spain, &c. he had the Profeſſorſhip of Civil Law given him with a good ſtipend (*b*). He died the 13th of October 1662 (*c*). I ſhall ſpeak below of his Works [*A*], and particularly of an edition, which he procured of the famous book of *The Tax of the Roman Chancery* [*B*]. This is a work remarkable enough to deſerve ſome mention of, and

(*a*) Witte, *Diarium Biograph. ad ann.* 1662.

(*b*) Banckius, *Epiſt. Dedicat. Taxæ Cancellariæ Romanæ.*

(*c*) Witte, *Diar. Biogr. ad ann.* 1662.

[*A*] *I ſhall ſpeak below of his works.*] He publiſhed at Franeker in 1649 a book intitled *de Tyrannide Papæ in Reges & Principes Chriſtianos*. Seven years after he publiſhed *Romæ triumphans, ſeu Inauguratio Innocentii X*. With regard to his writings *de Bancæ Ruptoribus*; *de Duellis*; *de Conſiliis & Conſiliariis Principum*, &c. (1), I cannot tell the date of them.

(1) Witte, *Diar. Biogr. ad ann.* 1662.

[*B*] .... *and of an edition which he procured of the* Tax of the Roman Chancery.] I have mentioned in another place (2) ſeveral things relating to this Tax, and particularly of the edition which Pinet procured of it in the year 1564. I have obſerved likewiſe that D'Aubigne quotes the edition of Paris of 1520. That was not the firſt as ſome have imagined; for the edition of Bois-le-Duc in 1664 (3) informs me, that this book was printed at Rome in 1514, and at Cologne (4) in 1515: and that it was intitled *Regule, Conſtitutiones, Reſervationis Cancellarie S. Domini noſtri Leonis Pape decimi, noviter edite & publicate, per Marcellum Silber alias Franck, Romæ, in Campo Flore, Anno MDXIV die xviii Novembris impreſſe, finiunt feliciter*. This is what is teſtified by the two Echevins of Bois-le-Duc, who, with the Secretary of the City, had collated word for word this edition of Rome with that, which Stephen du Mont, Bookſeller of Bois-le-Duc, publiſhed in the year 1664, and which is intitled *Taxæ Cancellariæ Apoſtolicæ, & Taxæ ſacræ pœnitentiariæ Apoſtolicæ*. We find there (5) the paſſage quoted by D'Aubigné from the Paris edition in 1520 (6): *Abſolutio pro eo, qui matrem, ſororem, aut aliam conſanguineam vel affinem ſuam, aut commatrem, carnaliter cognovit, gr. v.* (7). *Abſolutio pro eo, qui Virginem deſloravit, gr. vi.* i. e. "Abſolution for "him, who has carnally known his mother, ſiſter, "or

(2) In the remark [*B*] of the article PINET.

(3) It is in the Latin and Dutch, in 8vo. See the Preface and pag. 130.

(4) *Apud Goſuinum Colinium.*

(5) *Taxæ Cancell. Apoſt* pag. 95, 96, edition of Bois-le-Duc.

(6) See remark [*B*] of the article PINET.

(7) That is, he muſt pay five Gros.

and to give occaſion to ſome reflections, both to rectify what I have already ſaid in another place,

" or other relation by blood or marriage, or god-
" mother, gr. v. Abſolution for him, who has de-
" flowered a Virgin, vi gr." We find this likewiſe in the edition of Franeker in 1651 (8). I am ſurprized that we do not find it in the edition of Pinet, intitled, *Taxe des Parties Caſuelles de la Bontigne du Pape*. It is in Latin and French with a great many notes by that Author. He did very wrong not to mention what copy he printed from; for it is different from the others both with reſpect to the ſubjects, and to the money. It ſpeaks only of *Tournois*, *Ducats*, and *Carlins*; the others mention only *Gros*, or at leaſt very ſeldom ſpeak of Ducats or Carlins. D'Aubigné aſſures us (9), that the Paris edition ſays, that *for killing one's father or mother, one muſt pay a Ducat and five Carlins*; but in the edition of Franeker (10), and that of Bois-le-Duc (11) there is an *Abſolutio pro eo, qui interfecit patrem, matrem, ſororem, uxorem.... g. v, vel vii* (12); that is, " An Abſolution for him, " who has killed his father, mother, ſiſter, wife, ... " v or vii Gros." I am ſurprized once more, that this article of inceſt is wanting in the edition of Pinet (13), in which we find the moſt enormous articles; as for inſtance the following: *Abſolutio à lapſu carnis ſuper quocunque actu libidinoſo commiſſo per clericum, etiam cum monialibus, intra & extra ſepta monaſterii, aut cum conſanguineis vel affinibus, aut filiâ ſpirituali, aut quibuſdam aliis, ſive ab unoquoque de per ſe, ſive ſimul ab omnibus abſolutio petatur cum diſpenſatione ad ordines & beneficia, cum inhibitione tur.* 36, *duc.* 3. *Si verò cum illis petatur abſolutio etiam à crimine commiſſo contra naturam, vel cum brutis, cum diſpenſatione, ut ſupra, & cum inhibitione, turon.* 90, *duc.* 12, *col.* 16. *Si verò petatur tantum abſolutio à crimine contra naturam, vel cum brutis, cum diſpenſatione & inhibitione, turon.* 36, *duc.* 9. *Abſolutio pro Monialì, quæ ſe permiſit pluries cognoſci intra & extra ſepta monaſterii, cum rehabilitate ad dignitates illius ordinis, etiam abbatialem, turon.* 36, *duc.* 9. *Abſolutio pro concubinario, cum diſpenſatione ad ordines & beneficia, turon.* 21, *duc.* 5, *carlin.* 6. (14). That is: " The abſolution and pardon of " all the acts of lewdneſs committed by a Clerk, " of whatever kind it may be, tho' it were even with " a Nun, within or without the bounds of his Mo-" naſtery, or with his relations by blood or affinity, " or with his God-daughter, or with any other women " of any quality whatſoever; likewiſe whether the " ſaid abſolution be made in the name of the Clerk " himſelf, or for him and his miſtreſſes, with a diſpen-" ſation to be capable of taking Orders, and to hold " eccleſiaſtical benefits, with an inhibitory clauſe " likewiſe coſts 36 tourn. and 3 ducats. And " if, beſides this above, there be an abſolution for " ſodomy, and the ſin againſt nature, or for beſtiali-" ty, and the above diſpenſation and inhibitory clauſe " be added, it will coſt 90 tourn. 12 duc. and 16 car-" lins. But if there is only a ſimple abſolution for " ſodomy, or the ſin againſt nature, or for beſtiality, " with the diſpenſation and inhibitory clauſe, it coſt " 36 tourn. and 9 ducates. A Nun, having com-" mitted the act of lewdneſs ſeveral times within and " without the bounds of her Convent, ſhall be ab-" ſolv'd and reſtored to the power of holding all the " dignities of her Order, even that of Abbeſs, upon " her paying 36 tourn. and 9 duc. The abſolution " for one, who ſhall keep a concubine, with a diſ-" penſation to take Orders and hold eccleſiaſtical be-" nefits, coſts 21 tourn. 5. duc. and 9 carlins (15)." I imagine that Du Pinet followed the edition, which the Proteſtant Princes cauſed to be inſerted in their cauſes of rejecting the Council of Trent, and which is intitled *Taxa ſacræ Pœnitentiariæ* (16). Mr. Heidegger has given ſome extracts, which are exactly like the edition of Du Pinet (17). Some perſons have obſerved, that the Epitome of the Tax of the Chancery of Rome is to be ſeen in page 603, and the following of a work intitled *Luculenta Deductio cauſarum recuſati Concilii Tridentini à Proteſtantium Germaniæ Principibus publicatorum*; and before Hunnius's book *de Indulgentiis*, and in page 216 and the following of Muſculus's *Loci Communes* (18). He, that publiſhed in 1612 the book intitled *Simonia Curiæ Romanæ*, inſerted in it this paſſage from the ſame *Loci Communes* (19). Compare this with the remark [*A*] of the article TUPPIUS.

I ſhall now ſpeak ſomething of the edition, which Laurence Banck procured. It was publiſhed at Franeker in the year 1651 in 8vo. He ſays, that he conſulted the moſt antient copies, printed or manuſcript, and by comparing them word for word, ſupplied by means of one what was wanting in others. He made uſe of the edition of Cologne in 1523, of that of Wittemberg in 1538, of that of Venice in 1584 (20), and of a Manuſcript, which had been communicated to him by John Baptiſta Sibon, a Bernardine Monk, and Reader in the College of Rome. By this means he has made his edition ſomewhat larger than all that had been publiſhed before. He has added notes, in which he explains a great many terms, which are difficult to be underſtood: it is a kind of gloſſary. He has likewiſe joined to it a ſmall Italian tract, which contains the tax, which was made uſe of under Pope Innocent X; and he has explained the value of the money as it was at that time. His notes have been very ſerviceable to the perſon, who has added remarks to the edition of Bois-le-Duc. We may remark, that in the preface of the latter it is obſerved that the Inquiſitors have ranked the Tax of the Chancery amongſt the prohibited books. *Naſcentem ſuffocare conati ſunt ipſi Authores & in Indice Librorum prohibitorum, ex Patrum Concilii Tridentini authoritate, Hiſpaniarumque Regis & Ducis Alban. decreto, Leodii* ANNO 1570 *edito, inter primæ claſſis Authores atro calculo notârunt* (21). I have not this edition of the *Index Librorum prohibitorum*. That, which I make uſe of, and which was printed from the edition of Madrid in 1667 in *folio*, has only ranged under the third claſs the *Praxis & Taxa Officinæ Pœnitentiariæ Papæ ab Hæreticis depravata* (22); and we may obſerve that they have condemned it only upon a ſuppoſition that the heretics had falſified it: the *Index*, publiſh'd at Rome by order of Alexander VII, uſes the ſame words as that of Spain (23). But tho' they ſuppoſe that heretics have corrupted it; yet thoſe editions, which can never be diſavowed, as that of Rome in 1514; that of Cologne in 1515; thoſe of Paris in 1520, 1545, and 1625 (24); and thoſe of Venice (25), one in the ſixth volume of the edition of the *Oceanus Juris*, publiſh'd in 1533, and the other in the fifteenth volume of the ſame Collection reprinted in 1584; theſe editions, I ſay, are more than ſufficient to juſtify the reproaches of Proteſtants, and to cover the Romiſh Church with ſhame. Our Laurence Banck knew nothing of almoſt all the editions, which I have mentioned above, and that of Francfort in 1612 in 4to (26). Rivet, Voetius, Hottinger, and ſeveral other *Helluones Librorum*, that is, *Devourers of Books*, imagined falſly that the edition of 1520 was the firſt (27); for they oppoſed that chiefly to the Roman Catholics, who would never allow that the Tax of the Chancery was ever publiſhed with a privilege. Voetius relates, that in 1633 a Counſellor of Bois-le-Duc declared, that he would abjure the Catholic Religion, if any perſon could ſhew him the horrid paſſages, which the Proteſtants cited as taken out of the Tax of Chancery at Rome. Recourſe was had to Rivet, who lent his copy of the edition of Paris in 1520 (28). Voetius gives this account, not without a pathetical exhortation to the Library-Keepers of the Proteſtant Univerſities to preſerve and collect the authentic copies of this work. *Quia autem*, ſays he (29), *hîc* Taxæ Pœnitentiariæ *mentio facta, moneo exemplaria pauca hodiè haberi poſſe (quâ & quorum arte facilè prudentiores conjiciunt;) aliqua tamen in manibus noſtrorum ſupereſſe editionis Pariſienſis* 1520 *in* 4*to, apud Tuſſain Denis. Edita etiam eſt Venetiis, cum quam plurimis aliis Tractatibus in Oceano Juris. Addo, rem & librum à Pontificiis paſſim negari, ubi ita uſu venit, ut noſtri allegando illam Taxam, mendacii & calumniæ ſuſpecti fiant, imò & arguantur. Accidit anno* 1633, *ut quis J. Conſultus idemque Senator Sylvæducenſis, deſertionem & rejectionem Papatus minaretur, (more ipſis non inſolito,) ſi quidem tam abominanda, qualia ex Taxâ noſtri referunt, demonſtrari poſſent. Ut ampliſſ. & conſult. huic Viro ex aſſe ſatisfieret, quæſitum apud exemplari* (30), *me de etiam à me poſtulatum eſt. Quod cum mihi ab ipſis Pontificiis editum nullum eſſet, petii commodato*

(8) It is that which L. Banck procured. See pag. 127.

(9) See the remark [*B*] of the article PINET.
(10) Pag. 132.
(11) Pag. 103.

(12) That is to ſay, he muſt pay five or ſeven Gros.

(13) It is that of Lyons in 1564, and it was reprinted at Leyden in 1607, and with a new Frenchtranſlation at Amſterdam in 1701. Theſe three editions are in 8vo.

(14) *Taxe des Parties Caſuelles de la Boutique du Pape*, pag. 55, *& ſeq.* edition of Lyons in 1564, in 8vo.

(15) This is according to the French tranſlation of Pinet.

(16) *See* Heidegger *Myſter. Babyl. Magnæ*, tom. 2. pag. 350 and 547.
(17) Ibid. pag. 350, *& ſeq.*
(18) Daniel Francus, *Diſquiſit. Academ. de Indicib. Libr. prohib. & expurgand.* pag. 115. edit. Lipſ. *ad ann.* 1684, in 4to.

(19) Lydii Analect. in Clemang. pag. 17.

(20) He means that which is inſerted in the 15th volume Part 1. fol. 368, of *Tractatus Tractatuum ſeu Oceanus Juris univerſi.*

(21) Preface to the *Taxæ Cancell. & Pœnitent. Apoſtat.* edition of Bois-le-Duc 1664.

(22) *Indices Libr. prohibitor. & expurgandor. Hiſpanic. & Romanus*, edit. Genev. ann. 1667, in folio, pag. 859. col. 2.
(23) Ibid. *in Indice Romano, ejuſd.* edit. pag. 106.
(24) Monſ. Drelincourt quotes theſe three editions of Paris. See his words in the remark [*B*] of the article PINET.
(25) Heideggeri *Myſter. Babyl. Magnæ*, tom. 1. pag. 547.
(26) *Catalog. Biblioth. Oxonienſis*, pag. 132.
(27) Franci *Diſquiſ. de Indicib. Libr. prohibit.* pag. 115, 116.

(28) Voetii *Diſput. Theolog.* tom. 2. pag. 296.

(29) Idem, ibid.

(30) There is an error in this paſſage. The Errata of the Author informs us that we ſhould read it, *me de Exemplari.* This does not remove the error. Daniel Francus, *Diſſert. de Indicibus Libr. prohibitor.* pag. 115. quoting this paſſage, ſays *quæſitum apud alios de Exemplari, etiam à me poſtulatum Exemplar.*

place (*d*), and to examine what we are told, by different authors, who have not explained themſelves with ſufficient exactneſs.

(*d*) In the remark [*B*] of the article PINET.

commodato à celeberrimo Theologo Andreâ Riveto. Ante biennium alibi concertatione inter noſtros & Pontificios quoſdam obortâ ſuper eadem hac Taxâ denuò conſultus, commonſtravi Bibliothecam D. Riveti, in quâ certò ſcirem exemplar edit. Pariſ. 1520 *haberi; quippe quod ipſe ante annos aliquot manibus & oculis meis uſurpâſſem, & Fratribus Sylvæducenſibus ex ſummi illius Theologi conceſſione aliquamdiu uſurpandam miſiſſem. Velim hac occaſione obteſtatos omnes publicos Reformatarum Scholarum, Eccleſiarum, Politicarum, Bibliothecarios, exemplaria, ſi qua in ipſorum poteſtate ſint, capſis incluſa diligenter cuſtodiant, ne à Plagiariis auferantur; aut ſi non ſint, hoc agant, ut à privatis ſive bibliopolis, ſive viris literatis, prece aut precio quovis redimant.*

I believe that the Romiſh controverſial Writers, who cannot diſprove the edition of Rome, or that of Paris, find themſelves in a prodigious perplexity. We may judge of this from the anſwer of the Abbé Richard to *the Prejudices of Mr. Jurieu.* That Miniſter had ſhewn the ſhocking abuſe of the Tax of the Chancery (31). The Abbot replies, that theſe were only *particular Facts*, which had never been *authorized by the Laws and Canons of the Church of Rome* (32). "We take it "well, *continues he* (33), that Mr. Jurieu gives an ac- "count * of the Taxes from an old Book of the "Chancery of Rome. But is it not extremely ridi- "culous to make a Book of Taxes paſs for the Laws "and Canons of the Church? Would it not turn the "Civil Law into a mere fable, to inſert the fees of "Executioners in the code, and place them among "the Laws. Would not this do a great honour to "the Gentlemen concerned? Let Mr. Jurieu learn "then what the Laws and Canons of the Church of "Rome are; and let him know in the mean time, "that theſe old Taxes of the Chancery of Rome, are "not only of no authority in the Church, but that "ſhe has always abhorred them. Theſe Taxes of the "Chancery did not begin till under the Pontificate "of John XXII, about the year 1320; and the Taxes "of the Penitentiary did not appear till towards the "year 1336, under Benedict XII †; and both of them "were immediately ſuppreſſed, and afterwards rank'd "amongſt the prohibited books, according to the "obſervation of the Sieur du Mont, who publiſhed "them in 1664; which ſhews ſufficiently the abhor- "rence, which the Church of Rome had for theſe "Taxes; ſo far was ſhe from propoſing or holding "them as rules, as Mr. Jurieu would make us believe. "Let him know then that the actions of the Officers "of the Court of Rome are only the actions of par- "ticular men, and not of the Church." This An- ſwer is not juſt; for in the firſt place, the Church of Rome has not ſhewn by the ſuppreſſion of theſe Taxes, that ſhe abhorred them. They were print- ed three times at Paris, twice at Cologne, twice at Venice; and there have been ſome of theſe edi- tions publiſhed, ſince Claudius Eſpencæus remonſtrat- ed publicly againſt the enormities of that book. We have ſeen that the Inquiſition of Spain, and that of Rome, have not condemned it but upon a ſuppoſition that the heretics had corrupted it. I add in the ſecond place, that the ſuppreſſion of ſuch a work is not a ſign that the rules, which it contains, are diſapproved. They may only ſignify, that they repented, that they had permitted them to be expoſed to the eyes of the Public, and ſo gave occaſion to heretics to inſult the Court of Rome, and wound the Church of Rome thro' the ſides of the Pope. We ought to judge that theſe were myſteries of State, *Arcana Imperii*, which ſhould not have been divulged (34). Have there not been ſome perſons, who have judged ſo with reſpect to ceremonies (35)? I omit ſeveral other conſiderations, which a controverſial Writer might alledge againſt the antagoniſt of Mr. Jurieu; but I ſhall content myſelf with obſerving that Claudius Eſpencæus declaimed very warmly againſt the abominations of theſe Taxes (36); I ſhall remark likewiſe, that the Proteſtant Controver- ſial Writers quote this in every diſpute; and that the Inquiſition of Spain has thought proper to order this paſſage of that Doctor's book to be eraſed (37). We may obſerve that the Inquiſition at Rome condemned Laurence Banck's edition of the Taxes (38).

(31) Jurieu, *Prejuges legit. contre le Papiſme*, tom. 1. p. 295, *& ſeq.*

(32) Richard, *Examen des prejuges de Mr. Jurieu*, pag. 218.

(33) Ibid. pag. 219.

* Part 1. pag. 295. of his *Prejuges.*

† Polyd. Virgil. *de Invent. Rerum*, lib. 8. cap. 2.

(34) Compare what Horace ſays *de Arte Poetica*, ver. 182.

Non tamen intus
Digna geri promes in ſcenam; multaque tolles
Ex oculis, quæ mox narret Facundia præſens.

(35) See the remark [*D*] of the article GRASSIS.

(36) See his words in a paſſage of Mr. Drelincourt quoted in the remark [*B*] of the article PINET.

(37) *Index Hiſpan. Libr. prohibitor.* pag. 232. col. 1.

(38) *Index Rom. Libr. prohibit.* pag. 124. col. 2. and pag. 261.

BANDEL (MATTHEW) born at Caſtro-Novo in Lombardy, flouriſhed in the XVIth Century (*a*). He was a Dominican. Moreri (*b*) has related of him moſt of the things that Voſſius had ſaid before; but he ſhould have added ſeveral other curious facts, and not have omitted two circumſtances, that Voſſius has given us an account of; one is, that the *Tranſlation of Hegeſippus* is in Italian; the other is, that the inhabitants of Fermo placed amongſt their Archives the *Oration*, which Matthew Bandel compoſed in praiſe of their city in the year 1513 (*c*). The following is as a ſupplement to their accounts. This Monk being at Mantua, contracted an intimate friendſhip with Julius Cæſar Scaliger, which continued as long as he lived, and which he cultivated very ſtudiouſly in Gui- enne [*A*]. He was Biſhop of Agen for ſeveral months; and it was in that city, that he wrote in Italian the *Hiſtories* or *Gallant Novels*, which rendered him ſo famous. I have quoted them in the remark [*M*] of the article LEO X, and in the remark [*I*] of the ar- ticle MAHOMET II. Each of them is dedicated to ſome perſon of his acquaintance (*d*). The XXI of the ſecond part is dedicated to Lucretia de Gonzaga, whoſe Preceptor he had been (*e*). He has dedicated another to his friend Scaliger. They have been tran- ſlated into French, and we muſt ſpeak a word of the judgment, which the Tranſlator has paſſed upon them [*B*]. The catalogue of the library of Thuanus (*f*) informs me, that the

(*a*) Theſe words of Voſſius, *circa annum* 1500 *vivebat Matthæus Bandellus, in* pag. 677. *de Hiſtor. Latin.* are nothing to the purpoſe.

(*b*) Moreri under the word *Bandella.*

(*c*) Voſſ. *de Hiſt. Latin.* pag. 677.

(*d*) See remark [*A*].

(*e*) See the article of that Lady.

(*f*) Page 408 of the ſecond part.

[*A*] *He contracted an intimate friendſhip with Julius Cæſar Scaliger.*] We have no account of this but from the following paſſage: *Eodem tempore Mantuæ degebat Matthæus Bandellus Inſuber Dominicanus, vir eloquentiſſimus & optimus, qui poſtea per aliquot menſes Epiſcopus Aginnenſis fuit, & Mantuæ Marium Æquicolum ſummâ obſervantiâ coluit, atque ibi cum Julio Cæſare arctiſſimâ amicitiæ neceſſitudine conjunctus fuit, quam ab eo tempore, ad ſupremum uſque vitæ diem in Aquitaniâ perpetuavit. Is, quum unam Hiſtoriarum ſuarum, quas Aginni Etruſcâ linguâ Boccatium imitatus conſcripſit Julio dedicaret, eum non ſolum Scaligerum agnoſcit, ſed etiam illuſtriſſimum vocat in Epiſtolâ dedicationis. Et quum in quatuor tomis ingentibus, ſingulas ſingulis ſummis & nobiliſſimis, ac genereoſiſſimis viris dedicaret, neminem eorum majore honore, quam Julium affecit, quum tamen aliquot ex illis illuſtres vocare nulla fuiſſet invidia* (1). Lucretia de Gonzaga wrote two Letters to Father Bandel, which intimate to us, that he was raiſed to ſome poſt. The firſt (2) ſhews that he was in France, and the ſecond (3) that he was in Guienne; in the firſt he is called *Reverendo Padre*; but in the other he is ſtiled *Monſignor P. Bandello*, and congratulated upon his new dignity. The date of the year is not mentioned. He was not a Biſhop, when Julius Cæſar Scaliger wrote him a Letter (4) upon the death of Fracaſtorius. His Anſwer (5) is dated *Baſſennii, 22 Novemb.* 1553.

[*B*] *His* Novels *have been tranſlated into French . . . and here is the judgment of the Tranſlator upon them.*] We muſt obſerve firſt, that the ſix firſt were tranſlated into French by Peter Boaiſteau, and the reſt by Belle- foreſt.

(1) Joſeph. Scaliger. *in Confutat. Fabulæ Burdonianæ*, pag. 269, 270.

(2) It is in pag. 61. of the Letters of Lucretia de Gonzaga, printed at Venice in the year 1552.

(3) It is in p. 63.

(4) It is the 56th of his *Letters*, pag. 186. of the Leyden edition in 1600.

(5) It is the 57th Letter amongſt thoſe of Julius Cæſar Scaliger.

the three firſt parts were printed at Lucca in the year 1554 in 4to, and the fourth at Lyons in 1573 in 8vo. I am ſurprized, that Mr. Menage has not placed this Monk in his Catalogue of Eccleſiaſtics, who have written Verſes of Gallantry (g) [C].

(g) It is at the end of his *Anti-Baillet.*

ſoreſt. The Advertiſement to the Reader before the firſt volume (6) contains theſe words: *Deſiring thee moreover not to take it ill, if I have not confined myſelf to the ſtyle of Bandel; for his phraſe ſeemed to me ſo harſh, his terms ſo improper, his diſcourſe ſo ill connected, and his ſentences ſo dry, that I choſe rather to new mold it, and put it in a new form, than to follow him too ſuperſtitiouſly; and I have only taken from him the ſubject of the Hiſtory, as thou may'ſt eaſily perceive, if thou art curious enough to compare my ſtyle with his.* See here a fact, that is curious enough. Belleforeſt, being engaged in the tranſlation of the XXXVIIth Novel, was ſeized with ſuch a remorſe of conſcience, that he reſolved to break off there his undertaking. *I lay down here,* ſays he (7), *my arms, and leave henceforward theſe ſubjects, which may be turned every way, and from which ſome may receive inſtruction, and others an example to make uſe of in their youthful follies; for what I have done now was rather to gratify a friend of mine, than out of any deſire that ſuch a work ſhould be publiſh'd by me. Not that age diſpenſes me from ſpeaking that which is merry and gay; but there are different times for ſuch mirth and humour, whatever there may be that is concealed and colours over thoſe expreſſions, which are too luſcious, tho' neceſſary, when affairs of gallantry are ſpoken of. And beſides I have deſigns of more importance than Bandel's Hiſtories, or the amours of thoſe, who from their example ought to warn us from following ſo much our ſenſual appetites, as to become at laſt a tale to poſterity by the memory of our folly. This King* (8) *therefore ſhall conclude our courſe, and end from henceforward every profane undertaking of mine, if ſometimes a more ſolid Hiſtory does not awaken my ſpirits, and a longer diſcourſe does not make me think longer than I have done to follow ſimply the Author's ſteps, whom I have rather adorn'd and amplified than followed or imitated.* To excuſe what was paſt he adds this remark. "I do not write ſtories of love as a laſcivious "perſon, but as one, that laughs at fools, and diverts "himſelf with thoſe, who are hurried away with their "irregular paſſions. I accuſe adulterers, deteſt infamous perſons, abhor murderers, and am ſorry "that there are in the world ſuch abſurd men, as to "throw away their lives for ſo tranſient a pleaſure, as "that of their body. In ſhort I commend virtue, "and accuſe vice, wiſhing that I myſelf improving "by this reading may ſee others come to an end of "their follies, and amend their lives. If any perſon "takes more pleaſure in the merry ſtories, which are in "Bandel, let him divert himſelf as he will; as for "me (as I have ſaid before) I give up my part to "him, and leave him all the pleaſure and glory, "which he may gain by it, having enriched both "this barren author, and our language with the native ſweetneſs of its eloquence (9)." We ſee here a French Layman, who ſcruples to tranſlate what an Italian Monk had written of Love: but this ſcruple did not continue long; for Belleforeſt finiſhed this tranſlation, and made ſeveral additions to it.

(6) It was printed at Paris in the year 1567, and reprinted the ſame year at Antwerp.

(7) Belleforeſt, *Hiſtoires Tragiq.* tom. 3. pag. 53, 54. edit. of Roan in 1604.

(8) That is, Henry VIII, King of England.

(9) Belleforeſt, *Hiſt. Tragiques*, tom. 3. pag. 55.

[C] *Mr. Menage has not placed him in the number of the Eccleſiaſtics, who have written verſes of gallantry.*] Bandel wrote ſeveral, and was congratulated upon them by his friends. See Julius Cæſar Scaliger's Epigram *de Bandelli Amoribus Thuſcâ Linguâ decantatio* (10), and the four verſes following:

Dum teneros loquitur dulcis Bandellus amores,
Ipſe ſui oblitus tela remiſit amor.
Seu canit Aonium fontem fontiſque ſorores
Fonti ipſi ex illo lactea vena fluit (11).

"While tuneful Bandel ſings his tender loves,
"Attentive Cupid drops his uſeleſs darts;
"Or when he ſings th' Aonian fount, and all
"Th' harmonious ſiſters of the ſacred ſpring,
"His numbers add new charms to Pindus' ſhades.

(10) I ſhall give it in the remark [B] of the article of (LUCRETIA DE) GONZAGA.

(11) Jul. Cæſ. Scaliger, *in Heroibus*, pag. 327. Part. 1. *Poematum.*

The Catalogue of Nicholas Heinſius's Library (12) informs me that the *Canti xi, &c. del Bandello* were printed at Agen in the year 1545, in 8vo.

(12) In pag. 200 of the 2d Part.

BANDOLE (ANTHONY DE) Advocate in the Parliament of Provence, publiſhed a French Tranſlation of *Xiphilin* at Paris in the year 1610 in 4to. He publiſhed likewiſe in the ſame city in 1609 in 4to *A Parallel between Cæſar and Henry IV*, prefixed to Cæſar's Commentaries, tranſlated into French, and commented upon by Vigenere.

BANGIUS (THOMAS) Doctor and Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Copenhagen, was born in the year 1600 (a). He finiſhed his Humanity Studies in the College of Ottenſée in the iſle of Funen, and then went over to Copenhagen about the end of the year 1621, where he continued his ſtudies with great ſucceſs. Gaſpar Brochmand, Profeſſor of Divinity, and Biſhop of Selande, made him Tutor to his ſon. Bangius was Preceptor at the ſame time to Chriſtian Friis, eldeſt ſon to the Chancellor of Denmark. After he had continued in that employment above five years, he obtained a penſion from the King, and went to Roſtoch, from whence he returned to Copenhagen, when the Emperor's troops drew near to the Baltic Sea. He finiſhed his courſe of Divinity under Profeſſor Brochmand, and afterwards went to Franeker, where he learned Rabbinical and Chaldee learning under Sixtinus Amama, by whom he was greatly eſteemed. He ſtudied afterwards at Wittemberg, and received there in the year 1630 a letter from the Rector and Academical Council of Copenhagen, with an offer of the Profeſſorſhip in Hebrew. He excuſed himſelf, alledging that he had not learning ſufficient to diſcharge that office worthily; but finding himſelf adviſed by Mr. Brochmand, who was then Rector, not to refuſe what was offered, he accepted it on condition that he ſhould be permitted to employ the revenue of that place in ſtudying for ſome years the Arabic and Syriac tongues under Gabriel Sionita (b). This condition being agreed to, he went to Copenhagen, and took poſſeſſion in September 1630 of the Profeſſorſhip of Hebrew, and a little after of his Doctor's Degree in Philoſophy. He diſcharged that Profeſſorſhip with great advantage to Students till the year 1652, when he was raiſed to the Profeſſorſhip of Divinity, vacant by the death of Mr. Brochmand. He was promoted to the Doctorſhip in the ſame Faculty in the year 1653, in the preſence of the King and Queen. Three years after he had the office of Library-keeper to the Univerſity conferred upon him, and he performed the Dedication of the Church of the Trinity in a Latin Sermon (c). Falling ſick the 11th of October 1661, his principal care was that of his ſoul: he confeſſed himſelf, and communicated on the ſixth day of his ſickneſs, and died the 27th of the ſame month (d). he

(a) *Flemloſiæ Finorum.* I chooſe rather to give the name of his country in Latin, than to give the vulgar name wrong.

(b) He taught them at Paris.

(c) This church was deſigned for the religious exerciſes of the Students.

(d) Taken from his *Funeral Programma*, written by Peter Scavenius, Rector of the Univerſity of Copenhagen, quoted by Witte, *Memor. Theolog. renov.* pag. 1387.

he married in 1635 a Senator's daughter, by whom he had fourteen children, eight ſons, and ſix daughters. His writings teſtify his learning [*A*].

[*A*] *His writings teſtify his learning.*] He was an Author before he was a Doctor; for he publiſhed in the year 1627 an Expoſition of a paſſage in Jeremiah (1). His *Vindiciæ locorum Geneſ.* xlviii. 16; Geneſ. vi. 1; Pſalm xix. 1. were publiſhed in the year 1630. He publiſhed the year following *Fontium Iſraëlis Trias, Jona, Michea, Ruth*; and in the year 1634 his *Exercitatio Glottologica de Ortu Linguarum.* His *Exercitationes octo Literariæ Antiquitatis* appeared in the year 1638. The two books *Obſervationum Philologicarum* appeared two years after. His *Hermes & Pan Hebraicus, quo vivum abſoluti Hebraici Lexicographi exemplum proponitur,* was printed in 1641 (2). The *Phoſphorus Inſcriptionis hieroſymbolicæ, quo Stellæburgum Regium Hafnienſe illuſtratur,* appeared in the year 1648, and was followed the year after by the *Tropæum protevangelicum, quo ex ſcriptis pontificiorum oſtenditur veram eſſe lectionem,* Ipſum conteret tibi caput, *& ſoli Chriſto convenire.* The *Exercitatio elenchtica de Nephilimis, Gigantibus vulgò dictis, oppoſita Jacobo Boulducco,* was a product of the year 1652; and the *Oliva ſacræ pacis repurgata,* a product of the year 1654; and the *Cælum Orientis & priſci Mundi,* a product of the year 1657. I paſs by the titles of ſome other of his works, which have not been omitted in his *Funeral Programma,* or by Albert Bartholin (3). Some of the books, which I have given the titles of, are only ſpeeches; the *Oliva ſacræ pacis repurgata* is of that number. However this has given the Author a place in the Catalogue of the Reconcilers in Religion (4), and been inſerted at large by John Duræus in his *Irenicorum tractatuum Prodromus.*

(1) It is the 24th verſe of the 23d chapter.

(2) Father Labbe *Biblioth. Bibliothec.* pag. 198. ſpeaks of this book, tho' it had no relation to his deſign, and aſcribes it to Thomas Bengus.

(3) *In Libro de Scriptis Danorum.*

(4) *See* Heidegger. *de Concordiæ Eccleſiaſt. Prot.* pag. 208.

☞ BANISTER (JOHN), an eminent Phyſician in the XVIth Century, and Author of ſeveral Treatiſes in Chirurgery [*A*], was born of honeſt and wealthy parents. He ſtudied at the Univerſity of Oxford, and entering upon the Phyſic Line, applied himſelf ſolely to that Faculty and Chirurgery (*a*). In July 1573 he was licenſed by that Univerſity to practiſe Phyſic (*b*). He ſettled afterwards at Nottingham, where he lived many years, and had very great practice, on account of his admirable ſkill in Phyſic and Chirurgery. There was likewiſe one Richard Baniſter, who wrote a piece upon the Diſeaſes of the eyes [*B*].

(*a*) Wood, *Athen. Oxonienſ.* vol. 1. col. 243. 2d edit. 1721.

(*b*) Idem, ibid. and *Faſti Oxon.* col. 109.

[*A*] *Author of ſeveral Treatiſes in Chirurgery.*] I. *A needful, new, and neceſſary Treatiſe of Chirurgery, briefly comprehending the general and particular Curation of Ulcers,* London 1575, in 8vo. II. *Certain Experiments of his own Invention, &c.* III. *Hiſtory of Man, ſucked from the ſap of the moſt approved Anatomiſts, &c. in nine books.* London 1578, in a thin folio. IV. *Compendious Chirurgery, gathered and tranſlated eſpecially out of Wecker, &c.* London 1585, in 12mo. V. *Antidotary Chirurgical, containing Variety of all ſorts of Medicines, &c.* London 1589, in 8vo. Several years after his death in 1633, his works were publiſhed at London in 4to in ſix books. 1. Of Tumours; 2. Of Wounds; 3. Of Ulcers, in general and particular; 4. Of Fractures and Luxations; 5. Of the Curation of Ulcers; and 6. The Antidotary, abovementioned.

[*B*] *Who wrote a piece upon the Diſeaſes of the Eyes.*] It is intitled; *A Treatiſe of one hundred and thirteen Diſeaſes of the Eyes and Eye-Lids,* commonly called *Baniſter's Breviary of the Eyes.* Mr. Wood tells us (1), that he never ſaw this Treatiſe, but only the title of it mentioned in the book following; *An appendant part of a Treatiſe of one hundred and thirteen Diſeaſes of the Eyes and Eye-Lids, called* Cervifia Medicata, *purging Ale, with divers Aphoriſms and Principles, &c.* London 1622, in 12mo, 2d edition. The Epiſtle is dated from Stamford in Lincolnſhire. It appears from the 9th chapter of that book, that the Author was living in the year 1617, and from the 6th chapter that he was alive in 1619, and perhaps in 1622, when the ſecond edition was publiſhed. He tells us in the 4th chapter, that in his Treatiſe of the Eyes he had *named the beſt Oculiſts that have been in this Land for fifty or ſixty years, who were no Graduates either in Cambridge or Oxford.* T.

(1) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 244.

☞ BANKS (Sir JOHN) Lord Chief Juſtice of the Common Pleas in the reign of King Charles I, was born of honeſt parents at Keſwick in Cumberland, and entered a Commoner in Queen's-College Oxford in 1604, at fifteen years of age; but left the Univerſity before he took a Degree, and ſettled in Grays-Inn, where he diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his uncommon application to the ſtudy of the Law, and became Barriſter and a Counſellor of great eminence. He afterwards received the honour of Knighthood, and was appointed Attorney to Prince Charles; and in the ſixth year of King Charles I was choſen Lent-Reader to the Society of Grays-Inn, and the year following Treaſurer to that Houſe (*a*). In 1640 he was made Lord Chief Juſtice of the King's-Bench (*b*), and ſoon after following his Majeſty, when he was obliged to leave Weſtminſter, he was choſen one of his Privy-Council at Oxford, and Lord Chief Juſtice of the Common Pleas. January the 31ſt 1642 he was created Doctor of the Civil Law in that Univerſity, where he died December the 28th 1644, and was interred in the Cathedral of Chriſt Church there (*c*), and had a monument erected to him [*A*]. By his laſt will he gave thirty pounds *per annum*, with other emoluments to be beſtowed upon pious uſes, and eſpecially to ſet up a manufacture of coarſe cottons at Keſwick, where he was born (*d*). His invention was ready; his apprehenſion quick; his memory capacious and retentive; his knowledge in the Law, even the moſt abſtruſe parts of it, profound; his experience in affairs of State univerſal. He was patient in hearing; ſparing, but pertinent in ſpeaking;

(*a*) Wood, *Faſti Oxonienſ.* vol. 2. col. 26. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*b*) Dugdale *in Chron. Serie, ann.* 1640. *apud* Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(*c*) Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(*d*) *See* Fuller's *Worthies in Cumberland.*

[*A*] *Had a monument erected to him.*] His epitaph inſcribed upon it is as follows.

P. M. S. Hoc loco in ſpem futuri ſæculi depoſitum jacet JOHANNIS BANKES, qui Reginalis Collegii in hâc Academiâ Alumnus, Eques auratus ornatiſſimus, Attornatus Generalis, de communi Banco Cap.' Juſticiarius, a ſecretioribus Conſiliis Regi Carolo, Peritiam, Integritatem, fidem egregie præſtitit. Ex Æde Chriſti in Ædes Chriſti tranſiit menſe Decembris die 28. *Anno dom.* 1644. *Ætatis ſuæ* 55 (1). i. e. "Here lie interr'd in hopes of the Reſurrection the Remains of "Sir John Banks, Knight, educated in Queen's "College in this Univerſity, afterwards Attorney-"General, and Lord Chief Juſtice of the Common "Pleas, and Privy-Counſellor to King Charles; in "which ſtations he gave ſignal proofs of his Abili-"ties, Integrity, and Fidelity. He departed this "Life at Chriſt-Church, and was removed to the "Manſions of Chriſt in Heaven December 28th "1644, in the 55th year of his age." T.

(1) See *Hiſtor. & Antiquit. Univerſit. Oxon.* lib. 2. pag. 289. ed. Oxon. 1674.

ing; highly pleaſed with a juſt and clear repreſentation of a cauſe, and able to penetrate through all diſguſes into the real merits of it. He was a Gentleman of a ſingular modeſty, of the antient freedom, and unſpotted integrity; grave and ſevere in his behaviour, but at the ſame time eaſy and affable; in ſhort ſo uniform and circumſpect in the ſeveral changes of his life, that though he went himſelf, and brought over as many perſons as he had any intereſt in, to the King, yet he fell under no extraordinary diſpleaſure from the contrary party (*d*).

(*d*) *See* Lloyd's *State Worthies*, pag. 961, 962. edit. London 1670 in 8vo.

BARANZAN (REDEMPTUS) a Barnabite Friar, was one of the firſt who in the XVIIth Century ventured to depart from the Ariſtotelian way of philoſophizing. La Mothe le Vayer ſays that he might juſtly *rank him amongſt the firſt Wits of our age* (*a*), and the productions of his youth are ſufficient to give him that claim [*A*]. He adds, that this honeſt Barnabite had *ſeveral times aſſured him, but always with ſubmiſſion to the good pleaſure of God*, that he would appear to him, *if he ſhould depart firſt out of this world*. He did not keep his promiſe, *Providence having ordered it otherwiſe*; and he verified the ſentence of a Latin Poet;

(*a*) La Mothe le Vayer, *Diſcours Chretien de l'Immortalite de l'Ame*, tom. 4. of his Works, in 12mo, pag. 172.

Qui nunc it per iter tenebricoſum,
Illuc unde negant redire quenquam (*b*).

(*b*) Catull. Epigr. 3.

" He paſs'd the dark and dreary way,
" From whence there's no return to the bright genial day.

I ſhall ſpeak in another place (*c*) of ſome perſons, who made the ſame kind of promiſes. Baranzan was of Verceil: he taught Mathematics and Philoſophy in the city of Anneci in Savoy. Naudæus in page 79 of the *Inſtruction*, which he publiſhed in 1623, concerning the Roſicrucians, ſpeaks of him as a perſon already deceaſed.

(*c*) In the article BONFADIUS.

[*A*] *He may be rank'd amongſt the firſt Wits of our Age: the productions of his youth are ſufficient to give him that claim.*] He means without doubt the book *de novis Opinionibus Phyſicæ*, printed at Lions in 1619. Konig mentions two books of this work; *Edidit*, ſays he, *Uranoſcopium & Campum Philoſophicum, an.* 1620 (1). I had in my hands a copy of the *Campus Philoſophicus*, printed at Lyons in 1619. It contains but one volume, and treats only of Logic, and that in a manner very conformable to that of the Peripatetics: but the approbation makes me imagine that this volume is only the firſt part of Baranzan's Courſe of Philoſophy; and that this Courſe had for its general title *Summa Philoſophica Anneciacenſis*; which confirms what I have ſaid, that this author taught in Anneci.

(1) The Catalogue of the Oxford Library ſays *Uranoſcopia ſeu Univerſa Doctrina de Cœlo*, 1617.

BARBARUS (FRANCIS) a noble Venetian, was a man of great fame in the XVth Century. He had not only a great fund of Learning, but likewiſe a very ſkillful addreſs in the management of affairs of importance; he was no leſs a Stateſman, than a man of Letters; and he ſhewed this in all the public employments, which he was intruſted with, and eſpecially when he was Governor of Breſcia. The vigilance, reſolution, activity, and other great virtues, with which he defended that City againſt the forces of the Duke of Milan, commanded by the famous Picinin, can never be ſufficiently admir'd. He had to engage with enemies both at home and abroad, and yet he gained the advantage over them all. There were prodigious diviſions in the City; the Avogadri, and the Martinenghi were the heads of two oppoſite factions: he induced them by his eloquence to reunite, and to join together in promoting the intereſts of the common cauſe. The length of the ſiege, or blockade, occaſioned a famine in the City; the famine occaſioned a peſtilence; and yet amidſt all theſe embaraſſments, he had the advantage of rendring uſeleſs all the efforts of the enemy for three years, and obliging them to retire. This happen'd about the year 1439 (*a*). There are ſome authors, who imagine that our Francis Barbarus is the ſame with him, who wrote a book *De Re Uxoria*, ſeveral *Letters*, and ſome *Speeches*. This is the opinion of Volaterranus (*b*), who adds, that he had been the Scholar of Chryſoloras, and that he forgot all his Greek in his old age. Volaterranus might perhaps be miſtaken in ſomething [*A*]. Francis Barbarus died in the year 1454 (*c*).

(*a*) Taken from Vianoli in his 18th book of the *Hiſtory of Venice*, tom. 1. See likewiſe what he ſays in the 20th book, p. 768.

(*b*) Volaterran. lib. 21. p. 773.

(*c*) Voſſius *de Hiſt. Lat.* pag. 620.

BARBARUS

[*A*] *Volaterranus might perhaps be miſtaken in ſomething relating to Fr. Barbarus.*] This is the reaſon of my ſuſpicion. I find in Vianoli, that Francis Barbarus, who defended ſo ſucceſsfully the city of Breſcia, was father to Zachary, and that Zachary was father to Hermolaus Barbarus (1). I find in Geſner's *Bibliotheca*, that Francis Barbarus, author of the book *de Re Uxoriâ*, tranſlated from the Greek of Plutarch the *Life of Ariſtides*, and that of *Cato*, and dedicated them to Zachary his brother. I find in Volaterranus (2), that Hermolaus Barbarus was nephew (3) to that Francis Barbarus, who defended the city of Breſcia. Volaterranus had ſpoken of this Francis Barbarus in pag. 733, and ſaid of him among other things what follows; " He underſtood the Greek tongue; but he " forgot it entirely in his old age, as I have heard " Hermolaus Barbarus his kinſman ſay." *Hic poſtremo feneſcens, uti ab Hermolao ejus neceſſario accepi, Literarum Græcarum quas probe tenebat, erat omnino oblitus.* The other things, which Volaterranus related of this Francis Barbarus, are, that he had been the ſcholar of Chryſoloras, that he wrote a book *de Re Uxoria*, ſome Speeches, and Letters, and that he raiſed himſelf a great reputation by defending the city of Breſcia. *Dum Brixiæ prætor eſſet, eam urbem à Philippi Ducis obſidione magnâ cum laude liberavit.* This might make one ſuſpect that Volaterranus confounded what regarded the Father, and what belonged only to the ſon. The paſſage of Geſner ſhews that Francis Barbarus, author of the book *de Re Uxoria*, and tranſlator of *the Life of Ariſtides*, was brother to Zachary Barbarus. Now, according to Vianoli, Zachary Barbarus was ſon to him, who defended Breſcia, and father to Hermolaus; ſo that we muſt ſay, that he, who defended Breſcia, had a ſon named Francis Barbarus, who wrote a book *de Re Uxoriâ*, and tranſlated from the Greek of Plutarch

(1) *Hiſt. of Venice* by *Vianoli*, tom. 1. liv. 20. pag. 768.

(2) Lib. 21. pag. 777.

(3) *Ex fratre nepos.*

BARBARUS (HERMOLAUS) grandſon of the preceding, was one of the moſt learned men in the XVth Century. He was born at Venice the 21ſt of May 1454 (*a*). He made a great progreſs in his ſtudies, and ſo quickly, that he began to write books in the eighteenth year of his age [*A*]. The publick employments, which he was entruſted with very early, did not prevent him from cultivating polite Learning with great application [*B*]. He was ſent by the Venetians to the Emperor Frederic, and to Maximilian his ſon, King of the Romans; and that deputation was ſo far from putting a ſtop to his pen, that it ſupplied him with matter to maintain the character of an author; for he not only publiſhed the *Oration* [*C*], which he ſpoke before theſe two Princes at Bruges in the year 1486; but he likewiſe wrote *A Treatiſe of the agreement of Aſtronomy with Phyſic*; he wrote it, I ſay, the ſame year, as he paſſed through the city of Cologne to go to Mentz. It was at the deſire of Theodoric Flas, Phyſician of Nuis, that he compoſed it (*b*). As he was very well ſkilled in Greek, he undertook the moſt difficult tranſlations, and began with a famous Paraphraſt upon Ariſtotle, I mean *Themiſtius*. He then attempted *Dioſcorides*, whoſe Text he corrected in the beſt manner he could, and gave a tranſlation of him, to which he added a very learned *Commentary*. It is ſaid that he laboured likewiſe upon two treatiſes of *Plutarch*, which are the moſt difficult of all (*c*): I cannot tell whether this tranſlation was ever publiſhed. He had a deſign to tranſlate all *The Works of Ariſtotle* [*D*], and he ſays in one of his Epiſtles Dedicatory, that the execution of that deſign was already very much advanced. He had an extraordinary facility in making verſes, and it is ſaid that he compoſed above twelve thouſand [*E*]. But of all his Works, there

(a) Geſner. *Bibliotb.* fol. 246. *ex Tritbemio.*

(b) Geſner. *in Bibliotb.* fol. 317.

(c) *De Iſide & Oſiride, & cur Oracula deſierint.* Geſner. *in Bibliotbec.* fol. 317.

tarch *the Life of Ariſtides* and that of *Cato*, and who was uncle to Hermolaus Barbarus. According to this, Volaterranus muſt have aſcribed to the father ſome things, which agree only to the ſon. Beſides he, that defended Breſcia, muſt have had a brother named Zachary, to whom he dedicated his two Tranſlations; and ſo all the error of Volaterranus would conſiſt in not having known that Francis Barbarus was grandfather to Hermolaus. If I had the works of Francis Barbarus, I ſhould probably find ſomewhat to decide this diſpute. But as I had them not, I deſired Mr. de Larroque to clear my doubt; and this is what he anſwered me: "Mr. Joli (4) proves that the author of "the book *de Re Uxoriâ* was grandfather to Hermo"laus, and that he publiſhed it about the time of the "Council of Conſtance; for Poggio and Paul Verger "ſpeak of this book in their Letters dated from the "city of Conſtance. Poggio's Letter is written to "Guerin of Verona, and that of Verger to Nicholas "Leontin. They commend Fr. Barbaro for having "written ſo well concerning Marriage, tho' he was "very young and unmarried. He dedicated to his "brother Zachary the Tranſlation of the Lives of A"riſtides and Cato, and died in the year 1454. Mr. "Joli diſtinguiſhes two Daniel Barbarus's." Obſerve that I have been informed, that this Preface of Mr. Joli, which I have quoted, contains ſeveral Elogiums upon the author of the book *de Re Uxoriâ*, and an Explication of many things relating to learned Men.

(4) In the preface to the French tranſlation of the book *de Re Uxoria*, printed at Paris in 1667.

Geſner and Voſſius quote a Letter of Andrew Brentius, from which we may learn that Francis Barbarus, grandfather to Hermolaus, and father to Zachary, wrote and tranſlated a great many books. *Nimirum in te omnia Franciſci Barbari patris virtutum lumina eluceſcunt; cui certè multum Latina lingua debet tot tantiſque ab eo libris compoſitis, partim converſis, à quo minimè degenerat Hermolaus filius, te tanto patre non indignus* (5). It is very certain, even from the teſtimony of Hermolaus himſelf (6), that his father's name was Zachary. So that Philip of Bergamo was much miſtaken, when he repreſented him as ſon to Francis Barbarus, and grandſon to Zachary; *Franciſci Barbari filius, Zachariæ Barbari nepos* (7). Moreri, as well here as in an hundred other places, tranſlates *Nepos Nephew*. This is an exceeding blunder. Thoſe, who value themſelves upon true Latin, uſe *Nepos* only to ſignify *a Grandſon*; but thoſe, who are not exact in their Latin ſtyle, uſe indeed the word *Nepos* for *Nephew*; but they generally add *ex fratre* or *ex ſorore* in order to prevent an equivocation; if they ſay *Nepos* without any addition, they mean *a Grandſon*.

(5) Andreas Brentius Patavinus, *Epiſtolâ ad Zachariam Barbarum*, *apud* Voſſium *de Hiſtor. Latin.* pag. 621. In the *Appendix* to Dr. Cave, pag. 157. we are aſſured that Hermolaus was ſon to Francis.

(6) See the 32d Letter of the 12th book of *Politian's Letters.*

(7) Philip. Borg. *apud* Voſſium *de Hiſtor. Lat.* pag. 621.

[*A*] *He began to write books in the eighteenth year of his age.*] It is Geſner, who acquaints us with this: *Ab octavo decimo ætatis ſuæ anno ſcribere exorſus multa elegantiſſima Opuſcula compoſuit* (1). Voſſius intended to ſay the ſame thing; but his Printer having forgot two Letters, it occaſioned Mr. Teiſſier to ſay that Hermolaus Barbarus *began to write at twenty two years of age* (2). Thus he tranſlates theſe words of Voſſius, *ab anno ætatis duo vigeſimo ſcribere orſus fuit* (3); of ſuch conſequence ſometimes are the errors of Printers. It is plain that Voſſius had put *duodevigeſimo*; two letters of this word being ſuppreſſed have taken away four years of glory from our author. We find in page 157 of the Appendix of Dr. Cave the error of Mr. Teiſſier.

(1) Geſner. *Bibliotb.* folio 317.

(2) Teiſſier, *Addit. aux Eloges de Monſ. de Thou.* p. 354.

(3) Voſſius, *de Hiſt. Lat.* p. 622.

[*B*] *His public employments . . . . did not prevent him from cultivating polite Learning.*] We muſt underſtand this with ſome reſtriction; for it is certain that theſe employments diverted him very much from ſtudy. *Honores*, ſays he (4), *in republicâ geſſi multos & magnos: quâ fide, quâ opinione, quâ gratiâ, non dixerim. Placet quidem impendiſſe annos penitus duodecim, ſed octo reipub. continuos: totum id tamen tempus literis fere periit.*

(4) Herm. Barbarus, *Epiſt.* 31. lib. 12. *inter Politiani Epiſtol.*

[*C*] *He publiſhed* an Oration.] It was dedicated to Carondelet, who was then firſt Secretary to the King of the Romans. The author owns that he did not publiſh it entirely as he ſpoke it; but he declares at the ſame time, that he gave it juſt as he had prepared it. If he did not ſpeak all that he had prepared, it was becauſe the Courtiers had recommended to him to be ſhort, and to come immediately to the point. They were not ignorant that the ſtudy of polite Learning flouriſhed in Italy then, and that the Embaſſadors of that Country were fond of making long ſpeeches, filled with all the ornaments of Rhetoric. It was neceſſary therefore to reduce the two ſpeeches, which Hermolaus and his collegue had prepared, into one; and as this abridgment and reduction of them was to be done in an hour and an half's time, we may judge of Hermolaus's preſence of mind, who happily ſurmounted all theſe difficulties. *Obſecro ne mirere ſi qua leges in hoc libello, quæ tunc dicta non fuerunt. Nec enim addidi nunc ea, ſed detraxi tunc, admonitus ab aulicis extemplo quam limen attigi ne longus eſſem, ambitioſa reciderem, optima quæque dicerem, patientiſſimis omnino, ſed occupatiſſimis tamen Principibus parcerem. Amputavi ſubito conſilio multa. . . . . Conſiderans hoc & æſtimans quod ſeſqui horam antequam Principes adiremus ſignificatum nobis fuerit non duas orationes ſeorſum, ut cogitabamus & paraveramus, ſed unam duobus junctim habendam & recitandam eſſe* (5).

(5) Herm. Barbar. *Epiſt. ad Carondelet. inter Epiſt. Politian.* 45. lib. 12.

[*D*] *He had a deſign to tranſlate all the works of Ariſtotle.*] In this manner he ſpeaks in the Preface to his Pomponius Mela (6). *Vocant nos majora quædam ſtudia, urgemuſque noſtrum illud vetus, omnes Ariſtotelis libros in Latinum vertendi exponendique propoſitum. Quod ſi ad exitum perduxero (nam bona ejus pars jam pridem peracta eſt) non dubito futurum, quin de reliquo in literis labore gratia mihi fiat.* His tranſlation of Ariſtotle's Rhetoric was publiſhed after his death. See the article following.

(6) *Apud* Geſner. *Bibliotb.* fol. 317. *verſo.*

[*E*] *He had an extraordinary facility in writing verſes: he compoſed above twelve thouſand.*] Amongſt other

there is none, which has gained him so much reputation as that, which he made upon *Pliny*. He corrected in him above five thousand passages; and restored occasionally three hundred in *Pomponius Mela* (*d*). There have not been wanting censurers with respect to this noble Work [*F*], no more than to his other performances [*G*]. He was Ambassador from the Republic of Venice to Pope Innocent VIII, when the Patriarch of Aquileia died. The Pope immediately conferred the Patriarchate upon him. Hermolaus was so imprudent as to accept it, without waiting for the consent of his Superiors [*H*], though he could not be ignorant that the Republic of Venice had made Laws to forbid all the Ministers, which they sent to the Court of Rome, to accept any Benefice. Hermolaus's excuses, which were founded upon the Pope's forcing him to take the Prelacy, were not heard. The Council of Ten signified to him in very severe terms, that he must renounce the Patriarchate; and that if he did not do it, his father should be degraded of all his Dignitles, and soon see all his estate confiscated. They were inflexible: Zachary Barbarus employed all the means imaginable to obtain the consent of the Republic to his son's being Patriarch;

(*d*) Hermol. Barbar. *in præfat. ad Alexandr. VI.*

other pieces of Poetry he wrote a work of 600 verses, the title of which is the same with that of his grandfather Francis Barbarus's work: I mean that this Poem is entitled *de Re Uxoriâ*, but it is very different from the prose work under that name. Francis Barbarus prescribes rules, as well to those who would marry, as to those, who are already married (7): he enters so particularly into the subject, that he has one chapter *de Coitus Ratione*. Hermolaus confines himself to this question, *Whether a wise man ought to marry* (8)? and concludes for the negative.

(7) See the titles of the chapters of his book in the *Bibliotheca of Gesner*, folio 246 *verso*.

(8) Gesner, *Biblioth.* fol. 317.

[*F*] *There have not been wanting censurers with regard to his work upon* Pliny.] It is pretended that he has given too great a scope to his conjectures and his memory. Pintianus censures him very severely upon that account. Those who pardon his slips of memory, will not forgive him his rashness, and say very freely of him, that he attempted to correct a great many things, which were not faults, but which surpassed his understanding. It is true that in several editions of Pliny great regard has been had to Hermolaus's corrections, because they have been inserted in the text; but it has been a long time said, that this pretended Physician of Pliny had given him more wounds, than he had cured. I shall give this in Father Hardouin's words. *Ipse* (Hermolaus) *in iis quæ attigit, sæpe nimium conjecturæ, memoriæ etiam plus quam hominem deceat, tribuit; uti paulo acerbius eam ob rem invectus in eum Pintianus olim exprobravit. Sed concessa facile venia μνημονικῶν ἁμαρτημάτων, quod minus mirum sit memoriam excidere aliquarum rerum, quam constare omnium; at non veniâ dignus æquè, cum neglectis veterum exemplarium vestigiis, & priscarum ante se editionum securus, plurima pro arbitrio, eruditè magis quam cautè ac verè, mutavit, vel planè peffumdedit: cum plurima ex iis quæ castigavit, non errata illa sint, sed parum intellecta. Tantum nihilominus auctoritati Barbari subsecuta ætas, eruditionique tribuit, ut conjecturas illius, ceu totidem κυρίους ὀδόντας in contextum inseruerit, unde eliminandæ a nobis variis argumentis fuere. Sensit jamdudum hanc labem operi Pliniano illatam auctor Epigrammatis alias haud perelegantis, in Commentarios a Stephano Aquæo editos, de quibus agendum mox erit. Sic enim ille;*

Dum facere Hermoleos medicinam Barbarus optat
Non paucis lacero vulneribus Plinio;
Perlæsum gravius conjectâ vulnerat arte:
Nec minus incautâ plurima turba manu.
In tantum ut Latio jam deploratus abiret,
Ob multa in Stygias vulnera fessus aquas, &c.

Felicior aliquanto Sigismundus Gelenius, *qui uno duntaxat archetyporum præsidio, collatis inter se exemplaribus, non pauca restituit, quæ Hermolao latuerant* (9). I have quoted this long passage in order to convince Mr. Varillas more effectually, that he was mistaken in a point, which is pretty well known. But I am notwithstanding sufficiently persuaded that Hermolaus's work upon Pliny's *Natural History* is worthy of admiration, considering the great number of authors, which he was obliged to consult, and the little time that he wanted for doing it. Twenty months were sufficient for him, he says; he broke the ice for others; he found Pliny in a very wretched condition, and like a piece of land, which has been long uncultivated, and an house infected with the plague, or haunted with spectres. *Hæc erant in Pliniano codice flagitia, propter quæ non parum multi divinum opus tanquam sentetum, imo verò quasi pestilens aut lemuribus infame domicilium vitabant. Ea nos Græcis & Latinis auctoribus perlectis omnibus lucubratione viginti mensium revellere ac publicare curavimus* (10). With respect to Volaterranus's sentiment, that this was an employment inconsistent with the character of Hermolaus Barbarus, *opus impar ejus dignitati & vitæ instituto* (11), it has been very justly condemned, as well because Hermolaus had engaged in this work before he took Orders in the Church, as because it were to be wished that several Prelates would commit the same faults. *Utinam sic a multis ejus dignitatis atque instituti peccaretur* (12). Vossius adds another reason; which is, that Pliny did not make the Patriarch neglect his episcopal functions, as appears from his *Sermons*, which are preserved in manuscript at Padua. I should choose rather to say, that since the Venetians would not suffer him to accept of that dignity, he could not neglect his patriarchal functions in favour of Pliny. We may observe, that having published this work in 1492, he added an Appendix to it, which he called *Secundæ Castigationes*, and which is dated from Rome the 13th of January 1493.

(9) Hardouinus *in præfat. in Plinium ad usum Delphini.*

(10) Herm. Barbar. *in Epilogo Operis*, pag. 425. edit. Basil. *an.* 1534.

(11) Volaterranus, lib. 21. pag. 777.

(12) *Cogitare debuerat Volaterranus, jam antea quam ad Episcopatum provectus esset, parata majori ex parte laboris esse, quæ ad istud opus pertinerent.* Vossius *de Hist. Latin.* pag. 623. Hermolaus says only, *Plinianas Castigationes, quas Legatus Romæ, nec dum sacris initiatus, inchoaveram. Præfat. ad Alexandrum VI.*

[*G*] . . . . . *No more than to his other performances.*] His *Translation of Themistius* is not exact, if we believe Vossius. *Ipse ille Themistius ab Hermolao Barbaro, dum nimium studet elegantiæ, tantâ conversus est libertate, ut sæpissimè longè aliud dicat quam senserit Themistius* (13); and he has shewn by his Translation of *Aristotle's Rhetoric*, that he did not understand Greek sufficiently, if we may depend on Francis de Escobar (14). It is said that he was so full of Pliny, that he accommodated the words of Dioscorides too often to those of Pliny, when he translated the former. This Translation has been frequently criticised upon by Marcellus Virgilius. *Doctè quidem & eleganter translati, sed (ut nonnullis videtur) nimis ad imitationem Plinii, quem dum ubique sequitur, à Dioscoridis verbis aliquando recedere videtur. Marcellus Virgilius, qui post Hermolaum eosdem Libros transtulit, plerumque interpretationem ejus carpit* (15).

(13) Vossius *de Philos.* pag. 8.

(14) *Apud* Andream Schottum, *Biblioth. Hispan.* pag. 333.

(15) Gesner. *in Biblioth.* fol. 317 *verso.*

[*H*] *Hermolaus was so imprudent as to accept the Patriarchate of Aquileia, without waiting for the consent of his Superiors.*] No person, that I know of, has succeeded better than Peter Bembus in relating this fact: for which reason it will be very convenient and agreeable to those, who have not that Historian, to see here what he says. *Eo mortuo Innocentius Patriarchatum (sic enim appellant) Aquileiensem . . . . Hermolao Barbaro, legato apud se Veneto attribuit. Quod ubi civitas intellexit, tametsi Hermolaus ad Senatum scripserat, coactum se à Pontifice vestem senatoriam mutavisse; quoniam tamen sacerdotiis cooptari cives Veneti, qui legati Romæ essent, lege prohibebantur, graviter tulit, ausum illum contra leges patrias facere. Auxit ejus rei magnopere invidiam, quod antea ex Hermolai literis, quas ad Senatum de Barbi morte dederat, more institutoque majorum comitiis senatoriis præjudicium patres fecerant, cujus ipsi civis nomen ad id adipiscendum sacerdotium Innocentio commendarit. Itaque deceptos in eo sese, ac prope delusos querebantur. Erat omnino Hermolaus, propter ejus summam in literarum atque optimarum artium studiis præstantiam, magnum apud exteras nationes nomen, apud suos quidem certe maximum: nam ad doctrinæ singularem opinionem, etiam vitæ perpetuam innocentiam adjunxerat. Simul is multum patris opibus & gratia, qui*

Patriarch; but not being able to gain any thing, he died of grief [I]. His ſon followed him ſoon after: ſome tell us, that he died likewiſe of grief [K]; but it is more probable that he died of the plague. Pierius Valerianus has placed him at the head of his Unfortunate Learned Men. He has carried the point too far, I think, when he ſays, that it is not even known whether Hermolaus Barbarus was buried [L]. This great man died at Rome in the year 1493. He teſtifies in his Letters a great reſignation, and tranquillity of mind, with reſpect to the treatment, which he had received from his Country (c). I do not think it can be affirm'd, that he was made Cardinal [M]. It is reported that he had recourſe to the Devil, to know the ſenſe of a Greek word [N], which Ariſtotle makes uſe of.

(c) See the remark [K].

qui ſummo proximum in civitate magiſtratum gerebat; multum clientelis, neceſſitudinibus, propinquatibuſque pollebat. Quibus tamen in rebus omnibus ſatis ſibi præſidii non habuit; cum pluris à patribus una legum charitas, majeſtaſque, quam ullorum civium omnibus aucta nominibus dignitas, atque claritas fieret. Decemviri enim literas ad eum ſeverè ſcriptas dederunt; morâ omni excuſationeque ſublata ſacerdotium repudiaret; id ſi non faceret, patrem magiſtratu remoturos, & bona ejus publicaturos præ ſe tulerunt. At pater, perſpectâ civitatis voluntate, omnibus tentatis rebus, cum jam eam flecti & leniri poſſe diffideret, ægritudine animi eſt mortuus. Filius non multo poſt Romæ, editis Plinianis Caſtigationibus, immenſi prope laboris opere, privatus plebeio morbo periit. Eum vitæ finem Hermolaus habuit, omnium ex ſua civitate, qui ante illum nati eſſent, Latinorum & Græcorum literis plane doctiſſimus (16).

(16) Bembus, *Hiſt. Venetæ*, lib. 1. fol. 18 *verſo.*

[I] *His father . . . died of grief.*] We have ſeen that Bembus aſſures us of it. The thing is probable enough; for he was a man in years, and filled one of the chief poſts of the Commonwealth. Such a ſevere proof of the decline of one's credit in one's old age, and to the prejudice of an illuſtrious ſon, whom one loves extremely, is generally a fatal blow. Zachary Barbarus died in the year 1492, fully reſigned to the orders of Providence: he was then entered into his 70th year; he was extremely regretted; his funeral pomp was magnificent. See Hermolaus's Letter to his friend Antonius Calvus (17). *Accedit quod ſeptuageſimum ingreſſus annum, quandiu in familiâ noſtrâ vixit nemo; quod functus omnibus honoribus; quod republica incolumi; quod liberis honeſto loco poſitis; incredibili deſiderio & amore civitatis exceſſit, frequentiâ funeris tanta (ut audio) quanta in cive nunquam.*

(17) It is the 32d of the 12th book of *Politian's Letters.*

[K] . . . . . *It is ſaid that he likewiſe died of grief.*] Volaterranus affirms it: *Romæ deceſſit ex animi dolore exacerbante, quod orator a Venetis miſſus, præter ejus auctoritatem Senatus, Patriarcha Aquileienſis ab Innocentio fuerat creatus, ac propterea contumax & exul* (18). I am ſtrongly of opinion that he died under the brand of a rebel and a baniſh'd perſon; for he always gave himſelf the title of Patriarch, notwithſtanding the preciſe orders, which he had received from his Sovereign to renounce the Patriarchate; but I believe he died of the plague and not of grief. My reaſons are, I, that after he was in diſgrace till his death he engaged in a work, which required a great freedom of mind, and a firm ſtate of health (19): II, That Peter Crinitus, who lived at that time, aſſures us that Hermolaus died of the plague (20). He does not aſſure us of this in a vague uncertain manner, but adds to his account a circumſtance which is very particular; and that is, that Picus of Mirandola, being informed at Florence, that Hermolaus was ſick of the plague, ſent him as ſoon as poſſibly he could an antidote, which he thought to be of ſovereign efficacy; but the meſſenger came too late. Paulus Jovius relates the ſame ſtory. *Mors ante diem irrepſit & peſtilenti quidem morbo periit, adeò ut quod a Pico Politianoque Florentiâ laboranti per diſpoſitos equos mittebatur miræ poteſtatis antidotum, veneni celeritate præverterit* (21). So that I can eaſily aſſent to the teſtimony, which Hermolaus Barbarus gives of himſelf, that he ſupported his diſgrace without grief, and even congratulated himſelf upon an injury, which put him into a full liberty of purſuing his ſtudies (22). His friends were fearful leſt he ſhould ſink under it, and his enemies publiſhed it every where. The latter were without doubt thoſe, who, in order to deprive him of the glory of his conſtancy and tranquillity, imputed to his grief what was only to be imputed to a contagious diſtemper. See in the remark [P] what I quote from Alcyonius.

(18) Volater. lib. 21. p. 777.

(19) The correction of Pliny.

(20) Crinitus *de honeſtâ Diſciplinâ*, lib. 1. cap. 7.

(21) Jovius, *Elog.* cap. 36.

(22) See the 31ſt Letter of the 12th Book of *Politian's Epiſtles.*

[L] *Pierius Valerianus . . . . . ſays that it is not known whether Hermolaus Barbarus was buried.*] I obſerve once more, that I believe Pierius Valerianus has carried things too far, when he ſays that this Patriarch dying in poverty, and being abandoned, was deprived of a burial: *Ob ſuſceptum inconſulto ſenatu ſuo Aquilienſe ſacerdotium exſul factus, & de poſſeſſione ejectus vitam inopem aliquandiu traxit, Alexandri Pontificis ſummi ſportulâ quodammodo ſuſtentatus; paucis vero poſt menſibus peſtilentia contactus, deſertus ab omnibus, infeliciſſimo mortis genere oppreſſus eſt; quique laudatione, & eloquentia ſua innumeros ætatis ſuæ homines illuſtraverat, & funere, & honore ſepulchri ita defraudatus eſt, ut ubi ſepultus, quove hominis cadaver conjectum fuerit, ignoretur* (23). Paulus Jovius, who wrote after Pierius Valerianus, not only ſays that Hermolaus Barbarus was buried, but even mentions the place of his burial. *Scilicet ut nimis ſevera patria optimi civis oſſa non haberet, quæ ſub colle hortorum ad Flumentanam portam ſepulchro condita e Campo Martio ab erudita Romana juventute ſalutantur* (24). Mr. de la Rochepozai (25), and Father Oldoini (26), ſhew more clearly the place of his burial; they fix it at St. Mary del Popolo. If Valerianus had only ſaid that the fear of the plague had driven away thoſe, who ſhould have aſſiſted the Patriarch (27), he would not have fallen into an hyperbole.

(23) Pier. Valer. *de Litteratorum Infelicit.* pag. 9.

(24) Jov. *Elog.* cap. 36.
(25) Rochepozai, *in Nomenclat. Cardinal*
(26) Oldoini, *in Athen. Roman.*
(27) See below the paſſage of Alcyonius.

[M] *I do not think it can be affirm'd that he was made Cardinal.*] Pierius Valerianus has not poſitively affirmed this; he ſays ſome things incompatible with it; but does Paulus Jovius, who has ſo plainly contradicted him with regard to Hermolaus Barbarus's burial, ſay that this Patriarch obtained a Cardinal's Hat? By no means: he only ſays that this honour was deſigned for him. *Tuliſti quippe æquo animo ſuffragiorum ſeveritatem, quum ex eo tamen pari merito tibi purpura pararetur. Sed mors ante diem irrepſit* (28). The author of the *Nomenclator Cardinalium* relates that Trithemius, who was followed in this by Pierius Valerianus, and ſeveral others, affirms, that Hermolaus Barbarus was raiſed to a Cardinalſhip. As for his own part, he affirms nothing; he only makes uſe of theſe words *Cardinalis deſignatus, ſed ut fertur nondum evulgatus*; that is, "He was deſigned to be made a "Cardinal, but not then, as it is reported, publickly "acknowledg'd ſo." Voſſius has quoted John Roche a Franciſcan, who affirms (29) that Hermolaus was made a Cardinal (30). Father Hardouin aſſerts the ſame thing (31).

(28) Valer. *de Litterator. Infelicitate*, pag. 9.

(29) *In Compendio Hiſtorico.*
(30) Voſſius *de Hiſt. Latin.* pag. 621.
(31) *Præfat. in Plinium.*

[N] *It is reported that he had recourſe to the Devil, to know the ſenſe of a Greek word.*] This word is ſo eſſential to the Natural Philoſophy of the Ariſtotelians, that while the ſenſe of it was not known, there was no poſſibility of underſtanding what Ariſtotle meant concerning the Nature of Body. I ſpeak of the word ἐντελέχια, which ſome Latin Writers, after having ſought to no purpoſe for others more proper, have at laſt render'd by that of *Perfectihabia*. Peter Crinitus ſpeaks as if Hermolaus himſelf had boaſted of this magical conſultation, and had ſaid that the anſwer was given in ſo low a tone of voice, that he could underſtand nothing of it. *Et reverà perexilis vocula dæmonum & exigua eſt, quod olim noſter quoque Venetus Hermolaus dicebat, vocem ſe dæmonis prætenuem & pene ſubſibilantem audiſſe, qua ille de Ariſtotelis forte entelechia interrogatus, ſibi ipſi & Georgio Placentino reſponſitavit* (32). I think I have gone to the original authority for this fact, in quoting Peter Crinitus; moſt Writers (33) only quote the *Dæmonomania* of Bodinus, where I have not yet found this Action of Hermolaus (34). Some quote Monlorius, who ſpeaks of it in his treatiſe *de Entelechiâ*. Laſtly, ſome pretend that Budæus is the inventor of *Perfectihabia*: you will find theſe words in Du Verdier Vau-Privas. "And even "thoſe, who have had a mind to praiſe him, have ſaid, "of him, *Eſt fœliciſſimus quidem, ſed audaciſſimus in no-*

(32) Crinit. *de honeſtâ Diſciplinâ*, lib. 6. c. 11.
(33) Father Rapin, *Reflex. ſur la Philoſ.* p. 350. Teiſſier *Eloges, &c.* tom. 1. pag. 355.
(34) I have not had leiſure to look page after page; but I could not find it in thoſe places, where it was probable that I ſhould find it.

of. We must not forget that Laurence de Medicis gave him marks of a singular esteem [O]. Mr. Varillas has given a very agreeable and elaborate account of Hermolaus Barbarus; but he is mistaken in a great many things, and much oftener than Moreri [P].

I shall quote a passage from Alcyonius, in which we shall find that our Harmolaus congratulated himself upon his disgrace; and that he never prosecuted his studies with so much application, as after his Country had ill treated him [Q].

BARBARUS

"wandis vocibus; that is, "He was very happy indeed, "but very bold in coining new words, as for instance "when he rendered the *Entelechia* of Aristotle *Perfectihabia* (35)." We may observe that several authors have maintained that Cicero has translated this word of Aristotle very ill (36).

(35) Du Verdier, *Biblioth. Françoise*, pag. 472. reporting what Genebrard said of Budæus.

(36) Joannes Ferrerius Pedemontanus confutes them in his Treatise *de Entelechiâ*.

[O] *Laurence de Medicis gave him marks of a singular esteem.*] He went to meet him notwithstanding his indisposition, and gave him a magnificent entertainment at his country-house. Read this Latin: *Cum Hermolaus Barbarus Reipublicæ Venetæ nomine legationes forte per Italiam obiret, & ad urbem Florentiam obiter accederet, Laurentius Medices (qui Florentinam Rempublicam non minore tum consilio, quam fortunâ gubernabat) statim tanto viro cum amicis pluribus (ut fit) obviam procedit; nihil veritus, quod ægros pedes haberet, ac summis doloribus vexaretur. Tum in Caiana villa, (quam infinitis propè sumptibus ædificabat) honorificentissimè illum accepit, simulque tanti hominis ingenio, & doctrina singulari provocatus, eam quoque liberalissimè studiorum nomine illi obtulit, cum insigni atque instructissima bibliotheca, quam ad exemplum Philadelphi mira tum industria paraverat, ut in eo quasi Musarum secessu simul cum Pico Mirandula honestioribus disciplinis, ac philosophiæ sacris pro arbitrio incumberet. In quo Hermolaus Barbarus (ut homo maxime humanus) libenter se dixit, & studiorum causa, & Laurentii merito talem animum agnoscere, villamque ipsam, si per publicas curas liceret, excipere* (37).

(37) Petrus Crinitus *de honestâ Disciplinâ*, lib. 15. cap. 9. pag. 400.

[P] *Mr. Varillas has given a very agreeable account . . . . of Herm. Barbarus; but he is mistaken in a great many things, and much oftner than Moreri.*] He says (38), I, That Hermolaus Barbarus past at Venice for the Nobleman, who above all others made profession of the highest and most refined gallantry. II, That no person ever saw him at study, and that no books were to be seen in his chamber or closet. I doubt the first of these two things, and think the second to be false. III, That having undertaken the greatest work, which was then in the Republick of Letters, (it was the correction of Pliny) (39), he made use of the authority of manuscripts, and of the Greek and Roman Writers, who had treated of the same subjects; and that *in the places, where these two helps failed him, he made use of his own conjectures, with so much probability and success, that not one of them has been rejected.* See the Confutation of this in the remark [F]. IV, *That it was by this ingenious method, that he discovered that Pliny was born at Como, and that he wrote a Dissertation, which convinced all that read it.* Of all the authors, which I have consulted concerning the Catalogue of Barbarus's works, I have not found one, that ascribes such a Dissertation to him. It is true in the Preface of Pliny, he seems to prefer the reading of *Catullum congerronem meum* to that of *Catullum conterraneum meum*, by which he eludes a very strong argument, which is drawn from this passage to prove that Pliny was of Verona. It is true, that independently of the reading *Congerronem*, which he will neither admit or reject absolutely, he declares that Pliny was of Como, and not of Verona; but he does enlarge upon this point; three lines are sufficient for him. This is not therefore what is called a Dissertation in form. Now tho' Mr. Varillas was right in this point, yet he has been guilty of a great error; for there is scarce any able and unprejudiced Critic, who has not always adjudged Pliny to the people of Verona. *Causam dudum adjudicârunt Veronensibus eruditi, inter quos præcipui Polycarpus Palermus singulari opere de Plinii patriâ, & Scaliger. in Euseb. Chron. pag.* 190 (40). Paulus Jovius's words being misunderstood very probably lead Mr. Varillas into this mistake. *Novo-comensibus C. Plinium secundum civem suum ab imperitis invidiosè surreptum, eruditâ præclarâque sententiâ reddidisti* (41). V, *The wonderful desire*, says he in his Anecdotes, which Barbarus had to remedy the disorders of Physic, *made him undertake the same work upon Dioscorides, which he had executed upon Pliny.* This is reverse of the proper order of time. Barbarus lived so short a time after his work upon Pliny's Natural History was published, that he formed no new designs; he had books enough to finish, and I do not doubt but that he wrote upon Dioscorides before he applied himself entirely to Pliny (42). VI, Hermolaus's friends advised him *to rest and enjoy the glory, which he had gained by his Pliny and Dioscorides*; but he himself told them, that he must translate what Themistius had left us upon Aristotle; and *he executed it as he proposed.* Here is a new Anachronism: the Translation of Themistius is one of the first, which Barbarus published. *Themistii Peripatetici Paraphrases in aliquot Aristotelis Libros admodum adolescens Latinas effecit* (43). He dedicated it to Sixtus IV, who had been dead eight years when he publish'd his Notes upon Pliny. VII, *Hermolaus did the Republic justice against his own interest, and confest that they had reason to be against him. He conjured the Pope to confer the benefice upon him, who should be presented by the Embassador of Venice, and declared formally, that he would not have it, if he must on that account incur the envy of his Citizens.* This seems to be a mere romance: we have seen above (44) in the passage of Peter Bembus, that the father of Hermolaus would never quit his hold, and that he endeavoured only to soften the Republic. Besides it is certain, that the new Patriarch always kept his title, and never submitted to his temporal Superiors. VIII, I cannot tell where Mr. Varillas read, that *the only remedy to cure Hermolaus was to send him right bezoar, and that there was some at Florence in a vessel of agate, which the Sultan Caitbey had made a present of to Laurence de Medicis.* Peter Crinitus, who ought to know as much of this as any person, says that the antidote belonged to Picus of Mirandola, who understood the composition of it. *Pharmacon contra pestem, quod ille sibi si quando incidisset, asservabat diligentissimè, curat ut Romam quam celerrimè ad Hermolaum devehatur. Dicebat autem Picus illud ipsum ex oleo scorpionum linguisque aspidum, & aliis ejusmodi venenis confectum* (45).

(38) Varill. *Anecdot. de Florence*, pag. 187, *& seq.*

(39) Mr. Varillas says that Pliny's *Natural History* contains 36 books: he should have said 37.

(40) Hardouin. *in Plin.* tom. 1. pag. 2.

(41) Jovius *in Elog.* cap. 36.

(42) See the following remark towards the end.

(43) Gesner. *Bibliothec.* fol. 318. The words in the *Journal of Leipsic*, pag. 461. for the year 1685, are not exact: *Hos libros Themistii paraphrasticos Hermolaus Barbarus Venetiis A.* 1570, *in fol. edidit*: for that edition was long after the author's death.

(44) Quotation (16).

(45) Petrus Crinitus, *de honestâ Disciplinâ*, lib. 1. cap. 7.

Moreri's errors consist in his saying, I, that the Senate did not approve the choice, which Innocent VIII made of Hermolaus Barbarus for Patriarch of Aquileia: II, that Herm. Barbarus publish'd Pliny's Natural History. The Senate would no less have disapproved of the election of any other person; and it was not on Hermolaus Barbarus's account, that the Senate was displeased with what Innocent VIII had done. They were angry that the Pope should pretend to dispose of the Patriarchate without consulting of them, and that Hermolaus had recognized the Pope's pretended right, by accepting of this dignity contrary to the laws of his country. He published his Corrections upon Pliny without the text of that author (46).

(46) All this Paragraph was at the end of the remark of the article of (FRANCIS) BARBARUS in the first edition.

[Q] *A passage of Alcyonius will shew that Hermolaus . . . . never prosecuted his studies with so much application, as after his country had ill treated him.*] This passage is as follows: it is Cardinal John de Medicis (47), who speaks. *Exsilium igitur Barbaro non solum calamitatem detraxit, sed etiam dignitatem auxit, quod quidem ita constanter moderatèque ferebat, ut facetissimè jocaretur Musas illud sibi à patriâ impetrasse, quoniam ægrè ferrent hominem suis sacris initiatum ambitione vulgarium honorum distineri, & plebeis occupationibus impediri. Itaque plura scripsit biennio exsul quam XX ante annos cum patria frueretur, & honoribus illius florentissimus esset, recognitionem erratorum Pliniani codicis, explanationem librorum de animâ Aristotelis, cum tamen ante ejusdem Philosophi libros talis argumenti in Latinum convertisset, & XVI libros de ratione disserendi, veteres Peripatetici organon eos appellant; & V Rhetoricos & unum Poeticum, octoque Dioscoridæ Medicos, quos alio etiam opere instruxerat, quod Corollarium inscribebat. Adjecerat quoque pulcherrimam expositionem ad libros analyticos posteriores Aristotelis ante in Latinum tralatos* (48). This seems to confute what I have said above,

(47) He was afterwards Pope Leo X.

(48) Petrus Alcyonius *in Medice Legato priore de Exsilio.*

BARBARUS (DANIEL) grand-nephew of the preceding procur'd himself a great reputation by his Learning. He published *A Commentary upon the five Fragments of Porphyrius* in the year 1542. Two years after he published *A Commentary upon the three Books of Aristotle's Rhetoric to Theodectus*, which had been translated into Latin by Hermolaus Barbarus. He wrote to Gesner, that he hoped to publish soon several works of Hermolaus (a). We are obliged to him for the edition of Speron Sperone's Dialogues.

(a) Taken from the *Bibliotheca* of Gesner, folio 192 *verso*.

(49) In the remark [P] num. 5 and 6.

above (49): but upon a careful examination I have nothing to apprehend; for besides that there may be some inaccuracy in this enumeration of Alcyonius, it is certain that part of the writings, which he mentions, are rather a revisal, or fuller exposition of what Hermolaus had done, than an entire new undertaking: and it is very plain, that Dioscorides had passed thro' his hands before his exile, and before his Corrections of the text of Pliny. This is a confirmation of what I have said against Mr. Varillas. Besides, we must observe that the writings in this Catalogue were not published before the author's death: so that he could not be exhorted to rest himself, by reason that his *Pliny*, and afterwards his *Dioscorides* had gained him glory enough. We shall see that Alcyonius observes, that these works of Barbarus were kept in manuscript in a Library *Et hæc quidem omnia* (50) *adhuc diligentissimè asservari vidi à fratribus illius cum sedecim abhinc annos* (51) *Venetiis Bibliothecam illius exciterem, atque incredibili sum lætitiâ elatus, cum cognovi doctissimi amicissimique hominis elucubrationes non intercidisse, quod ne evenisset magopere verebar, cum in suburbano Oliverii Caraphæ collegæ mei ex pestilentiâ obiisset, & domestici intimique familiares fugâ salutis suæ consuluissent, omniaque tanquam bona caduca in medium reliquissent. Sed ejus generis scripta ab interitu & furto vindicata fuisse narrabant Zenotelis cujusdam operâ, quum ille habebat ad manum* (52). I cannot deny but that Barbarus in the Epilogue to his Corrections upon Pliny promised an edition of Dioscorides: *Scire oportet*, says he (53), *annotamenta hæc . . . Dioscoridi quoque propediem emittendo profutura*; but I still insist upon it, that Mr. Varillas has not distinguished the times. There was a work of this author published upon Dioscorides before that upon Pliny, and after he had given the paraphrase of Themistius. See what follows: *Primum quidem dum Themistii nobis paraphrasin atque id juvenis adhuc tam eleganter Latinè loquentem producit, mox edito in Dioscoridem corollario tam variam ac reconditam doctrinæ rerum omnium supellectilem depromit: postremum Plinio . . . succurrit* (54).

(50) He should have excepted his work upon Pliny, which was published by the Author himself.

(51) Alcyonius supposes that the Cardinal John de Medicis said this about the year 1512.

(52) Alcyon. *in Medice Legato priore.*

(53) Herm. Barbar. *in Monit. ad Lector. ad calcem Castigat.* pag. 521.

(54) Jo. Oporinus, *Epist. dedicat. Castig.* Herm. Barbari *in Plinium.*

BARBARUS (DANIEL) of the same family with the preceding, was Patriarch of Aquileia, and famous for his Learning. He had engaged himself very deeply in Mathematics and Philosophy, before he had any Dignity in the Church; but after his promotion to the Bishoprick, he applied himself entirely to the study of Divinity. He was so prejudiced in favour of Aristotle, that he would readily have taken an oath of fidelity to him, if he had not been a Christian (a). He was Ambassador from Venice to England, when Pope Paul IV named him Coadjutor to the Patriarch Grimani (b). He was one of the Fathers of the Council of Trent, where he acted with great zeal for the Pope's interest. He voted strongly against those, who insisted upon the Communion in both kinds (c). He died in 1569 at forty one years of age (d). He published divers Works [A]; and if he had lived longer, without doubt would have published a great many more (e).

(a) Taken from Thuanus, lib. 46. p. 942.

(b) Pallavic. *Hist. Concil. Trident.* lib. 16. cap. 4. num. 22.

(c) Idem, lib. 18. cap. 4. num. 4. *ad ann.* 1562.

(d) Vossius *de Scient. Mathem.* pag. 355. Thuan. lib. 46. p. 942.

(e) Thuan. ibid.

[A] *He publish'd divers works.*] *A Commentary upon Vitruvius*, which was printed at Venice in 1567. *La prattica della Perspectiva*, printed at the same place in 1559 and 1568 (1). *Catena Græcorum Patrum in quinquaginta Psalmos Latinè versa.* Aubert Miræus (2), Moreri, Mr. Teissier (3), Konig, Paul Freher (4), &c. ascribe to him *the Commentary upon the five Predicaments of Porphyry*, and *the Commentary upon Aristotle's Rhetoric*, which I mentioned in the preceding article: but as the first of these Commentaries was printed in 1542, and the second in 1544, it is plain that they are not the Production of our Daniel Barbarus, who was born in the year 1528 (5). (6) Freher, thro' a very strange mistake, has said that our Daniel Barbarus, who died in the year 1569 at forty years of age, had obtained of Pope Innocent VIII, to whom he was Embassador from Venice, the Patriarchate of Aquileia.

(1) Vossius *de Scient. Mathem.* p. 355 and 425.

(2) *De Scriptor. Sæculi* 16.

(3) Teissier, *Addit. à Mr. de Thou*, tom. 1. pag. 354.

(4) Freheri *Theatrum Viror. Illustr.* pag. 1465.

(5) That is according to Thuanus and Vossius.

(6) Freher. *Theatr. Viror. Illustr.* pag. 1465.

BARBARA, wife of the Emperor Sigismond, was the daughter of Herman Count of Cilia in Hungary. Sigismond had been taken by the Hungarians, and placed under the guard of two young Gentlemen, whose father he had put to death. While they had him in custody, he persuaded their mother to let him escape. This was not gained without a great many excuses for the death of her husband, and a great many promises. He promised among other things to marry the daughter of the Count of Cilia, a near relation of that widow, which promise he performed (a). He had the most extraordinary wife of her that ever was seen. She had no manner of shame for her abandoned life. This is not the thing in which her great singularity consisted; for there are but too many Princesses, who are above being concerned at any imputations on account of their lewdness. What was extraordinary in her was her Atheism [A], a thing, which there is scarce any instance

(a) Æneas Sylvius, *in Addition. ad Anton. Panormitan. de Dictis & Factis Alphonsi*, lib. 3. num. 44. p. 69.

[A] *What was extraordinary in her was her Atheism, ... which we have scarce any instance of amongst the women.*] I am not ignorant of what has been lately publish'd in a Satyr on the sex, which is, I think, the master-piece of Mr. Despreaux. We find in this new piece that even irreligion is represented as one of the enormities of the women.

Dans le sexe j'ai peint la piété caustique.
Et que seroit-ce donc, si, censeur plus tragique,
J'allois y faire voir l'Atheisme établi,
Et non moins que l'honneur le ciel mis en oubli?
Si j'allois y montrer plus d'une Capanée;
Pour souveraine loi mettant la destinée,
Du tonnerre dans l'air bravant les vains carreaux,
Et nous parlant de Dieu du ton de Des Barreaux?

" If the whole sex I should pretend to trace
" In whom their caustic piety's grimace.
" But should I a more tragic story tell,
" Shew a She-Atheist ridiculing Hell;
" More than one *Capanea* should I paint;
" What would you say, at Heaven to hear her rant;
" Laugh at the glories of a future state,
" And make the sovereign Law consist in fate;
" To brave Heav'ns thunders, and with scoffs despise
" The voice and lightnings of the vengeful skies;
" Against

inſtance of amongſt the women. She believed neither Heaven nor Hell [B], and ſhe laughed at the Nuns, who renounced the pleaſures of this life, and mortified their bodies. Sigiſmond found himſelf likewiſe ill married upon other accounts; for his wife Barbara engaged in plots with ſeveral great Lords of Bohemia, in order to drive him out of the Kingdom, and ſo to get another huſband. He diſcovered this contrivance, and condemned the Empreſs to perpetual impriſonment. When he was dead, ſhe was ſet at liberty (b); and as ſhe deſigned to marry again, ſomebody repreſented to her the example of the turtle-dove, who continues ſingle all her life, after the death of her firſt mate. *If you will propoſe to me*, replied ſhe, *the example of beaſts, propoſe that of pigeons and ſparrows* (c) [C]. She grew old at Grats, in Bohemia, without renouncing her debaucheries (d), and died there about the

(b) *Ex* Matthiæ *Theatro Hiſtor. in Sigiſmunde*, pag. 998.

(c) Æneas Sylvius, *in Addition. ad Ant. Parnormit.* num. 5. pag. 56.

(d) *Gretii in Bohemiâ in vitâ turpi & fœdis libidinibus infami conſenuit.* Mathias, *Theatr. Hiſt.* pag. 998.

" Againſt the great Creator to declaim,
" And with lewd tongue inſult his mighty name."

But all this may be true, tho' there are not above four or five women in France, who have given into theſe impious maxims. I would not deny that this prodigy is become a little leſs extraordinary, ſince the ſex does not value themſelves upon their ignorance ſo much as they did before. There is occaſion for a certain degree of falſe Metaphyſics to fall into this fatal abyſs of irreligion. However that be, I am very well perſuaded with the author of *the Thoughts upon Comets*, that it is not upon this account the women deſerve cenſure. *Their fault is not Atheiſm; they make it a virtue not to enter into any deep train of reaſonings; ſo that they keep ſtrictly to their Catechiſm, being much more inclined to ſuperſtition than to impiety; they are great lovers of Indulgences and Sermons, and ſo much employed by a thouſand paſſions, which fall as it were to their lot, that they have neither time nor capacity enough to call in queſtion the articles of their faith* (1). It is certain they would ſooner find out the ſecret of reconciling their paſſions and their religion, tho' it were even in Moliniſm itſelf, than an expedient to believe nothing.

(1) *Penſees diverſes ſur les Comet.* num. 142. pag. 421.

[B] *She believed neither heaven nor hell.*] Here is the picture, which Bonfinius has left of that woman. *Barbaram Imperatricem eâ tempeſtate Græci diem obiiſſe ferunt, indomitæ libidinis mulierem, quæ inter adulteros publicè vitam duxit, proſtitutoque pudore viros ſæpius petiit quam peteretur. Quum ab omni religione deſtituta foret, ſuperos ac inferos eſſe negabat: religioſas ancillas, jejuniis aut oratorii rebuſque divinis intentas gravius increpabat, nullis aſſeverans moleſtiis ac inedia corpus eſſe macerandum, immò lautè paſcendum, in deliciis & voluptatibus alendum, & poſt mortem, cum nihil ſuperſit, nullam deorum animorumque curam eſſe ſubeundum* (2).

(2) Bonfinius, *Rerum Ungaricar.* Decade 3. lib. 7. pag. 344, 345.

[C] *If you will propoſe to me, ſaid ſhe, the example of beaſts, propoſe that of pigeons and ſparrows.*] This is one of the fineſt common places in Morality, to ſhew men their diſorders, by comparing their irregular conduct with the regularity of beaſts. Men tear one another to pieces: man is a wolf to man (3); but beaſts of the ſame ſpecies never fight amongſt themſelves. It is by this argument that Horace endeavoured to make the Romans aſhamed for engaging in civil wars: *Wolves and lions*, ſaid he, *do not act in that manner*. He ſuppoſes that this objection is ſo ſtrong, that thoſe, to whom it is propoſed, would be reduced to a ſhameful ſilence.

(3) *Homo homini lupus.* Eraſm. *Adagior.* Chil. 1. num. 70. p. 48.

THE inconveniences of moral reflections taken from the conduct of beaſts.

Neque hic lupis mos, nec fuit leonibus
Unquam, niſi in diſpar, feris.
Furorne cæcus, an rapit vis acrior?
An culpa? reſponſum date.
Tacent, & ora pallor albus inficit,
Menteſque perculſæ ſtupent (4).

(4) Horat. Epod. 7.

" Ev'n wolves are to more gentle thoughts inclin'd,
" And prey but on another kind:
" What is it madneſs, is it ſtupid rage
" That doth the brutal arms engage?
" Or is it ſin? Speak: not one word will come;
" Tis cruel fate, that urges Rome."

Creech.

Juvenal has made uſe of the ſame moral reflection in his xvth Satyr. ver. 159.

Sed jam ſerpentum major concordia; parcit
Cognatis maculis ſimilis fera: quando leoni
Fortiter eripuit vitam leo? quo nemore unquam
Exſpiravit aper majoris dentibus apri?
Indica Tigris agit rabidâ cum tigride pacem
Perpetuam, ſævis inter ſe convenit urſis?
Aſt homini, &c.

" But ſerpents now more amity maintain!
" From ſpotted ſkins the Leopard does refrain;
" No weaker Lion's by a ſtronger ſlain.
" Nor from his larger tuſks the foreſt Boar
" Commiſſion takes his brother ſwine to gore.
" Tyger with Tyger, Bear with Bear you'll find
" In leagues offenſive and defenſive join'd.
" But lawleſs man &c."

Tate.

Mr. Deſpreaux has extremely well tranſlated the Latin of theſe two Poets, and added new examples to them (5).

(5) See his 8th Satyr.

Voit-on les loups brigans, comme nous inhumains,
Pour détrouſſer les loups, courir les grands chemins?
. . . . . .
Un aigle ſur un champ prétendant droit d'aubeine
Ne fait point appeller un aigle à la huitaine:
Jamais contre un regard chicanant un poulet
Un renard de ſon ſac n'alla charger Rolet.
Jamais la biche en rut n'a pour fait d'impuiſſance
Traîné du fond des bois un cerf à l'audience:
Et jamais juge entre eux ordonnant le congrès,
De ce burleſque mot n'a ſali ſes arrêts.

" Who ever ſaw the wolves ſo bent on prey,
" To rob their fellow wolves upon the way?
. . . . . .
" No eagle does upon his peerage ſue,
" And ſtrive ſome meaner eagle to undo:
" No fox was e'er ſuborn'd by ſpite or pay
" To ſwear his brother fox's life away:
" Nor any hind for impotence at Rut
" Did e'er the ſtag into the arches put;
" Where a grave Dean the *Congreſs* might ordain,
" And with that burleſque word his ſentence ſtain."

How fine ſoever this common place may be, and how capable ſoever of affecting us, yet it has its weak ſide; for firſt it may be eluded by a ſtroke of pleaſantry; and ſecondly it may be ſeriouſly attacked by the common maxim,

Nil agit exemplum, litem quod lite reſolvit (6);

(6) Horat. Sat. 3. ver. 103. lib. 2.

—— —— " That example's vain,
" That ſolves all doubts by raiſing more again."

That is, it may be retorted, and by turning the tables, an advantage may be gained over the Moraliſt. I do not pretend to approve of thoſe, who oppoſe raillery to reaſon; but I ſay it is a very great diſadvantage to a point of reaſoning, that it may be turned to ridicule by perſons, who are fond of jeſting. We may prove this from an example. If any one had undertaken to make Mr. Bautru believe, that he had better chooſe an old miſtreſs than a young one, and had quoted a paſſage from Pliny, where it is ſaid, that *the rams ſeek old ewes rather than young ones*; would not ſuch a perſon have been confounded by this humorous anſwer (7), *That is becauſe they are rams* (8)? A Roman Lady made uſe of a thought of that kind to a man, who could not comprehend why the females among beaſts do not deſire the male but when they want to become mothers: *This is*, replied the Lady, *becauſe they are beaſts. Simile dictum Populiæ Marci filiæ, quæ miranti cuidem quid eſſet quapropter aliæ beſtiæ nunquam marem deſiderarent, niſi cum prægnantes vellent fieri, reſpondit,* beſtiæ

(7) See *Menagiana*, pag. 323. of the firſt edit. of Holland.

(8) *Vervecum in patriâ craſſoque ſub aëre naſci.* Juven. Sat. 10. ver. 50.

the year 1451. The Bohemians notwithſtanding gave her a magnificent funeral at Prague, and buried her in the tomb of their Kings, as we are aſſured by Bonfinius in the VII Book of the III Decade. Prateolus has not omitted her in his alphabetical catalogue of Heretics; in which he has made himſelf very ridiculous; for ſhe never forged any new opinions, or raiſed her

beſtiæ enim ſunt (9). Was not this a terrible and confounding ſtroke to the enquirer? And thus much for the firſt inconveniency. The other is no leſs ſo; for in ſhort a man, whom you ſhould ſend to the ſchool of beaſts to learn his duty, would tell you that he deſires nothing better. *I ſhould learn there*, he would ſay, *to ſubject right to force; a dog, that is ſtronger than another dog, makes no ſcruple of taking his portion away from him. What is more common than to ſee dogs fighting with each other? Do not chickens fight together in the ſight of their common mother? Do not cocks fight ſo furiouſly with one another, that ſometimes nothing but the death of one of them will put an end to the battle? Do not pigeons, the ſymbol of gentleneſs, very often come to blows? What is more furious than the battle of bulls? Is it not force, that decides their diſputes in the affair of love?*

(9) Macrob. Saturn. lib. 2. cap. 5. *in fine.*

——— *Ignotis perierunt mortibus illi,*
Quos Venerem incertam rapientes MORE FERARUM
Viribus editior cædebat, ut in grege TAURUS (10).

(10) Horat. Sat. 3. lib. 1. ver. 108.

" They fought, and fell unknown, like beaſts they
" ſtray'd,
" Each caught his willing female, and enjoy'd;
" Till one more ſtrong kill'd him, and was preferr'd,
" Juſt as the greater bull amongſt the herd."
CREECH.

Illi alternantes multa vi prælia miſcent
Vulneribus crebris; lavit ater corpora ſanguis,
Verſaque in obnixos urgentur cornua vaſto
Cum gemitu; reboant ſilvæque & magnus Olympus:
Nec mos bellantes una ſtabulare, ſed alter
Victus abiit, longèque ignotis exulat oris,
Multa gemens, ignominiam plagaſque ſuperbi
Victoris, tum quos amiſit inultus amores,
Et ſtabula aſpectans regnis exceſſit avitis (11).

(11) Virgil. *Georgic.* lib. 3. ver. 220.

" The ſtooping Warriours, aiming head to head,
" Engage their claſhing horns, with dreadful ſound;
" The foreſt rattles, and the rocks rebound.
" They fence, they puſh, and puſhing loudly roar;
" Their dew-laps, and their ſides are both in gore.
" Nor when the war is over, is it peace;
" Nor will the vanquiſh'd bull his claim releaſe;
" But feeding in his breaſt his antient fires,
" And curſing fate, from his proud foe retires,
" Draw'n from his native land to foreign grounds,
" He with a generous rage reſents his wounds,
" His ignominious flight the victors boaſt,
" And more than both, the loves, which unreveng'd
" he loſt.
" Often he turns his eyes, and with a groan
" Surveys the pleaſing Kingdoms once his own."
DRYDEN.

Shall not I learn at the ſchool, which you ſend me to, the moſt unnatural barbarity? Are not there beaſts which devour their young ones? Shall not I learn inceſt there?

——— *Sed enim damnare negatur*
Hanc Venerem pietas, coëuntque animalia nullo
Cætera delectu, nec habetur turpe juvencæ
Ferre patrem tergo: ſit equo ſua filia conjux,
Quouſque creavit init pecudes caper, ipſaque, cujus
Semine concepta eſt, ex illo concipit ales.
Felices quibus iſta licent; humana malignas
Cura dedit leges, & quod natura remittit
Invida jura negant (12).

(12) Myrrhe *in* Ovid. *Metam.* lib. 10. ver. 323.

——— " No piety
" Condemns ſuch Venus; Nature's common tie.
" Horſes their fillies back, ſires heifer's bear;
" Goats kids beget on thoſe, whoſe kids they were.
" Birds of that ſeed conceive, whereof but late
" Conceiv'd themſelves; nor they degenerate.
" Happy in this are thoſe! But human care
" Hath fram'd malignant laws; and we, who are
" By nature free, malicious cuſtoms bind." SANDYS.

Shall not I learn there to lay hold on every thing, that is within my power, in order to make proviſion for myſelf like the ant?

——— ——— ——— *Sicut*
Parvula, nam exemplo eſt, magni formica laboris,
Ore trahit quodcunque poteſt, atque addit acervo
Quem ſtruit, haud ignara ac non incauta futuri (13).

(13) Horat. Sat. 1. lib. 1. ver. 32.

" As the ſmall ant (for ſhe inſtructs the man,
" And preaches labour) gathers all ſhe can;
" And brings it to increaſe her heap at home,
" Againſt the winter, which ſhe knows will come."
CREECH.

Shall not I reſcue myſelf from the hard ſervitude, under which ſo many perſons groan, and which extorts from them ſuch mournful complaints as theſe?

Que votre bonheur eſt extrême
Cruel lions, ſauvages ours,
Vous qui n'avez dans vos amours,
D'autre regle que l'amour même!
Que j'envie un ſemblable ſort!
Et que nous ſommes malheureuſes,
Nous, de qui les loix rigoureuſes
Puniſſent l'amour par la mort (14)!

(14) Theſe verſes are from *Paſtor Fido*, according to the Counteſs *De la Suze*'s tranſlation.

It is impoſſible therefore to deny, that the example, which we may find of all kinds of irregularity in the ſchool of brute beaſts, weakens a little the moral reflections, which I mentioned in the beginning of this remark; for ſince according to Divinity all beaſts are exempt from ſin, it cannot be ſaid that for the puniſhment of ſome fault ſome have fallen into diſorder, while others in reward for their good works have been continued in a regular courſe. So that all that they do is equally regular; and if any perſon ſhall aſk you, as Sigiſmond's widow did, *Why would you have me imitate the turtle-dove rather than the pigeon or the ſparrow?* you would have nothing of any force to reply to this, unleſs you conſult the foundations of morality, which you would be obliged to conſult, if you did not make uſe of the example of the turtle-dove. What could Mr. Deſpreaux anſwer to a Sophiſter, who ſhould maintain that his *rutting Hind* is a very falſe compariſon? For to make it a good one, it is neceſſary, that this beaſt ſhould be in the ſame caſe, in which thoſe women are, who ſue a man at law *for impotency*. How is it poſſible that an hind ſhould be in ſuch a caſe? Does ſhe engage her faith to a ſingle ſtag? If one fails her, does ſhe not find others? Mr. Deſpreaux's invective and ſevere cenſure would be well founded in a country, where the laws of marriage are unknown; but it is very certain that in ſuch a country the men would not be any more expoſed than the ſtags to a ſuit on account of impotency, and no body would be condemned to *the congreſs* by a Decree of Parliament.

However what I have ſaid above does not hinder me from thinking that the reflections, which we are ſpeaking of, are very proper to make an impreſſion upon the greateſt part of mankind. I do not blame therefore Francis de Sales, who has propoſed the elephant for an example of chaſtity, and I condemn the Empreſs Barbara's anſwer. There might be a thouſand things ſtarted upon this ſubject. The actions of Beaſts are perhaps one of the moſt profound abyſſes, which our reaſon can exerciſe itſelf upon; and I am ſurprized that ſo few people perceive it. But let us ſee the words of Francis de Sales. *The elephant*, ſays he (15), *is only a great beaſt; but yet the worthieſt and moſt ſenſible of any upon earth. I ſhall ſpeak a word of his chaſtity; he never changes his female; he loves her tenderly whom he has choſen, and yet he cohabits with her but every third year, and this only for five days, and ſo ſecretly, that he is never ſeen in the act; but he appears on the ſixth day, when before all things he goes directly to the river, in which he waſhes his whole body, without ever returning to the herd, till he is purified. Does not this beaſt ſhew a noble and chaſte*

(13) *Introduct. à la Vie devote*, Part 3. chap. 39. *de l'Honneteté du Lit. nuptial.*

her self to be the head of a Sect; she only gave into such impieties as are common to all ages. In every country the profane and impious have always ridiculed those persons, who expose themselves out of a principle of Religion to the burning of the flesh, rather than follow the inclinations of nature (e).

(e) *Barbara ... stultas appellabat Virgines, quæ pro Christinomine passæ fuissent, propterea quod voluptatis gaudia non gustassent.* Pratcol. p. 85.

disposition, by which he calls upon married persons not to attach themselves too much to the sensuality and pleasure, which they have gratified according to their calling, but when those are past to wash their heart and affections, and to purify themselves as soon as possible, in order to practise afterwards with a greater freedom of mind other actions, which are more pure and elevated, &c. What is said of the elephant is taken from Aristotle (16), Pliny (17), and Ælian (18). Claudius Despensius in his Treatise of *the State of Widowhood*, where he speaks of *Monogamy*, had already observed this of the elephant, and represented him together with the turtle-dove as noble examples of modesty and chastity to Christians.

(16) Arist. *Hist. Animal.* lib. 5. cap. 25.
(17) Plin. lib. 8. cap. 5.
(18) Ælian. *Hist. Animal.* lib. 8. cap. 17.

BARBERINI (FRANCIS) one of the most excellent Poets of his age, was born in the year 1264 at Barberino in Tuscany. As his mother was of Florence, he went and settled himself in that City, where his profession of the Law, but especially the beauty of his Poetry, raised him a very considerable character. The greatest part of his works are lost. That, which was intitled, *The precepts of Love* [A], had better fortune. It was published at Rome, adorned with beautiful figures in the year 1640, by the care of Frederic Ubaldini, who thought this was a proper method of paying his court to the higher powers; for the family of Barberini, which was descended from this Poet, was at that time possessed of the Popedom. He prefixed to that work the Author's life, with several Elogiums upon him; and as there are in these verses a great many words which are not in use now, he added a glossary to it, in order to explain them, which illustrates or confirms the sense of them by the authority of contemporary Poets (a).

(a) Taken from the *Journal of Leipsic.* Sect. 8. tom. 1. of the Supplem. p. 349.

[A] *His Poem entitled* The Precepts of Love *has been preserved.*] This is equivocal: it might be imagined that this Poem is a school of coquettry, like that of Ovid *de Arte Amandi*; but this would be a great mistake. There is nothing in the world more moral than this Poem of Barberini. It contains nothing but rules to instruct those in their duty, who have a regard for glory, virtue, and eternity (1).

(1) *Journal of Leipsic*, p. 249. tom. 1. of the Supplement.

BARCLAY or BARCLEY (a) or BARKLAY (b), or DE BARKLAY (c) (ALEXANDER) a learned Writer in the 16th Century, was descended from an antient family in Scotland, where he was born, according to Dr. Mackenzie [A], tho' Pits and Mr. Wood are of opinion that he was an Englishman; and the latter thinks, that he was born at or near a town of the same name with himself in Somersetshire. Of what rank or quality our Author's parents were, or the time of his birth, we have no particular account; but when he had finished the course of his studies at home, he was transplanted to the University of Oxford, and entered into Oriel-College there, of which his great patron and favourer of his studies, Thomas Cornish, afterwards Bishop of Tyne, was then Provost (d). From Oxon he went over to Holland, and from thence to Germany, Italy, and France. During his travels into these countries he learned their Languages to great perfection (e), and improved himself in all parts of Learning, as appears from his translations and other works [B]. Upon his return to England he found his Patron, the Provost of Oriel College, preferred to the Bishoprick of Tyne, who made him his Chaplain, and afterwards one of the Priests of the College of St. Mary at Otery in Devonshire, founded by John Grandison Bishop of Exeter. But Bishop Cornish dying soon after, he entered into the Order of St. Benedict; but the rules of that Society not pleasing him, he changed his habit, and became a Franciscan Friar (f). Upon the dissolution of the Monasteries, he obtained the Vicarage of Much Badew or Baddow in Essex, being at that time Doctor of Divinity; and in 1546 he became Vicar of the Church

(a) Pitseus, *Relation. Histor. de Rebus Anglic. ad ann.* 1552. Numb. 989. pag. 745. edit. Paris. 1619.

(b) Dr. George Mackenzie's *Lives and Characters of the most eminent Writers of the Scots Nation*, vol. 11. pag. 287. edit. Edinburgh 1711.

(c) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 86. 2d edit. London 1721.

(d) Idem, ibid.

(e) Mackenzie, *ubi supra.*

(f) Idem, ibid. and Wood, *ubi supra.*

[A] *Descended from an antient family in Scotland, where he was born, according to Dr. Mackenzie.*] That Writer tells us, that the *Barklies, from whom this Gentleman*, says he, *was descended*, are of a very antient standing in Scotland. For we find Walter de Berkeley in the reign of King Malcolm IV about the year 1152, and both in the Registers and Chronicles this *Walterus de Berkeley* throughout all King William's reign is stiled *Camerarius Regis*, or the *King's Chamberlain*. And in the time of King Alexander III in the year 1252 Fordon mentions David de Berkeley. Hence Dr. Mackenzie concludes, that our Author was not born in England; and tells us, that *Pits, one of the English Biographers, acknowledges him to be a Scots Man.* But he is evidently mistaken in his last assertion, since Pits expressly says (1), that though some persons imagined him to be a *Scot*, he was really an *Englishman*, and very probably of *Devonshire*. *Quibusdam Scotus videtur, sed Anglus verè fuit, patriâ, ut probabile est, Devoniensis.* Bale * leaves this point doubtful, and observes, that some assert, that he was born in Scotland, and others in England. *Quem alii Scotum alii Anglum fuisse contendunt.*

(1) Pag. 745.

* *Script. Illustr. Major. Brytann. Cent. IX.* num. 66. p. 723. edit. Basil. 1557.

[B] *His translations and other works.*] I. *The Figure of our Mother Holy Church oppressed by the French King.* Printed at London by Richard Pynson in 4to (2). II. *The Miseries and miserable Lives of Courtiers* (3). III. *The Lives of several Saints*, translated from Latin into English verse, particularly that of St. George, the Patron of England, and St. Margaret, the Patroness of Scotland, St. Catherine, St. Ethelreda, and others, amongst Mr. Selden's manuscripts (4). IV. Navis Stultifera, *or the Ship of Fools.* Printed at London by Richard Pynson 1509 (5), and 1509 in fol. (6), and 1570 in 4to (7). This work consists of divers verses of his own composition, and several translations from the Latin, French and Dutch into English, and dedicated to his Patron Dr. Thomas Cornish, Bishop of Tyne, and Suffragan Bishop of Wells (8). It is adorned with a great variety of pictures printed from wooden cuts. The original Author of this book was Sebastian Brantius, who was celebrated in his time for his excellent compositions (9). V. A translation of Sallust's *History of the Jugurthine War* into English (10). VI. *The Castle of Labour*, translated from the French into English (11). VII. *Several Poems of John Baptista Mantuanus*, *Bale*, *Pits*, and *Dempster* in his *Histor. Eccles. Gentis Scot.* lib. 2. mention several other of his translations.

(2) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 1. col. 86.
(3) Idem, ibid.
(4) Idem, ibid. and Mackenzie, pag. 294, 295.
(5) Wood, Col. 87.
(6) Mackenzie, pag. 295.
(7) Idem, ibid.
(8) Wood, Col. 87. Dr. Mackenzie calls him Suffragan Bishop of *Wales.*
(9) Wood, ibid.
(10) Bale and Pits, *ubi supra.*
(11) Idem, *ubi supra.*

Church of St. Matthew the Apoſtle at Wokey in Somerſetſhire upon the deceaſe of Mr. Richard Eryngton, which ſeems to be all the preferment that he obtained till his death (*g*). He lived to a very advanced age (*b*), and died at Croyden in Surry in June 1552, in the reign of King Edward VI, and was buried in the Church there (*i*). We ſhall give his character in the note [*C*].

(*g*) Mackenzie and Wood, *ubi ſupra.*

(*b*) Wood, col. 87.

(*i*) Jo. Balæus, *Scriptorum illuſtrium Majoris Brytanniæ*, Centur. 9. cap. 66. p. 723. edit. Baſileæ 1557, and Pitſeus, *ubi ſupra.*

[*C*] *We ſhall give his character in the Note.*] Bale tells us, that he was an excellent Poet and Orator, and eminent for his Learning, but very variable in his profeſſion of Religion, ſometimes executing the functions of a Prieſt, and at other times appearing as a Benedictine or Franciſcan Monk, without attaching himſelf long to any particular method of life. And he informs us, that in every ſtation he was averſe to truth, (by which it is to be preſumed Bale meant the *Reformation of Religion*,) and guilty of the moſt ſcandalous debauchery and adultery under the covert of celibacy. However he acknowledges that his tranſlations and writings were very elegant. *Poeta ac rhetor inſignis, ab eruditis artibus magnam ſibi, dum viveret, exiſtimationem peperit. Plures ſectas ille probavit; quandoque ſacrificulum, quandoque Benedictinum aut Franciſcanum induens; nulli certus; ſed in illis omnibus Veritatis oſor, & ſub cœlibatûs fuco fœdus adulter perpetuò manſit. Multa tamen in Anglicum ſermonem eliganter ille tranſtulit ac ſcripſit.* Mr. Wood's reflection upon this paſſage is (11), that *Bale gives an ill report of our Author, becauſe he lived and died a ſingle man*; whereas that Writer's objection againſt him, if true, is on account of the looſeneſs of his morals, and not merely becauſe he lived in celibacy. Pits gives him the character of a man well ſkilled in polite Literature, and no ordinary Poet and Orator; and obſerves, that he applied all his ſtudies to Religion, and ſpent his time in reading and writing the Lives of the Saints. *Vir cultioribus diſciplinis benè inſtructus, Poetâ & Rhetor non vulgaris. . . . . Omnè ſuum ſtudium in rebus piis & hiſtoriis ſanctorum legendis atque ſcribendis poſuit.* Mr. Wood has copied this character of him from Pits; and Dr. Mackenzie (12) tells us from Dempſter, that he was as famous for his talents in Oratory and Poetry, as any of his contemporaries. T.

(11) Col. 86.

(12) Pag. 294.

BARCLAY (WILLIAM) a learned Civilian in the XVIth Century, was of Aberdeen in Scotland, and of a very good family [*A*]. Though he had been in favour with Queen Mary Stuart, yet he could not make his fortune in the leaſt at the Court of the King of Scots who was ſon to that Princeſs. This made him take a reſolution to retire to France in the year 1573 (*a*); and though he was then near thirty years of age, yet he went to ſtudy Law at Bourges. Some time after he took his Doctor's Degree there [*B*]; and as he was a man of great wit, and applied himſelf extremely to ſtudy, he ſoon made himſelf able to teach the Civil Law. Edmund Hay the Jeſuit, his uncle, procured him a Profeſſorſhip in that ſcience in the Univerſity of Pontamouſſon, by his intereſt with the Duke of Lorrain, who had lately founded that Academy. This Duke not only conferred upon Barclay the firſt Profeſſorſhip, but he made him likewiſe Counſellor in his Councils, and Maſter of the Requeſts of his Palace. Barclay married in 1582 (*b*) a young Lady of Lorrain (*c*), by whom he had a ſon, who was afterwards a very famous man, and the innocent occaſion of his father's conteſt with the Jeſuits. This youth had ſo promiſing a genius, that they endeavoured as much as poſſible to engage him in their Society. His father was diſpleaſed at this; and they reſented it ſo highly on their part, and did him ſo many ill offices with the Duke, that he was obliged to leave Lorrain. He went to London to King James, who offered him a place in his Council, with a very good penſion; but he refuſed theſe offers, on account of the condition that was annexed to them, which was, that he ſhould embrace the Religion of the Church of England. He returned to France in the beginning of the year 1604, and accepted a Profeſſorſhip in Civil Law, which was offered him by the Univerſity of Angers. He taught there with great applauſe [*C*] till

(*a*) *The Life of John Barclay* prefix'd to the *Argenis* places it in the year 1571.

(*b*) See the remark [*A*] of the following Article.

(*c*) Her name was Anne de Malleville.

[*A*] *He was of a very good family.*] Namely that of Barclay, which is allied to all the beſt families in Scotland, as appears from a Patent of King James, printed before the Argenis. I make uſe of the word *Patent*, becauſe it is not a ſimple letter written to the Duke of Lorrain, as Mr. Menage aſſures us (1); but a Letter ſealed with the great Seal of the Kingdom, and addreſſed to every perſon in the uſual form, *To all to whom theſe preſents ſhall come, Greeting.* Mr. Menage is very excuſable in his miſtake, but he that put this ſubſcription to King James's Atteſtation, *Epiſtola Jacobi, Scotiæ Regis, Carolo Lotharingiæ Duci*, is a deceiver, or an ignorant, who cannot poſſibly be excuſed. He ought to have read this writing, ſince he cauſed it to be prefixed to a book (2); now he could not find a line in it, which did not ſhew, that it was not a Letter written to the Duke of Lorrain. The Italian Tranſlator of the Argenis (3) tells us, that the relations of Mademoiſelle Malleville would not conſent to her marriage with William Barclay, till they ſaw proofs of the Nobility, which he boaſted of. He adds that this was not the cauſe of the leaſt uneaſineſs to Barclay, but only on account of the amorous impatience, that tranſported him; for he was obliged to wait for the coming of a certificate, before he could taſte the pleaſures of enjoyment. *The relations of the fair Lady*, continues he, *had no ſooner ſeen the Royal Atteſtation, than they were the firſt to haſten the marriage.* One cannot but be aſtoniſhed, when one reads theſe things in the ſame page, in which the Certificate of the King of Scotland is; for that Prince declares expreſly that Barclay had a wife already (4); and this appears likewiſe from the date of the Atteſtation (5). This date is above a month later than the birth of John Barclay, the ſon of William, and of Mademoiſelle Malleville. We ſee how the amorous William Barclay was obliged to ſuffer the ſuſpenſion of his happineſs by waiting for a Certificate. The author of the Latin Life of John Barclay was in the ſame miſtake: the Atteſtation, according to him, was required, that he might ſhew himſelf as a man of quality to his future ſpouſe. *Cum Annâ de Malavillâ contracturus nuptias ex Scotia Regias Literas accerſivit, quibus ingenuæ nobilitatis titulos futuræ ſponſæ approbaret.*

(1) Menage, *Remarq. ſur la Vie d'Ayrault*, pag. 228.

(2) It is printed before the *Argenis.*

(3) His name is *Franceſco Pona*; he has written the *Life of John Barclay*, which he has prefixed to his tranſlation of the *Argenis.*

(4) *In Lotharingiâ conſidiſſe ibique affinitatem genere moribuſque ſuis non indignam contraxiſſe.*

(5) The 19th of March 1582. Moreri ſays the 28th.

[*B*] *He ſtudied Civil Law at Bourges . . . . and took his Doctor's Degree there.*] Cujacius preſided at that Act (6). It is a very great error to ſay, that Barclay's marriage did not interrupt his ſtudies, and that having continued them after his entrance into that State of life, from a Scholar he became a Doctor, and from a Doctor a Profeſſor of Civil Law. *Lequali* (nozze) *non rompendo il bel filo de gli ſtudii di lui, ſucceſſe che di ſcolare ch'egli era, paſſato al grado del Dottorato, riceve una lettura principale di Leggi* (7).

(6) Menage, *Remarq. ſur la Vie d'Ayrault*, pag. 228.

(7) Franceſco Pona, in his *Life of John Barclay*, before the Italian tranſlation of the *Argenis.*

[*C*] *He taught at Angers with great applauſe.*] "When he went to read his Lectures, he was followed "by his ſon and two ſervants, in a magnificent gown, "and a great gold chain about his neck (8)."

(8) Menage, *Remarq. ſur la Vie d'Ayrault*, pag. 231.

till his death, which happened about the end of the year 1605 [*D*]. He was buried in the Franciſcan Church (*d*). He publiſhed ſeveral books [*E*], and among the reſt one, in which he refuted ſome authors, who, though they were of different Religions, yet agreed upon Republican Maxims in favour of Religion [*F*]. He had an averſion to the Calviniſts [*G*]; and it is very probable that the condition, in which he ſaw his Country, and which he had left for the ſake of the Catholic Religion (*e*), had raiſed in him that ſpirit of bitterneſs againſt them.

(*d*) Taken from Mr. Menage, *Remarques ſur la Vie de Pierre Ayrault*, p. 228, *& ſeq.*

(*e*) *Quas* (litteras) *cum idem Guillelmus videret una cum avitâ religione ſordeſcere, principem verò ſuam marceſcere in infamis carceris ſitu, dolore confectus migravit anno* 1571 *Lutetiam.* Vita Jo. Barclaii.

[*D*] *He died about the end of the year* 1605.] Moreri, being deceived by Nicius Erythræus and others, has put the year 1609 inſtead of 1605. He thought with reaſon that our Barclay went to teach Civil Law at Angers in 1604, and he found in Nicius Erythræus that this Profeſſor lived five years after he had taken poſſeſſion of that place. *Ab Andibus optimis conditionibus evocatur, ut in ipſorum gymnaſio primariam juris civilis cathedram obtineret, ubi cum jam quinquennium docuiſſet eſt mortuus* (9). It was eaſy to conclude that he did not die till *about the year* 1609. But the Italian Author is miſtaken, ſince beſides the authority of Mr. Menage I can alledge this reaſon: that William Barclay was dead before the differences between Paul V and the Venetians were terminated. *Accendebat hominem & pietate & jam ſenectâ liberiorem illæ turbæ, quas multi ominabantur, cum Pontifex in Anglum Venetoſque diſtrictus, illum quidem jam à ſacris noſtris alienum acerbare, hos autem alienari videbatur. Sed tam pium conatum intercepit felix & in Chriſto obitus.* This we find in the Preface to the book *de Poteſtate Papæ* (10). The differences between the Pope and the Republic of Venice were ended in the year 1607. The Sieur Witte being perhaps deceived by Moreri only, has placed Barclay's death in the year 1609 (11).

(9) Nic. Erythr. *Pinacoth.* 3. pag. 76. Paul Freher, *Theatr.* p. 1515. makes his Profeſſorſhip to laſt five years; he quoted Imperialis and Thomaſin.

(10) Mr. Menage aſcribes this preface to John Barclay the ſon of William. See p. 228. of his *Remarques ſur la Vie d'Ayrault.*

(11) Witte *in Appendice Diarii Biographici.*

[*E*] *He publiſhed ſeveral books.*] Among others *Præmetia* upon the Life of Agricola, and a Commentary upon the Title of the Pandects *de Rebus creditis & de Jurejurando.* He publiſh'd it at Paris in the year 1605. But the two works, which made him moſt famous are his Treatiſe of the Power of the Pope, and his Treatiſe of the Power of Kings. The firſt is entitled, *De Poteſtate Papæ, an & quatenus in Reges & Principes ſeculares jus & imperium habeat:* the ſecond is entitled, *de Regno & regali Poteſtate, adverſus Buchananum, Brutum, Boucherium, & reliquos Monarchomachos.* He publiſh'd this laſt work at Paris in the year 1600, and dedicated it to Henry IV. The other was not publiſhed till after the author's death, who durſt not own that he was about ſuch a work. *Et quidem* de Regno *libros quibus popularem ambitum exagitabat nulla diſſimulatione conſcripſit. Sed hoc opus* (DE POTESTATE PAPÆ) *ſecreto aggreſſus eſt, cum tunc aliquid Pontifici negare hæreſis cenſeretur* (12). He undertook theſe two works, when he ſaw the diſorders of the league, ſubjects in arms againſt their King, and the lawful poſſeſſors of the Crown declared to have no right to it by the Papal Bulls. Lorrain, where he was ſettled to great advantage, was carried away with the torrent; and approved the revolt of ſubjects, and the violent attempts of the Court of Rome upon the temporalities of Princes. However he continued firm in his principles; he had learn'd them in a good ſchool; for there is no doubt but the ſeditions of the Scots had been his chief Catechiſm in that point. Nothing is more proper to raiſe a perſon's averſion to republican maxims, than to ſee that they have been the ſource of the troubles, which have deſtroyed the Religion, which he believes to be the true one, and overturned the Throne of a Queen, by whom he was beloved. However that be, the Profeſſor of Pontamouſſon ſhewed a more than ordinary firmneſs; moſt people change their principles, as they change their country and intereſts: but he, in the midſt of Lorrain, perſevered ſtill in the maxims, which he maintained in Scotland, tho' the ſituation of affairs was very much changed. The authority of the people raiſed upon the regal power ſerved in Scotland to deſtroy Popery, and in France to ruin the Proteſtants. Notwithſtanding this Barclay never changed his opinion: he thought it unjuſt in Scotland, where it was contrary to the Catholic Religion; he thought it no leſs unjuſt in France, where it was very ſerviceable to the ſame Religion. It is rare to ſee ſuch a ſteadineſs in a Doctor; whereas we perpetually meet with perſons, whoſe principles turn about like a weather-cock. I obſerved, that Barclay durſt not own that he was writing againſt the maxims of the Ultramontains. This muſt not be extended beyond the time of the League; for when that was diſſipated, he made no ſecret of his work. He gave it to the Printer, and dedicated it to Clement VIII (13). But he took it back from the preſs, and kept it private almoſt ten years, during which time he added ſeveral things, and retrenched a great many others. He was making all poſſible haſte to finiſh it upon a proſpect of the differences which were apprehended between the Pope and the Venetians; but death prevented him from putting the laſt hand to his work (14).

(12) *In præfat. Oper. de poteſt. Papæ.*

THE league did not change Barclay's hypotheſis of the independence of Kings.

(13) See *Præfat. Oper. de poteſt. Papæ.*

(14) Ibid.

[*F*] *He confuted thoſe authors, who, though they were of different Religions, yet agreed in republican maxims in favour of Religion.*] He confuted two Proteſtants, Buchanan and Hubert Languet; he confuted likewiſe Boucher, one of the Curates of Paris, and a very zealous Leaguer. The latter ſubjected the ſovereign authority to the people, for the good of the Catholic Religion; the two former did the ſame thing, for the good of the Proteſtant Religion. So that all three of them were reunited in the general Theſis, and all three were Barclay's antagoniſts.

[*G*] *He had an averſion to the Calviniſts.*] This appears from his writings. Read theſe words of Mr. Menage: "He was a great enemy of the Calviniſts "and Lutherans. In his Commentary upon the Title "of the Digeſt *de Rebus creditis*, he ſays ſpeaking of "Donellus, Regent-Doctor of Civil Law in the Uni"verſity of Bourges: *Hugo Donellus, unus ex præcep"toribus meis, vir civilis Diſciplinæ peritus, ſed malus, "quia hæreticus Calviniſta* (15). That is, "Hugo "Donellus, one of my maſters, well ſkilled in Civil "Law, but a bad man, becauſe he was a Calviniſtical "Heretic."

(15) Menage, *Remarques ſur la Vie de P. Ayrault*, pag. 229.

BARCLAY (JOHN) the ſon of the preceding, was born at Pontamouſſon the 28th of January 1583 [*A*]. The Jeſuits of that city, under whom he ſtudied, were ſo highly charmed with the beauty of his genius, that they made uſe of all their efforts to engage

[*A*] *He was born at Pontamouſſon the 28th of January* 1583.] I have followed Mr. Menage implicitly; but I reſerve to myſelf the liberty of correcting him here by himſelf. He relates in page 228 that, which ſerves for the text of this remark, and afterwards in page 232 he aſſures us that John Barclay died *the 12th of Auguſt* 1621, *aged* 39 *years and ſix months.* So that he was born in the beginning of the year 1582. This is confirmed by another fact mentioned by Mr. Menage. John Barclay dedicated to the King of England in 1603 the firſt part of the *Euphormio* (1), and he declares in the Apology for the *Euphormio*, that he was but one and twenty years of age, when he publiſhed this firſt part (2). An author, who is but twenty years and ſome months old, does not uſe to ſay that he is but one and twenty: he never ſays ſo, but when his 22d year is not far advanced. Barclay therefore was at leaſt one and twenty years complete in 1603: and conſequently he could not be born in 1583 but in 1582; ſo that if his birth-day was the 28th of January, his father's marriage muſt be placed under the year 1581, and not, as Mr. Menage has done, under the year 1582. The ſame conſequences may be drawn from what he ſays (3), that Barclay in 1601, *when he was but nineteen years old, publiſh'd* a Commentary upon Statius. He remarks that *he, who wrote the Life of John Barclay, printed before the Argenis, was ſtrangely miſtaken, in ſaying that John Barclay was born at Aberdeen*

(1) Menage, *Remarques ſur la Vie de P. Ayrault*, pag. 229.
(2) Ibid. p. 231.

(3) Ibid. p. 228, 229.

engage him in their Society. I have already obſerved that this was the cauſe why his father went to King James, who was lately come to the Crown of England. He carried his ſon with him, his ſon I ſay, who was already an author [*B*], and had prepared ſeveral new works; for he had publiſhed *a Commentary upon the Thebais of Statius* in the year 1601 (*a*); and *a Latin Poem upon the Coronation of King James*, and the firſt part of the *Euphormio* in 1603. Theſe two pieces pleaſed his Britannic Majeſty very well, who had a great affection for the Sciences, and was well ſkilled in them. John Barclay dedicated to him that beginning of the Euphormio. He returned to France with his father, who would not leave him with King James, for fear that Prince, who had been ſo very deſirous to retain him, ſhould engage him to abjure the Romiſh Faith. He lived at Angers till the death of his father, and then went to Paris, where he took a wife [*C*], and ſoon after went to London. He was there in the year 1606; and it was then, that he became acquainted with Mr. de Peireſc. He had publiſhed a little before *The Hiſtory of the Gun-powder Treaſon Plot*. It is a pamphlet of ſix leaves (*b*), printed at Amſterdam. He publiſhed at London in 1610 (*c*) *An Apology for the Euphormio*, and his Father's treatiſe *De Poteſtate Papæ* [*D*]. He publiſhed at Paris in 1612 a book, which he intitled *Pietas* [*E*]. It is an anſwer to Cardinal Bellarmin, who had written againſt William Barclay's book concerning the power of the Pope. Two years after he publiſhed at London his *Icon Animarum*. He left that City in the year 1616, and went to Paris, where he was preſented to Mr. du Vair the Keeper of the Seals by his good friend Mr. de Peireſc. He went afterwards to Rome, being invited thither by Pope Paul V, and publiſhed

(*a*) It was printed at Pontamouſſon, and dedicated to Charles III of that name, Duke of Lorrain.

(*b*) Intitled *Series patefacti divinitus parricidii in maximum Regem Regnumque Britanniæ cogitati & inſtructi.*

(*c*) See the remark [*D*] at the end.

berdeen (4). If he miſtook the place of his birth, he was no leſs miſtaken in the time, which was according to him the 28th of January 1582. Now we find under the effigies of John Barclay before the Argenis, that he was born the 28th of January 1682; thus you ſee how the Engravers deceive us as well as the Printers.

(4) Ibid. pag. 228.

[*B*] *He became an author very early.*] We have ſeen above that at nineteen years of age he publiſhed *a Commentary upon Statius*; ſo that he deſerves a place in the ſecond edition of Baillet's *Famous Children*; and he would deſerve it much more, if his age had been ſufficiently known to Nicius Erythræus; for in that caſe he would have been an author at fifteen years of age. In ſhort Erythræus aſſures us that Barclay was but ſeventeen years of age, when he wrote *a Poem upon the Coronation of King James*, that is, in 1603. *Annum tum agebat Joannes decimum ſeptimum, cum de Regis inauguratione elegantiſſimum Carmen edidit, maximo verborum ſententiarumque ſplendore illuminatum, quod lectum Rex adeò probavit, ut &c.* (5). Upon that repreſentation he could not have been above fifteen years of age, when he publiſhed in 1601 *a Commentary upon the Thebais of Statius*. I ſhall give an account here of a new miſtake of this Italian Author, which has proved contagious to Moreri, and ſo very contagious, that it has produced another. Moreri has not only ſaid, that Barclay was but ſeventeen years of age when King James was crowned, but he has converted the printed Poem of that author into an Oration, which was ſpoken. Paul Freher places the Birth of John Barclay in the year 1585, and the Panegyric upon the Coronation in the ſeventeenth year of his age (6).

(5) Nicius Eryth. *Pinacoth.* 3. pag. 76.

(6) Freheri, *Theatrum*, p. 1515.

[*C*] *He went to Paris, where he took a wife.*] "He married Louiſe Debonnaire, the daughter of "Michael Debonnaire, Treaſurer of the old Troops, "and of Urſina Deniſot..... He afterwards went "over to England with his wife, where he had two "ſons and a daughter by her (7)." He did not marry at Rome: Moreri, who ſays ſo, did not underſtand Nicius Erythræus his author, who might have informed him eaſily, that Barclay fled from England with his wife and ſon, and retired to Rome, where his wife was brought to bed of another ſon. *Ibi Barclaius, ex uxore, quam habebat, maſculam prolem ſuſcepit. Sed aliquanto poſt .... clam ex Angliâ unà cum uxore & filio ſe fugâ ſurripuit, ac Romam venit.....* (8). *Romæ novam ex uxore ſuâ maſculam prolem accepit, ac cive uno urbem noſtram auxit* (9). Mapheus Barberinus, who was afterwards Pope Urban VIII, was Godfather to this young ſon of our Barclay (10). One would never imagine from reading theſe words of Erythræus, that Barclay's wife did not go to Rome till four years after her huſband; and yet Mr. Gaſſendi aſſures us that this is true. Read the paſſage, where he mentions the good offices, which Mr. de Peireſc did to the huſband in 1616, and to the wife and ſon in 1620. *Prætereo fuiſſe Peireſkio non minorem circa Barclaii uxorem, filium, & Jo. Ludovicum Debonærum uxoris germanum, cum* quarto *poſt* anno *profecti Romam ad illum ſunt* (11). If Mr. Menage had well conſidered theſe words of Gaſſendi, he would not have ſaid that Barclay went to Rome in 1617, and that his wife, his ſon, and his brother-in-law came to him there in 1619 (12). He adds that Barclay's ſon came to Paris with his mother in 1652, that *he was no very conſiderable man*; that he made Latin verſes, and publiſhed at that time at Paris a Latin Elegy. Erythræus ſpeaks of Barclay's widow as a woman of a preſumptuous and haughty temper: See below the remark [*G*]. In the Latin Life of John Barclay, it is falſly ſaid that he married Louiſe Debonnaire, after he had been employed in divers embaſſies by King James.

(7) Menage, *Remarques ſur la Vie de P. Ayrault*, pag. 230.

(8) Nic. Erythr. *Pinac.* 3. p. 77.

(9) Ibid. pag. 79.

(10) Ibid.

(11) Gaſſend. *in Vitâ Peireskii, ad ann.* 1616, pag. 283. See likewiſe p. 288.

(12) Menage, *Remarques ſur la Vie de P. Ayrault*, pag. 231, 232.

[*D*] *He publiſhed his father's treatiſe* de Poteſtate Papæ.] The printing of that book *made him loſe*, if we believe Mr. Menage (13), *part of the favour, which the King of England had for him.* I cannot comprehend how that could come to paſs, ſince it is a book, which ſtrongly confutes the pretenſions of the Ultramontains, and Bellarmin's reaſons expreſly, and maintains vigorouſly the Independence of Kings. Could any thing be written more agreeable to King James? I conjecture that Gaſſendi's Latin (14) impoſed upon Mr. Menage; and this ſhews us more and more how difficult it is to write very clearly in Latin. When we conſider it more exactly, we find that this author does not affirm that the book of the Power of the Pope cooled King James's regard; but this may be imagined, if one does not uſe ſome kind of attention. The Jeſuits did not believe that the printing of this book had diſpleaſed the King of Great Britain: on the contrary they reproached John Barclay for having put it to the Preſs with the conſent of that Prince, and the corrections of the Engliſh Divines. *Neque verò niſi ejus* (Regis) *nutu patris tui librum à Britanniti Evangelii miniſtris ad libidinem deformatum, Londini typis excuſum* (15). Beſides Mr. Menage has not marked the year of its impreſſion right. This work was printed in 1609. The Congregation of the *Index* condemned it the ſame year by their Decree of the 9th of November.

(13) Menage, *Rem. ſur la Vie de P. Ayrault*, pag. 231, 232.

(14) *Joannes Barclaius, qui poſt editum de Summo Pontifice Opus, nec jam ſolitâ apud Regem ſuoſque pollens gratiâ .... ſubduxit ſeſe ex Angliâ.* Gaſſendi *Vitâ Peireskii*, pag. 282.

(15) Eudæmon Johannes, *Epiſt. Monitor. ad Jo. Barclaium*, num 1.

[*E*] *He publiſhed at Paris a book, which he entitled* Pietas.] To give the whole title we muſt add, *Sive publicæ pro Regibus ac Principibus, & privatæ pro Gul. Barclaio parente Vindiciæ contra Bellarminum.* The Letter of Eudæmon Johannes, which I have quoted, declares that Barclay took a journey to Paris in order to print that work; and this, that he might do the greater ſervice to the Proteſtants of England: "for "he believed, *it is ſaid*, that he ſhould be leſs ſuſpected "of having intelligence with the enemies of the "Church, if he ſhould publiſh this work out of Eng-"land." *At nunc quoque non diſſimili conſilio te Lutetiam è Britannia demigraſſe, ut cum & coram apud viros principes, & ſcriptis apud cæteros, Eccleſiæ cauſam calumniis tuis traduceres, tamen quanto majore locorum intervallo ab Rege diſjungereris, hoc longius abeſſes à ſuſpicione fraudis* (16). Here we ſee one of the moſt ſubtle and ordinary ſtrokes of the ODIUM THEOLOGICUM

(16) Ibid.

ed there a book of controverſy, intitled, *Paræneſis ad Sectarios.* He received a great many civilities from Cardinal Bellarmin, though he had written againſt him. He died at Rome the 12th of Auguſt 1621 (*d*), while his *Argenis* was printing in France (*e*) [*F*]. His body was carried to the Church of St. Onuphrius upon the Janiculus. His ſon erected a Monument of Marble to him in the Church of St. Laurence upon the way to Tivoli (*f*): we ſhall give an account in the remarks why the widow cauſed her huſband's Buſt to be removed [*G*]. Several perſons are of opinion that John Barclay made a profeſſion of the Proteſtant Religion in England [*H*]. He denied it publickly [*I*]. His books of controverſy had no very great ſucceſs: his other pieces have many admirers [*K*], and

(*d*) In the cut before the *Argenis*, they have put the 12th of April.

(*e*) Taken from Mr. Menage, *Ken: ſur la Vie d'Ayrault*, pag. 228, & *ſeq.*

(*f*) Nicius Erythræus *Pinacoth.* 3. pag. 80.

GICUM. Thoſe, who cannot tell how to anſwer the objections, which are propoſed againſt the common opinions, fall upon the perſons, who propoſe theſe objections: they exclaim, that they are ſo many ſecret enemies, who carry on a correſpondence with the adverſary, and only retain the exterior profeſſion of orthodoxy, that they may be the better able to give the more dangerous blows.

[*F*] *He died . . . . while his* Argenis *was printing in France.*] Mr. de Peireſc his good friend, to whom he had ſent the manuſcript, took care to find him a Printer at Paris (17). The firſt edition therefore of this celebrated book is that of Paris in 1621. It has been tranſlated into divers languages, French, Engliſh, Italian, Dutch &c. Nicius Erythræus obſerves it was to gratify the curioſity of the Ladies, that it was tranſlated into Italian. The praiſes, which they heard given to this book, inſpired them with an ardent deſire to know what it contained. *Eadem ingenii fœcunditate peperit egregium illud opus, Argenida nomine, quod & argumenti novitate & verborum ſplendore, ac rerum varietate, tantum commendationis habuit, ut mulierum etiam, quæ illud miris in cœlum laudibus offerri audiebant, ad cognoſcendum, quid illud afferret, ſtudia commoverit; adeo ut quidam, quo animum illis expleret, in Italicum ſermonem illud converterit* (18). Mr. de Peireſc cauſed the effigies of the author to be placed before the book, with a diſtich, which he deſired Grotius to add to it (19). The diſtich is as follows:

(17) Gaſſendi *Vita Peireskii*, pag. 288, 290.

(18) Nic. Erythræus, *Pinac.* 3. pag. 77, 78.

(19) Gaſſendi, *Vita Peireskii*, pag. 290.

Gente Caledonius, Gallus natalibus, hic eſt,
Romam Romano qui docet ore loqui.

That is,

"This is he, who tho' by nation a Scot, and by birth "a Frenchman, has taught even the Romans themſelves to ſpeak their own language to perfection."

[*G*] *Why his widow cauſed her huſband's buſt to be removed from the Church of St. Laurence.*] The monument of John Barclay was at the entrance of the Church-yard, oppoſite to another monument, which Cardinal Francis Barberini has erected to Bernard William his tutor. Theſe two monuments were exactly alike in every reſpect. The widow of John Barclay being diſpleaſed at the great likeneſs between them had a mind to demoliſh her huſband's monument, but not being able to do that, ſhe ordered however his marble buſt to be taken away, and carried to her houſe. Her haughtineſs could not bear, that her huſband, who was famous for his birth, and much more ſo for his wit and learning, ſhould be put upon an equality with a wretched pedant. *Quod uxor Barclaii, mulier tumido, ut aiebant, animo atque elato, cum vidiſſet, ſtatim viri ſui imaginem ex ſepulcro illo, quod totum demoliri non poſſet, detrahi juſſit, ac domum ſuam afferri; quod acciperet indigne, eum, cui ipſa nupta fuiſſet, generis ſplendore clarum, ſed ingenii & eruditionis famâ clariorem, cum homine obſcuro, ac nullius ferè ingenii, &, ut ipſa dicebat, pædagogo, componi* (20).

(20) Nic. Eryth. *Pinac.* 3. p. 81.

[*H*] *Several perſons are of opinion that John Barclay made profeſſion of the Proteſtant Religion in England.*] The Jeſuit Eudæmon Joannes reproaches him, that while he lived at the King of England's Court he was an Heretic, or conſidered as an Heretic. He adds, that it was ſaid, that this Prince employed him to tranſlate into Latin his preface concerning the oath of allegiance, and to carry it to ſeveral Princes. *Nam te quidem aliquot annis in aulâ ejus Regis ita verſatum ferunt, ut hæreticus aut planè eſſes, aut haberere quidem certè. Cui nonnullam etiam Latinè reddenda, deferendaque ad principes præfatione ejus monitoriâ operam abs te navatam memorant* (21). Erythræus, though he does not venture to ſay poſitively that Barclay was an Heretic in England, or at leaſt that he made profeſſion of hereſy, yet aſſures us, as the opinion of all the Papiſts of that country, that King James employed John Barclay's pen in writing the book intitled, *Funiculus triplex, & Cuniculus triplex.* He ſpeaks as follows: *Utrum autem, apud Regem, incorruptam catholicam religionem ſemper conſervaverit, vel ſaltem, ſi non animo, ſpecie tenus hæreticorum ſe erroribus oblinierit, incertum eſt mihi; illud autem certum catholicorum omnium in Angliâ fuiſſe opinionem, Regem illum in eo libro, cui titulus eſt,* Funiculus triplex, & Cuniculus triplex, *componendo, uſum fuiſſe Barclaio adjutore atque magiſtro* (22). No perſon, that I know of, has been more deciſive upon this queſtion than Imperialis. He ſays plainly, that Barclay embraced the Religion of the Church of England, and afterwards abjured it; but that they were at Rome ſo little perſuaded of the ſincerity of his converſion, that they ordered after his death the inſcription and ſtatue which his ſon had placed upon his tomb, to be taken away (23). Paul Freher aſcribes this to the Jeſuits: *Statuam & inſcriptionem quam ejus demortui gloriæ filius in templo S. Laurentii extra muros erexerat, patres So. Jeſu ſublatam & deletam volucrunt* (24). It is difficult to know the truth of this; perhaps ſomewhat might be found among his papers or elſewhere, which might ſhew he was a Proteſtant in his heart, and upon that account they might order ſome puniſhment againſt his tomb. Perhaps too it was only his wife's vanity which occaſioned this demolition of his tomb, and this might give occaſion to ſuſpicious perſons and idle commentators on the talk of the town, to find a myſtery in it, and ſome ſecret proceeding of the tribunal of the inquiſition.

(21) Eudæm. Joannes, *Epiſt. monitoria, ad Barclaium*, num. 1.

(22) Nic. Erythræus, *Pinac.* 3. pag. 77.

(23) *Imperialis, in Muſæo Hiſtorico.*

(24) Freherus, *in Theatro*, pag. 1515. He quotes Imperialis and Tomaſin.

[*I*] . . , . *He denied it publickly.*] We muſt renounce the ſureſt maxims, by which we judge of facts, or elſe agree that John Barclay did not renounce in England the profeſſion of the Catholic Religion. He declares publickly, that he was born and always had been a Catholic (25), and that though he had a poſt under King James (26), yet he never was preſent at the worſhip of the Church of England, and never abſented himſelf from the Aſſemblies of the Catholics. *I was conſtant,* ſays he, *at the latter.* He calls for witneſſes of this upon the Embaſſadors of France and Spain, and their Confeſſors, *who were,* ſays he, *likewiſe mine.* Nay, what is ſtill more ſtrong, he calls King James to witneſs, whoſe privilege he boaſted he had obtained that he might not be diſturbed on account of the Catholic Religion. King James was living when Barclay publiſhed theſe things; the Embaſſadors whom he appeals to were not all dead. How is it credible, that he ſhould relate a falſity? He juſtifies himſelf from another thing, which he was accuſed of; which was, that he was the author or favourer of a bloody Libel, which was publiſhed againſt King James, as ſoon as Barclay departed from England. Laſtly he declares, that he revokes certain doctrines which are in his book againſt Cardinal Bellarmin. He does not forget to ſay, that he departed with the King's good leave. *Neque furtum mei feci; impetratâ Regis pace publicè cum familiâ a Britanniæ orâ ſolvi.*

(25) *In præfat. Paræneſis ad Sectarios.* This book was printed in the year 1617.

(26) *In Regis familiâ eſſe... inter domeſticos.* Erythræus ſays that the King made him his Secretary, *ab Epiſtolis & Conſiliorum omnium participem habuit.* Freher, who quotes Imperialis and Tomaſin, ſays that his place was that of Gentleman of the Chamber, *titulo nobilis cubiculi regii honeſtatus.*

[*K*] *Some of his books have had a great many admirers.*] See in Sir Thomas Pope-Blount (27), and Mr. Baillet (28), ſeveral elogiums which have been given to Barclay. The greateſt without diſpute will be this, if it is true with regard to his character as an Author. It is ſaid that Cardinal Richelieu was perpetually reading the Argenis, and that it was from this book he learned all the counſels and political expedients, by which he raiſed France to ſo advantageous a ſituation. *Ad Immortalitatem Barclaii una ſufficiet illius Argenis, quam Richelæus ævi noſtri miraculum aſſiduis, ut aiunt* (29), *verſabat manibus, habebatque quaſi præceptricem ac directricem illius regiminis, quo deinceps Galliam venerabilem juxta terribilemque gentibus cæteris fecit* (30).

(27) *Cenſuræ Author.* p. 655.

(28) *Jugem. ſur les Poet.* tom. 4. pag. 152.

(29) Here is an *Hearſay*, which looks very much like a fable.

(30) In the *Life of Barclay* before the *Argenis.*

and have not wanted cenſurers [*L*]. With regard to the fortune, which he made at Rome, it is differently ſpoken of. Some ſay that Mapheo Barberini, who had a great affection for him, when he was elected Pope, was a conſiderable benefactor to him, and conferred upon his eldeſt ſon a rich benefice, and the office of Chamberlain to his Holineſs (*g*). Others ſay that he was obliged to divert himſelf with the culture of flowers, and that without this he could not have prevented the vexation of ſeeing himſelf ſo little advanced (*h*) [*M*]. What is certain, is that he died before Mapheo Barberini was elected Pope. He wrote poetry; and a great many good judges aſſerted that his Latin verſes are excellent (*i*).

(*g*) Nic. Erythr. *Pinacoth.* 3. pag. 79.

(*h*) Imperialis and Tomaſinus, *apud* Paulum Freherum *Theatri*, p. 1515.

(*i*) *See* Baillet, *Jugem. ſur les Poetes*, tom. 4. pag. 152. and Pope-Blount, *Cenſura Autorum*, p. 655.

We

[*L*] .... *And have not wanted cenſurers.*] We have ſeen the Diſtich which Grotius wrote to be placed under Barclay's picture (31). It is a great commendation of this Author's Latin. Every body does not approve of his ſtyle. "The anonymous Author "of a little book, intitled *Cenſura Euphormionis*, "printed at Paris in 1620, ſpeaks of the ſtyle of the "*Euphormio* in theſe terms: *& quod miretur aliquis, "Latinitas quoque ipſa Romanas aures peregrinitate "radit, & veteris ſaporis imbutum palatum offendit*; "that is, *And what any one would wonder at, the "Latin itſelf is grating to Roman ears from the fo-"reign turn of it, and very diſagreeable to thoſe who "have a true reliſh for antiquity.* It is ſuppoſed, by "the bye, that Seton a Scotchman is the Author of "this little book. Joſeph Scaliger in a letter of his "to Charles Labbe, which is the 311th of his Let-"ters, does not ſpeak more favourably of this Satyr "of Barclay. *Quanti Euphormionem Barclæi faciam "ex eo cognoſcere potes, quod vix ſex folia ejus legere "potuerim*; that is, *You may gueſs what opinion I "have of Barclay's Euphormio, when I tell you, that I "could ſcarce read ſix leaves of it.* Thus we have it "in the original of that Letter which I have ſeen in "the hands of Charles Labbe, for in the edition of "Scaliger's Letters, inſtead of *Euphormionem Barclæi*, "there is an Aſterick. He ſpeaks almoſt in the ſame "manner in the *Scaligerana ſecunda*. *There is a Pe-"dant at Angers, who has written a Satyricon, which "at firſt ſeems to be ſomething; but afterwards proves no-"thing at all* (32). Peter Muſnier, Canon of Veze-"lai, anſwered the book intitled *Cenſura Euphormionis*, "in another book intitled *Cenſura Cenſuræ Euphor-"mionis*; but his Anſwer is very ill written; and "this is probably what obliged John Barclay to write "himſelf an Apology for his Euphormio (33). But "as it has been remarked, John Barclay was but 21 "years of age, when he publiſhed the firſt part of that "Satyr. His Argenis, which was written in a more "advanced age, is better written; and if we may "believe the author of John Barclay's Life, printed "before the Argenis, Cardinal Richelieu had an ex-"traordinary value for that work. I have ſtill to ob-"ſerve, that a Benedictine Monk, whoſe name was "Bugnot, who taught Rhetoric in the Abbey of "Tiron, wrote Latin Notes upon that work. Theſe "Notes were printed at Leyden in 1644 with the Ar-"genis (34)."

(31) See the end of the remark [*F*].

(32) See the ſecond Addition of Mr. Menage to the *Life of P. Ayrault*, pag. 539.

(33) Mr. Menage has ſaid in page 231. that Barclay publiſhed at London in 1610, an Apology for his *Euphormio*, which he dedicated to Charles Emanuel Duke of Savoy. How then could he ſay here, that the wretched Anſwer which was written to a Cenſure printed in the year 1620, obliged Barclay to write an Apology himſelf?

(34) Menage, *Rem. ſur la Vie de P. Ayrault*, pag. 232, 233.

This is the collection of Mr. Menage; let us ſee whether we can find any gleanings after him, and begin with theſe words of Balzac: *An Academician of Rome, a confident, and as he expreſſes himſelf, an intimate friend of the formidable Scioppius, knowing the friendſhip, which was between Mr. Barclay and me, and the eſteem, which I had for his Argenis, in order to moderate, he ſaid, the violence of my paſſion, offered to ſhew me in that new Hiſtory, which we had then in manuſcript, 1500 improprieties, upon a fair computation and I cannot tell how many original faults, and ſtrange expreſſions* (35). Sorel, an enemy of Balzac, judged in the ſame manner as he did of the ſtyle of the Argenis. *With regard to the Argenis*, ſays he (36), *if any one eſteems the Latin of it, I am entirely of the contrary opinion; for there is an infinite number of new words, which were never uſed at Rome; ſo that if Salluſt was to return to the world, he would ſcarce underſtand them.* He pretends *that in this point he only follows the opinion of the moſt learned men, ſo that ſome body ſaid, Barclay ſpoke French rather than Latin* (37). He not only finds fault with the ſtyle, but likewiſe condemns the œconomy of the work, and gives a very ſevere cenſure of the Euphormio (38). *It is an Hiſtory of a man of mean quality*, ſays he (39), *but it is extremely abſurd.* .... "That, "which made this book read, was becauſe it is in "Latin, and it was not uſual to ſee modern romances "in that language; but it has not been conſidered, "that it happened well for the author that he did not "write in the vulgar tongue, becauſe it is not obſerv-"ed, that he does not underſtand how to make every "perſon ſpeak according to their character, which is "the peculiar excellence of a Satyr. Whereas on the "contrary he has introduced pedantical diſcourſes, "and made a ſervant ſpeak in the forms of a School-"maſter, who underſtands the Greek and Roman Hi-"ſtory; ſo that all theſe things being conſidered with "the lowneſs of the adventures, it appears that the "Satyr of the Euphormio is the work of a Scholar, "who juſt begins to exerciſe himſelf in writing (40)." When he grew old, he ſoftened his criticiſm a little; but he ſtill maintained a diſguſt for the Euphormio (41). *This Satyr was*, ſays he (42), *written in Latin by John Barclay, and tranſlated into French by John Berault, Doctor of Phyſic of the Faculty of Paris. We find a great deal of learning in it, with a cenſure upon ſeveral vices of the age; but the invention is not the moſt ingenious and agreeable that can be found.* We have ſeen already what Scaliger thought of the work of Euphormio itſelf; here is his judgment of the ſtyle. *There are a great many faults, which every body will not diſcover, as in the verſes of Mr. Beza there are a great many Galliciſms* (43). We muſt not forget that this book had the ſame fate with the treatiſe *of the Power of the Pope*: it was condemned by the Inquiſition. The Decree orders that certain things ſhould be retrenched; but Nicius Erythræus informs me, that the Bookſellers were forbidden to ſell it, and all perſons to have it in their poſſeſſion or read it; and that before this he had read ſomething of it. *Partem Euphormionis deguſtavi tum, cum nondum lata lex erat, ne Bibliopolæ cuipiam liceret eum vendere, aut cuiquam domi habere aut legere* (44). Theſe words ſhould be well remark'd, and compared with ſome others in page 77. We ſhall be ſurprized that the Court of Rome had ſo little regard for the Congregation of the *Index*: we ſhall find that John Barclay was received at Rome in a very kind manner, and had conſiderable favours conferred upon him by the Pope, on account of the reputation, which he had acquired by the Euphormio. *Romam venit, ubi cum pro* EO *quod ex* EUPHORMIONE, *quem ediderat, celebratum ejus nomen eſſet, eſt ab omnibus humaniter exceptus, & à Paulo V, qui tum Romanam Eccleſiam Pontifex adminiſtrabat, bonis omnibus, quibus ſponte ſe exuerat, amiſſis, in victu, veſtitu, ac cæteris omnibus ad vitam neceſſariis, magnificè ac liberaliter habitus* (45). Mr. Menage has criticized upon one thing in the Dedication of the Argenis (46). Barclay addreſſing himſelf to King Lewis XIII, tells him, that the Prince, whoſe ſon he was, deſerved in his life-time the ſurname of *Great*, which was not conferred upon him till after his death. *Eo es parente genitus, qui vel confeſſione teſtium, ſæculi ſui ſummus* Magni *cognomen ferre vivus debuerat, quod vos modeſtius extincto addidiſtis* (47). This is a miſtake; for even the Father of John Barclay, in the Dedication of his book *de Regno* to Henry IV, in the year 1609, calls him HENRICUS MAGNUS. Mr. Menage owns that he was obliged for this obſervation to Mr. Nublé.

(35) The 16th Diſcourſe among his *Oeuvres diverſes*, p. 405.

(36) *Berger extravagant*, lib. 13. pag. 83.

(37) Sorel, *Rem. ſur le Berger extravagant*, pag. 698. See likewiſe his *Bibliotheque Françoiſe*, p. 182.

(38) Sorel, lib. 13. of the *Berger extravagant*, and *Remarques* upon the 13th book, and elſewhere.

(39) *Remarques ſur le Berger extravagant*, pag. 763.

(40) Ibid. p. 765.

(41) *Biblioth. Franç.* p. 182.

(42) Ibid. p. 193. See the end of the text of this Article.

(43) Scalig. pag. 23.

(44) Nic. Eryth. *Pinac.* 3. p. 74.

(45) Idem, ibid. pag. 77.

(46) Menage, *Rem. ſur la Vie d'Ayrault*, pag. 232.

(47) Barcl. *Epiſt. Ded. Argenid.*

[*M*] *The vexation of ſeeing himſelf ſo little advanced.*] The author of the Italian Tranſlation of the Argenis acknowledges that the favours of Paul V and Gregory XV were by no means proportioned to the merit of John Barclay, *whether*, ſays he (48), *fortune is pleaſed always to perſecute virtue, or whether the Pope conſidered that poverty is the true mother of knowledge* (49). He inſinuates that Barclay was no good Oeconomiſt, and that a large family, and his liberal temper, reduced him to ſome little ſtreights. *Ivi dunque, ſi trattoneva il Barcleio con facolta non poco anguſte riſpetto la numeroſa*

(48) Franceſco Pona, in the *Life of John Barclay*.

(49) This propoſition is very uncertain, and often very falſe. See *Haud facile emergunt quorum virtutibus obſtat Res anguſta domi & curta Supplex* of Juvenal, Sat. 3. ver. 164. See likewiſe Sat. 7. ver. 56, & *ſeq.*

We have but a confuſed account of his works in Moreri's Dictionary [*N*]. He reviſed his *Euphormio* in order to publiſh it. He left the *Hiſtory of the Conqueſt of Jeruſalem* (*k*), and ſeveral ſheets of the *Hiſtory of Europe* (*l*). It cannot be ſaid that he was ſent on an Embaſſy by King James to the Courts of the Emperor, the King of Hungary, and the Duke of Savoy [*O*]. He ſays nothing of this, when he gives a deſcription of the life which he led at King James's Court (*m*); and all that we can preſume, I think, is, that this Prince employed him in ſending to ſeveral Princes copies of the book, which he wrote upon their common intereſts, againſt the pretenſions of the Court of Rome.

(*k*) *Ha laſciato dopo ſe l'Hiſtoria de Bello ſacro, ch'è la medeſima ch'ha il Taſſo cantato nel ſuo Goſfredo.* Franceſco: Pona in the *Life of John Barclay.*

(*l*) Ibid.

(*m*) Barcl. *in præfat. paran. ad Sectarios.*

His *Euphormio* and *Argenis* have been tranſlated into French [*P*].

meroſa famiglia, & gli ſuoi ſpiriti generoſi. Barclay in the Latin verſes, where he introduces his wife having her picture drawn, gives her but two ſons. In his Latin Life theſe verſes are quoted to prove that he had two ſons and a daughter; which is extremely abſurd.

[*N*] *We have but a confuſed account of his works in the Dictionary of Moreri.*] I, I have obſerved in the remarks [*B*] and [*C*] that this author has converted a piece of Poetry into an Oration: II, and that he has falſly placed the ſcene of Barclay's marriage at Rome; III, and his birth in the year 1586. IV, He was miſtaken in ſaying that the *Satiricon Euphormionis* of Barclay contains five books: properly ſpeaking it does not contain above two; for the third is only an apology for the two others: the fourth is not Barclay's but Moriſot's; and the fourth is not built upon the model of the preceding. It is the book, which the author intitled *Icon Animarum*. V, Moreri knew nothing of it, ſince he ſpeaks of this *Icon Animarum*, as a work, which had nothing common with the five pretended books of the *Satiricon Ephormionis*. VI, If I am not miſtaken all the works publiſhed by John Barclay againſt thoſe of the Proteſtant Religion are only the *Paræneſis ad Sectarios*, which he brought already finiſh'd into Italy, and publiſhed at Rome as ſoon as he arrived there. And yet Moreri tells us, that Barclay publiſh'd books againſt the Proteſtants, during the melancholy and ſolitary life which he led at Rome, in the midſt of the favours, which Paul V and Gregory XV *his ſucceſſor* conferred upon him. The *Paræneſis ad Sectarios* was printed in 1617. Gregory XV was not elected till 1621. VII. He adds that Barclay publiſhed likewiſe at that time the *Icon Animarum*. This is a miſtake. This work was printed at London in 1614, two years before the author went to Rome.

[*O*] *It cannot be ſaid that he was ſent on an Embaſſy.*] A writer of Elogiums and Lives eaſily runs into ſtrong and emphatical expreſſions. If a Prince makes uſe of any perſon to carry any packet of importance, you'll ſee immediately that the journey of a Courier ſhall be turned into an extraordinary deputation or even a real embaſſy. I am willing to believe, that if the preſents, which King James ſent to ſeveral Princes as an author, were entruſted to Barclay, it was not as to a mere meſſenger; he had very probably the juſtice done to his merit, to have his commiſſion made agreeable to him in the manner of it; but in ſhort this meſſage of his made ſo little noiſe, that it is a jeſt to ſay, *Illius* (Regis Magnæ Britanniæ) *nomine, Legationem obivit ad Rodolphum Imperatorem, ad Matthiam Pannoniæ Regem, & ad Emanuelem Philibertum* (50) *Ducem Allobrogum* (51): that is, "He "went Embaſſador from the King of England to the "Emperor Rodolphus, Matthias King of Hungary, "and Emanuel Philibert Duke of Savoy.

(50) The Duke of Savoy's name then was Charles Emanuel.

(51) See the *Life of Barclay* before the *Argenis*.

[*P*] *His Euphormio and Argenis have been tranſlated into French.*] I have already quoted Sorel (52), who obſerves that the *Euphormio* was tranſlated into French by John Berault: I add that this Tranſlation was printed at Paris in 1640 in 8vo, and that it was preceded by two others, the authors of which, *for fear of keeping too ſuperſtitiouſly to the words of the original, had left the work at leaſt as difficult as it was before* (53). Berault has given a Key and a Commentary at the end of his Tranſlation. The Tranſlation of the *Argenis* was printed at Paris by N. Buon in 1624 in 8vo, but without the name of the tranſlator.

(52) Above quotation (32).

(53) See the Advertiſement of the Bookſeller before Berault's tranſlation.

☞ BARCLAY (ROBERT), one of the moſt eminent Writers among the Quakers, was the ſon of Colonel David Barclay, deſcended of the antient and honourable family of the Barclays, and of Katherine Gordon from the houſe of the Dukes of Gordon (*a*). He was born at Edinburgh in the year 1648, and educated under an uncle of his at Paris, where the Papiſts uſed all their efforts to draw him over to their Religion. But though in that tender age he ſeemed a little too ready to comply with their ſolicitations, yet as he advanced in years and knowledge, he ſaw farther into the errors of the Church of Rome, and became more averſe to it (*b*). This is the account of the Quaker-Writers themſelves; but Gerard Croeſe, a Dutch Divine, in his *Hiſtoria Quakeriana* (*c*) tells us, that Mr. Barclay's uncle was Principal of the Scots Popiſh College at Paris; and that he was perſuaded by him to leave the Reformed Religion, and turn Papiſt; upon hearing which his father ſent for him home. During his reſidence in France he gained a perfect knowledge of the French and Latin tongues, and having accompliſhed himſelf in moſt of the branches of Learning, he returned to Scotland about the year 1664, being then ſixteen years of age. Mr. Pen, Mr. Sewell, and Mr. Croeſe inform us (*d*), that during his abſence his father had embraced the Doctrine of the Quakers; which appears to be a miſtake; ſince Mr. Barclay himſelf tells us in his *Teſtimony* concerning his father at the end of his Works, that he joined himſelf to the Quakers in the year 1666, which was two years after his ſon's return from France. Our Author became a Proſelyte to that Sect in 1667 (*e*); and diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his zeal and abilities in defence of their doctrines. He wrote ſeveral books for that purpoſe; the firſt of which was printed in 1670, and intitled, *Truth cleared of Calumnies* [*A*]; and the ſame year he wrote *Queries to the inhabitants*

(*a*) Will. Pen's Teſtimony to the memory of R. Barclay, prefixed to the edition of Mr. Barclay's Works, London 1692. fol.

(*b*) Will. Sewell's *Hiſtory of the Quakers*, pag. 472. ed. London 1722, in fol.

(*c*) Lib. 1. Part 1. pag. 151. Engliſh tranſlation, London 1696 in 8vo.

(*d*) *Ubi ſupra.*

(*e*) Pen and Sewell, *ubi ſupra.* Mr. Croeſe ſays *that he became a Quaker when he was 18 years of age.*

[*A*] *Publiſhed in* 1670, *and intitled,* Truth cleared of Calumnies,] The whole title was as follows: *Truth cleared of Calumnies; wherein a book, intitled,* A Dialogue between a Quaker and ſtable Chriſtian, *(printed at Aberdeen and upon good ground, judged to be writ by William Mitchell, a Preacher near by it, or at leaſt, that he had the chief hand in it,) is examined, and the diſingenuity of the author in his repreſenting the Quakers is diſcovered. Here is alſo their caſe truly ſtated, cleared, demonſtrated, and the objections of their oppoſers anſwered, according to truth, ſcripture, and right reaſon.* Mr. Barclay obſerves in his *Preface*, that the Quakers had been repreſented by their adverſaries, as diſtracted, and poſſeſſed of the Devil, and practiſing abominations under colour of being led to them by the Spirit; that they denied the true Chriſt, heaven,

tants of Aberdeen [*B*]. His third performance was written upon the ſame controverſy, and againſt the ſame antagoniſt as his firſt piece [*C*]. In 1672 he publiſhed *A ſeaſonable Warning and Exhortation to and Expoſtulation with the inhabitants of Aberdeen, concerning this preſent Diſpenſation and Day of God's living Viſitation towards them, with an Anſwer to ſome Queries annexed.* He tells us in this piece, that he had been commanded by God to paſs through the ſtreets of that City covered with ſack-cloth and aſhes, and to call the inhabitants of it to repentance; and that he felt the greateſt agonies of mind imaginable, till he had executed that command. In 1675 he wrote a *Catechiſm and Confeſſion of Faith* [*D*]; and the year following a book, intitled, *The Anarchy of the Ranters and other Libertines, the Hierarchy of the Romaniſts and other pretended Churches, equally refuſed and refuted in a twofold Apology for the Church and People of God, called in deriſion* QUAKERS, *&c.* [*E*]. In 1676 he publiſhed in Latin at Amſterdam in 4to, his *Apology for the Quakers*;

hell, the exiſtence of Angels, the reſurrection of the body, and the day of judgment; and that their principles were inconſiſtent with Magiſtracy, and of as dangerous a conſequence, as of thoſe of John of Leyden and his accomplices. This, he tells us, was the vulgar and familiar languages of the pulpits, which was for ſome time received as unqueſtionable truth, till about the year 1663, when the doctrines of the Quakers came to be examined by ſome impartial perſons, who detected the calumnies of their antagoniſts. He complains likewiſe, that great pains had been taken to ſuppreſs them by threatnings and perſecution at Aberdeen, as well as by preaching and writing; and refers his vindication of them from the miſrepreſentations caſt upon them to *that innocent and pure principle the Light of Chriſt Jeſus within the mind of man.*

[*B*] *Queries to the inhabitants of Aberdeen.*] This piece is intitled, *Some things of weighty concernment; propoſed in meekneſs and love by way of queries to the ſerious conſideration of the inhabitants of Aberdeen; which alſo may be of uſe to ſuch, as are of the ſame mind with them elſewhere in this Nation.* This was ſubjoined by way of *Appendix* to his former tract.

[*C*] *Written upon the ſame controverſy, and againſt the ſame antagoniſt as his firſt piece.*] The title of it is; *William Mitchell unmaſk'd; or the ſtaggering inſtability of the pretended ſtable Chriſtian diſcovered, his omiſſions obſerved, and weakneſs unvailed, in his late faint and feeble animadverſions by way of reply to a book, intitled,* Truth cleared of Calumnies; *wherein the integrity of the Quakers doctrine is the ſecond time juſtified, and cleared from the reiterate, clamorous, but cauſeleſs calumnies of this cavilling Catechiſt.* The author of the *Preface* to Mr. *Barclay's Works*, publiſh'd in 1692, tells us (1), that in this piece the diſpute riſes high, and the conteſt ſeems ſharp and cloſe. "But to every "impartial reader, *continues he*, the advantage evi- "dently runs upon our author's ſide; who appears "rather zealous than heated, and ſharp on his ene- "my's matter, than perſon; for he rather pities his "enemy, than triumphs over his weakneſs and en- "vy." *Here, as in an exact draught, the reader has an account of the fabulous principles given under our names, and thoſe that we really profeſs; and the pleaſure even men pretending to religion take to render a poor ſelf-denying people, that, which they are not; as if they fear'd we ſhould be in the right, or hold principles nearer to what they profeſs themſelves to believe, than is convenient for their intereſt with the people to allow; leſt that together with the ſobriety, their worſt enemies confeſs to be ſo conſpicuous among them, ſhould give them too great a credit with their hearers.*

(1) Pag. 11.

[*D*] *A Cathechiſm and Confeſſion of Faith.*] The title of it is; *A Catechiſm and Confeſſion of Faith, approved of and agreed unto by the general aſſembly of the Patriarchs, Prophets, and Apoſtles, Chriſt himſelf chief Speaker in and among them.* This, he tells us, "con- "tains a true and faithful account of the principles and "doctrines, which are moſt ſurely believed by the "Churches of Chriſt in Great Britain and Ireland, "who are reproachfully called by the name of Quak- "ers; yet are found in one faith with the primitive "Church and Saints; as is moſt clearly demonſtrated "by ſome plain Scripture-teſtimonies (without conſe- "quences or commentaries,) which are here collected "and inſerted by way of anſwer to a few weighty, "yet eaſy and familiar queſtions, fitted as well for "the wiſeſt and largeſt, as for the weakeſt and loweſt "capacities. To which is added an *Expoſtulation* "with, and *Appeal* to all other Profeſſors." He obſerves in his *Preface*, that the generality of all Proteſtants, tho' in many other things miſerably rent among themſelves, agree in dividing from the Church of Rome in theſe two particulars; 1. That every principle and doctrine of the Chriſtian Faith is and ought to be founded upon the Scriptures; and that whatſoever principles or doctrines are not only not contrary, but even not according thereto, ought to be denied, as Antichriſtian. 2. That the Scriptures themſelves are plain and eaſy to be underſtood; and that every private Chriſtian and Member of the Church ought to read and peruſe them, that they may know their faith and belief founded upon them, and receive them for that cauſe alone, and not becauſe any Church or Aſſembly has compounded and recommended them, the choiceſt and moſt pure of which they are obliged to look upon as fallible. He tells us then, that in contradiction *to this known and acknowledg'd principle, they moſt vigorouſly proſecute and perſecute others with the like ſeverity the Papiſts did their Fathers for believing things, that are plainly ſet down in the Scriptures; and for not believing divers principles, for which themſelves are forced to recur to Tradition, and can by no means prove from Scripture.* He declares, that in the anſwers to the Queſtions there is not one word, that he knows of, but the expreſs words of Scripture; and if in ſome of the queſtions there is ſomewhat ſubſumed of what in his judgment was the plain and naked import of the words, it was not to impoſe his ſenſe upon the reader; but to make way for the next queſtion, for the ſake of the dependence of the matter. *I ſhall leave it,* ſays he, *to the reaſon of any underſtanding and judicious man, who is not biaſſed by ſelf-intereſt, (that great enemy to true equity,) and who in the leaſt meaſure is willing to give way to the light of Chriſt in his conſcience, if the Scriptures do not pertinently and aptly anſwer to the queſtions.* The author of the Preface before Mr. *Barclay's Works* (2) tells us, that it was a Scripture-Eſſay in the heat of divers controverſies then on foot, and that it had paſſed thro' three impreſſions before it was printed in the collection of his works. That his aim was to give the clear and native ſenſe and authority of the Holy Ghoſt in Scripture upon every point of faith and practice, eſpecially thoſe that were controverted, ſuggeſting the points ſucceſſively in queſtions from head to head, and giving anſwer by proper Scriptures without any conſequences; leaving it to every reader to judge how far the queſtion and anſwer agreed, and what ſenſe the Holy Scripture expreſt as to the point ſtated in the queſtion. *And indeed,* continues that author, *it were greatly to be deſired, that where men cannot agree in their comment, who yet agree in the text, they would ſtrive to improve piety and charity under generalities, where they do and can meet, and would ſtudy to be quiet and follow peace with all men, and holineſs, without which no man ſhall ſee the Lord. It was a great unhappineſs to men, as well as injury to religion itſelf, that it has been branched and broken into ſo many parts and points; and more, that ſome men have ſo boldly and critically ſuperfined upon them; but worſt of all, that Governments have troubled themſelves to give them authority, and make them the current creeds of their countries; and to deny and put down as baſe and adulterate all principles or doctrines of a differing ſenſe, tho' they have an intrinſic worth, and the exemplary virtue of their profeſſions to recommend them.*

(2) Pag. 12.

[*E*] *A book, intitled,* The Anarchy of the Ranters and other Libertines, &c.] In this work he endeavours, as he tells us in the title, to vindicate the Quakers from thoſe, that accuſe them of diſorder and confuſion

kers [F]; which is the moſt celebrated of all his Works. The *Theſes Theologicæ*, which are the foundation of this Work, and addreſſed to *the Clergy of what ſort ſoever*, were publiſhed a conſiderable time before the writing of this Apology, and printed in Latin, French, High and Low Dutch, and Engliſh. He ſent them to the Doctors, Profeſſors, and Students of Divinity, both Popiſh and Proteſtant in every Country in Europe, deſiring them to examine them, and return an anſwer to them (*f*). When he had written his *Apology*, he ſent two copies of it to every Prince's Embaſſador at Nimeguen, in order that they might conſider it, and ſend it to their Princes for their cognizance and enquiry. He publiſhed

(*f*) Croeſe's *General Hiſtory of the Quakers*, Book 2. p. 90.

confuſion on the one hand, and from ſuch as calumniate them with tyranny and impoſition on the other; and to ſhew, that as the true and pure principles of the Goſpel are reſtored by their teſtimony, ſo alſo the antient Apoſtolic Order of the Church of Chriſt is re-eſtabliſhed among them, and ſettled upon its right baſis and foundation. He complains in the Preface, that the Quakers are ſometimes repreſented as *a rude, diſorderly rabble, leaving every one to do, as they liſt, againſt all good order and government; and at other times, that they are ſo much for order, as not to admit men to exerciſe the liberty of their own judgments.* He obſerves that there were two things eſpecially, both of which in their primitive uſe were appointed, and very much contributed towards the edification of the Church. The one was the power and authority, which the Apoſtles had given them of Chriſt for the gathering, building up, and governing of his Church; by virtue of which power and authority they alſo wrote the holy Scriptures. The other is that privilege given to every Chriſtian under the Goſpel to be led and guided by the Spirit of Chriſt, and to be taught by it in all things. But theſe, he tells us, are by the perverſeneſs of men frequently made to claſh with and deſtroy each other. *For on the one hand the authority and power, that reſided in the Apoſtles, while it is annexed and entailed to an outward ordination and ſucceſſion of Teachers, is made uſe of to cloak and cover all manner of abuſes, even the height of idolatry and ſuperſtition. But he remarks, that on the other hand ſome are ſo great pretenders to inward motions and revelations of the Spirit, that there are no extravagancies ſo wild, which they will not cloak with it; and ſo much are they for every one's following their own mind, as can admit of no Chriſtian fellowſhip and community, nor of that good order and diſcipline, which the Church of Chriſt never was nor can be without. This gives an open door to all libertiniſm, and brings great reproach to the Chriſtian Faith. And on this hand have foully fallen the German Anabaptiſts ſo called, John of Leyden, Knipperdolling, &c. (in caſe thoſe monſtrous things committed by them be ſuch as they are related,) and ſome more moderate of that kind have been found among the people in England, called* Ranters. *As it is true, the people called* Quakers *have been branded with both of theſe extremes; it is as true, it hath been and is their work to avoid them, and to be found in that even and good path of the primitive Church, where all were no doubt led and acted by the Holy Spirit, and might have all propheſied one by one; and yet there was a ſubjection of the Prophets to the Spirits of the Prophets.* The author of the Preface to his *Works* (3) informs us, that "this "diſcourſe touching the tender place, both of thoſe, "that exerciſe a coercive authority over conſcience on "the one hand, and of thoſe, that to avoid the extreme run into an abſolute perſonal independency in "point of order and government on the other hand. "Both ſorts were not a little diſguſted; but the latter "more eſpecially, that thought themſelves chiefly "concerned in the author's intentions and labour. And "indeed the riſe and ground of the diſcourſe was the "diſſatisfaction of ſome, that profeſſed to be of the "ſame Society, about the methods of proceeding, as "a Chriſtian Community for the honour of our holy "Profeſſion. Some miſtook him; others too deſignedly inveighed againſt him. The animoſity roſe ſo "high in ſome few leading perſons of that diſſent, as "to queſtion his ſincerity to the profeſſion he made of "Religion in general, whiſpering him to be Popiſhly affected, if not a Papiſt, and perhaps a graduated one too. And why? firſt becauſe he was bred "in France at ſchool under an uncle, that was a "Papiſt, if not a Prieſt. Secondly, becauſe he maintained Church-Authority at as high a rate, at leaſt "upon the ſame principles." The writer of the Preface proceeds then to vindicate him from theſe imputations.

(3) Pag. 14.

[F] *In* 1675 *he publiſhed his Apology for the Quakers.*] The title of it in the Engliſh edition is as follows: *An Apology for the true Chriſtian Divinity, as the ſame is held forth and preached by the people called in ſcorn Quakers; being a full explanation and vindication of their principles and doctrines by many arguments deduced from Scripture, and right reaſon, and the teſtimonies of famous authors both ancient and modern. With a full anſwer to the ſtrongeſt objections uſually made againſt them. Preſented to the King.* This work is divided into fifteen propoſitions, which are amply explained. The *firſt* is concerning *the true foundation of knowledge.* The *ſecond is of immediate revelation*; which though it neither does nor can ever contradict the outward teſtimony of the Scriptures, or right and ſound reaſon, yet is not to be ſubjected to the examination of either, as to a more noble or certain rule and touchſtone. Since this divine revelation and inward illumination is that, which is evident and clear of it ſelf, forcing by its own evidence and clearneſs the well-diſpoſed underſtanding to aſſent. The *third* propoſition is *concerning the Scriptures*, which becauſe they are only a declaration of the fountain, and not the fountain itſelf, are not to be eſteemed the principal ground of all truth and knowledge, nor yet the adequate, primary rule of faith and manners. However as they gave a true and faithful teſtimony of the firſt foundation, they are and may be eſteemed a ſecondary rule, ſubordinate to the ſpirit, from which they have all their excellency and certainty. The *fourth* is *concerning the condition of man in the fall*, in which ſtate he can know nothing aright, and his thoughts and conceptions concerning God and ſpiritual things are unprofitable to himſelf and others. However this evil ſeed is not imputed to infants, until by tranſgreſſion they actually join themſelves with it. The *fifth* is of *the univerſal redemption by Chriſt, and alſo the ſaving and ſpiritual Light, wherewith every man is enlightened.* Mr. Barclay endeavours to prove the reality and influences of this light from ſeveral paſſages of Scripture; and in the *ſixth propoſition* affirms, that according to this principle or hypotheſis all the objections againſt the univerſality of Chriſt's death are eaſily ſolved. And from hence, ſays he, it follows, that as ſome of the old Philoſophers might have been ſaved, ſo alſo may now ſome, who by Providence are caſt into thoſe remote parts of the world, where the knowledge of the Hiſtory is wanting, be made partakers of the divine Myſtery, if they receive and reſiſt not that grace, *a manifeſtation whereof is given to every man to profit withal.* The *ſeventh* is concerning *Juſtification.* As many as reſiſt not this light, but receive it, procure the fruits of holineſs, by which means they are ſanctified and juſtified before God; not indeed by their own works wrought in our will, nor yet by good works, conſidered as of themſelves, but by Chriſt, who is both the Gift and the Giver, and the cauſe producing the effects within us. The *eighth* is concerning *Perfection.* Thoſe, in whom this holy and pure birth is fully brought forth, are free from actual ſinning, and in that reſpect perfect. Yet this perfection admits of a growth; and there remains a poſſibility of ſinning, where the mind does not moſt diligently attend unto the Lord. The *ninth* is of *perſeverance, and the poſſibility of falling from grace.* The *tenth* is concerning *the Miniſtry.* He tells us, that as by this gift or light of God all true knowledge in things ſpiritual is received; ſo by the ſame every true Miniſter is ordained and ſupplied in the work of the Miniſtry. That ſuch perſons as have this authority may preach, though without commiſſion or literature; as on the other hand, thoſe who want the authority of this divine gift, however learned or authorized by the commiſſions of

liſhed an Engliſh tranſlation of it done by himſelf in 1678; and it has been ſince tranſlated into High Dutch, Low Dutch, French and Spaniſh. There have been ſeveral editions of it in Engliſh ſince. He had a diſpute in the year 1675 with ſome Students of the Univerſity of Aberdeen, an account of which was afterwards publiſhed. In 1676 he publiſhed his *Quakeriſm confirmed; a Vindication of the chief Doctrines and Principles of the Quakers, from the Arguments and Objections of the Students of Divinity (ſo called) of Aberdeen, in their book, intitled,* Quakeriſm canvaſſed. The year following he wrote his *Univerſal Love conſidered and eſtabliſhed upon its right Foundation* [G]; and another piece, intitled, *An Epiſtle of Love and friendly Advice to the Ambaſſadors of the ſeveral Princes of Europe met at Nimeguen to conſult the Peace of Chriſtendom, ſo far as they are concerned* [H]. His next Treatiſe was publiſhed in 1679, and intitled, *R. B.'s Apology for*

men and churches, are to be eſteemed but as deceivers, and not true Miniſters of the Goſpel. Thoſe likewiſe who have received this gift, ought to give it freely, without hire or bargaining; far leſs to uſe it as a trade to get money by. Yet if God hath called any from their employments or trades, it may be lawful for ſuch to receive ſuch temporals, (that is, what may be needful to them for meat and cloathing,) as are freely given them by thoſe, to whom they have communicated Spirituals. The *eleventh* is concerning *Worſhip*. All true and acceptable worſhip to God is offered in the inward and immediate moving and drawing of his own Spirit; which is neither limited to places, times, or perſons. For though we are to worſhip him always, becauſe we are to fear before him; yet as to the outward ſignification thereof in prayers, praiſes or preachings, we ought not to do it where and when we will, but where and when we are moved thereunto by the ſecret inſpirations of his Spirit in our hearts; which God heareth and accepteth, and is never wanting to move us thereunto, when need is; of which he himſelf is the alone proper judge. All other worſhip then, both praiſes, prayers, and preachings, which man ſets about in his own will and at his own appointment, which he can both begin and end at his pleaſure, do or leave undone as himſelf ſees meet, whether they be a preſcribed form, as a Liturgy, or prayers conceived extemporarily by the natural ſtrength and faculty of the mind, they are all but ſuperſtitions, will-worſhip and abominable idolatry in the ſight of God. The *twelfth* propoſition is concerning *Baptiſm*; which is a pure and ſpiritual thing, to wit, the baptiſm of the ſpirit and fire, of which the baptiſm of John was a figure; which was commanded for a time, and not to continue for ever. As to the baptiſm of infants, it is a mere human tradition; for which neither precept nor practice is to be found in all the Scripture. The *thirteenth* is concerning *the Communion* or *Participation of the Body and Blood of Chriſt*; which is inward and ſpiritual; and of this the breaking of bread by Chriſt with his Diſciples was a figure, which they even uſed in the Church for a time, who had received the ſubſtance on account of the weak; even as abſtaining from things ſtrangled and blood, the waſhing one another's feet, and the anointing of the ſick with oil; all which are commanded with no leſs authority and ſolemnity than the former. Yet ſeeing they are but the ſhadows of better things, they ceaſe in ſuch as have obtained the ſubſtance. The *fourteenth* propoſition is concerning *the power of the civil Magiſtrate in matters purely religious, and pertaining to the conſcience*. Since God hath aſſumed to himſelf the power and dominion of the conſcience, who alone can rightly inſtruct and govern it, therefore it is not lawful for any one whatſoever, by virtue of any authority or principality they bear in the government of this world, to force the conſcience of others. And therefore all killing, baniſhing, fining, impriſoning, and other ſuch things, which men are afflicted with only for the exerciſe of their conſcience, or difference in worſhip or opinion, proceeds from the ſpirit of Cain the murtherer, and is contrary to the truth; providing always, that no man under the pretence of conſcience prejudice his neighbour in his life or eſtate, or do any thing deſtructive to, or inconſiſtent with human ſociety; in which caſe the Law is for the tranſgreſſor, and juſtice is to be adminiſtred upon all without reſpect of perſons. The *fifteenth* propoſition concerning *Salutations, Recreations, &c.* is as follows. Seeing the chief end of all Religion is to redeem man from the ſpirit and vain converſation of this world, and to lead them into inward communion with God, before whom if we fear always, we are accounted happy; therefore all the vain cuſtoms and habits thereof both in word and deed are to be rejected and forſaken by thoſe who come to this fear; ſuch as the taking off the hat to a man, the bowings and cringings of the body, and other ſuch ſalutations of that kind, with all the fooliſh and ſuperſtitious formalities attending them; all which man has invented in his degenerate ſtate to feed his pride, in the vain pomp and glory of this world. As alſo the unprofitable plays, frivolous recreations, ſportings and gamings, which are invented to paſs away the precious time, and divert the mind from the witneſs of God in the heart, and from the living ſenſe of his fear, and from that evangelical ſpirit, wherewith Chriſtians ought to be armed; and which leads into ſobriety, gravity and godly fear, in which as we abide, the bleſſing of God is felt to attend us in theſe actions, which we are neceſſarily engaged in order to the taking care for the ſuſtenance of the outward man. The Author of the *Preface* to his *Works* quoted above tells us (4), that this *Apology* is the moſt comprehenſive of all his performances, and was publiſhed in Latin, Dutch and Engliſh. *It firſt lays down*, ſays he, *our avowed principles of belief and practice, diſtinguiſhed from what our enemies are pleaſed to ſay in our names, who by making us erroneous, give themſelves the eaſier taſk to confute us, and then triumph. After he has ſtated our principles, he has put the objections, which he had collected out of our adverſaries books, or rather that he did apprehend might be made to thoſe principles; and anſwers them. And laſtly cites divers Authors, both antient and modern, eſpecially ſome of the primitive ages, for further illuſtration and confirmation of our ſaid belief and practice. The method and ſtyle of the book may be ſomewhat ſingular, and like a ſcholar; for we make that ſort of learning no part of divine ſcience. But that was not to ſhew himſelf, but out of his tenderneſs to ſcholars, and as far as the ſimplicity and purity of the truth would permit, in condeſcention to their education and way of treating of thoſe points herein handled.*

(4) Pag. 21.

[G] *He wrote his* Univerſal Love conſider'd &c.] The title of it is as follows: *Univerſal Love conſidered and eſtabliſh'd upon its right foundation; being a ſerious enquiry how far charity may and ought to be extended towards perſons of different judgments in matters of Religion, and whoſe principles among the ſeveral ſects of Chriſtians do moſt naturally lead to that due moderation required.* He obſerves in his 4th ſection of this piece, that as there are two ways chiefly, whereby a people or ſociety ſignify their charity and love towards others, who differ from them; ſo by theſe two alſo is ſignified their contrary principles and practice. The firſt by a favourable and charitable judgment of the condition of men's ſouls, tho' of different and contrary principles from them, in ſuppoſing, or at leaſt not abſolutely denying, but that they may even upon their own principles, if faithful thereto, obtain peace with God, and life eternal. The ſecond is by a friendly and neighbourly deportment towards men's perſons, in not ſeeking to ruin and deſtroy them, whether in life, liberty, or eſtate; tho' their judgment concerning God and things ſpiritual in the nature and manner of the exerciſe of their worſhip be both contrary and different. Where the defect of either of theſe two is, there of neceſſity muſt be wanting univerſal love and charity. This piece is dated from Aberdeen-priſon 1677.

[H] *Another piece, intitled,* An Epiſtle of love and friendly Advice &c.] In this piece he endeavours to ſhew

for the true Chriſtian Divinity vindicated from John Browne's Examination and pretended Confutation thereof in his book, intitled, Quakeriſm the Path-way to Paganiſm. He wrote likewiſe the ſame year *A Vindication* of his *Anarchy of the Ranters, &c. ſerving as an explanatory Poſtſcript thereof.* His laſt Tract was publiſhed in 1686, and intitled, *The Poſſibility and Neceſſity of the inward and immediate Revelation of the Spirit of God towards the Foundation and Ground of true Faith, proved in a Letter writ in Latin to a Perſon of Quality in Holland, and now alſo put into Engliſh* [*I*]. He travelled into England, Holland and Germany with Mr. William Pen, in order to propagate the Doctrines of the Quakers; and in Holland he had a Conference upon Religion with Mr. Labadie, well known for the peculiarity of his notions in Religion. Mr. Sewell, the Author of *The Hiſtory of the Quakers*, who was perſonally acquainted with him, tells us (*g*), that he was a man of eminent gifts and endowments, well ſkilled not only in the learned Languages, but likewiſe in the Writings of the antient Fathers and other Eccleſiaſtical Writers. That he had a ſound judgment, and a great underſtanding; and was of a friendly and pleaſant, though grave converſation; remarkably qualified for compoſing of differences; and "that he really lived "up to what he profeſſed, being of an unblameable deportment, truly pious, and well be-"loved of thoſe he converſed with." Mr. Pen likewiſe in his *Teſtimony to the Memory* of him tells us, that he was a dutiful ſon, a loving huſband, a tender and careful father, an eaſy maſter, and a good and kind neighbour and friend. Mr. George Keith, who had been formerly one of the moſt conſiderable preachers and writers among the Quakers, and very

(g) Pag. 627, 628.

ſhew the true cauſe of the war, and to propoſe the right remedy and means for a firm and ſettled peace. A copy of it was delivered February 22d and 24th 1678 at Nimeguen to each of the Embaſſadors, and their Principals, together with his Apology in Latin.

[*I*] *His laſt Tract was publiſhed in* 1686, *and intitled,* The Poſſibility and Neceſſity of the inward and immediate Revelation &c.] Mr. Sewell in his *Hiſtory of the Quakers* (5) tells us, that he wrote this Letter in 1676 to the Heer Adrian Paets, with whom Mr. Barclay had ſome diſcourſe, when that Gentleman returned from Spain, where he had been Embaſſador from the States of the United Provinces. He had written a Letter ſome time before to Chriſtian Hartzoeker, concerning the Doctrine of the Quakers, which Letter is publiſh'd in the *Præſtantium ac eruditorum virorum Epiſtolæ Eccleſiaſticæ & Theologicæ*, Amſterdam 1704; and having afterwards diſcourſed with Mr. Barclay concerning the immediate Revelation of the Spirit of God, the latter was induced to write him a letter in Latin upon that ſubject. This letter being ſent over from Scotland to Holland was delivered by Mr. Benjamin Furly at Rotterdam to Mr. Paets, with a requeſt, that he would return an anſwer to it, which he promis'd to do. But as he neglected it, Mr. Furly at laſt publiſhed the Letter without mentioning the perſon's name, to whom it was written, but only his character, viz. *Cuidam Legato*; i. e. "To a certain Embaſſador." In this Letter he firſt ſets down the objection of Mr. Paets, that ſince the being and ſubſtance of the Chriſtian Religion conſiſts in the knowledge of and faith concerning the Birth, Life, Death, Reſurrection and Aſcenſion of Chriſt Jeſus, he conſidered the ſubſtance of the Chriſtian Religion as a contingent truth; which contingent truth was matter of fact. And matter of fact could not be known by the revelation of another, or by the perception of the outward ſenſes; becauſe there are naturally in our ſouls no ideas of contingent truths, ſuch as are concerning neceſſary truths, viz. that God is, and that the whole is greater than the part. And ſince it might without abſurdity be ſaid, that God cannot make a contingent truth to become a neceſſary truth; neither can God reveal contingent truths or matters of fact, but as contingent truths are revealed; and matters of fact not being revealed but by the outward ſenſes, the concluſion drawn from thence is, that men are not obliged to believe God producing any revelation in the ſoul concerning matters of fact, whether of a thing done or to be done, unleſs there be added ſome miracles obvious to the outward ſenſes, by which the ſoul may be aſcertained that this revelation comes from God. In anſwer to theſe arguments, Mr. Barclay premiſes firſt, that it was falſly ſuppoſed, that the eſſence of the Chriſtian Religion conſiſted in the hiſtorical faith and knowledge of the Birth, Death, Life, Reſurrection, and Aſcenſion of Chriſt. That faith and hiſtorical knowledge is indeed a part of the Chriſtian Religion, but not ſuch an eſſential part, as that without it the Chriſtian Religion cannot conſiſt; but an integral part, which goes to the compleating of the Chriſtian Religion, as the hands or feet of a man are integral parts of a man, without which nevertheleſs a man may exiſt, but not an entire and compleat man. Yet he agrees, that the hiſtorical knowledge of Chriſt is commonly manifeſted to us by the holy Scripture as the means; but nevertheleſs he aſſerts, that God could without ſuch an outward means manifeſt that hiſtorical knowledge to our minds; and likewiſe, that a contingent truth may be known by a ſupernatural knowledge. He obſerves that when God makes known to men any matter of fact by divine revelation, he then ſpeaks as to the ear of the heart of the inward man. And that as when any natural idea is excited in us, we clearly know it; ſo alſo when a ſupernatural idea is raiſed, we clearly know that, of which it is the idea. He explains likewiſe what properly is the inward ſupernatural ſenſe in man; and then he diſtinguiſhes between contingent and neceſſary truths, and ſhews how a divine Revelation may be known to be ſuch, affirming that natural and ſpiritual ſenſes are diſtinguiſhable by their objects, and demonſtrating how godly men may know that they are in the favour of God, and how the wicked feel the wrath of God as fire. He obſerves after what manner the ſpiritual ſenſes diſtinguiſh the good and evil; and he confeſſes that there is in all men as well the godly as ungodly ſome ſort of idea of God, as of a moſt perfect Being. But he aſſerts, that the ſupernatural idea of God differs much from the natural; and that in all men there is a ſupernatural idea of God. He ſhews likewiſe wherein the motions of the mind differ from thoſe of the body; and that there are ideas as well of ſupernatural as of natural things. And obſerving from whence the errors of falſe likeneſſes of reaſon proceed, he ſays, that natural reaſon cannot perceive ſupernatural things. He aſſerts, that the revelations to the Prophets were by inward inſpirations in their minds; and that they were moſt certainly perſuaded, that they were divinely inſpired even without any outward miracle. And that it is by the inſpiration of the ſame divine Spirit, by which the Prophets prophefied, that we believe their words and writings to be divine, concerning contingent truths, as well paſt as to come. He enquires likewiſe, whether faith comes by outward hearing; and he ſhews how the outward ſenſes may be deceived, nay, that often they are vitiated both by outward caſualties and natural infirmities, to which the godly are no leſs ſubject than the wicked. Mr. Barclay treats of theſe points very largely in his Letter; and he tells us, that in the year 1685 he diſcourſed with Mr. Paets upon the ſame ſubject at London, where the latter was one of the Commiſſioners for the Dutch Eaſt-India Company. *But I could not,* ſays our author in his Advertiſement to the reader, *find him propoſe any thing new, nor what I could conceive had any weight towards a reply. What his reaſons were not to proſecute this matter, I ſhall not determine. But thus far he readily yielded,* "That he had been miſtaken in his notion of the "Quakers; for he found they could make a reaſonable

(5) Pag. 536.

very intimate with Mr. Barclay, but afterwards took Orders in the Church of England, in his *Standard of the Quakers examined* (*b*), places him in the claſs of *ſuch erring Chriſtians that cannot be denied to be in Chriſt.* Mr. Jerem. Jones (*i*) ſtyles him *a man unqueſtionably of a good genius.* The Dedication of his *Apology* to King Charles II is very remarkable, for the uncommon frankneſs and ſimplicity, with which it is written [*K*]; but that Work, which is eſteemed the ſtandard of the Doctrines of the Quakers, has been attacked by ſeveral Writers [*L*]. However ſeveral very eminent Writers acknowledge, that it is written with great force and extent of Learning. Mr. Norris tells us (*k*), that he cannot

(*b*) Pag. 405.

(*i*) *New and full Method of ſettling the Canonical Authority of the New Teſtament*, vol. 2. Part 3. cap. 35. pag. 489. edit. London 1726, in 8vo.

(*k*) *Two Treatiſes of Divine Light*, Tract 2. pag. 32.

" plea for the foundation of their Religion." He informs us then, that upon reading it over again, he found an inclination in himſelf, and was perſuaded by ſome friends, to publiſh a Tranſlation of it in Engliſh. He obſerves with regard to the ground and foundation of faith, that it is reſolved either into *Tradition* or *Revelation*; ſince thoſe, who lay claim to the *Scriptures*, and would make it the foundation of their *faith*, reſolve it merely into Tradition, when the motives of credibility are enquired into. *For my part*, ſays he, *I think, the Papiſts do wiſely in pleading for Infallibility; for certainly the true Church never was nor can be without it. And the Proteſtants do honeſtly in not claiming it, becauſe they are ſenſible they want it. I ſhould therefore deſire the one to prove, that they are infallible, and adviſe the other to believe they may, and ſeek after it. But I am ſure neither the one is, nor the other cannot, without immediate, divine Revelation. Therefore as to deny Revelation is a bad way to prove Infallibility; ſo to deny Infallibility is a bad way to make a Reformation; ſince they, who do reform, had need to be certain they are doing ſo. The aſſerting of Infallibility in the Church of Chriſt is not the error of the Church of Rome; but the pretending to it, when they have it not, and placing it where they ſhould not. But ſince thoſe, who oppoſe immediate Revelation, do it on the account, that they reckon it either impoſſible or unneceſſary, I hope there will be as much found in this Epiſtle, as will evince the contrary.*

[*K*] *Very remarkable for the frankneſs and ſimplicity, with which it is written.*] Mr. Voltaire in his *Letters concerning the Engliſh Nation* (6), having obſerved, that Mr. Barclay's *Apology is a work as well drawn up as the ſubject could poſſibly admit*, tells us, that the Dedication to Charles II *is not filled with mean flattering encomiums; but abounds with bold touches in favour of truth, and with the wiſeſt counſels.* " He hath often " faithfully warned thee by his ſervants, *ſays he in the* " *cloſe of his Epiſtle Dedicatory*, ſince he reſtored thee " to the Royal Dignity, that thy heart might not wax " wanton againſt him to forget his Mercies and Pro- " vidence towards thee, whereby he might permit " thee to be ſoothed up and lulled aſleep in thy ſins " by the flattering of Court Paraſites, who by their " fawning are the ruin of many Princes." . . . . *Thou haſt taſted of proſperity and adverſity; thou knoweſt what it is to be baniſhed thy native country; to be over-ruled, as well as to rule and ſit upon the Throne; and being oppreſſed thou haſt reaſon to know how hateful the oppreſſor is both to God and man. If after all theſe warnings and advertiſements thou doſt not turn unto the Lord with all thy heart, but forget him, who remembered thee in thy diſtreſs, and give up thyſelf to follow luſt and vanity; ſurely great will be thy condemnation. Againſt which ſnare, as well as the temptation of thoſe, that may or do feed thee, and prompt thee to evil, the moſt excellent and prevalent remedy will be to apply thyſelf to that light of Chriſt, which ſhineth in thy conſcience; which neither can nor will flatter thee, nor ſuffer thee to be at eaſe in thy ſins; but doth and will deal plainly and faithfully with thee, as thoſe, that are followers thereof, have alſo done. God Almighty, who hath ſo ſignally hitherto viſited thee with his love, ſo touch and reach thy heart, e'er the day of thy viſitation be expired, that thou mayſt effectually turn to him, ſo as to improve thy place and ſtation for his name.* Mr. Voltaire remarks, that " a more ſurprizing circum- " ſtance is, that this Epiſtle, written by a private man " of no figure, was ſo happy in its effects as to put " a ſtop to the proſecution." That Gentleman ſeems to be miſtaken in aſſerting, that Mr. Barclay was a private man of no figure, ſince he was a perſon of a very good family and fortune, and particularly eminent for his extenſive learning. And there appears to be no manner of ground for affirming, that this Epiſtle was the reaſon, that a ſtop was put to the proſecution againſt the Quakers; ſince we find nothing to that purpoſe in any of their Hiſtories or other Writings.

(6) Letter 3. p. 22. edit. London 1733.

[*L*] *Has been attacked by ſeveral Writers.*] We ſhall give the reader a liſt of the Writers againſt the *Theſes* and *Apology*. I. Mr. John Brown, a Preſbyterian Divine in Scotland, in his *Quakeriſm the Path-Way to Paganiſm*; which was anſwered by Mr. Barclay himſelf in 1679, as we obſerved in the text of this Article. II. Nicholas Arnoldus, Profeſſor of Divinity at Franeker in Frieſland (7) wrote an *Exercitation* in anſwer to the *Theſes Theologicæ*; of which Mr. Barclay takes frequent notice in his *Apology*. III. John George Bajerus, a Lutheran Divine, and Doctor and Profeſſor of Divinity at Jena, publiſhed a piece concerning *the beginning of the true and ſaving knowledge of God*, in oppoſition to Mr. Barclay's *Theſes* and *Apology*; and objecting againſt ſome expreſſions of our Author, as improper, abſurd, obſcure, and unintelligible, he was anſwered by Mr. George Keith, (Mr. Barclay being then employed in ſome other affairs;) to whom Mr. Bajerus made no reply (8). IV. John Chriſtopher Holthuſius, a Divine of the Augſburgh Confeſſion, wrote a large treatiſe in High Dutch; which Croeſe tells us (9) deſerves the title of the *German Anti-Barclaian*, ſince the Quakers have not yet anſwered it. V. Mr. George Keith abovementioned publiſhed a book intitled *The Quakers Standard examined*, in anſwer to the *Apology*; to which no anſwer has been made. VI. In the year 1683 a Latin Treatiſe was publiſhed at Hamborough in 8vo againſt the *Apology* by a Lutheran Divine, whoſe name was L. Ant. Reiſer, a native of Augſburgh in Germany, from whence he was expelled on account of his Religion, and retired to Hamborough, where he was appointed Miniſter of the Church of St. James. His book is intitled *Anti-Barclaius, id eſt, Examen Apologiæ, quam non ita pridem* Robertus Barclajus, *Scoto-Britannus, pro Theologiâ vere Chriſtiana edidit, inſtitutum in gratiam Evangelicorum a L. Ant. Reiſero Auguſtano, nunc Paſtore ad D. Jacobi Hamburgenſis.* We have an account of this book in the *Acta Eruditorum* for the year 1683 (10), the Authors of which obſerve, that Mr. Barclay's *Apology* is written in a manner very different from the uſual writings of the Quakers; for though he declares in his Preface that he was no admirer and imitator of the School-men, but rather an oppoſer and deſpiſer of them, yet he has drawn up his *Theſes* after the ſcholaſtic form, and ſupported them with paſſages from the Scriptures and the Fathers, and replied to all the objections which had been or might be oppoſed to his ſyſtem, with great art and ſagacity. Beſides he was not ignorant of human learning, which was the general characteriſtic of the Quakers, defended even by that Author himſelf in his *tenth Theſis*; but he was well ſkilled in Philology, Philoſophy, and the Fathers, as appears from his whole work. *Quamvis enim is Scholaſticorum non* admiratorem & imitatorem, *ſed* contemptorem, & adverſarium *in præfatione ad Lectorem ſe eſſe fateatur*; Theſes *tamen ſuas in* Apologia, *non confuſè, uti Fanatice plerique alii, ſed ſcholaſticorum more, h. e.* κατασκευαστικῶς & ἀνασκευαστικῶς *propugnat; quippe* ecthеſes *ſuas non* Scripturæ *tantum ac patrum dictis communiens undique, ſed ad ea quoque, quæ ſectæ ſuæ vel oppoſita jam ſunt, vel opponi ulterius poſſe prævidet, pro virili reſpondens. Neque enim humanæ literaturæ ignarus eſt Barclajus, qui Quakerorum alias character eſt, ab ipſo Barclajo Theſi X requiſitus; ſed in Philologiâ, Philoſophiâ, & lectione patrum non tralatitiè, ut totum hoc opus loquitur, verſatur* (11). Mr. Barclay having paſſed frequent cenſures upon the Lutherans among other Proteſtants in his 1, 7, 9, 11, 14 and 15 *Theſes*, Mr. Reiſer undertook the defence of them in this book, and

(7) See his Article in Mr. Bayle.

(8) Croeſe, Book 2. pag. 91.

(9) Ibid.

(10) Pag. 544, & *ſeq. See likewiſe* Baillet, *Jugemens des Savans*, tom. 6. pag. 85. edit. Amſterdam 1725, in 4to.

(11) Ibid. pag. 545.

cannot think Quakeriſm inconſiderable, as the principles of it are laid down and managed by our Author; and "that the great and general contempt, which they lie under, did not "hinder him from thinking the Sect of the Quakers to be far the moſt conſiderable "of any, that divide from the Church, in caſe the Quakeriſm that is generally held, be "the ſame with that which Mr. Barclay has delivered to the World for ſuch:" *Whom*, ſays he, *I take to be ſo great a man, that I profeſs freely, that I had rather engage againſt an hundred* Bellarmins, Hardings, *and* Stapletons, *than with one* Barclay. Mr. Trenchard in a Diſcourſe upon *Enthuſiaſm*, publiſhed in Vol. IV (*l*) of *Cato's Letters*, tells us, that he is not aſhamed to own, that he had with great pleaſure read over his *Apology*, and really thinks it to be the *moſt maſterly, charitable, and reaſonable ſyſtem*, that he had ever ſeen. "It ſolves the numerous difficulties raiſed by other Sects, and by turns thrown at "one another; ſhews all parts of Scripture to be uniform and conſiſtent; and as Sir "Iſaac Newton, by allowing him gravitation, has accounted for all the phenomena of "nature, ſo if we allow to Mr. Barclay thoſe operations of the Spirit, which the Qua-"kers pretend to feel, and which he ſays every man in the world has and may feel, if he "watches its motions, and does not ſuppreſs them; then I think all the jangling vain "queſtions, numerous ſuperſtitions, and various oppreſſions, which have plagued the "world

(*l*) Num. 124. pag. 153-163. 3d edition London 1733.

and examined the *Apology* of our Author, and endeavoured to ſhew not only the heterodoxy of many of his doctrines, but even to diſcover the latent errors in other parts of his wrirings, which ſeemed leſs obnoxious. "He takes notice, according to the Writers of "the *Acta Eruditorum* (12), of his frequent ſelf-con-"tradictions, and the impertinence of his quotations "from Scripture and the Fathers in favour of his "opinions; and confutes his anſwers to thoſe objec-"tions which had been ſuggeſted by others or him-"ſelf; and explodes his abſurd and chimerical gloſſes, "and inconſequential manner of arguing." *Examinavit enim theſes atque ectheſes Barclaji omnes, neque heterodoxas tantum ex orthodoxiâ ſubvertit; ſed &, quid ὕπουλον ſub illis, quæ ſaniores videntur, latitet, detexit; quam ſæpe etiam ſibi contradixerit Apologetes, quamque frivolè inepteque Scripturæ ac Patrum dicta ad incruſtanda dogmata ſua adhibuerit, oſtendit, exploſis etiam omnibus ad objectiones vel ab aliis vel a ſeipſo factas reſponſionibus, gloſſis item cerebrinis, & conſequentiis malè cohærentibus.* And ſince the principal doctrines of the Quakers are contained in the firſt propoſitions of the *Apology*, Mr. Reiſer is more copious in the confutation of them, than in the ſubſequent ones, in which Mr. Barclay advances almoſt the very ſame notions with the Anabaptiſts; and though a great many reproaches are fixed upon thoſe of different ſentiments in Religion, yet Mr. Reiſer confines himſelf chiefly to the defence of the Lutherans; though he does not deny, that even they have ſome defects, and that many learned and pious men in that communion wiſh for the removal of theſe grievances; but at the ſame time he affirms, that the uſe ought to be diſtinguiſhed from the abuſe in ſome points, which are cenſured in the 2d and 15th propoſitions of the *Apology*. *Non diffitetur interim & ſuis Lutheranis eſſe nævos; atque hinc orta non tantum* Gravamina, *ſed* pia *multorum doctorum bonorumque in Eccleſiâ Lutheranâ eſſe Deſideria; uſum etiam ab abuſu in multis, in illis maximè, quæ in* 2 & 15 *Ectheſibus taxantur, diſcernendum eſſe contendit* (13). He has ſubjoined to this Treatiſe a piece of Dr. Henry More addreſſed to the Quakers, and declares himſelf to be of the ſame opinion with that Divine, that this Sect has borrowed a great many of their doctrines from Jacob Behmen, known by the title of the Teutonic Philoſopher. VII. In the year 1705 Mr. Thomas Bennet, afterwards Vicar of St. Giles's Cripplegate, publiſhed a Treatiſe in twenty ſix chapters, in which he particularly attacks Mr. Barclay, the third edition of which was printed in 1733. It is intitled, *A Confutation of Quakeriſm, or a plain proof of the Falſhood of what the principal Quaker Writers (eſpecially Mr. R. Barclay in his* Apology *and other Works) do teach, concerning the neceſſity of immediate Revelation, in order to a ſaving Chriſtian Faith; the Being, Nature, and Operation of the pretended* Univerſal Light within; *its ſtirring with men, moving them to prayer, and calling them to the Miniſtry; Regeneration, Sanctification, Juſtification, Salvation, and Union with God; the Nature of a Church; the Rule of Faith; Water Baptiſm; and the Lord's Supper. Divers Queſtions alſo concerning Perfection, Chriſt's Satisfaction, the Judge of Controverſies, &c. are briefly ſtated and reſolved.*

(12) Ibid.

(13) Ibid.

He obſerves in his preface, that "he cannot but think "*Quakeriſm* one of the vileſt and moſt pernicious "hereſies, that our unhappy Nation has ever been "infected with." He tells us likewiſe, that this Sect, when it firſt appeared in the world, diſtinguiſhed themſelves by ſuch an incredible variety of enthuſiaſtic freaks as made their perſons utterly ridiculous. *Their books alſo were then ſtuffed with ſuch prodigious quantities of ribaldry and jargon of bitterneſs, moſt unchriſtian language, and even blaſphemy itſelf, as inclined all ſober perſons to believe, that they ought to be rather burnt than confuted. At length*, continues he, *Mr.* William Pen, *Mr.* George Keith, *and Mr.* ROBERT BARCLAY *aroſe. Theſe dreſſed up their Religion to the beſt advantage. The two laſt eſpecially endeavoured to refine Quakeriſm. They joined their ſtudies and labours; they knew and improved each other's Notions; and what books they publiſhed, either ſeparately or jointly, were received with great applauſe by their own party.* Mr. Bennet having afterwards obſerved that Mr. Keith, who had left the Quakers, had returned an anſwer to Mr. Barclay's *Apology*, tells us, that this *is certainly the exacteſt piece that ever was written in defence of Quakeriſm.* In his tenth chapter he endeavours to give a brief account of what the *Quakers* mean by the *Univerſal Light within*, from a variety of paſſages in Mr. Barclay's Works. He remarks that by this *Light*, which Mr. Barclay likewiſe calls the *Seed*, the *Spirit*, the *Grace*, the *Word of God*, *Chriſt within*, *vehiculum Dei*, or *the ſpiritual Body of Chriſt which came down from Heaven*, he does not mean the eſſence of God; ſince Mr. Barclay ſays (14), that *by this Seed, Grace, and Word of God, &c. we underſtand not the proper Eſſence and Nature of God preciſely taken.* Nor does he mean by the *Light* the rational ſoul of man, or any faculty of it, particularly that which we call human underſtanding, or man's natural conſcience, or his reaſon, or any part of man's nature; ſince Mr. Barclay ſays (15), *we do not underſtand this divine principle to be any part of man's nature, &c. We make it a diſtinct and ſeparate thing from man's ſoul and all the faculties of it.* But by the *Light* they mean, as Mr. Bennet tells us, a certain ſubſtance, or real, ſpiritual, heavenly, and inviſible principle, in which they ſuppoſe, that God as Father, Son, and Spirit, dwells. For Mr. Barclay ſays (16), *we know it to be a ſubſtance, and by this Seed, &c. we underſtand a ſpiritual, heavenly and inviſible Principle*, (as he expreſſes it juſt after) *a real ſpiritual Subſtance, in which God, as Father, Son and Spirit dwells.* He obſerves likewiſe (17), that *this Seed and ſpiritual Body of Chriſt is as really and immediately united unto the Word, as his outward Body was*; *and* that *this Seed and ſpiritual Nature doth belong to him, as he is the ſecond Adam or Man-Chriſt.* He affirms likewiſe, that "Chriſt in us, or the Seed, "is not a third ſpiritual Nature diſtinct from that "which was the Man Chriſt Jeſus, that was crucified "according to the fleſh at Jeruſalem. For the ſame "that is in us, was and is in him. And as it is in "him, it is the fulneſs or ſpring of the ſame in us "as the ſtream. Nor is there any difference, but "ſuch as is betwixt the ſpring and the ſtream, which

(14) *Apol.* Propoſ. 5, 6.

(15) Ibid.

(16) Ibid.

(17) See his *Quakeriſm confirm'd*, Sect. 4.

" world from the beginning, would ceaſe and be at an end." But this Author propoſes ſome exceptions to Mr. Barclay's firſt principle of immediate Revelation [*M*]; and obſerves, that this *poſtulatum* will not be granted, and he fears will never be proved, though ſuch a diſcovery is much to be wiſhed, and that the opinion of it alone muſt render thoſe very happy, who can perſuade themſelves, that they have attained to it. He obſerves likewiſe, that if Mr. Barclay had meant only by the teſtimony of the Spirit that natural faculty or principle, which the Deity has inſpir'd into all men, to regulate their actions, and to acknowledge his divine bounty, (which principle Mr. Trenchard calls reaſon) and could have reconciled the workings of his light to the only one he can find in himſelf, he could readily have ſubſcribed to a very great part of his ſyſtem; which he tells us, he *muſt confeſs to be moſt beneficent to the world, moſt agreeable to the Scriptures; and that it makes them, or rather ſhews them, to be moſt conſiſtent with themſelves, and comprehends every thing, which has been ſaid by the beſt Writers for Liberty of Conſcience, and againſt all ſorts of religious impoſitions. And this Mr. Barclay has done with as much wit, happy turn, and maſtery of expreſſion, as is conſiſtent with the plainneſs and ſimplicity affected by thoſe of his Sect, and for the moſt part uſed in the holy Writings.*

" are one in their nature and ſubſtance.... Therefore " this ſeed being in us, the Man Chriſt is in us; not " according to his whole manhood, but according un- " to that, which is proper unto it; and yet without " all diviſion. As the natural life is in all the mem- " bers, but more eſpecially in the head and heart, " without any diviſion; ſo this ſpiritual Life and " Nature is both in Chriſt our head and in us; by " which he dwelleth in us, as the ſpirit of a man " doth in the body." Mr. Bennet examines this hypotheſis, and endeavours to ſhew both from experience and Scripture, that there is no ſuch *univerſal Light within*. The firſt *nine chapters* of this book were anſwered by Mr. Benjamin Lindley in 1710 in 4to, under the title of *The Neceſſity of Immediate Revelation toward the Foundation and Ground of true Faith proved &c.* And the laſt *ſeventeen Chapters* were anſwered in a *ſecond part* of that book under the ſame title in 1713. VIII. Mr. Thomas Chubb publiſhed in the year 1726 a ſhort piece in anſwer to Mr. Barclay's *fourth Propoſition*; in which he tells us (18), that he thinks our Author's book *contains a confuſed, abſurd ſcheme of Religion; in which God is conſidered as dealing with his creatures, not according to the moral fitneſs of things, but from arbitrary pleaſure.* This occaſioned ſeveral anſwers in defence of Mr. Barclay by Mr. Thomas Beaven and Dr. Thomas Morgan, a Phyſician of Briſtol, and Author of ſeveral pieces relating to the Doctrine of the Trinity, &c. Mr. Chubb replied to theſe Writers in ſeveral pieces republiſhed in his *Collection of Tracts*, printed in 4to 1730.

(18) Pag. 7.

[*M*] *This author propoſes ſome exceptions to Mr. Barclay's firſt principle of immediate Revelation.*] He obſerves, that he cannot concur with Mr. Barclay, in believing, that all men, who cannot find this ſpirit in themſelves, do or have ſuppreſſed it; ſince he believes there are many thouſands in all reſpects equally virtuous with himſelf, who have actually tried all experiments of watching, internal prayer, outward and inward reſignation, ſeparation from worldly thoughts and actions, and acquieſcence of mind, and ſubmiſſion to the operations of the Deity; and yet have found themſelves after all juſt where they ſet out; nor could recollect any thing that happened to them in thoſe intervals, but abſence of thought. *It is ſuppoſed*, continues he, *that the power ſo claimed is Jeſus Chriſt operating within us; and at it is allowed by all, that the leaſt drop of his natural blood was enough to atone for the ſins of the whole world; ſo one might imagine, that the leaſt portion of his Godhead working within us might be too hard for and overcome the depravity tranſmitted to us by our firſt parents, or at leaſt be able to engage our attention or acquieſcence, which is all that is ſuppoſed requiſite to the farther progreſs and effuſion of his Deity. It is very hard to conceive, that we can ſerve God by ſequeſtring for a time all the faculties he has given us, by ſending our wits out of doors to make room for Grace, and by believing that the Spirit of God will never exert itſelf but in an empty head. And therefore I ſhall preſume to believe, till I am better informed, that as the Almighty ſhews and exhibits to us the viſible world by the medium of the outward ſenſes, he had before given to us, ſo he diſpenſes all that we do know or can know of the viſible one thro' the vehicle of our reaſoning faculties.* He obſerves afterwards, that as it is not to be denied but that Almighty God has ſometimes communicated himſelf to particular perſons by ſecret impreſſions upon their ſenſes and underſtandings; ſo he dares not affirm, that he may not; and does not do ſo ſtill; and that he will not dogmatically aſſert, that any one, who pretends to feel his divine Spirit, is a lyar or enthuſiaſt; but he thinks he may ſafely affirm, that no one is concerned in his viſions or revelations but himſelf, unleſs the other feels them too, or he can prove the truth of them by miracles. He concludes with remarking, that God has given to us reaſon to diſtinguiſh truth from falſhood, impoſture from revelation, deluſion from inſpiration; and when we quit that light, we muſt wander thro' endleſs mazes and dark labyrinths, and ramble wherever fancy, imagination, or fraud, leads us.

T.

BARCOCHEBAS, or BARCOCHAB (*a*), was the author of a thouſand diſorders in Judea by his impoſtures, and involved his nation in a dreadful calamity under the Emperor Hadrian. He was a Jew, who proclaimed himſelf the Meſſiah, and found a famous Rabbi, who applauded this impious pretenſion of his (*b*). This falſe Meſſiah accommodated himſelf wonderfully to the prejudices of this wretched people: he ſpoke of nothing but wars, battles, and triumphs; and the firſt leſſon of his Goſpel was that they muſt riſe againſt the Romans. He had ſo much the leſs difficulty in perſuading them of this doctrine, becauſe he took the opportunity, when the zeal of the Jews for their Religion had enraged them againſt the Emperor. This Prince had lately ſettled a Colony near Jeruſalem (*c*), and eſtabliſhed Idolatry. The Jews conſidered this as an inſupportable abomination, and a prodigious profanation of their holy place; upon which account they were extremely diſpoſed to riſe. Some writers pretend, that Circumciſion was forbid them [*A*],

(*a*) That is to ſay, *the Son of the Star*. He applied to himſelf the prophecy of the book of *Numbers*, chap. xxiv. ver. 17. *There ſhall riſe a ſtar out of Jacob.*

(*b*) His name was *Akiba*. See his Article.

(*c*) Which he called *Ælia Capitolina*, from his own name, and from that of Jupiter Capitolinus, to whom he built a Temple.

[*A*] *Some writers pretend that Circumciſion was forbid the Jews.*] Spartian aſcribes their inſurrection to this prohibition: *Moverunt ea tempeſtate & Judæi bellum, quod vetabantur mutilare genitalia* (1). It is not improbable that they were prohibited to circumciſe their children, ſince we read in Modeſtinus, that he obtained of Antoninus Pius the liberty of obſerving that inſtitution; ſo that they had been diſturbed upon that account, and were obliged to have recourſe to the juſtice of the Emperor. *Circumcidere Judæis filios ſuos tantum, reſcripto Divi Pii permittitur; in non ejuſdem religionis, qui hoc fecerit, caſtrantis pœna irrogatur* (2). The

(1) Spart. *in Vitâ Adriani*, cap. 14.

(2) Modeſtinus, *Libro Regularum*, *apud* Caſaubonum *in Spartian Adrian.* ca p. 1

which was a violation upon their conſcience. The Talmud alledges another reaſon for their taking arms [*B*]. It is ſaid that their Impoſtor made uſe of the ſame artifice, which Eunus had practiſed in Sicily, to inſpire the ſlaves with a reſolution to revolt; that is, he ſet fire to ſtraw in his mouth, that he might ſeem to vomit flames [*C*]. He fortified himſelf in divers places; but he choſe the City of Bitter for his place of arms, and the ſeat of his Empire. It is ſaid that in order to try the courage of his followers he required them to cut off one of their fingers; and that upon the remonſtrances, which were made to him, he left off that trial, and made uſe of another invention [*D*]. He ravaged a prodigious many places, and maſſacred an infinite number of people; his chief cruelty was againſt the Chriſtians [*E*]. The Emperor being informed of theſe ravages, ſent troops to Rufus Governor of Judea with orders to ſuppreſs this ſedition immediately (*d*). Rufus in obedience to theſe orders exerciſed a thouſand cruelties, and yet could not finiſh his attempt. The Emperor was therefore obliged to ſend for Julius Severus, the greateſt General of that time, and to intruſt him with the whole care of this war (*e*). This General obtained his end upon the Jews, without ever having attacked them in a direct battle. He thought proper to attack them in a different manner, as well on account of their prodigious number, as becauſe he ſaw them carrying on the war like deſperate men. He choſe rather therefore to fall upon them ſeparately to cut off their proviſions, to ſhut them up, and ſtreighten them (*f*); and at laſt the whole affair was reduced to the ſiege of Bitter in the eighteenth year of Hadrian (*g*). The vaſt number of Jews, who threw themſelves into that City, was the cauſe that they defended themſelves a long while, and that they were reduced by famine to terrible extremities (*b*). After the taking of this City, the war was not entirely concluded; but it did not continue much longer. Barcochebas periſhed there (*i*); and

(*d*) Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 4. cap. 6. pag. 118.

(*e*) Xiphil. *in Adriano.*

(*f*) Idem, ibid.

(*g*) That is, about the 134th of Jeſus Chriſt.

(*b*) Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 4. cap. 6. p. 118.

(*i*) Idem, ibid.

The Decree, which they obtain'd, ſeems to intimate, that ſometimes they circumciſed children, who were not born in their Sect. This was forbid them under the penalties eſtabliſhed againſt Caſtration.

[*B*] . . . . *The Talmud alledges another reaſon for their taking arms.*] It is ſaid, that the Jews had a cuſtom of planting a cedar, when they had a ſon born, and planting a pine, when they had a daughter born; and of uſing of the wood of theſe trees to make the marriage-bed of, when their children married. It is added, that in a journey, which the Emperor's daughter took into Judea, a piece of her chariot broke, upon which her ſervants cut down one of theſe cedars, and brought it to her; that the Jews could not bear this, but roſe immediately, and killed thoſe, who had cut down this tree. The Emperor being informed that the Jews had revolted, marched againſt them with great indignation, and exterminated them. *Ob crus carpenti vaſtata eſt Bethara. In more fuit ut cum naſceretur infans plantarent cedrum, cum infantula, pinum; cumque nati contraherent matrimonium, ex iis conficerent thalamum. Die quadam tranſiit filia Cæſaris, & confractum eſt ei crus carpenti: cedrum iſtiuſmodi exciderunt atque ad eum attulerunt. Inſurrexerunt in eos Judæi, atque eos ceciderunt. Relatum eſt Cæſari rebellare Judæos. Profectus ille in eos iracundus, excidit totum cornu Iſraelis* (3). The Jews would have been abſolutely inexcuſable, if they had revolted upon ſuch a trifling occaſion as this. Theſe poor people are not able even to tell a lie to their advantage. It is prodigious ignorance, to give the Emperor Hadrian a daughter. Beſides, pine-trees are too ſlow of growth (4) to be ready to furniſh a bed, as ſoon as a maid is ready to ſhare it with a man; and a great many would have deſerved pity, if they had been obliged to ſtay for marriage till their pines had gained the neceſſary height.

(3) *In Tractatu Talmudico Babyl.* Gittin, folio 57. *apud* Joh. à Lent, *de Judæorum Pſeudo-Meſſiis*, pag. 7.

(4) It might be ſaid *Arbos lenta venit ſeris factura nepotibus umbram.* Virgil. *Georg.* lib. 2. ver. 58.

[*C*] *It is ſaid that Barcochebas made uſe of the ſame artifice that Eunus did, ... that is, he ſeemed to vomit flames.*] This is what we are informed of by St. Jerom, *Tu videlicet flammeus, immò fulminans, qui in loquendo fulminas. Atque ut Barcochebas auctor ſeditionis Judaicæ ſtipulam in ore ſuccenſam anhelitu ventilabat, ut flammas evomere videretur* (5). Here we have a man, whoſe words were fire and flame as well literally as figuratively. With reſpect to Eunus, Florus tells us as follows: *Syrus quidam, nomine Eunus, (magnitudo cladium facit ut meminerimus) fanatico furore ſimulato dum Syriæ Deæ comas jactat, ad libertatem & arma ſervos quaſi numinum imperio concitavit; idque ut divinitus fieri probaret in ore abdita nuce, quam ſulphure & igne ſtipaverat, leniter inſpirans flammam inter verba fundebat* (6). That is, "A certain "Syrian, by name Eunus, (which name of his has "been remembered on account of the prodigious "ſlaughter occaſioned by him,) pretending a fanatical "fury, while he brandiſhes the Locks of the Syrian "Goddeſs, excited the ſlaves to liberty and arms as "it were by the command of the Gods; and that he "might ſhew this to be a divine impulſe, he hid in "his mouth a nut, which he had filled with brimſtone and fire, and blowing it gently, vomited out "flames as he ſpoke." This is an example, which ſhews Sovereigns how much thoſe are to be dreaded in a State, who boaſt of inſpiration. This impoſtor, by counterfeiting the Fanatic, induced above ſixty thouſand men to take up arms, and occaſioned a great deal of trouble to the Roman people.

(5) Hieronym. *Apol.* 2. *adverſus Ruffinum.*

(6) Florus, lib. 3. cap. 19.

[*D*] *It it ſaid that he tried his followers by obliging them to cut off one of their fingers . . . and that he made uſe of another invention.*] We are told, that he drew after him two hundred thouſand men, who had cut off one of their fingers in order to prove their courage. The Wiſe Men not approving of ſuch a mutilation, ſent ſome perſons to aſk him how long he would mutilate the Jewiſh Nation? *uſque quo tute Judæos mancos efficies?* He anſwered, *How would you then have try their ſtrength?* They replied, that he ſhould enroll none but thoſe, who could tear up a Cedar of Libanus with their hands. He agreed to that advice, and found notwithſtanding two hundred thouſand men, who gave this proof of their ſtrength (7). Theſe, it will be ſaid, are Jewiſh fables. It is true; and it is upon that foot I relate them; and it is upon that account they belong the more properly to this Dictionary.

(7) *In Madraſch Rabbeta Megillot*, fol. 67. *apud* Joh. à Lent *de Pſeudo-Meſſiis*, pag. 10, 11.

[*E*] *His chief cruelty was againſt the Chriſtians.*] It is true he made a great ſlaughter of the Heathens; but without requiring them to renounce their Religion. He acted the part of a Converter only towards Chriſtians; I ſay of a Dragooning Converter, and perhaps ſtill worſe than that (8); for he condemned to death thoſe, who would not abjure Jeſus Chriſt, and load him with curſes. *Proximo namque bello Judaico Barcochebas defectionis Judæorum Dux & Princeps, ſolos Chriſtianos ad gravia ſupplicia niſi Chriſtum abnegarent, & maledictis inceſſerent, protrahi juſſit* (9). David Gans does not deny that at this time thoſe of his Nation ſhed whole torrents of blood (10). I believe that he repreſents the ſlaughter much more terrible than it really was. He pretends that in the city of Alexandria only they killed above two hundred thouſand perſons, and that in the Iſle of Cyprus and the adjacent parts, they left not a ſoul alive. *Tunc Judæi Biterrenſes unxerunt eum* (Barcocheban), *& elegerunt ipſum in regem ſuper ſe, jugum Romanorum abjicientes. Occiderunt ex Romanis & Græcis, qui in Africâ innumerabiles inſtar arenæ maris, ſimiliter fecerunt Ægyptiis; incolæ urbis Alexandrinæ etiam ex Romanis interfecerunt ultra bis centena millia, qui in Cypria, occiderunt omnes planè gentes vicinas, ut ne ſuperſtes quidem remaneret.* See what I ſhall ſay below (11) concerning the omiſſion of a form in Hadrian's Letter. O ye religious wars, how horrible are your cruelties!

(8) I make uſe of the word *perhaps*, becauſe ſeveral perſons pretend that the alternative of abjuration or death, would have been a leſs evil, than what was done in France by the Dragoons, in the year 1685.

(9) Juſtin. *Apolog. pro Chriſtianis ad Antoninum Pium.*

(10) David Gans, *in Germine Davidis, ad ann.* 880 *millenarii quarti apud* à Lent, pag. 9.

(11) In the remark [*I*].

and the Jews have not been wanting to invent fables about it [F]. The manner, in which Hadrian diſperſed the remains of this unhappy Nation was very dreadful [G]. But we muſt not credit all the ſtories of the Rabbi's upon this ſubject [H]. This war coſt the Romans a great deal of blood (k). If I relate in my remarks ſeveral facts, which concern this war, it is becauſe the article of Hadrian refers my reader hither, and it was neceſſary to make uſe of ſuch a reference, that the article of that Emperor might not be too prolix. The Jewiſh Authors ſuppoſe that Hadrian was in perſon in this war [I], that he beſieged and took the City of Bitter, and that he diſputed with a Rabbi concerning the Doctrine of

(k) See the remark [E].

[F] *The Jews have not been wanting to invent Fables concerning the death of Barcochebas.*] They ſay, that after the taking of Bitter the head of Barcochebas was carried to the Emperor Hadrian, and that he aſked, *Who it was that killed him?* and that he commanded a ſoldier, who anſwered *It was I*, to go and ſearch for the body. The ſoldier going upon that deſign found a ſerpent twin'd round the neck of Barcochebas. The Emperor having ſeen the body ſaid, *If this man had not been killed by his own God, who is there that could have done him any harm* (12)?

(12) Joh. à Lent, *de Pſeudo-Meſſiis*, pag. 14. *ex Echa Rabbati.*

[G] *The manner in which Hadrian diſperſed the remains of the Jews, was very dreadful.*] It is with good reaſon that I make uſe of the word *remains*; for the number of the Jews, who periſhed in this war, was innumerable. The Abbreviator of Dion relates, that they had fifty fortreſſes, and nine hundred and eighty five very conſiderable boroughs deſtroyed; that they had five hundred and eighty thouſand men killed in inroads or battles; and that the number of thoſe who periſhed by famine, ſickneſs, and fire, was infinite; ſo that almoſt all Judea was left deſolate (13). Let us ſee now what was done with thoſe who eſcaped this deſolation. *There was an incredible number of every age and both ſexes* * *ſold at a very famous Fair called the Fair of the Turpentine Tree* †, *at the ſame price as horſes; upon which account the Jews have a great abhorrence for this Fair. . . . Thoſe who could not be ſold at this Fair were carried to Gaza* ‡, *and expoſed to ſale at another Fair, which Adrian had eſtabliſhed there, and which is ſtill called Adrian's Fair, as we find by the Chronicle of Alexandria. Thoſe who could not be ſold in Paleſtina were tranſported to Egypt* ‡, *where they periſhed by ſhipwrecks, and famine, or were killed by the Pagans. . . . When the war was finiſhed, Adrian forbid all the Jews by a publick Edict* ** *ever to ſet a foot within Jeruſalem, on pain of death* ††, *and guards were placed on purpoſe to prevent them from going into it* ‡‡. *This Law prohibited them even to come near it, and to be found in any places, from whence it might be ſeen* §§. *Tertullian* ¶, *and St. Jerom* †, *go ſtill further, and extend this prohibition to all Judea, and the Jews ſeem to agree to this, when they ſpeak of the faſt which they appointed on account of the Decree, by which their fathers had been forbid to enter into the Land of Judea* †. The Author from whom I borrow this paſſage with all its quotations (14), makes a remark concerning the Fair of the Turpentine-Tree. He obſerves that St. Jerom ‡ *ſays in a particular paſſage* that *the Jews were ſold at Abraham's Tent, where there is held, ſays he, every year a Fair, that is extremely frequented. This is not difficult to be granted, for in the place where Abraham had lived in the valley of Mamre* [near Hebron], *and where he entertained the three Angels, there was ſtill in the fourth Century a Turpentine-Tree, which the people of the country ſaid had continued there from the creation of the world.* See the remark [G] of the article ABRAHAM. Let us return now to the misfortune of the Jews. Hadrian ordered their ears to be cut off, and tranſported them to Spain, as ſome Authors tell us (15). There is a great deal of probability, that part of the falſe worſhip, which that Emperor eſtabliſhed in the new city of Jeruſalem, did not begin till after the ruin of Bitter, and the death of Barcochebas. This was one of the ſevereſt ſhocks which that unhappy Nation ever had to ſuffer. Hadrian, knowing the abhorrence which they had for ſwine, ordered one of marble to be placed upon the gate which leads to Bethlehem **. He made the ſtones of Solomon's Temple ſerve for the building of a Theatre, and divers Temples ††. Two of his ſtatues, and ſeveral idols were ſet up in the place where that Temple ſtood ‡‡. The ſtatue of Jupiter was erected in the place of our Saviour's paſſion. This is what St Paulinus ſays §§, but according to St. Jerom * the ſtatue of Jupiter was placed where Jeſus Chriſt roſe again, and that of Venus where he died. The cave where he was born, was profaned by the temple and infamous worſhip of Adonis †. See Mr. Tillemont, from whom I have borrowed theſe particulars (16).

(13) Xiphil. *in Adriano.*

* Hieron. *in Jeremiam*, cap. 31. p. 342. b.

† *Chronic. Alex.* pag. 596.

‡ Idem, ibid.

‡ Hieron. *in Zac.* cap. 11. p. 272. d.

** Idem *in Iſ.* cap. 6. p. 31. d.

†† Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 4. cap. 6. p. 118. and *Demonſtrat. Evangel.* lib. 2. cap. 38. p. 71. a. Juſtin. *Apol.* 2. pag. 84. b, c. Dial. p. 234, a.

‡‡ Juſtin. pag. 84, b. Sulpic. Sever. lib. 2. p. 149.

§§ Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* p. 118. d. Hieron. *in Iſ.* lib. 3. p. 227.

¶ *Apolog.* cap. 21. pag. 20. d.

† *In Judic.* cap. 13. p. 224, 225. cap. 6. pag. 31, d. *In Daniel* cap. 9. p. 595, d.

‡ Scalig. *Iſag.* lib. 1. cap. 6. pag. 45.

(14) Tillem. *Hiſt. des Emper.* tom. 2. p. 501, 502, 503.

‡ *In Zachar.* cap. 8. p. 262.

(15) *Apud* à Lent, *de Pſeudo-Meſſiis*, pag. 17.

** Hieron. *in Chron.*

†† Euſeb. *Demonſtrat.* lib. 8. cap. 3. p. 406.

‡‡ Iter. *Burd.* p. 432. Sulpic. Sever. lib. 2. pag. 149.

[H] . . . *but we muſt not credit all the ſtories of the Rabbi's upon that ſubject.*] They ſay that the ſlaughter was ſo great in Bitter, when the Romans made themſelves maſters of it after a ſiege of three years and an half, that the horſes marched up to the mouth in blood (17). The blood, continue they, run down with ſuch a force, that it carried along with it ſtones of four pounds weight, and run into the Sea the ſpace of four miles. Now it was four miles from Bitter to the Sea. Hadrian had a vineyard-plot eighteen miles long, and as many wide; (it is the diſtance from Tiberias to Zipori;) he made a fence or incloſure to it of the bodies of thoſe who were killed in Bitter, for he would not ſuffer them to be buried; which was not granted them till the reign of his ſucceſſor. There were two rivers in the City of Jadaim, one of which run on one ſide, and the other on the other (18); the Rabbi's reckoned that the water made but two thirds of theſe rivers, and the blood the other third. The Heathens had no need for ſeven years to dung their vines; for they were fruitful enough from the blood of the Jews. The blood carried along with it ſtones of an immeaſurable bigneſs, and run forty miles into the Sea. *Quin imò ſanguis rapiebat ſecum petras magnitudinis quadraginta modiorum, donec ad quadraginta milliaria uſque in Oceanum fluereſt* (19). There were found upon one ſtone three hundred ſkulls of young children. We find in theſe Rabbinical expreſſions ſome traces of the ſtyle, which Rabelais makes uſe of to repreſent the qualifications or proweſs of his Garagantua and Pantagruel. But let us relate another ſtory relating to the ſlaughter at Bitter. There were in this city four hundred colleges, and in every college four hundred maſters, who had each of them in their claſs four hundred ſcholars. At the firſt attack the ſcholars made uſe of their bodkins (20) to kill the enemies; but after the taking of the city, they were packed up with their books and thrown into the fire. *Ita pubes principio hoſtes impetum facientes graphiis ſuis confodiebat; cum vero hi prævalerent, urbem cepiſſent, involverunt puerulos illos cum libris ſuis, eoſque in igne ſic cremarunt* (21). The Jews pretend that Hadrian deſtroyed twice as many more people of their Nation, than Moſes brought out of Egypt; and they conſider him as a greater deſtroyer than Nebuchodonoſor and Titus (22). One of their beſt Chronologers aſſures us, that the loſs which their Nation ſuffered in the time of Nebuſaraddan, or Titus, was not equal to that which Hadrian made them undergo; for the Talmud tells us, that there periſhed at Bitter four millions of perſons, *quadringentas myriadas*. However in the Ritual of the Jews there is an Hymn for the ninth day of the month Ab, in which Hadrian's Edict was publiſhed to forbid them to ſet a foot in Judea; there is, I ſay, an Hymn, in which Nebuchodonoſor and Hadrian are equally repreſented as the two great ſcourges of their Nation. This Hymn names them often; but it does not ſpeak above once of Veſpaſian and Titus; it mentions four hundred and eighty Synagogues burnt by Hadrian. *Recordare Domine qualis fuerit Adrianus, crudelitatis conſilia amplexus, conſuluit Idola ſe perverteutia. Et ſuſtulit combuſſitque quadringentas & octoginta ſynagogas* (23).

(17) See the book *Echa Rabati ſuper Thren.* 11. ver. 2. *apud* Noldium *de Vitâ & Geſtis Heroidum*, pag. 453.

(18) *In Tractatu Talmudico Giffin, apud* à Lent, pag. 16.

(19) Ibid.

(20) An inſtrument with which they wrote at that time.

(21) *Tract.* Giffin, *apud* à Lent, pag. 13.

(22) *See* Joh. à Lent, pag. 14.

(23) *Apud eundem* à Lent, pag. 18, 19.

[I] *The Jewiſh Authors ſuppoſe that Hadrian was in perſon in this war.*] Euſebius ſays expreſly that this Emperor ſent troops to the Governor of Judea, in order to puniſh the revolt of Barcochebas, and mentions nothing of that Prince's going afterwards thither himſelf. The abbreviator of Dion ſpeaks only of

of the Reſurrection of the Dead [K]. The fact is curious; we ſhall give an account of it in the remarks. Euſebius ſuppoſes that Hadrian carried on this war by his Lieutenants (l). We may at leaſt conſider it as very falſe, that Hadrian commanded in Judea, the troops of Trajan his uncle, during the Rebellion of Barcochebas. The Jewiſh Hiſtorian David Gans is very much miſtaken in this (m). Some pretend that there were two Barcochebas's, one under Titus, and the other under Hadrian; and that the former, not being able to bear the trial, which he was put to, was killed as an impoſtor and a falſe Meſſiah. As ſoon as he had boaſted himſelf to be the Meſſiah, there was urged to him a paſſage of Scripture, which declares, according to the gloſs of the Jews, that the Meſſiah ſhall be able to diſcover by the ſmell whether an accuſed perſon is innocent or guilty (n) [L]; and finding that this pretended Meſſiah had not a noſe good enough to make that diſtinction, they put him to death. This opinion is not much followed (o).

(l) Euſeb. *Hiſt. Eccleſ.* lib. 4. cap. 6.

(m) *Tandem Trajanus Imperator miſit Adrianum ſororis ſuæ filium* (this kindred is falſe) *Ducem exercitus contra ipſos.* David Gans, *in Germine Davidis ad ann.* 3880. *apud* Leon, *de Pſeudo-Meſſiis*, pag. 9.

(n) Iſaiah xi. 3.

(24) Xiphil. *in Adriano.*

the Generals, who were ſent to Judea by Hadrian (24). He obſerves that while this Emperor continued in Egypt and Syria, the Jews, tho' enraged at the building of the *Ælea Capitolina*, durſt not riſe; but they took up arms openly, when he was gone from thence. He adds, that Hadrian ſent againſt them the beſt of his Generals, and particularly Julius Severus. It was here a proper place to ſay whether he went in perſon to chaſtiſe the rebels; and yet this writer does not ſay ſo; from whence it may juſtly be concluded that Hadrian did not go then to Judea. But to conceal nothing, we muſt own that Dion makes a remark, which inſinuates that Hadrian was preſent in this war. He ſays that the Romans loſt ſo many men in it, that this Emperor did not make uſe of the uſual preamble in writing to the Senate, *Si vos liberique veſtri valetis, bene eſt, ego quidem & exercitus valemus*; that is, "If you and your children are in good health, it is "well; I and the army are in good health likewiſe." A Prince, who makes uſe of this preface, muſt one would think be in the army; and if he was not there, he ought not to make uſe of this compliment, neither when affairs ſucceeded well or ill. It ſeems probable therefore that Dion would not have made that obſervation, if he had imagined that Hadrian was near Rome, or at a great diſtance from the army, when he wrote to the Senate. I anſwer that this is no great difficulty; for in the firſt place, it may be ſaid that the abſence of Hadrian was the cauſe of his not making uſe of that form; from whence it would follow that Dion was not acquainted with all the cauſes of this omiſſion in ſuppoſing it to be occaſioned by the loſs he had ſuſtained. It may be ſaid in the ſecond place, that an Emperor, at a diſtance from his army, might very properly make uſe of this form, in a letter, wherein he acquaints the Senate with the good news, which his general had written to him. Laſtly it may be urged againſt Dion, that the victory obtained over the Jews, was ſo complete, and that it cut off in ſuch a manner all the cauſes of a new inſurrection, that, tho' the Roman army had ſuffered great loſſes, yet there would be ſufficient reaſon for writing to the Senate in the ſame ſtyle, which is uſed in news of ſucceſs. It is poſſible therefore, that this writer may have made a falſe obſervation.

[K] . . . . . *And that he diſputed with a Rabbi concerning the Doctrine of the Reſurrection of the Dead.*] The chief difficulty with Hadrian, as this fable tells us, was to ſay that the parts of a dead body were diſperſed in a thouſand places. It was anſwered him, that there is in our body a little bone, which is incorruptible; and that God will reſtore our body out of that little bone. The Jews pretend that a celeſtial dew will ſoften this bone, and make it grow, as a little leaven raiſes all the dough. *Officulum illud dicunt rore quodam cæleſti molliendum & extendendum ad inſtar fermenti, quod in totam ſe maſſam diffundit, vel quemadmodum granum aliquod tritici in criſtam ſe experrigit* (25). Hadrian would believe nothing concerning the incorruptibility of this bone; but the Rabbi, with whom he diſputed, gave him a proof of it: this bone reſiſted every thing, fire, water, an hammer &c. Here is a long account of Manaſſeh Ben-Iſrael. *Aiunt in ſpinâ dorſi aliquod officulum eſſe, quod nunquam pereat; ex ipſo officulo ſolo poſt interitum & annihilationem omnium aliarum partium, dicunt hominem inſtauratum, reſtitutumque iri, in reſurrectione mortuorum, juxta illud, quod in Bereſit Raba. Paraſ.* 28 *legitur: Adrianus (cujus oſſa comminuantur) quæſivit ex R. Joſuah filio Hanina, unde Deus benedictus germinare facit hominem in futura ſæculo? Reſpondit ille, ex . . . Luz, ſeu officulo ſpinæ. Rurſus alter, unde nôſti hoc? da mihi illud, inquit ille, officulum, & te docebo: contudit illud in molâ, ſed non tuſum eſt; conjecit in ignem, & non conflagravit; conjecit in aquum, & non attritum eſt; impoſuit incudi, malleoque cecidit, ſed ne hilum comminutum eſt. Imperator Romanus, ſive quod rideret reſurrectionem mortuorum, ſive quod audiverat aliquid incorruptibile officulum eſſe in corpore humano, cupiditate ejus ſcindi; vel quia, uti veriſimilius eſt, hæſitabat ob difficultatem ejus, quam jam recenſuimus, quæſivit ex R. Joſua filio Hanina, unde, vel quomodo reſtituentur mortui, quorum membra tam longè latèque diſperſa eſſent & diſſipata? Reſpondit illi R. Joſua, ex officulo ſpinæ dorſi, appellato Luz, quod incorruptibile eſt. Qui cum non poſſit facilè adhibere fidem, experimento ei oſtendit ita eſſe. Hæc opinio, ſi quid antiquis credimus, non improbabilis eſt. Iſtud enim officulum tale eſt, ut nequeat interire, quamvis hodie nullus ſit, qui illud noverit. Sunt qui arbitrentur Davidem hujus officuli mentionem facere, cum ait, Cuſtodiens oſſa ejus, unum ex iis non conſumptum eſt. Pſalm.* xxxiv. 21 (26). Theſe Writers of Reveries ſhould have ſaid that this little bone is the true ſeat of the ſoul.

(25) Hoornbeeck *contra Judæos*, lib. 8. cap. 5. pag. 556.

(26) Manaſſe Ben-Iſrael, *de Reſurrectione*, lib. 2. cap. 16.

[L] *The Meſſiah ſhall be able to diſcover by the ſmell whether an accuſed perſon is innocent or guilty.*] Compare this with what I ſhall obſerve in the remark [C] of the article DEMOCRITUS.

What the Jews relate of a little bone called Luz, which they ſay is in the back of a man.

BARDE (JOHN DE LA) Counſellor of State, Marquis of Marolles upon the Seine, was Ambaſſador from France to Switzerland under the reign of Lewis XIV. He had been chief Deputy of Monſieur de Chavigni Secretary of State (a). He aſſiſted at the conferences at Munſter, as a Miniſter of the ſecond rank, and endeavours were made uſe of to procure him the title of Excellency; but they did not ſucceed [A]. He had been already named for the Embaſſy in Switzerland. He ſerved France with great integrity

(a) *See* Wicquefort, *de l'Ambaſſadeur*, tom. 1. pag. 959.

[A] *Endeavours were made uſe of to procure him the title of Excellency at the Conferences at Munſter; but they did not ſucceed.*] Mr. de Wicquefort relates this, and ſays that the Plenipotentiaries of France made their firſt attempt with the Nuncio, who anſwered that he would not do it (1). They would have had him given the Sieur de la Barde that title, and made him the firſt viſit. The reaſons of his refuſal were, that *he would not give an example, that no body would follow, nor make Mr. de la Barde uſeleſs, who was of great ſervice in the Aſſembly.* He would have made him uſeleſs, becauſe if he had done him the honours which were deſired, he would have put him under a kind of neceſſity of requiring it of all the other Embaſſadors, and of not appearing again there, if it ſhould be refuſed him, as it would infallibly have happened. The Embaſſador of Venice followed the Nuncio's example; and *ſo la Barde was obliged to content himſelf with the honours, which they were willing to allow him. He deſired the Emperor's Miniſters at Oſnabrug, to diſtinguiſh him from the other Miniſters of the ſecond Order, and ſince they could not treat him as an Embaſſador, that they*

(1) Wicquefort, *de l'Ambaſſadeur*, tom. 1. p. 360.

grity and addreſs, during the whole courſe of this Embaſſy. He wrote in Latin the *Hiſtory of France* from the death of Lewis XIII to the year 1652. This work was a long time expected as a Maſter-piece [*B*]: it was printed at laſt in the year 1671 (*b*), and well received by the Public. The ſtyle is excellent; affairs are related without flattery, and with great ſkill in the Intrigues of the Cabinet. The Author has Latinis'd his name by that of *Labardæus*. The reader would find himſelf ſtrangely puzzled by the Latin names, if he had not taken care to put the French names in the margin. He had made a French tranſlation of this Hiſtory, which in the opinion of good judges was much inferior to the original Latin (*c*). "As he was very learned in points of Divinity, he publiſhed a book "of Controverſy in Latin, againſt the opinion of Proteſtants concerning the Euchariſt (*d*) [*C*]. The Gazettes of Holland inform us that he died in the year 1692, being ninety years of age. The reader will ſee below what I have to add to the remark [*C*] of this article [*D*].

(*b*) It is in 4to; it contains 780 pages.

(*c*) A manuſcript Memoir communicated by Mr. Lancelot, one of the Under-Library Keepers of the Mazarin Library at Paris.

(*d*) The Abbé de Marolles, *Denombrement des Auteurs.*

they would not treat him as a Reſident; and provided he was treated as a third perſon after the Italian manner, he would not pretend to the place of honour in the Viſits or Conferences. In ſhort, *his Credential Letters for the Swiſs Cantons could not procure him any regard either at Munſter or Oſnabrug.* Mr. de la Barde complained of an Italian Writer, who had not ſpoken of theſe things as he ought, and he pretended to convince him of it, by relating that the Plenipotentiaries of France always treated him as an Embaſſador, which they could not diſpenſe with doing, conſidering that the King's Patents, and all the Letters from the Court gave him that character. *Avauxius & Servianus hunc haud ſecùs ac ſeipſos invicem habuere; neque aliter poterant, cum regio diplomate atque omnibus Regis atque Mazarini ad ſe atque ad alios literis legatus eſſet appellatus. Id eo accuratius mihi dicendum fuit, quod homo quidam Italicus eâ de re ſecus ſcripſit ex aliena lubidine atque invidiâ in Labardæum: nam id illi ipſi tribuere volim, qui in hujuſcemodi rebus etiam ſupra verum aliis favit, hos cum Reſidentes aut ad minores Principes abſque ullo titulo miſſi eſſent, Legatos nihilo ſecùs appellando* (2).

(2) Labardæus, *Hiſt. de Rebus Gallicis*, lib. 4. pag. 89. *ad ann.* 1646.

[*B*] *His* Hiſtory of France *was a long time expected as a maſter-piece.*] "Mr. de la Barde is preparing "a Latin Hiſtory, in which we are to have a Sal-"luſt or Virgil of our own." This is what Father le Moine thought proper to inform the Public of in his Treatiſe of Hiſtory.

[*C*] *He wrote a book of controverſy againſt the opinion of Proteſtants concerning the Euchariſt.*] On occaſion of this I ſhall mention that he applied himſelf for ſeveral years with great care to examine the ſentiments of ſeveral of the Fathers upon this queſtion, and wrote a large volume of very abſtruſe enquiries; but all of a ſudden he took it into his fancy to deſtroy this prodigious work of his, ſo that one morning he threw all that he had written upon that ſubject into the fire. That is what I have heard from the Abbot of Brion, his grandſon, Canon of Notre-Dame at Paris.

[*D*] *Here is what I have to add to the remark* [*C*] *of this article.*] This relates to his book of controverſy. "He wrote to one of his friends in a manu-"ſcript Letter, dated from Soleurre the third of March "1663, the following words. *Libellum ad te de re "ſeriâ, imò divinâ mitto, quo tibi otii mei, ſicuti prius "negotii, ratio conſtet: in eo. Latinitatem noſtram ne "quæſiveris, quam de divinis ſcribendi atque diſpu-"tandi genus vix patitur.* That is, "I ſend you a "book upon a ſerious, nay, a divine ſubject, that I "may give you a good account of my leiſure, as I "did formerly of my buſineſs. You are not to ex-"pect from me elegance of Latin in it, ſince the "manner of writing and diſputing upon ſubjects of "Divinity will not admit of it." His friend anſwered him ſome time after in theſe terms: "*Reſtat ut "de opuſculo tuo theologico gratias agam: in hoc ſolitam "elegantiam tuam deſideravi; neque verò tu argu-"menti ſeveritatem excuſa; quid enim eſt tam con-"tumax, quod niteſcere, quid tam horridum, quod po-"liri amœnitate iſtâ tuâ non poſſit? ſed nimirum inge-"niis Helvetiis ſcribebas.* That is; "I have now "to thank you for your book of Divinity: in which "I perceive nothing of your uſual elegance. But "you ought not to caſt the blame of that upon the "ſeverity of the ſubject; for what is there ſo rough, "that will not be poliſhed by the agreeable turn of "your wit? but I ſee you wrote for the genius's of "Switzerland." This Anſwer is dated the 19th of the ſame month. By theſe two paſſages we may fix the Epocha of this book of Controverſy to the year 1663 (3).

(3) A manuſcript memorial of Mr. Lancelot.

BARLETTA (GABRIEL) a Dominican Monk, diſtinguiſhed himſelf about the end of the XVth Century [*A*] by a manner of preaching much more proper for a Buffoon than a Miniſter of the Goſpel. He was born at Barletto (*a*) in the Kingdom of Naples. Henry Stephens is not the only perſon, who remonſtrated againſt this manner of preaching (*b*), which was full of a prodigious number of mean explications, and only proper to expoſe our moſt ſolemn myſteries to ridicule: there are ſome Roman Catholicks, who have not ſpared Gabriel Barletta upon that account [*B*]; and this is much more edifying and

(*a*) In Latin *Baruhum.*

(*b*) See the *Apology for Herodotus*, in which the reader will find a great many Extracts from Barletta.

[*A*] *He diſtinguiſhed himſelf about the end of the fifteenth Century.*] Altamura in his *Bibliotheca* of the Dominicans, places him under the year 1470; from whence it appears that Poſſevinus is not miſtaken above two hundred years. *Gabriel Barletta*, ſays he (1), *Neapolitani regni, Apulus, Ordinis autem Dominicani, Theologus & Concionator utilis, cum floreret anno* 1270. He adds, that his Sermons were printed ſeveral times before the edition of Venice in the year 1571.

(1) Poſſevin. *Appar. Sacri*, tom. 1. fol. 521. *apud* Altam[illegible] pag. 518. This error is not to be found in the edition of Cologne in 1607. We ſee there in p. 610. *cum floreret anno* 1470.

[*B*] *There are ſome Roman-Catholics, who have not ſpared him.*] Peter de Vaucluſe (2) has vigorouſly attacked Barletta, and reproached him particularly for impertinence in his anſwer to this queſtion, *How the woman of Samaria knew that Jeſus Chriſt was a Jew? She knew it*, ſays he, *by his Circumciſion.* It muſt be owned that this criticiſm is not ſo exact as it ſhould be; for he not only did not take notice of the other two marks, by which, according to Barletta, the woman diſcovered Jeſus Chriſt to be a Jew; but he likewiſe imputes to Barletta that he had advanced, that ſhe ſaw our Saviour was circumciſed: now it is certain that Barletta does not expreſs himſelf in that manner. *Prima ad habitum, quem portabat....; ſecunda quia Nazaræus in cujus capite novaculum non aſcendit....; tertia ratio ad circumciſionem; nullus alius populus erat circumciſus:* that is, "The firſt reaſon was on account of his ha-"bit; the ſecond becauſe he was a Nazarene, upon "whoſe head the razor had never come; the third "was his Circumciſion; no other people were cir-"cumciſed." It will ſignify nothing to the juſtification of this cenſurer, to ſay, that what he imputes to Barletta, may be inferred from his words; for what a man ſays ought never to be confounded with the conſequences, which may ariſe from it. How many things eſcape not only an Orator, but even an Author, the neareſt conſequences of which he does not ſee? It is very poſſible therefore, that in imputing to him that he had ſaid theſe conſequences, we may impute to him what he never thought. So that if we would criticize with exactneſs and ſincerity, we muſt lay down this rule: *Accuſe others of having ſaid preciſely*

(2) *A Valle clauſa.* It is the controverſial name, which *Theophilus Raynaud* has diſguis'd himſelf under.

A RULE, which ought to be obſerved by thoſe, who impute certain things to an Author.

and reputable to the Catholicks, than the pains, which the Dominicans have taken to justify this preacher [C]. His *Sermons* were printed at Venice in the year 1571, in two volumes 8vo. In the first volume are his *Lent Sermons*; the other volume contains his *Sermons for Advent, Whitsuntide, Ascension, and the other Festivals* (c). He was still living when the Turks took Otranto in the year 1480 (d). Some of his friends have attempted to vindicate him, by alledging that he is not the Author of the Sermons, which have been published under his name [D].

(c) Possevin. *Appar. Sacri*, tom. 1. p. 610.

(d) Altamura, *Bibliotheca Ordinis Prædicatorum*, pag. 195.

cisely what they have said; but be very scrupulous of taking away or adding any thing; shew them the consequences, which arise from it; but do not be positive that they saw these consequences, and have admitted them; wait for what they will say, when they are told, that these consequences result naturally and necessarily from what they have said. I cannot imagine with myself that Barletta was so imprudent and extravagant as to publish *impudoratam blasphemiam, a shameful blasphemy*, which his censurer imputes to him in his fine Latin. It is sufficient to accuse him of not knowing what he said with his third mark. I leave therefore his critick to the resentment of Altamura. *Pessimè igitur à Valle clausâ falsavit calumniaturus Barlettæ sententiam exscribendo; respondit Samaritanam cognovisse Christum esse Judæum videndo eum esse circumcisum. Ubi fraudulento silentio præterivit duas priores illius rationes, &c.* (3). There is more accuracy in the censure of another sermon. He is treating in that sermon of the reasons why the Holy Ghost deferred his coming into the world for ten days. Barletta ascribes this to the fear of being treated in the same manner, that the Son of God had been; and he determines the dispute between the Father and the Holy Ghost by this expedient. The Holy Ghost thought proper to assume the form of wind and fire, that he might not run any risque amongst men. What can be said more mean and unworthy of the Majesty of God? *decus commune in Italiâ proloquium,* NESCIT PRÆDICARE, QUI NESCIT BARLETTARE (5) (e). With regard to the ground of the other objection, he answers it in a very absurd manner; for he pretends that according to Barletta the women of Samaria knew by the habit and hair of Jesus Christ that he was a Jew, from whence she reasoned, and drew this consequence, *He is therefore circumcis'd.* Once more, the shortest way is to say, that this poor preacher did not know what he said in his third mark; he did not understand where he was, if he took this for a point of reasoning.

(3) Altamura, *Biblioth. Ord. Prædic.* p. 519.

(5) He had said this before in page 195. with a great many pompous Elogies upon him.

[C] *The Dominicans have taken great pains to justify this preacher.*] To begin with his Sermon for Whitsuntide, I observe that Altamura is so far from owning that there is any thing in it to be objected against, that on the contrary he found a wonderful art in it of representing the obduracy of mankind; and he is extremely surprized that any body should attempt to censure such a preacher for it. *Tanti nominis*, says he (4), *Concionatorem, tantoque cum fructu verbum Dei disseminantem, ut adhuc vigeat ad perpetuum tanti viri*

(4) Idem, ibid.

[D] *Some of his friends have attempted to vindicate him, by alledging that he is not the Author of the Sermons, which have been published under his name.*] Leander Alberti boasted that he had known in his youth the ignorant person, who forged those unworthy productions, which were published under the celebrated name of Barletta (6). It is surprizing that the new Author of the *Bibliotheca* of that Order has not alledged that reason to vindicate their brother; and it will be said, that they durst not make use of it, because they knew that the fact advanced by Leander Alberti was not true. But whether it be so or not, it is at least very certain, that in the writings, which are incontestably Barletta's, there are several impertinencies. We have seen above what Peter de Vaucluse has censured in them. Moreri has been very wrong to maintain, that *divers Protestant Authors have made use of these pretended Sermons of Barletta, to turn the Catholics into ridicule, and that amongst them Henry Stephens was the first*; for I dare positively affirm, that the Sermons, from which Henry Stephens has taken his railleries, are none of those which Alberti ascribes to an impostor. The dispute between the Father and the Holy Ghost is one of the gaieties of Henry Stephens; now Altamura acknowledges this for a genuine production of Barletta.

(6) Alberti, *Descriptio Italiæ*, pag. 370.

(e). France had likewise her *Barletta* in the beginning of the sixteenth Century, in the person of the Dominican *William Pepin*, a celebrated Preacher. See the 12th note upon the 7th chapter of the 2d book of Rabelais. CRIT. REM.]

BARLÆUS (MELCHIOR) born at Antwerp, a Latin Poet of the XVIth Century, and son of Lambert Barlæus, who was Keeper of the Records of Antwerp above forty years, was educated under good masters, and has shewn by several of his writings, as well in verse as in prose [A], the progress which he made. One of his brothers, whose name was JAMES, quitted his country for the sake of Religion, and took refuge in Holland, where after he had been Regent of the second class in the College of Leyden, he was called to the Brille, in order to be Rector of the College there. GASPAR BARLÆUS, the elder brother of Melchior [B], succeeded him in the office of *the Keeper of the Records*, which his father had; but when Antwerp was reduced under the yoak of the Spanish Government, he left his countrey, and retired to Holland. He carried with him thither his eldest son, who was then in the cradle (a), and of whom I shall speak in the following article.

(a) Taken from the *Funeral Oration upon Gaspar Barleus*, spoken at Amsterdam, by John Arn. Corvinus, the 18th of January 1648.

[A] *He wrote divers pieces as well in verse as in prose.*] The titles of them are as follow: *Brabantiados Libri V, & Antverpiæ Encomium. De Diis Gentium Libri duo*, in elegiac verses, printed at Antwerp in 1562 (1). *De raptu Ganymedis Libri tres* (2), *& Bucolica*, at Antwerp in 1572. An Oration *de Vitæ humanæ Felicitate, cum adjuncto Carmine de Rerum humanarum vicissitudine* ad Gasparum Fratrem, at Antwerp in 1566 (3). *Historia de Domus Austriacæ Eminentiâ* (4).

(1) Valer. And. *Bibl. Belg.* pag. 669.
(2) Corvin. *in Orat. funebri Caspar. Barlæi.*
(3) Valer. And. *Bibl. Belg.* pag. 669.
(4) Corvin. *in Orat. funebri Barlæi.*

[B] *Gaspar Barleus was the elder brother of Melchior.*] I do not question but Valerius Andreas took this Gaspar for him that was Professor at Amsterdam, and whose Latin verses have been so famous. If he did so, he is extremely mistaken; this Professor was nephew to Melchior, and not his brother. If, in order to excuse Valerius Andreas on that account, it be said, that he did not take things in the manner, which I suppose, he will run into an error on the other side; for when we would make an Author known by his relations, we ought not to mention relations, who are unknown, either in the Republic of Letters, or in the world; and consequently these words of Valerius Andreas, *Melchior Barlæus, Antverpiensis, Gasparis frater*, would be impertinent, if they were to be understood of Melchior's brother; for this brother, though he taught at Bommel, is a person unknown. Moreri has committed the same error as Valerius Andreas.

BARLÆUS (GASPAR), nephew of the preceding, was Profeſſor of Philoſophy at Amſterdam, and one of the beſt Latin Poets of the XVIIth Century. He was born at Antwerp in the year 1584 (*a*). His father, who was of the Proteſtant Religion, fled to Holland, as ſoon as the Duke of Parma made himſelf maſter of that City. He ſtaid three years at Leyden, after which he was called to Bommel, to be Rector of the College there. He enjoyed that place for ſeven years, and then died, having deſigned his ſon Gaſpar for a Miniſter of the Goſpel. This Gaſpar ſtudied eight years in the College of the Province of Holland at Leyden, and afterwards being received a Miniſter, ſerved a Church in a village near the Brill. Bertius being raiſed from the place of Sub-Principal to that of Principal of this College, thought that no perſon was more proper to ſucceed him than our Barlæus. His recommendation had its effect: Barlæus was made Sub-Principal; and ſome time after he had the Profeſſorſhip of Logic in the Univerſity of Leyden conferred upon him. He intereſted himſelf ſo far in the diſputes of the Arminians, that he was depoſed from all his offices, as ſoon as the oppoſite party had entirely gained the ſuperiority in the Synod of Dort. Barlæus then applied himſelf to Phyſic, and in two years he thought himſelf fit for the Doctorſhip. He took his Degrees at Caen; but he ſcarce ever practiſed in that Faculty. There were ſeveral young Gentlemen there, who deſired him to read them Lectures of Philoſophy and polite Learning; and as he had been uſed to that, he undertook it again, and recovered even at Leyden a great character in that employment. The Magiſtrates of Amſterdam having erected an illuſtrious ſchool in the year 1631, offered him the Profeſſorſhip of Philoſophy; which he accepted, and diſcharged very honourably till his death, which happened the fourteenth of January 1648 (*b*). He was a man of great merit. We have a volume of *Orations*, which he pronounced on divers occaſions, and which are valuable, not only on account of their ſtyle, but likewiſe for the turn and various ſtrokes of wit in them. Poetry was his chief excellence; his Muſes had a great deal of copiouſneſs and elevation (*c*). There was ſcarce any thing great, which happened in the world while he lived, but he made a pompous elogy upon it, when reaſons of ſtate were no obſtacle to it [*A*]. Cardinal Richelieu, and Chancellor Oxenſtiern were not forgotten; much leſs did he forget the conqueſts and noble actions of Frederic Henry Prince of Orange. Queen Mary de Medicis, and the magnificent reception, which was given her at Amſterdam (*d*), employed the eloquence of Barlæus. He had publiſhed ſeveral very ſharp pieces of controverſy againſt the adverſaries of Arminius [*B*]. This wound was never

(a) By the Epiſtle Dedicatory of his Letters, it appears that he was born the 12th of February.

(b) Taken from his *Funeral Oration*, pronounced by John Arnold Corvinus. The *Diarium* of the Sieur Witte places his death under the year 1647.

(c) See the Elogiums which are given to him by Borrichius, *Diſſert. de Poetis*, pag. 140.

(d) In 1637.

[*A*] *There was ſcarce any thing great, which happened in the world, while he lived, but he made a pompous elogy upon it, when reaſons of State were no obſtacle to it.*] I make uſe of this reſtriction, becauſe I have read in Barleus's Letters, that he refuſed to write a Poem upon the coronation of the Emperor Ferdinand III, as he had been deſired. He conſidered that he had to do with ſuſpicious people, who would not fail to exclaim againſt him as a penſioner to the Houſe of Auſtria; and beſides he thought, that after he had extolled ſo highly the victories of Guſtavus over the Emperor, he could not with any propriety praiſe Ferdinand for the great glory, which he had obtained in his wars againſt the Swedes. Here we have an honeſt man of a Poet. How many are there of that profeſſion, who are not ſo ſcrupulous? They have a two-handed pen; they not only prepare a panegyric for the party that ſhall prove conqueror, whoever he may be; but even after the event, they write verſes for both parties (1). I do not doubt, but there are Poets in Italy, who have already or will praiſe the Dauphin and Prince Lewis of Baden upon the campaign of 1693. *Literas accepi Viennâ*, theſe are the words of Barleus (2), *quibus petitur uti laudatione aliquâ velim proſequi coronationem Ferdinandi tertii Imperatoris. Ego ſi ſapiam abſtinebo ab illâ laudatione religioſiſſimè. Quanquam enim ea poſſem ſcribere quæ ad laudes Imperatoris faciant, nec Reip. noſtræ adverſentur, tamen prout ſunt noſtratium ingenia, judicarent me beneficio obſtrictum Auſtriacis. Scimus Cæſarem non quidem aperto Marte nos petere, ſed per latus Hiſpani nobis gravem eſſe. Laudavi etiam non ita pridem Guſtavum Sueciæ Regem, ejuſque adverſus Cæſarem bella probavi. Jam ut laudem Ferdinandum tertium ob geſta adverſus Suecos feliciter bella, à prudentiâ meâ impetrare non poſſum. Non ſum ambidexter, ſed ab omni adulatione alieniſſimus. Cuperem obſequi petitioni illuſtriſſimi Legati, ſed hoc cavendum ne dum ſaris benè, domi malè audiam. Forte nimis ſum meticuloſus, ſed & illud certum illam Cæſaris laudationem à me profectam calumniæ ſuſpicionibuſque opportunam fore.* Barleus's apprehenſion was not without foundation; and if reaſon would not ſuffer him to write a panegyric upon Ferdinand III, becauſe Holland was at war with the Houſe of Auſtria, and an Author ſhould not blow hot and cold, prudence no leſs required of him not to attempt that elogium. Thoſe who thought him a friend to the Arminians, would have defamed him as an enemy to God and to the State, and would not have been contented to ſay this both private and in public. To conclude, if all the Heroes, whom he praiſed, had paid him as well as Cardinal Richelieu (3), he would have had no reaſon to ſay, that the culture of Parnaſſus is that of an ungrateful ſoil.

(1) Compare this with what Macrobius, *Saturn.* l. 2. cap. 5. p. 337. relates of a man, who had taught two Ravens, one to congratulate Auguſtus, and the other Mark Anthony.

(2) Caſpar. Barlæus, *Epiſt.* 334. pag. 668. The Letter was written in the year 1636.

(3) This Cardinal gave him 5000 Livres for his Elogium, if we may believe Sorbiere, *Sorberiana*, pag. 40.

[*B*] *He publiſhed ſeveral very ſharp pieces of controverſy againſt the adverſaries of Arminius.*] He publiſhed at Leyden in 1615 a piece intitled *Bogermannus ἐλεγχόμενος, ſive Examen Epiſtolæ dedicatoriæ, quam ſuis ad pietatem illuſtrium Ordinum Hollandiæ & Weſt-Friſiæ notis præfixit Joannes Bogermannus, Eccleſiaſtes Leovardienſis; in quo etiam Crimina à Matthæo Slado impacta Eraſmo Roterodamo diluuntur.* The year following he publiſhed a little book under this title; *Diſſertatiuncula, in quâ aliquot patriæ Theologorum & Eccleſiaſticorum malè ſana conſilia & ſtudio juſtâ orationis libertate reprehenduntur.* There was too much bitterneſs in this piece, and too many reproaches againſt the Preachers; for he pretends (4) that there are in Holland, *Viros prædicatorii ordinis vocales plus ſatis, qui ad ſcribendos ſalutiferos libros inepti, ad prædicandam Chriſti ſapientiam elingues, tamen ad obtrectandum cum Magiſtratibus, tum diſſentientibus circa res religionis ſymmiſtis diſerti ſint & copioſi:* that is, "Preachers, "who are extremely clamorous, but incapable of "writing any uſeful books: who have no ablilities "to preach the Goſpel of Chriſt, and yet are very "eloquent and copious in their ſlanders both againſt "the Magiſtrates, and their brethren among the Di-"vines, who differ from them in points of religion." In the next page he ſays: *Si templa aliquot Hollandiæ peragrare libeat, Theologos quam plurimos in ſpermologos; concionatores in convitiatores; pacis præcones in factionum principes & ſchiſmatis faciendi buccinatores transformatos mirabere, nec tam reformatæ amplius, quam peſſimis aliquorum moribus deformatæ religionis antiſtites eſſe jurabis:* that is, "If you were to go over the Churches "of Holland, you would be ſurpriſed to find a great "many Divines transformed into ſlanderers, Preach-"ers into ſcurrilous abuſers of others, Teachers of "Peace into Heads of Factions, and Trumpeters "of

(4) Pag. 4.

never healed: he was considered all his life as a favourer of that Sect [C]; and a great many people murmured againſt the Magiſtrates of Amſterdam for entertaining ſuch a Profeſſor. Every part of his conduct was obſerved; and nothing was excuſed in him. There was a terrible clamour raiſed againſt him on account of certain verſes, which he had written upon a book of a Rabbi [D]. His *Letters* were publiſhed after his death in two volumes (*e*); but the *Sextus Empiricus*, which was expected from him, never appeared. He ſhewed his

(*e*) Gerard Brandt his ſon-in-law publiſhed them at Amſterdam in 1667. We find ſome of the chief of them in the Collection of the *Epiſtolæ præſtantium ac eruditorum Virorum*, publiſhed by the Arminians in 8vo in the year 1660, and in folio in 1684.

" of Schiſm; and you would ſwear that they were " not now any longer Miniſters of the Reformed Re- " ligion, but of a Religion deformed by the vices of " many of them." This is an exceſſive inſult upon thoſe, whoſe character ſhould render them venerable. This invective was immediately tranſlated into Dutch. I cannot well ſay, whether it was in this Diſſertation that he called one Vincent Drielenburch, who had ſet up for a Prophet, *Nebulo*; but it was either in this piece or ſome other, that he uſed that term of reproach; which provoked the other ſo highly, that he publiſhed a book, wherein, after he had called Barleus knave and raſcal, *nebulonem & ſceleſtum*, he engages to give an hundred livres to the Deaconry of Leyden, and to deliver himſelf up to juſtice, that his puniſhment might be for an example, in caſe it ſhould be proved by ſolid reaſon that he was a knave, *nebulo. Vincentius etiam Drielenburch ſuis prophetandi partibus non defuit, nam anno ſuperiore a Caſparo Barlæo in ſcripto quodam* Nebulonis *nomine deſignatus, id adeò Propheticæ ſuæ dignitati putavit eſſe injurioſum, ut edito mox ſcripto eundem Barlæum Sceleſtum & Nebulonem nuncuparet, &c.* (5). A little while after there appeared a book, in which what had been advanced againſt Drielenburch was pretended to be proved by ten inconteſtable reaſons. He replied to theſe ten reaſons, with prodigious ſeverity againſt Barleus. The latter compoſed *a Remonſtrance to the States General*, during his exile. It is dated from Francfort in Auguſt 1620, and intitled, *Fides imbellis, ſive Epiſtola paræneticaad illuſtriſſimos & potentiſſimos Fœderatarum Provinciarum Ordines.* It is a piece very well written, and in it we have a ſerious repreſentation of the evil conſequences of perſecution, and the rights of conſcience. It is publiſhed in the *Præſtantium & Eruditorum Virorum Epiſtolæ* (6).

(5) Salom. Theodot. *in pacificatorio diſſecti Belgii*, pag. 176, 177.

(6) Pag. 638, & *ſeq.* of the edition of 1684.

[C] *He was conſidered all his life as a favourer of the Sect of the Arminians.*] It is certain, that after he was reſtored to the Univerſity at Leyden, he did not break off his correſpondence with the Arminians. His CLVIth Letter informs Uytenbogard, that Polyander, Profeſſor of Divinity at Leyden, had diſcovered to his friends, that all the moderation, which appeared in the writing, which the Faculty of Divinity had publiſhed againſt the Arminians, came from him: *Quicquid mollius leniuſque ſcriptum reperitur in ſpecimine, à ſe profectum eſſe, reliqua aſperiora collegarum eſſe* (7); but that he wiſhed, that if the Arminians knew this, they would not mention it, ſince it would expoſe him to the reſentment of his collegues. *Rogavit me obnixè per D. Voſſium interruncium, vobis uti ſcriberem, ne ſi forte hæc res ad aures veſtras pervenerit, ejus in reſponſo veſtro meminiſſe velit, ne collegarum ſuorum invidiæ ac odiis, quorum jam ſemina jacta, miſer objiciatur* (8). The next Letter informs us, that one of Polyander's collegues had reproached him for having told this to Barleus, an enemy of the Church: *Tu hoc dixiſti Barlæo, quem ſcis eſſe hoſtem Eccleſiæ, qui illud ipſum ad Uytenbogardum & Epiſcopium perſcripturus eſt.* Theſe Letters were written in the year 1630. It appears from Barleus's Letters, that he always was in the opinion of the Remonſtrants.

(7) Barlæus, Epiſt. 156. pag. 356.

(8) Ibid.

[D] *There was a terrible clamour raiſed againſt .... the verſes, which he had written upon the book of a Rabbi.*] Manaſſes Ben Iſrael, one of the moſt ingenious men amongſt the Jews in the ſeventeenth Century, publiſhed a book concerning the Creation in the year 1634. Barleus wrote an epigram upon that book, and ſuffered it, according to cuſtom, to be printed before the work. He declared in it too plainly, that he preferred a good life to the truth in points of ſpeculation. A Divine of Deventer raiſed him a great deal of trouble upon that account; he publiſh'd a writing, in which he maintained, that the epigram was full of blaſphemies, and the author a Socinian. They were for bringing the affair before the States of Holland, in order to convict Barleus and all the Arminians of Socinianiſm: *Conſilia agitari uti libellus iſte cenſoris Ordinibus Hollandiæ exhibeatur, ut appareat Barlæum & Remonſtrantes eſſe Socinianos* (9). Barleus defended himſelf with warmth, and was extremely angry. He maintained that they had given a malicious interpretation to his words, and even falſified them; the better to colour the chicanery, which they made uſe of, in order to find out a ſenſe, which he had never thought of. *Epigramma quoddam meum .... quæſitis & perverſis deterſionibus malignè interpretantur. Dicit illo Epigrammate contineri varia, quæ Eccleſiæ perniciosa, religioni Chriſtianæ probroſa, & in Deum ac Dominum noſtrum Jeſum Chriſtum impia ſunt. Socinianiſmum ad hæc autori Epigrammatis impingit. .... Cenſor peſſimâ fide voculam è carmine ſuſtulit, & ſuam ſubſtituit,* maneamus *pro* vivamus. *Senſus affingit verſibus meis, de quibus ne per ſomnium quidem cogitavi* (10). He proteſted that he was not a Socinian, that he never had been one, and that he abhorred the doctrines of the Socinians. He added, that ſome perſons would be very glad to ſee him a Socinian, that their hatred to him might have the greater cauſe of triumph over him. *Non ſum Socinianus, nec fui unquam, imò hoſtis ſum iſtorum dogmatum acerrimus. Vellent quidam me eſſe, qui explendi in me odii materiam ſollicitè quærunt* (11). If this judgment was falſe, it was not far from being probable; for thoſe, who are engaged in diſputes about doctrines, accuſe their antagoniſt of ſo many things, that generally ſpeaking he cannot vex them more, than by appearing to be a quite different man from what they affirm him to be. However that be, Barleus had a right to repell this calumny; but he ought not to have made ſuch outragious verſes againſt the Divine of Deventer, that perhaps Archilochus himſelf could not have ſeverer. This Divine's name was Vedelius, and he intitled his book *Deus Synagogæ*. A Profeſſor of Utrecht (12) ſeconded him in this attack in a piece intitled *Voſſius redivivus*, which Vedelius had the care of publiſhing. Voſſius believed that Barleus fell ſick out of vexation for the inſult of theſe two antagoniſts. This is what he wrote to Grotius the 15th of December 1637. *Collega Barlæus jam tertium menſem laborat quartanâ. Metuitur ei a μυρασμῷ. Ut convaleſcat non videtur idem fore qui quondam* (13). *Affixit valetudinem opere properando quod non excuditur. Eſt hoc de ingreſſu* (14) *reginæ matris in urbem noſtram, & honore pompæ ei exhibito. Typis prodibit auguſtis plurimis exornatum picturis. Atque hoc quod dixi non diſſimulat apud amicos. Sed multum metuo ne morbum hunc inde contraxerit, quod nimis ad animum revocaret, quæ adverſus eum ſcripta ſint à Doct. Vedelio, & Magn. Schœckio* (15). That is, " My col- " legue Barleus has been ſick theſe three months of a " quartan ague. He is in ſome danger of a con- " ſumption. Tho' he ſhould recover, it is to be " feared, that he will not be the ſame man as he was " formerly. He injured his health by the pains, " which he took in haſtening a work, which is now " printing, concerning the Entrance of the Queen " Mother into our city, and the magnificent Reception " of her. It will be printed in a very noble manner, " and adorned with a great many copper-plates. What " I tell you, he does not ſcruple himſelf to own a- " mong his friends. But I am very much afraid, " that he contracted this diſtemper by reflecting too " much upon what has been written againſt him by " Doctor Vedelius and Mr. Schoockius." I believe that in general Barleus's beſt friends thought he was too much concerned on account of the cenſure of his Epigram; for they adviſed him to deſpiſe his cenſurers, and wrote concerning them in very ſevere terms. *Tibi ſum auctor ut eos poſthac præteritione mulctes. Acerrima vindicta eſt contemtus: in malam rem homines ad civilia ingenia vexanda nati. Ex Epigrammate ſcilicet, quo Manaſſen Judæum non proſcindis convitiis, totus in te Theologorum ordo aſperatus omnem Hæreticorum ſentinam in caput tuum infundet. .... Si verpum,*

(9) Epiſt. 388. pag. 675.

(10) Ibid. pag. 674, 675. See likewiſe p. 678.

(11) Ibid. pag. 679.

(12) Martin Schoockius. *See* Voetius, *Diſput. Select.* vol. 1. pag. 1156.

(13) The event did not confirm this conjecture. The like are made every day, which prove falſe.

(14) This is our true Galliciſm, *C'eſt celui de l'Entrée.*

(15) *Epiſt. Præſtant. & eruditorum Viror.* pag. 796. edit. in fol. of 1684.

his abilities in History by his *Relation of what passed in Brasil* during the Government of Count Maurice of Nassau. He published this *History* in the year 1647. There were strange rumours raised about his last sickness [*E*], and his death [*F*]; but the truth of it could never be certainly known. Little regard is to be paid to reports of that kind; for we find an hundred instances, that whenever an Author has been distinguished a little, common fame aggravates extremely the personal or domestic disgraces which happen to him; and on

verpum, apellam, recutitum eundem dixisses, & virum, ut videtur, non malum poeticis scommatibus exagitasses, palmarium meruisses. . . . . Si quid mihi apud te est fidei crabrones istos iterum dico posthac negliges. Acrius enim post repulsam instant, & ubi excusseris venenum omne in aculeos advocant tanquam ipsi læsi (16). That is, "I "would advise you to revenge yourself upon them for "the future by taking no notice of them. Contempt "is the severest punishment. Misfortune light upon "those men, who seem born to plague those of mo- "dest and peaceable dispositions. On account of that "Epigram, in which you did not think proper to abuse "Manasses the Jew, the whole Order of the Divines "will be provoked, and cast upon you all the odious "imputations, which were ever thrown upon here- "tics. . . . . If you had called him by all the terms "of reproach, and satyrized a person, who seems to "be a man of integrity, with all the poetical turns "of raillery, you would have been applauded. . . . . "If I have any interest in you, I would again "persuade you for the future absolutely to take no "notice of these hornets; for they return with the "greater violence after they are driven away; and "when you have shaken them off, they collect all "their poison into their stings, as if they had been first "injured." Barleus's Epigram, which gave occasion to so much clamour, should have been quoted here, if it had not been inserted lately in a little book, which is in every body's hands (17). I am surprized that but a very small part of Barleus's verses against Vedelius is inserted there; but I am much more surprized that Sorbiere could think, that the passage, which he mentions, shews the author to laugh at both religions. Here is what he says: *Cum Vedelius nomen suum in priori scripto analytico Epigrammatis Barlæani restituisset* (18), *ait,*

Quid tenebroso
Calumniator prave delites antro,
Et exoleta, sæve tergiversator
Arcessis ergo monstra perditæ sectæ?
Cur versipellis Sarmatæ malas voces
Portenta fidei, exsibilata Senensis
Commenta verbis affricas ferenatis?

Quæ sane nec Calvinianis satisfacere nec aliis, sed utriusque religionis ludibrio habitæ poetam meritò suspectum reddidere (19). That is, "Because Vedelius had "concealed his name in his first analytical piece a- "gainst Barleus's Epigram, he replies;

"Why do you, slanderer, hide yourself in darkness,
"Nor dare avow your charge? Why raise from
"hell
"The monstrous doctrines of an odious sect,
"And falsely brand me with Socinus' errors?

"This satisfied neither the Calvinists nor the other "party; but justly made the Poet suspected of ridi- "culing both religions." A man must be distracted or drunk, who can judge in that manner: for the verses above mentioned are the sharpest imaginable against Socinianism, and no person can give stronger testimony than Barleus has done, how much he abhorred the suspicion of that heresy. That author's prose, which Sorbiere quoted a little before, is no less severe against that Sect.

[*E*] *There were strange rumours raised about his last sickness.*] I have been told that he imagined himself to be of glass, and was afraid of being broken to pieces, when he saw any body come near him. Others have informed me, that he thought he was made of butter or straw; and in this false imagination he durst not go near the fire. This is inconsistent with the account in his Funeral Oration pronounced by the Sieur Corvin, Professor of Civil Law; for we are assured there, that he read a Lecture to his Scholars the day before his death, and that he was ready to read another, when he was seized by a fainting-fit, which he never recovered of. *Id quod dolemus; eo accidisse momento quo se parabat, ut juventuti sibi commissæ docendo debitum præstaret officium* (20). *Antecessit quidem eum morbus, cum quo luctabatur subinde, non tamen tantus quin aliquo modo consuetis adhuc sufficeret laboribus. Audiverant eum pridie diei, quo eum mors invasit, discipuli docentem; audivissent eâdem quâ occidit, nisi ipsis eum abstulisset, ita ut accepimus, plurimis hodie exemplis ferè epidemica lipothymia.* That is, "We "are sorry that it happened at that moment, when "he was preparing to read his Lectures to his pu- "pils. He was indeed before troubled with a dis- "temper, which frequently returned upon him, but "not so violently as to prevent him from being able "to execute his usual employments. His Scholars "heard him reading a Lecture the day before he died; "and they would have heard him the very day, on "which he died, if he had not been seized, as I have "been informed, with a sudden fainting, which ap- "pears from several instances to be almost epidemical "now." He had made use a little before (*quod notandum*) of the same circumstance. *Inopinata eum extinxit,* UT NOBIS RELATUM, *lipothymia. Inde factum ut eum exstinctum ante audiveramus, quam morti esse propinquum morbus prænuntiaret.* That is, "A "sudden fainting, as we have been informed, put "an end to his life; so that we heard, that he was "dead, before any distemper had shewn that he was "near death." We may observe that Corvinus had just before addressed his speech to the scholars of the deceased. Would he have ventured to say falsely in their presence, that they had assisted at one of his Lectures the day before his death?

[*F*] . . . . *And about his sickness.*] Morhof tells us, that Barleus was drowned in a well, and that it is not known, whether he fell by accident, or threw himself designedly into it. *Misero fato periit, puteo submersus, an sponte, an casu; incertum, de morte ejus jam supra diximus.* Thus he speaks in page 300 of his *Polybistor*. He refers us without doubt to page 155, when he says that he had already mentioned his death; but in page 155 he does not attribute it either to accident, or to a premeditated design; he only assures us, that Barleus fell distracted, and threw himself into a well, and quotes the LXIVth Letter of Sorbiere. *Eo nonnullorum excrescit è fiducia nimia ambitio, ut sinistro aliorum judiciorum in extremam incidant insaniam. Quod Barlæo accidit, qui ob prælatum sibi Spanhemium in maniam incidit, seque ipsum in puteo suffocavit, quod de eo Sorberius refert Epist. 64, extatque apud Duportum Musarum subcisivarum lib. 1. de eo Epigramma* (21). That is, "The self-conceit and pride "of some persons are carried to such an height, that "by being disappointed of the approbation of others, "they fall into the most extreme madness imagina- "ble. This was the case of Barleus, who lost his "senses, because Spanheim was preferred before him, "and drowned himself in a well, as Sorbiere tells us "in his *LXIV Letter*; and Dr. Duport has an Epi- "gram upon that subject in the first book of his "*Musæ Subcisivæ*." This quotation is very false; for Sorbiere writes as follows: "Barleus's death, which "you ask me some of the circumstances of, is not of "that importance (22), tho' he was a very worthy "man; for there will always be found more excel- "lent Poets than excellent Physicians. When I was "at Amsterdam, there were different reports of his "death, as if it had been hastened by melancholy. "It is true, that having written a *Funeral Oration* in "verse upon the Prince of Orange's Death, and Dr. "Spanheim having pronounced one in prose, he was "very uneasy that his reward should be inferior to "the other's. For, as Salmasius said very pleasantly, "there was a strange blunder in giving the trooper's "pay to a foot-soldier, and the foot-soldier's to the "trooper.

(16) Rochus Honerdius *in Epist. ad Barlæum*, ibid. p. 795.

(17) In the *Sorberiana*, pag. 37, 38. edition of Holland in 1694.

(18) This is without doubt an error of the press. The Author perhaps had said *silvisset*; for besides that is false that *Vedelius* named himself in his first piece, the verses here quoted suppose that he had suppressed his name.

(19) *Sorberiana*, pag. 39.

(20) Corvin. *in Orat. Funebri Barlæi.*

(21) Morhof. *Polybist.* p. 155.

(22) That is to say, of so much importance, as that of *Wallæus*, and *Vossingius*, which he had mentioned before.

on the other hand those who know the secret of the affair, are generally persons, who will not acknowledge what may occasion any disgrace.

" trooper. Barleus had but 500 livres, and the other " 500 crowns." We find nothing about Barleus's death in the *Sorberiana*. But we are told there, that, according to the common report, Barleus was subject to some intervals of madness: *Ferebatur intervalla quædam minus lucida habere, nec aberat conjectura oculorum, qui non bene sanum cerebri particulam viridem-bant.* That is, " He was said to have had some intervals of madness, and it appeared very probable " from a certain wildness about the eyes, that his brain " was not altogether sound."

BARLEUS (LAMBERT) brother of the preceding, was born at Bommel in Guelderland, in the year 1595 (*a*). He was Professor of Greek in the University of Leyden. Before this he had been Regent of the second Class in the College of Amsterdam [*A*]; and before he taught that Class, he had been Minister to Baron de Langerac Embassador of Holland in France (*b*). He was sent for to Leyden to fill up the place of Jeremiah Hoelzin, and there was a new privilege added to that office; for he had the title of Professor in Ordinary (*c*) given him, which has several advantages attending it. He pronounced his inaugural Oration *De Græcarum Literarum Præstantia ac Utilitate*, the 22d of October 1641. He published in 1652 the *Timon of Lucian*, with divers notes, which have nothing very exquisite or profound in them, but may be of great use to youth. He died the 16th of June 1655 (*d*). His *Commentary upon the Theogony of Hesiod* was printed in the year 1658.

(*a*) Witte, *in Diario Biographico.*

(*b*) Corvinus, *in Orat. funebri Casp. Barlæi.*

(*c*) See his Epistle Dedicatory to *Lucian's Timon.*

(*d*) Witte, *Diarium Biograph.*

[*A*] *He was Regent of the second class in the college of Amsterdam.*] The Dutch give those, who teach that class, the name of *Corrector*; which is as much as to say, *Assessor to the Rector*. He is called the *Rector* in Holland, who teaches the first class. He has the inspection over the other Regents.

BARLOW (THOMAS) Bishop of Lincoln in the reign of Charles II, was a man of eminent Learning. He was a long time Professor of Divinity in the University of Oxford, and a certain person has suspected that he was removed from that place, because he was too orthodox [*A*]. He was animated with a warm zeal against Popery, which he has shewn in his Writings [*B*]. He had a noble Library, and was a person of extensive reading. He died about the year 1690. Since his death some *Opuscula*, found amongst his papers, have been published. Some Writers confound him with WILLIAM BARLOW [*C*], Bishop of Lincoln, who flourished under King James I, and who died under that Prince.

☞ BARLOW

[*A*] *A certain person has suspected, that he was removed from the University of Oxford, because he was too orthodox.*] This person is a famous Minister and Professor of Divinity at Groningen; in short it is James Alting. He says in a Letter dated the 13th of March 1676, that Doctor Barlow was lately raised to the Bishoprick of Lincoln, that he might be removed from the University, where he taught the orthodox Faith (1); *for*, continues he, *the English incline very much to Pelagianism and Socinianism*: and upon that occasion he mentions a book *de Unione & Communione cum Christo*, the author of which is named *Sherlock*.

(1) Jac. Altingi, *Operum*, tom. 5. pag. 391.

[*B*] *He was animated with a warm zeal against Popery, which he has shewn in his writings.*] While there was so great a noise about Oates and the horrid conspiracy, which he discovered, this Bishop publish'd a book, in which he maintained against all evasions and subterfuges, that it is an article of the Romish Faith, that the Pope has power to depose Princes, and give their Dominions to others. This was a direct method to shew that he intended to prejudice the Papists; for of all things, which are capable of exciting the zeal of any Nation against them, there is nothing more effectual, than to shew, that they are always ready from a principle of conscience to rise up in arms against Protestant Princes. The book, which Dr. Barlow publish'd upon this subject, was immediately translated into French, and publish'd under this title, *An Historical Treatise upon the subject of the Excommunication and deposing of Kings. Printed at Paris by Claude Barbin*, 1681 (2).

(2) There is no need to observe, that the place of the impression is supposititious.

[*C*] *Some Writers confound him with* WILLIAM BARLOW.] The two Authors, who have given Supplements to John Deckher's Treatise *de Scriptis Adespoti*, have fallen into this error. Deckher had related that the Jesuit who wrote in English against King James upon the apology for the oath of Allegiance, was confuted by Mr. Baclo Bishop of Lincoln. One of his friends (3) wrote to him, that this Bishop's name was not Baclo, but THOMAS BARLOW. *Is si placet est* THOMAS BARLOVIUS *magni apud Anglos nominis, & de nostratibus optime meritus. Optandum foret videre aliquando scriptores ipsius, quorum magnam in instructissimâ suâ Bibliothecâ copiam habet, & nuperrime uno & altero opusculo præsertim contra Curiam Romanam magnum litteratis desiderium excitavit. Historia ejus de conspiratione contra* JACOBUM ANGLIÆ REGEM, *vulgo* The Gunpouder Treason, *non ita pridem publicum vidit.* i. e. " His name is Thomas " Barlow, and he is a man of great reputation in " England, and one, who has deserved very well of " our countrymen. It were to be wished, that the " world might be favoured with the publication of " his manuscript pieces, of which he has a great " number in his well-furnished Library, and he has " raised a prodigious curiosity in the men of Learning to see them, by one or two little tracts, which " he has lately published against the Court of Rome. " His History of the *Gun-powder Treason* Plot against " King James, was printed not long ago." The Letter, from which I have taken these words, was written from Strasbourg in 1681. It is plain therefore that Mr. Deckher's friend imagined that the Bishop of Lincoln, who wrote in defence of King James against a Jesuit, was yet living. Now this is a prodigious mistake. It was in the year 1609, that King James employed Dr. Barlow, the Bishop of Lincoln's Pen to write against Robert Parsons an English Jesuit. If this Doctor had been still living in 1681, his age would have been a thing very extraordinary; and one could not possibly excuse those who mention his Learning, and the books written by him, if they had forgot to mention his prodigious age. It will signify nothing to say that there are learned Men, who have lived an hundred years: this will not reach the case before us; since it is well known that the Bishop of Lincoln's name, who wrote in defence of King James, was William, and not Thomas, as his was, who was living in 1681. I cannot tell whether an hundred years would be sufficient for Thomas Barlow to be living at the time I speak of, and to have been a Bishop in 1609; for it is very rare in England for a man to be a Bishop before he is thirty five or forty years old. The Author of the *Nouvelles de la Republique des Lettres*, who has taken a short review of the errors of Mr. Deckher and Mr. Vindingius, has not only not perceived this, but even adopted it, which is worse (4).

(3) Paulus Vindingius. See the book *de Scriptis Adespotis*, p. 355. edit. ann. 1686.

(4) See the book *de Scriptis Adespotis*, pag. 372.

BARLOW (THOMAS). We ſhall endeavour to ſupply the defects of Mr. Bayle's Article of this great and learned Writer. He was the ſon of Mr. Richard Barlow, and was born at Langhill in the pariſh of Orton in Weſtmorland in the year 1607. He was educated at the free-ſchool at Appleby in that County under Mr. William Pickering, and ſent from thence in 1624 to Queen's College in Oxford, where he was plac'd under the care of Mr. Thomas Lough, and took the Degree of Maſter of Arts; and was appointed Fellow in 1633. Two years after he was choſen Reader in Metaphyſics to the Univerſity, and his Lectures being highly approved of, were publiſhed in 1637 [*A*]. When the garriſon of Oxford was ſurrendered for the uſe of the Parliament in 1646, he ſubmitted to the men then in power, and by the intereſt of Colonel Thomas Kelſey, Deputy Governor of that garriſon, he kept his Fellowſhip during the Parliamentary Viſitation in 1648 [*B*]. In 1651 he had a controverſy with Mr. John Goodwin concerning Univerſal Redemption [*C*]. In 1652 he was elected Keeper of the Bodleian Library, upon the deceaſe of Mr. John Rouſe, and about that time was made Lecturer of Church-Hill

[*A*] *His Lectures being highly approved of, were publiſhed in* 1637.] They are intitled, *Exercitationes aliquot Metaphyſicæ de Deo*, i. e. "Several Metaphyſical Exercitations concerning God." This edition was publiſhed at Oxford in 4to; and another likewiſe appeared in 1658 in 4to (1). Sir Peter Pett in the *Genuine Remains* of our Author publiſhed at London in 8vo 1695 tells us (2), that the Biſhop, when he was but a young Maſter of Arts, printed his *Exercitations* in Latin at the end of *Scheibler's Metaphyſics*, by which he gained a great reputation both in our own and in all the Proteſtant Univerſities of Chriſtendom. That Gentleman therefore was induced to publiſh an Engliſh tranſlation of one of thoſe *Exercitations*, which he ſtiles *incomparable*, and which, he tells us, the Biſhop owned to his friends, had coſt him more pains than any of the reſt. This piece turns upon the famous queſtion, *Whether it be more eligible to be annihilated, or not to be at all, than to be miſerable?* and examines Durandus's reaſons, who aſſerts, that it is better to be miſerable, than to be reduced to a ſimple non-entity. Our Author determines upon the contrary concluſion. We have likewiſe in the *Genuine Remains* an *Abſtract* in Engliſh of his *fourth Exercitation*, concerning the Exiſtence of God, wherein he endeavours to demonſtrate, that there is ſome knowledge of God attainable here by the light of Nature; and to point out the means and aſſiſtances proper for our advancement in that knowledge; with an anſwer to that queſtion, *How far this natural knowledge of God can poſſibly reach, or how much of him is cognoſcible by the Light of Nature?* He concludes, that it is abundantly demonſtrable by natural light, that there is a God, and that he is the firſt Cauſe of all things; from whence theſe inferences are plainly deducible; 1. That God is eternal; ſince the firſt Cauſe is not capable of receiving its production either from itſelf, or from another: 2. That he is a moſt ſimple Being; ſince the firſt cauſe, as it excludes all external, ſo likewiſe all internal conſtitutive cauſes: 3. That he is independent; for what is firſt can admit of nothing prior to it, whereupon to depend. So that not only the Exiſtence of God, but many of his Attributes deducible from thence by undoubted and natural conſequence, may be evidently demonſtrated from the Light of Nature.

(1) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 877.
(2) Pag. 469.

[*B*] *He kept his fellowſhip during the parliamentary viſitation.*] Mr. Wood tells us (3), that *he ſided with the men then in power*, and that he with others *preſented to the wife of* Col. Kelſey, the Deputy-Governor of the Garriſon, *certain gifts*. But we find, that he wrote a Pamphlet againſt the Parliamentary Viſitation, mentioned by that Hiſtorian (4), under the following title: *Pegaſus, or the Flying Horſe from Oxford; bringing the Proceedings of the Viſitors and other Bedlamites there, by the command of the Earl of Montgomery; Printed at Montgomery, heretofore called Oxford*; in one ſheet in 4to. It is written by way of Letter, dated at Oxford April the 18th 1648 (5). With this is printed another Letter in one ſheet and an half, dated at Oxon April the 17th 1648, and ſubſcribed by Baſilius Philomuſus.

(3) *Ubi ſupra*, col. 876.
(4) Ibid. col. 877.
(5) Idem, ibid. and col. 859.

[*C*] *In* 1651 *he had a controverſy with Mr. John Goodwin concerning Univerſal Redemption.*] Mr. Goodwin, who was at that time Miniſter of St. Stephen's Coleman-ſtreet, and famous for aſſerting the Arminian Doctrines, and particularly that of Univerſal Redemption, had made uſe of this argument in favour of that point in his book intitled *Redemption redeemed* (6). *If Chriſt died not for all men, then all men are not bound to believe on him. But all men are bound to believe on him. Therefore he died for all.* Mr. Barlow in a Letter to him dated September 1651, and publiſhed in his *Genuine Remains* (7), tells him, that he always finds in the proſecution of his arguments that perſpicuity and acuteneſs, which he often ſeeks and ſeldom finds in the writings of others. He then obſerves to Mr. Goodwin, that the latter aſſerts the *Univerſal Redemption for all mankind, without exception, by Jeſus Chriſt. Poſſibly*, continues he, *there wants not clear rays of truth in your diſcourſes, but I want eyes to ſee them. Therefore I lay the blame on my ſelf, well knowing, that you are not bound to find me arguments, and find me underſtanding too.* He proceeds next to conſider Mr. Goodwin's argument abovementioned, and remarks, that many of our Divines miſtake in untying the Gordian knot; and though ſeveral of them deny the *major*, yet he ſhall deny the *minor*, and affirm that *all men are not bound to believe on Jeſus Chriſt*; for which aſſertion he offers his own reaſons, and then endeavours to anſwer thoſe of his Antagoniſt. His own reaſons are, firſt, becauſe it will eaſily be granted, that no human obligation can bind men to this; ſince the internal acts of belief and dependence on Chriſt for ſalvation, as they are not within the compaſs of human cognizance, ſo no man was ever inveſted with ſuch a power and *Dominium* (which is the foundation of all Laws) over all mankind, as to be able to lay an obligation on all men univerſally, which in this caſe is required. Secondly, neither is there any *Divine Law*, which binds all men to believe in Jeſus Chriſt, as natural or poſitive. Thirdly, becauſe infants are not bound to believe in Chriſt; and they are a conſiderable part of the world. He then examines Mr. Goodwin's objections, who urges a paſſage from Acts, *Now God commanding all men to repent*. Mr. Barlow obſerves, that it does not follow, becauſe to *repent*, therefore to *believe*; ſince the Light of Nature commands all men, who have ſinned, to repent of their ſin, and would have done ſo, if Jeſus Chriſt had never been revealed to the world. In anſwer to the other objection, that *he that believes not ſhall be damned*, he remarks that *infidelity is two-fold*: firſt *privative*, when we do not believe the things which we are bound to believe; which is a vice and moral obliquity oppoſed to the virtue of faith. Secondly, *Infidelity* is *negative*; and this is taken to be *Carentia fidei in iis qui non tenentur credere*; that is, "The want of faith in thoſe who are not bound to believe." Thoſe reprobates, to whom Chriſt was never revealed, ſhall be tried by the Law of Nature, and not by the Law of the Goſpel, nor the poſitive Law given to the Jews, nor any part of it, moral, ceremonial, and judicial, as far as it was poſitive. Mr. Goodwin publiſhed by way of anſwer to this a book intitled, *The Pagan's Debt and Dowry, &c.* London 1651, in which he acknowledges (8), that Mr. Barlow hath pleaded the cauſe of what he aſſerted *with as much ingenuity and ſtrength as any man whatſoever could have done*; and obſerves (9), that he ſhall anſwer ſome of the more material parts of his diſcourſe, though not in the ſame order, to which he might be directed by his papers, but only as they came to his remembrance, he not having leiſure for a ſecond review.

(6) Ch. 18. § 6; and pag. 464.
(7) Pag. 122, & *ſeq.*
(8) Pag. 4. See *Genuine Remains, &c.* pag. 131.
(9) Pag. 6.

Hill near Burford in Oxfordshire (a). July the 23d 1657 he took his Degree of Bachelor of Divinity (b); and the same year he was admitted to the reading of the Sentences, and in the latter end of that year elected Provost of Queen's College upon the death of Dr. Langbaine. After the restoration of King Charles II he procured himself to be one of the Commissioners appointed at first by the Marquis of Hertford, Chancellor of the University, and afterwards by his Majesty, for the restoring of those Members, who had been unjustly ejected in 1648 (c). August the 2d 1660 he was not only actually created Doctor of Divinity among the Royalists (d), but likewise designed Margaret Professor of Divinity upon the ejection of Mr. Henry Wilkinson Sen. and was elected to that Professorship in September 1662 (e). In 1660 he wrote *the Case of a Toleration in Matters of Religion* to Mr. Robert Boyle [D]. Upon the decease of Dr. Barton Holyday, who

(a) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 876. 2d edit. London 1721.

(b) Idem, *Fasti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 116.

(c) Idem, *Athen. Oxon. ubi supra.*

(d) Idem, ibid. and *Fasti Oxon.* col. 136.

(e) Idem, *Athen. Oxon. ubi supra.*

view. Upon which Sir Peter Pett remarks in his *Abstract* of Mr. Goodwin's book (10), that it is to be regretted, that he had not endeavoured for the satisfaction of the world to have answered paragraph by paragraph, *as is usually done by the answerers of discourses written with such accurateness of method as Dr. Barlow's is.* And he tells us (11), that both "Dr. Barlow's Letter, "and Mr. Goodwin's Answer may be to such, who "write of controversial Divinity, an useful specimen "of two antagonists writing of the same subject with "candour, and like Gentlemen as well as Scholars and "Christians; which was suitable to the natural tem-"pers both of Dr. Barlow and Mr. Goodwin." The same Gentleman likewise observes, that Dr. Barlow's assertion is not in the least heterodox or inconsistent with the doctrines of the Church of England, since our *Great Bishop* Sanderson *(with as much honour now quoted in the Divinity-Schools as Aristotle is in those of Philosophy) tells us in his fourth Lecture, and of the adequate Rule of Conscience*, §. 21, "that the Gentiles to whom "the Gospel hath not been preached, are not bound to "believe the Gospel, or to believe on Christ; for "*nemo tenetur ad impossibile.*" And he asserts the same thing in §. 32.

(10) *Genuine Remains, ubi supra.*

(11) Ibid. pag. 239.

[D] *In* 1660 *he wrote* the Case of a Toleration in matters of Religion *to Mr. Robert Boyle.*] We are informed that it was addressed to that Gentleman in 1660 soon after the Restoration, in the Preface to Dr. Barlow's *Several miscellaneous and weighty cases of conscience*, publish'd at London 1692 in 8vo. He observes first (12), that the toleration spoken of is a toleration of several Religions, or several opinions concerning it; and that therefore Atheists (if there be any such) came not under it. For he who acknowledges no God, cannot possibly be of any Religion, which essentially includes both an acknowledgment and worship of a Deity. He tells us likewise (13), that as those, to whom a toleration is granted, may justly expect impunity, and exemption from all penal sufferings, tho' they conform not to the way of worship publicly established; so on the other side, *they cannot reasonably expect the rewards and encouragements, which a Prince distributes to those, who chearfully obey, and give conformity to the Religion established.* He then proceeds to the grand question, "Whether and how far the su-"preme Power may and ought to grant such a tole-"ration to religions and ways of worship differing "from that established (14)?" He observes (15), that no State should or will grant a toleration to any Religion, which contains any thing in it, which may be destructive to the civil peace and safety of itself. Upon which account he tells us it will be hard to tolerate, 1. Such Anabaptists, as deny all Magistracy; for why should any Prince own and protect them as subjects, who will not obey, or own him as their Prince (16)? 2. Such as make it a part of their Religion to believe all oaths unlawful, and so will take none; for on this account they will refuse all oaths of allegiance (17). 3. Such (especially if their number be considerable) as by the principles of their Religion think all war unlawful, and by consequence must deny their Prince any personal assistance in his wars, tho' he and his Kingdom be in the utmost hazard and necessity (18). 4. Such, who, (although they allow and will take an oath of allegiance, yet by the principles of their Religion acknowledge a Power, which can absolve them from that oath, and arm them against their Prince, depose him, and dispose of his Kingdom, nay of all the Kingdoms of the world; which is the doctrine of the Papists, as he shews very fully from their greatest writers (19). He remarks afterwards (20), that no King can tolerate such ways of worship, as are destructive of the Ecclesiastical State or peace of the Church, at least as far as they are so, and without such restrictions and qualifications, as may rationally secure the established way of worship. And that no prudent Prince will tolerate such religions and ways of worship, (if there are any such) as approve and practise any thing against the law of nature, as blasphemy, theft, perjury, adultery, &c. such as all sober men acknowledge to be crimes, and are destructive to the well-being of human society. Having premis'd these things, he comes now to the main question concerning matters of faith and false opinions; "Whether men of a false faith and heretical opinions "may be tolerated, and have a grant of impunity; "or whether the Magistrate is to punish such erring "persons, Papists, Sectaries, Socinians, &c. and then "how far, how long, with what punishments, and "what measure and degrees of them he is to do it "(21)?" *In answer to this*, says he (22), *tho' I shall not say, that it is absolutely unlawful for the Civil Magistrate in this case to use temporal and compulsory punishments, yet thus much (giving my reasons for it) I think I may safely and truly say, that it will be very difficult and dangerous for him to do it.* I. Because we find no warrant for it in the Gospel; there is neither any *precept* or *practice* of our Saviour or his Apostles to compel any to be Christians (23). II. There are several express places in the Gospel, which strongly persuade the contrary; that no violence nor coaction is or ought to be used (24). III. Such compelling punishments and coaction is not, cannot be a fit and congruous means to work faith and true religion in erring persons (25). IV. In all punishments, as the best Lawyers truly tell us, there must be two things; *Cognitio culpæ, & Æstimatio pœnæ.* The crime to be punished, together with the magnitude and measure of it, the degrees of the malice of it in itself, and the mischief which it does to others, must of necessity be certainly known, else it cannot justly be punish'd; for the justice of punishments consisting in a proportion between the crime and the punishment, he that would justly proportion this to that, must first know the crime and the measure of the malice contained in it, the mischief done by it; else it is impossible he should proportion a just punishment for it. But Dr. Barlow conceived it very difficult, if not impossible, for any man certainly to know how far erroneous opinions in religion or heresies (as they call them) are sinful. *For*, 1. *no heresy or erroneous opinion can be sinful, unless it be voluntary* (26). 2. It is a known maxim among all Lawyers and Divines, that no *positive* Law of God or man does or can bind us, without a sufficient promulgation, such a promulgation being necessary to the obligation of all positive laws. *But now, when the positive truths of the Gospel are sufficiently revealed and promulgated to Titius and Sempronius (to this and that particular person,) it is difficult, if not impossible for any man to know, unless he could know the divers abilities and capacities of those persons, to whom those truths are revealed. For as those Pagans, to whom the Gospel was never revealed (as to many Nations it never was) are no ways under the obligation of it, nor any way liable to sin, or punishment for not believing it (whence that saying of Augustine, speaking of the Gentiles,* Veniam habebunt propter infidelitatem, damnabuntur propter peccata contra naturam; i. e. "They will be pardoned on account of their infidelity, "but be condemned for their sins against nature;") *so among those, to whom it has been revealed, there is a great difference in respect of the sufficiency or insufficiency*

(12) Pag. 4, 5.

(13) Pag. 8.

(14) Pag. 11.

(15) Pag. 21.

(16) Pag. 22, 23.

(17) Pag. 23.

(18) Pag. 23, 24.

(19) Pag. 25, & *seq.*

(20) Pag. 30.

(21) Pag. 36, 37.

(22) Pag. 38, 39.

(23) Pag. 39.

(24) Pag. 49.

(25) Pag. 52, 53.

(26) Pag. 56, 57.

who died October 2d 1661 (*f*), he was made Archdeacon of Oxford, and the controverſy about that Dignity between him and Dr. Thomas Lamplugh was determined in favour of the former by the itinerant Juſtices in their Aſſizes at Oxford March 1, 1663; ſo that he was inſtalled in it June the 13th 1664 (*g*). His attachment to the principles of Calvin engaged him in a public oppoſition to the *Harmonia Apoſtolica* publiſhed in 1669 by Mr. George Bull, afterwards Biſhop of St. David's [*E*], and urged him to contend with great warmth againſt every thing, which ſeemed to ſavour of Arminianiſm. We find likewiſe, that he had a great averſion to the new Philoſophy [*F*]. In 1671 he wrote a learned diſcuſſion

(*f*) Idem, *Ath. Oxon.* col. 260

(*g*) Idem, ibid. col. 876.

of its promulgation to one, which (their capacities conſidered) is not to another; and ſo the error of one be a crime, when the other, tho' holding the ſame opinion, is innocent (27). V. Upon this ground the Doctor is abſolutely againſt puniſhing heretics with death, it being uncertain who are really ſuch. For 1. it is not yet agreed amongſt Divines, who are *formally heretics*. 2. Some would have the formality of hereſy to conſiſt in *pertinacy* or *contumacy*. Now ſince pertinacy is an internal thing, and ſuch a conſtitution of the ſoul, as none but God does or can know; it were but juſt to ſtay the execution of heretics, till it be certain what is hereſy. 3. The Greek *Scholiaſt of Theophylact and Oecumenius* on *Tit.* 3. 10. make it requiſite to an heretic to be αὐτοκατάκριτος, ἀνίατος, ἀδιόρθωτος, *ſelf-condemned, incurable, incorrigible*; but none of theſe are within the compaſs of human cognizance. 4. They ſay an hereſy muſt be *againſt the Articles of Faith*. Now it is not agreed which and how many are ſuch, and what makes them ſo; thoſe being articles of faith to ſome, which are not ſo to others (28). He concludes with two queries: 1. Whether the Prince, who would give a toleration to ſeveral Religions, ſhould not in prudence and conſcience firſt know what theſe Religions are, and what points they hold different from that eſtabliſhed, that ſo he may knowingly judge how far he may, or may not grant impunity? 2. Whether he that does (and juſtly may) tolerate a Religion different from that legally eſtabliſhed, and ſo compells none to be of his Religion, may not yet compel his ſubjects to thoſe means and the uſe of them, by which they may be informed of the reaſons and truth of his Religion (29)?

(27)] Pag. 58, 59, 60.

(28) Pag. 62, 63, 64.

(29) Pag. 90, 91.

[*E*] *His attachment to the principles of Calvin engaged him in a public oppoſition to the* Harmonia Apoſtolica, *publiſh'd in* 1669 *by Mr. George Bull, afterwards Biſhop of St. David's.*] The deſign of this treatiſe of Mr. Bull was to explain and defend the doctrine of St. James with relation to good Works, and to ſhew the agreement and harmony of St. Paul with him. But more particularly the author's chief aim in his *firſt Diſſertation* is to ſhew, that "good works, which "proceed from faith, and are conjoined with faith, "are a neceſſary condition required from us by God, "to the end that by the new and evangelical Co-"venant obtained by and ſealed in the Blood of Chriſt "the Mediator of it, we may be juſtified according "to his free and unmerited Grace (30)." Mr. Nelſon obſerves (31), that this book met with oppoſition from three conſiderable men in the Church, Dr. Morley Biſhop of Wincheſter, Dr. Barlow, and Dr. Tully; the two laſt of whom *were among the moſt zealous to oppoſe the pacific method for reconciling the different ſyſtems about attaining ſalvation, by their rigid adherence to certain tenets by them formerly imbibed, and to ſome ſcholaſtic terms unſupported either by Scripture or Antiquity. But tho' the firſt of theſe* (Dr. Barlow) *read public Lectures againſt the* Harmonia Apoſtolica *from the Divinity-chair; and tho' the other made it his buſineſs to anſwer it at large from the preſs; yet it failed not to make its way through all oppoſition and contradiction, and to gain continually more and more ground, as it came hereby to be more read and conſidered.* Mr. Nelſon afterwards informs us (32), that Dr. Barlow in his Lectures *is ſaid to have treated Mr. Bull very roughly, even ſo far as to give him opprobrious names*; an account of which was ſent to the latter by his friend Mr. Thomas, at that time Chaplain of Chriſt-Church, who was preſent, and took notes of all that related to his friend in theſe Lectures. This treatment brought Mr. Bull to Oxford, who with Mr. Thomas waited upon the Profeſſor, told him with what inhumanity he had been treated by him, and offered to clear himſelf from thoſe imputations by a public diſputation; but this would not be accepted of. Mr. Bull and his friend thought this refuſal was by no means equitable in the Profeſſor. *A diſputation*, ſays Mr. Nelſon, *was all that Mr. Bull deſired for himſelf; but was prudently enough declined by this Doctor of the Chair, not knowing what might have been the conſequences thereof. He excuſed himſelf therefore to Mr. Bull as well as he could, and endeavoured to avoid owning the fact, till Mr. Thomas poſitively affirmed it to his face, offering to produce the notes which he had taken, to which the Profeſſor had no more to ſay; and they parted with no other ſatisfaction to Mr. Bull, than that the perſon, who had been ſo forward to defame him in his abſence, durſt not make good the charge to his face.*

(30) See the *Life of Dr. George Bull, late Lord Biſhop of St. David's*, by Robert Nelſon, Eſq; pag. 95. 2d edit. London 1714.

(31) Ibid. pag. 102.

(32) Ibid. pag. 211.

[*F*] *He had a great averſion to the New Philoſophy.*] He tells his friend Sir J. B. in a ſecond Letter (33), which he wrote to him upon receiving from him a Lecture, read before the Royal Society Novemb. 26th 1674, "that he was and had been for a long time "not a little troubled to ſee Proteſtants, nay Clergy-"men and Biſhops, approve and propagate that, which "they miſcall *New Philoſophy*; ſo that our Univerſi-"ties begin to be infected with it, little conſidering "the cauſe or conſequences of it, or how it tends e-"vidently to the advantage of Rome, and the ruin of "our Religion. It is certain this *New Philoſophy* (as "they call it,) was ſet on foot, and has been carried "on by the arts of Rome, and thoſe (*a*), whoſe oath "and intereſt it is to maintain all her ſuperſtitions." He obſerves afterwards, that when he was Library-keeper, and ſaw the Jeſuits and Popiſh party extoll their *New Philoſophy*, he ſent by his friends to Paris, Venice, Florence, Rome, Alcala de Henares, &c. to enquire whether the Jeſuits in their colleges trained up their young men in the New Philoſophy; or whether in all their diſputations they kept them to ſtrict form and Ariſtotle's manner of ratiocination; and that the anſwer he had was, that none were more ſtrict than they in keeping all their pupils to the old principles and forms of diſputations. *For they well know*, continues he, *that all their ſchool-men, caſuiſts and controverſy-writers have ſo mixed Ariſtotle's Philoſophy with their Divinity, that he, who has not a comprehenſion of Ariſtotle's principles and the uſe of them in all ſcholaſtic diſputes and controverſies of Religion, will never be able rationally to defend or confute any controverted poſition in the Roman or Reformed Religion. Now while they keep cloſe to the old way of diſputing on the old received principles, if they can perſuade us to ſpend our time about novel whimſies and not well underſtood experiments, and neglect the ſeverer ſtudies of the old Philoſophy and ſcholaſtical Divinity, they will in all Divinity diſputations be every way too hard for us. Juſt ſo, as in this caſe; if I ſhould challenge a man to fight a duel with me in the field, and when we met there, if I could perſuade him to caſt away his ſword, or keep him from having any ſkill in it, I ſhould certainly be too hard for him.* Dr. Barlow concludes with the following paſſage. "A comprehenſion of the principles of the old Phi-"loſophy and School-Divinity is a weapon ſo neceſ-"ſary for a rational defence of any queſtion againſt "Rome, that he who wants it, diſables himſelf to "defend, and ſo betrays the truth; and this is un-"happily manifeſt in many of our late Scriblers." His great opinion of the School-Logic appears from a Letter of his to one of his friends, who had written to him for his judgment, *Wherein Mr. Chillingworth's peculiar excellency above other writers conſiſted*; in anſwer to which he tells him (34), that it conſiſted in *his acquired Logic. He induſtriouſly ſtudied it, finding the exceeding great uſe of it, eſpecially in controverſies of Religion.* But let us hear that great man's judgment of School-Divinity, which is very contrary to that of our author. The Jeſuit Knott had obſerved (35), that *the learning of Proteſtant Divines conſiſting only in ſome ſuperficial talent of preaching, languages, or elocution, and*

(33) See *Genuine Remains*, p. 157, *& ſeq.*

(*a*) *Vid. Juramentum Profeſſionis fidei* (which all her Eccleſiaſtics take) *in Concilio Trident.* Seſſ. 24. *De Reformatione, in Calce* cap. 12.

(34) *Genuine Remains*, pag. 348.

(35) *A Direction to be obſerved by N. N. if hee mean to proceede in anſwering the Booke intitled,* Mercy and Truth, or Charity maintained by Catholicks, pag. 19, 20. in 8vo, 1636.

discussion of the case of Mr. Cottington concerning the validity or nullity of his marriage with a Lady, whose former husband was living [G]. Upon the death of Dr. William Fuller Bishop of Lincoln April 22d 1675, Dr. Barlow, through the interest of both the Secretaries of State, Henry Coventry Esq; and Sir Joseph Williamson, who were formerly of his College, and of several of the Nobility, was introduced to the King, and had the grant of that See; to which he was consecrated at Ely House the 27th of June following (*b*). Mr. Wood informs us, that Archbishop Sheldon opposed his preferment (*i*). He never resided at Lincoln, or visited his Diocese in person; for which he alledged some reasons, which we shall mention in the note [*H*]. After the Popish Plot was

(*b*) Idem, ibid. col. 876 and 1161.

(*i*) Idem, col. 876.

and not in any deep knowledge of Philosophie, especially of Metaphisicks, and much lesse of that most solide, profitable, subtile, and succinct method, which we call School-Divinity; *when they come to be pressed by Socinians, are unable to satisfy their doubts, but either are caught themselves, as I know it happeth not seldome, or give occasion for the Socinians to be more settled in their errours, and for others to be drawn into the same infidelitie. And the Divel aymed at no lesse than this total ruin of all Faith and Religion, when he first moved hereticks to deride School-Divinity, and to nickname the professours thereof Dunses.* Mr. Chillingworth's answer to this is as follows (36): "Their learning (you say) "consists only in *some superficial talent of preaching, languages, and elocution, and not in any deep knowledge of Philosophy, especially of Metaphysics, and much lesse of that most solid, profitable, subtile, and* (o rem ridiculam, Cato, & jocosam!) *succinct method of School-Divinity.* Wherein you have discovered in yourself the true genius and spirit of detraction. For taking advantage from that, wherein envy itself cannot deny but they are very eminent, and which requires sufficiency of great substantial learning, you disparage them as insufficient in all things else. As if forsooth, because they dispute not eternally, *Utrum chimæra bombinans in vacuo, possit comedere secundas intentiones?* i. e. "Whether a million of "Angels may not sit upon a needle's point?" Because they fill not their brains with notions, that signifie nothing, to the utter extermination of all reason and common sense, and spend not an age in weaving and unweaving subtile cobwebs, fitter to catch flies than souls; therefore they have no deeper knowledge in the Acroamaticall part of learning? But I have too much honoured the poorness of this detraction to take notice of it."

(36) See his Preface to his *Religion of Protestants &c.* § 19.

[*G*] *A learned discussion of the case of Mr. Cottington concerning the Validity and Nullity of his Marriage with a Lady, whose former husband was living.*] The case was as follows (37): Gallina marries Patrimoniale in the year 1664, lives and cohabits with him as his wife a year and a half, and has a daughter by him; and all this while voluntarily gives him reverence and due benevolence, without any protestation or complaint of any *nullity* or *illegality* of the matrimonial contract by reason of any antecedent force or fear to make her consent and plighted troth involuntary; never endeavours to recede and make an escape from him, when she was in *loco tuto*, and had an opportunity to make such protestation or recess with safety. After this in the year 1666 the Archbishop of Turin by sentence given pronounces the said marriage void and null by reason of force and fear, into which her father put her; which rendered Gallina's consent involuntary (as was supposed) and contrary to the nature of a conjugal consent, which, *jure naturæ*, ought to be free and spontaneous; otherwise it will not be obligatory. After this in 1671 she marries Mr. Cottington, (her former husband then living, and who is yet alive) and claims him for her husband at Law and in the Court of Arches. The Court (*sententiâ latâ*) determines and declares, that Mr. Cottington and Gallina are lawfully *husband* and *wife*, without taking notice of the Archbishop of Turin's sentence, (whether it was valid or void,) and enjoined them to cohabit. The query upon this case was, Whether Mr. Cottington may acknowledge, take, and use Gallina as a lawful wife without sin? The Bishop examined this point with great accuracy and extent of learning, having premised these considerations; 1. That it is certain and confessed that the obligation of the patrimonial contract, is not grounded on any positive constitution of man, but on the divine law of God and of Nature. 2. That from hence it is, that this matrimonial contract, while the parties live, is immutable and indispensable. 3. That from hence it follows evidently, that if the conjugal contract between Patrimoniale and Gallina was a legal and valid marriage originally, then it continues so, and was and is still valid and obligatory. 4. And therefore if this be true and granted, then her marriage with Mr. Cottington is absolutely null and void. He proceeds then to the next query concerning the Invalidity and Nullity of Gallina's Marriage with Patrimoniale; which pretence seems to be founded only upon the authority and judicial sentence of the Archbishop of Turin, declaring it to be a Nullity; and upon the reason alledged, drawn from the force and fear, which made Gallina's consent involuntary. These *mediums* he conceives to be insufficient; and therefore concludes that the latter marriage is null and void. We are informed in the *Preface* to the *Miscellaneous and weighty Cases of Conscience* written by our author, that Mr. Cottington applied himself, and Mr. Brent came from the Earl of Danby to request his opinion; and that the resolution in this case may be of great use, it never being so fully stated before. Davila tells us in his fifth book of the *History of the Civil Wars of France*, that King Henry IV having been married to Queen Margaret at Notredame by the Cardinal of Bourbon, in the presence of the whole Court, when the Lady was given in marriage by King Charles IX her brother; yet after a long cohabitation the Cardinal de Joyeuse, the Pope's Nuncio, and the Archbishop of Arles, being delegated by the Pope, nulled the marriage, *propter vim & metum*, Queen Margaret alledging that she was forced to it by her brother. And the sentence gave liberty to the King and Queen to marry whom they pleased; and accordingly the King afterwards married Mary de Medicis, and Cardinal D'Ossat justified the legality of this sentence, tho' there had been no cause shewn. Sir Peter Pett in his Preface to the *Genuine Remains* is of opinion, that *a Discussion of any one case of conscience with such variety of learning as is contained in Bishop Barlow's Treatise of Mr. Cottington's Marriage-Case, is not to be found in the works of any foreign casuists.* We have in those *Remains* (38), a Letter of that Bishop concerning the Allowance and Respect, which the sentences of Protestant Bishops may expect from Popish ones, written by way of answer to a friend of Mr. Cottington's, who acquainted him, that the Court of Arches here was of opinion, that the sentence of the Archbishop of Turin could not be questioned here, by reason of the practice of Popish and Protestant Bishops allowing each other's sentences.

(37) See *Several miscellaneous and weighty Cases of Conscience, &c.* in Mr. *Cottington's Case*, p. 1, *& seq.* edit. London 1692, in 8vo.

(38) Pag. 216.

[*H*] *He alledged some reasons, which we shall mention in the note.*] He tells his friend Sir Peter Pett in a letter to him dated from Bugden Jan. 26, 1684. and publish'd in his *Genuine Remains* (39), that as for going to Lincoln, according to the advice of the Marquis of Halifax, he would not fail to do it, as soon as possible; but that at present his age and infirmities were such as to disable him for such a journey, since he had not been out of his house for thirteen or fourteen months. He observes, that he had written to the Lord Privy-Seal the reasons of his not going to Lincoln; which were, 1. that he had no house there: 2. That Bugden is in the center of his Diocese, and stands more conveniently for all business: 3. That Bishop Sanderson lived and died at Bugden, and Bishop Laney lived there likewise, till he was translated to Ely; nor were they ever accused or complained of for it: 4. That Lincoln might not think him unkind or negligent of them, he sent them one hundred pounds, of which fifty were given to the Church, and the other fifty

(39) Pag. 255, *& seq.*

was discovered in September 1678, he published several tracts against the Roman Catholic Religion [*I*], in which he shews an uncommon extent of learning and skill in polemical Divinity. He distinguished himself by his zeal against Popery in the House of Lords; for as Bishop Burnet in the *History of his own Times* (*k*) informs us, while the examinations relating to the Plot were going on, and preparation was making for the trial of the prisoners, a Bill was brought into the House of Commons, requiring all Members of either House, and all such as might come into the King's court or presence, to take a Test against Popery, in which not only Transubstantiation was renounced, but the Worship of the Virgin Mary and the Saints, as it was practised in the Church of Rome, was declared to be idolatrous. This passed in the House of Commons without any difficulty; but in the House of Lords Dr. Peter Gunning, Bishop of Ely, maintained, that the Church of Rome was not idolatrous. He was answered by Bishop Barlow. And the Lords, without paying any great regard to Bishop Gunning's arguments, passed the Bill. Mr. Wood (*l*) charges him upon this occasion with great inconsistency in his conduct, and tells us, that though he had *before been a seeming friend to the Papists, he became then a bitter enemy to them and to the Duke of York.* But that when the Duke was proclaimed King, he took all opportunities of expressing his affection towards him, and in particular was said to have written reasons for reading his Majesty's Declaration for Liberty of Conscience [*K*]. However that be, after the Revolution, he readily voted, that the King had abdicated his Kingdoms, and was very vigorous in excluding those of the Clergy, who refused the oaths, from their Benefices (*m*). Mr. Rapin likewise has passed a severe

(*k*) Vol. 1. pag. 435, 436. edit. London 1724. fol.

(*l*) Col. 877.

(*m*) Idem, ibid.

fifty to the City. And since that he had given to the City twenty pounds towards their expence in renewing their Charter; *which*, says he, *none of my predecessors have done; and yet I only must be accused and uncharitably condemned by my enemies*, causâ indictâ & inauditâ. *Ah! my dear friend, it is not my absence from Lincoln, or any of those little things they (I mean the Popish party) object against me, which troubles them; but that which indeed sets them on to calumniate me, is, they know I am an enemy to Rome, and their miscalled Catholic Religion, and (God willing) while I live, shall be so*, & hinc illæ lacrymæ. *I have been loyal to my good King, and dutiful to my holy Mother the Church of England; and (pardon my confidence) I have done them more faithful and better service than any of my enemies have or can; and notwithstanding any discouragements, I shall (God inabling me) continue to do. I am not afraid to anger my Popish enemies, or of any mischief they can do me. I serve a most gracious and omnipotent God, who can and (I hope) will deliver me from their cruelties; and if not, they shall know, that I will never worship the abominable idols they have set up. I have something, which in convenient time I shall publish, which will anger them more than any thing I have yet done.*

[*I*] *Published several Tracts against the Roman Catholic Religion.*] I. *Popery, or the Principles and Positions approved by the Church of Rome (when really believed and practised) are very dangerous to all, and to Protestant Kings and supreme Powers, more especially pernicious, and inconsistent with that loyalty, which by the Law of Nature and Scripture is indispensably due to supreme Powers. In a Letter to a person of honour.* Mr. Wood tells us (40), that this book was published at London in December 1678 in 4to, and there again in April in 8vo. It was animadverted upon in another book, intitled, *The Compendium, or a short view of the late Tryals in relation to the present Plot against his Majesty and Government, &c.* London 1679 in 4to, pag. 76, 77. written by Roger Palmer Earl of Castlemain. But these Reflections were replied to in the Preface to *A Memento for English Protestants.* The Bishop's book was likewise answered in a book intitled, *Four Letters on several subjects to persons of Quality. The fourth being an answer to the Lord Bishop of Lincoln's book intitled*, Popery, &c. published in 1686 in 8vo, and written by Peter Walsh, an Irish Friar of the Order of St. Francis. There was also a Latin translation of the Bishop's book by Rob. Grove, Bachelor of Divinity, and afterwards Bishop of Chichester, published under this title, *Papismus regiæ potestatis eversor, &c.* London 1681, in 8vo. II. *A Letter concerning Invocation of Saints and Adoration of the Cross, writ ten years since to John Evelyn of Deptford Esq;* London 1679 in 4to. It was published at the latter end of December 1678; upon which Mr. Wood observes (41) in his usual manner, that the Roman Catholicks at that time *being much troubled upon account of the Popish Plot, this Letter was then printed to make their trouble the greater.* III. *The Gun-powder Treason, with a Discourse of the manner of its Discovery, and a perfect relation of the Proceedings against those horrid Conspirators; wherein is contained their Examinations, Tryals, and Condemnations; likewise King James's Speech to both Houses of Parliament on that occasion. Now reprinted. A Preface touching that horrid Conspiracy by the right Reverend Father in God* Thomas *Lord Bishop of* Lincoln. *And by way of Appendix several Papers or Letters of Sir* Everard Digby, *chiefly relating to the Gun-powder Plot, never before printed.* London 1679 in 8vo. The substance of this *Preface* of the Bishop was afterwards published in his *Genuine Remains* (42). IV. Brutum Fulmen; *or the Bull of Pope Pius Sextus concerning the Damnation, Excommunication and Deposition of Queen Elizabeth; as also the Absolution of her Subjects from the Oath of Allegiance, with a peremptory injunction, upon pain of an Anathema never to obey any of her Laws and Commands; with some Observations and Animadversions upon it.* London 1681 in 4to. To this book, of which there are two editions, is annexed the Bull of Pope Paul III, containing the damnation, excommunication, &c. of King Henry VIII. V. *A Discourse concerning the Laws Ecclesiastical and Civil made against Heretics by Popes, Emperors and Kings, Provincial and General Councils, approved by the Church of Rome, shewing* 1. *What Protestant Subjects may expect to suffer under a Popish Prince acting according to those Laws:* 2. *That no oath or promise of such a Prince can give them any just security that he will not execute the Laws upon them.* London 1682 in 4to. There is a large Preface to it against persecuting and destroying Heretics, and some things said in favour of the Dissenters. There is no name set to this Discourse and Preface, but, as Mr. Wood informs us (43), when they were published in November 1681, the public and constant report was, that they were written by Bishop Barlow.

(40) Col. 877.

(41) Col. 878.

(42) Pag. 383, & seq.

(43) Col. 877.

[*K*] *He took all opportunities of expressing his affection towards him, and in particular was said to have written reasons for reading his Majesty's Declaration for Liberty of Conscience.*] We find among his *Genuine Remains* (44) a Letter giving an account of the Bishop and his Clergy's address to King James, wherein he tells his friend, that many of his Clergy had been sollicited by Letters from London not to subscribe the address; and that himself had two or three Letters sent him from unknown hands, without any name to them, warmly declaiming against that address and all subscriptions to it; but without mentioning any thing *like a reason to prove that such subscriptions are either unlawful, or (circumstances considered) imprudent, or inconvenient.* He observes likewise, that he had been lately informed by a person of quality from London, that the Bishop of Lincoln had indeed subscribed the address, but his Clergy refused it. *But the truth is*, says he, *that beside my self and three Arch-Deacons, above*

(44) Pag. 340, 341.

severe censure upon him for his compliance with regard to that King's Declaration; for he tells us (*m*), that if there were Nonconformists, who thought themselves obliged to express their gratitude for the King's Declaration by flattering addresses, there were likewise Bishops, *who with much less foundation prevailed with their Clergy to send Addresses of Thanks to the King, as for a signal favour to the Church of England*; of which number were *Crew* Bishop of *Durham*, Barlow of *Lincoln*, *Cartwright* of *Chester*, *Wood* of *Litchfield*, and *Watson* of *St. David's*. As for *Parker* Bishop of *Oxford*, he was not so successful, since he could find but one Clergyman in his whole Diocese, who would sign such an address. "It may easily be imagined, concludes Mr. Rapin, that had the King's "project succeeded, these Bishops would not have been the last to embrace the Popish "Religion." But the impartial Reader will expect some better grounds for such a reflection as this with respect to Bishop Barlow, when he considers the uncommon zeal and vigour, with which he appeared against Popery through his whole life. In 1682 he wrote a Letter in answer to some queries concerning Abbey-Lands, and concerning the opinions of Calvin and Luther relating to the punishment of Heretics [*L*]; and about the same time likewise he wrote another Letter upon the question, *Whether the Turk or Pope be the greater Antichrist* [*M*]? In 168¾ he wrote *a Breviate of the Case concerning setting up of images in the Parish-Church of Moulton in the Diocese and County of Lincoln* [*N*]. The

(*m*) Book 24. *ad ann.* 1687.

above six hundred of my Clergy have actually subscribed it, and their subscriptions are now in my hand. Sure I am, that his sacred Majesty's gracious promise to protect the Church of England, as by Law established, *is such (especially from a Roman Catholic Prince) as deserves the utmost of our thanks and gratitude, and most worthy to be acknowledged in a most humble and hearty address; and I fear that the obstinate denying to give him thanks in an address may give his Majesty some reason to say, he had little reason to protect them, who would not thank him for it. Sure I am, that it is a rule (and a rational one too) in your Canon-Law, that* (*a*) propter ingratudinem quod actum est revocatur.

(*a*) *Concilium Lateranum sub Alexandro* 3. *Anno* 1180, *de Pactionibus licitis & illicitis, Can.* 2.

[*L*] *About the opinions of Calvin and Luther relating to the punishment of Heretics.*] This Letter is published in his *Genuine Remains* (45). He observes there, that Calvin and the Senate of Geneva put Servetus an Arian to death; and that Beza (46) justifies the fact in his Tract, *De Hereticis a Magistratu puniendis*, where he cites *Melancthon*, *Bullinger*, *Capito*, and many more Protestants, who, according to him, were of the same opinion. But the Bishop observes, that the Church of England never put any Papists to death, though Heretics and Idolaters; and that this is publickly affirmed and justified in a book intitled, *Justitia Legum Anglicarum*. *And for my part*, says he, *I should not be willing, that any Heretick should be punished with death, unless he join with his heresy, blasphemy of God, or disloyalty against the King, or some sins against the Law of Nature evidently punishable by the Civil Magistrate, for the preservation of the public peace and safety of the Commonwealth.*

(45) Pag. 240, 241, 242.

(46) *Inter Opera Bezæ*, tom. 1. pag. 85. edit. Genevæ 1582.

[*M*] *He wrote another Letter upon the question, whether the Turk or Pope be the greater Antichrist.*] This Letter is dated from Bugden September the 9th 1682, and he observes in it, 1. That it is granted, that both the Pope and the Turk are Antichrists; for even in St. John's time there were (47), and ever since have been many Antichrists, that is, impious Heretics, and deserters of the truth of the Gospel (48); but amongst these many Antichrists there was ὁ Ἀντίχριστος, *one great Antichrist, who was to come*, as St. John there says. And of all the rest the *Turk* and *Pope* have the fairest pleas to be that Antichrist. But the Pope is certainly to be preferred, because he has some proprieties and characteristical marks of that Beast, which the Turk neither has nor can pretend to. As 1. the seat of Antichrist was to be the *great City, which reigned over the Kings of the earth* (49); which is unquestionably Rome, where the Pope has and does sit. 2. Another mark of the great Antichrist is, that *he exalts himself above all that is called God, &c.* (50), above all Kings and Emperors, who in Scripture are called *Gods*. This the Pope does, who takes upon him, (and his own Canonists and Council insist upon his right to do it) to depose Kings, and give away Kingdoms. But the Turk has never claimed such universal Monarchy. 3. It is a mark of *Antichrist*, or the *Whore of Babylon*, as St. John calls her (51), that *she was drunk with the blood of the Saints*. This does not agree to the Turk, who suffers Christians to live, if they do not rebel, and pay their taxes, and does not take away their lives, because they are not of his Religion. *But the Pope*, continues our author, *wherever he has power, suffers none to live, who will not submit to him, and embrace his Romish and idolatrous way of worship. The many thousands, (nay many hundred thousands,) who barely on this account have in these last six hundred years been murthered by the Pope and his party, either by open war, inquisitions, or other ways, are signal evidences of this truth; and among others, the French Massacre anno* 1572, *and our late Irish Massacre are sad and signal instances.*

(47) 1 John ii. 18.

(48) Ibid. ver. 19.

(49) Revelat. xvii. 18.

(50) 2 Thessal. ii. 3, 4.

(51) Revelat. xvii. 6.

[*N*] *In* 1683 *he wrote a Breviate of the case concerning setting up of images &c.*] We are told in the Preface to *Several miscellaneous and mighty Cases of Conscience &c.* that this was written upon occasion of his being cited before the Dean of the Arches for suffering such images to be defaced; and that upon reading the case, the whole persecution against him, which had been carried on with great violence, was immediately stopped. The case was as follows: Some of the parishioners of Moulton upon pretence of adorning and beautifying the church, washed out all the sentences of Scripture formerly written upon the walls in the church; and without the approbation or advice or general consent of the Parish set up the images of five or six of the Apostles; which giving offence, (for thirty seven of the parishioners protested against it under their hands,) they procured an order from the Deputy-Chancellor of Lincoln, to approve and confirm what they had done, and authorize them to set up more *effigies*, as they called them. By this order and authority they set up the images of *thirteen* Apostles, St. Paul being one. The image of Peter they placed above the Ten Commandments; and that of Paul above the King's Arms; and the Holy Ghost in the form of a Dove over them; and in contempt of the Translation of the Bible, approved and received in the Church of England, and in compliance with the erroneous and ridiculous Vulgar Latin (52), they painted Moses with horns. When they had done all this, they petitioned the Bishop for his approbation, who denied their petition, and for reasons given them told them, that *he never would nor* de jure *could approve what they had done without and against law.* At last the Chancellor nulls the order of his Deputy with regard to the setting up of those images; and those, who had done that work without the consent of the Parish, appealed to the Arches. The Bishop asserts (53), that *in the Reformation of our Church our supreme Powers, who regularly begun, and piously and happily finish'd it, expressly condemned not only the* worshipping of images, *but the* having them in our churches; which, he says, evidently appears in our authentic Records, publish'd by supreme authority for that purpose, to say nothing of our learned particular writers. He observes likewise (54) that the Church of England *absolutely condemns all images of the Trinity or any person of it* (55) *as absolutely unlawful, and expressly condemned in Scripture* (56); and that *no images of our blessed Saviour* (57), *or of any Saints and Martyrs are in the judgment of our Church to be tolerated in our temples, or any place of God's public worship. This*, says he, *I conceive,*

(52) Ex. xxxiv. 30, 35. In the Vulgate it is, *Facies Mosis erat cornuta*; whereas the most learned Translators among the Roman Catholicks, *Arias Montanus* and *Pagninus* are ashamed of it; and agreeably to our English Version, render it, *Resplendebat aut promicabat Facies Mosis.*

(53) Pag. 12, 13.

(54) Pag. 18, 19.

(55) See the 3d part of the Homily against the peril of Idolatry in the second book of *Homilies*, pag. 40.

(56) Deut. iv. 12, 15, 16, 23. Isa. xl. 18. Rom. i. 23, 25.

(57) See the last named *Homily*, as the most

The ſame year alſo he wrote the caſe of pardoning Murther [O]; and *a Letter for the putting in execution the Laws againſt Diſſenters, written in concurrence to that, which was drawn up by the Juſtices of the Peace of the County of Bedford*, dated the 14th of January 1684 [P]. Dr. Edmund Calamy in his *Memoirs of the Life of Mr. John Howe* (n) ſtyles this *a warm and angry Letter*, and tells us that Mr. Howe ſent his Lordſhip by the poſt a free letter in anſwer to it, a copy of which has been preſerved and printed in thoſe Memoirs. He was a zealous Calviniſt, and profoundly learned both in Divinity and the Civil and Canon Law. Arthur Earl of Angleſey in his *Memoirs* (o) gives him the following character. "I never think of this Biſhop and of his incomparable knowledge both in Theology and Church Hiſtory, and in the Eccleſiaſtical Law, without applying to him in my thoughts the character, that Cicero gives Craſſus; *Non unus è multis, ſed unus inter omnes propè ſingularis.*" We ſhall mention the reſt of his Works in the note [Q]. He died at Bugden in Huntingdonſhire in the 85th year of his age, October the 8th 1691, and

(n) Pag. 104. edit. London 1724, in 8vo.

(o) Pag. 20. edit. London 1693, in 8vo.

is the approved and received doctrine of the Church of England. And he concludes with remarking (58); that *they, who maintain and encourage this doctrine of ſetting up images in our churches, if they perſiſt in it, are by our known laws now in force, to be* excommunicated ipſo facto, *and if they be benificed Clergymen, to be deprived.*

(58) Pag. 24.

[O] *He wrote the Caſe of pardoning murder.*] It is upon this query, *Whether it be lawful for his ſacred Majeſty to reprieve or pardon a perſon convict and legally condemned for murder*; and dated from Bugden, January 20th, 1684. It is publiſh'd among his *Miſcellaneous and weighty Caſes of Conſcience*; in the Preface to which we are informed, that it was written upon occaſion of Mr. St. John's (now Lord Batterſea) being convicted for the unhappy death of Sir William Eaſtcourt Bart. He premiſes firſt ſome conſiderations to ſhew that the power of our Kings is *monarchical, ſupreme*, and *abſolute*, and then endeavours to demonſtrate that there is no divine law, which prohibits, and ſo makes it unlawful for ſupreme Princes to reprieve or pardon a perſon legally condemned for murder. We have likewiſe another little piece of his upon the ſame ſubject (59) intitled, *The Caſe of Murder, in anſwer to an objection made from Geneſ.* ix. 6. *that Kings have not power to pardon murder.*

(59) See *Several miſcellaneous and weighty Caſes of Conſcience*, &c. and *Genuine Remains*, pag. 374, &c. *ſeq.*

[P] *A Letter for the putting in execution the laws againſt Diſſenters, &c.*] We have the ſubſtance of this Letter publiſhed in his *Genuine Remains* (60); and Sir Peter Pett obſerves, that *all the compliance our moderate-ſpirited Prelate could be brought to in reference to that ſharp order of the Juſtices*, was only in this Letter to repreſent to his Clergy, that it is an evident truth, that all ſubjects both by the indiſpenſable Law of Nature and Scripture are obliged to obey the Power eſtabliſhed over them by God, and that moſt particularly in things more immediately relating to the great and important concerns of God's Glory and the Salvation of their own Souls. That the Liturgy had been for many years received by our Church with little or no oppoſition, and had been approv'd and commended by the moſt learned and pious Divines in foreign Proteſtant Churches, and ſo highly eſteemed by the renowned Proteſtant Martyrs in Queen Mary's reign, that one of their greateſt complaints was that they were deprived of the benefit of it. That the rejecting of it therefore, and the diſobeying the Laws, which enjoin it, makes our Diſſenters evidently ſchiſmatical, and renders it neceſſary that our good Laws ſhould be executed both for the preſervation of the public peace and unity, and the benefit even of the Diſſenters themſelves, ſince *afflictio dat intellectum*, and it was probable their ſufferings by the execution of our juſt Laws and the bleſſing of God upon them, might bring them to a ſenſe of their duty, and a deſire to perform it. For the attaining therefore of theſe good ends he requires all his Clergy within that County to publiſh the abovementioned Order the next Sunday after it ſhould be tendered to them, and diligently to advance the deſign of it, according to the ſeveral particular directions preſcribed in the Order; and both by preaching and catechiſing to inſtruct their people in their duty to God and their King.

(60) Pag. 641.

[Q] *We ſhall mention the reſt of his works in the note.*] I. Pietas in Patrem; *or a few Tears upon the lamentable death of his moſt dear and loving father Richard Barlow late of Langhill in Weſtmorland; who died Dec.* 29, 1636. Oxon. 1637. in two ſheets and an half in 4to. In this little piece are copies of verſes upon the ſame occaſion written by Matthew Wilkinſon, Tho. Tully, Lancelot Davies, and Tho. Smith, nephew to the deceaſed, and afterwards Biſhop of Carliſle. All theſe Gentlemen were then Members of Queen's College (61). II. *A Letter to Mr. John Tombes in defence of Anabaptiſm*; which Mr. Wood tells us (62) is inſerted in one of Mr. Tombe's books; but that he had not ſeen it, only quoted in *a Treatiſe of Baptiſm*, printed at London 1674 in 8vo, 2d edit. c. 7. p. 63. written by Henry Danvers. III. *A Treatiſe to prove that true Grace doth not lie ſo much in the degree as in the nature of it.* This is the ſixteenth and laſt chapter of a book intitled, *Sincerity and Hypocriſy, &c.* Oxford 1658 in 8vo, written by William Sheppard Eſq; Mr. Wood tells us (63), that this chapter is the beſt part of the whole book, having very good quotations in it, whereas the other chapters have few or none; and that it was anſwered by Mr. Richard Baxter in a book intitled, *Of Saving Faith; that it is not only gradually, but ſpecifically diſtinct from all common faith The Agreement of Richard Baxter with that very learned conſenting adverſary* (Thomas Barlow), *that hath maintained my aſſertion by a pretended confutation in the end of Serjeant Sheppard's Book of* Sincerity and Hypocriſy. London 1658 in 4to, and publiſh'd in the beginning of April that year. IV. *The Rights of the Biſhops to judge in capital caſes in Parliament cleared &c.* London 1680 in 8vo. This book, which ſhews the author to have had an extenſive knowledge of the common Law, was an anſwer to two books juſt then publiſhed; the firſt of which was intitled, *A Letter from a Gentleman to his Friend, ſhewing that the Biſhops are not to be Judges in Parliament in caſes capital*; printed in 8vo 1679, and written by Denzill Lord Holles; and the other intitled, *A Diſcourſe of the Peerage and Juriſdiction of the Lords ſpiritual in Parliament, &c.* There is no name prefixed to *The Rights of the Biſhops &c.* but it was generally aſcribed to Biſhop Barlow, tho' ſome were of opinion, that it was written by Mr. Tho. Turner of Grey's-Inn (64). V. *A few plain reaſons why a Proteſtant of the Church of England ſhould not turn Roman Catholic.* London 1688 in ſix ſheets and an half in 4to. Dr. John Battely the Licenſer would not ſuffer ſeveral ſheets to paſs, and therefore they were omitted (65). VI. *Several miſcellaneous and weighty Caſes of Conſcience, learnedly and judiciouſly reſolved by the Right Reverend Father in God, Dr. Thomas Barlow, late Lord Biſhop of Lincoln; viz.* 1. *Of Toleration of Proteſtant Diſſenters.* 2. *The King's Power to pardon murder.* 3. *Objections from* Gen. ix. 6. *anſwered.* 4. *Mr. Cottington's Caſe of Divorce; with the judgments of Dr. Alleſtry, Dr. Hall, Sir Richard Lloyd, Sir Richard Raines, Dr. Oldys, and the Doctors of Sorbonne, upon the ſame.* 5. *For Toleration of the Jews.* 6. *About ſetting up Images in Churches.* 7. An Dominium fundatur in Gratiâ? *With two pages omitted in the Engliſh* Machiavel, *and his Lordſhip's Cenſure thereupon.* London 1692 in 8vo. Mr. Wood tells us (66), that this book was publiſh'd by Sir Peter Pett without the knowledge of the Biſhop's domeſtic Chaplains, Mr. Will. Offley and Mr. Henry Brougham, who had all his original manuſcripts. But we are informed in the *Bookſeller's Preface to the Reader*, that all theſe Tracts were printed from MSS. written with the Biſhop's own hand, and that "tho' he gave them to his friends, "when firſt written, with his leave to print them, yet "they, fearing ſome of them might prejudice his further

(61) Wood, col. 877.

(62) Col. 879.

(63) Ibid.

(64) Wood, col. 878.

(65) Ibid.

(66) Ibid.

and was buried on the eleventh of the ſame month in the Chancel of the Church there, near the body of Dr. Sanderſon, formerly Biſhop of Lincoln, and according to his own deſire in the grave of Dr. William Barlow, who had likewiſe been Biſhop of that See; to whoſe memory as well as his own is erected a Monument with an Inſcription [*R*], which he wrote himſelf a few days before his death. He gave all ſuch books in his own Collection to the Bodleian Library, as were not there at the time of his death; and the remainder he beſtowed upon Queen's College, where the Society erected at a great expence a noble building to receive them in 1694. He left the Manuſcripts of his own compoſition to his two domeſtic Chaplains, Mr. William Offley, and Mr. Henry Brougham, Prebendaries of Lincoln, with a particular deſire, that they would not publiſh any of his Writings after his deceaſe (*p*).

(*p*) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 879.

"further promotion in the Church in thoſe days, "forbore the publication of them. Tho' we muſt do "his Lordſhip this right to own, that he had no re- "gard to that; ſo careleſs was he of the event of "any action he thought himſelf obliged to do *Religio- "nis cauſa*, that he has been often heard to ſay oc- "caſionally, as a kind of principle, viz. *He, who "thinks to ſave any thing by his Religion but his ſoul, "will be a loſer in the end.*" We may obſerve, that *the Caſe of the Lawfulneſs of Toleration of the Jews* was written at the requeſt of a Perſon of Quality, when the Jews made application to Cromwell for their re-admiſſion into England. He obſerves (67), that from what he had advanced, he believes *it may appear in part, that the Toleration of the Jews in this or any Chriſtian Common-weal is not in itſelf unlawful either* in ratione inhoneſti incommodi *or* ſcandali; *but that as* de facto *they have been ever tolerated in Chriſtian States, ſo* de jure *they may ſtill.* But he remarks (68), that with regard to the conditions of their admiſſion, and the reſtrictions and limitations to be put upon them, *a great deal of caution and Chriſtian prudence is to be uſed, leſt while we prevent their good, we do miſchief to our ſelves. For as to deny them all liberty and commerce with us may be an act of unchriſtian and indeed inhumane cruelty; ſo to give them too much, is an act of imprudence and folly.* His Letter upon *Machiavel* is dated from Oxford May 11th 1676, wherein he obſerves, that at the end of the Engliſh Tranſlation of Machiavel's Works, publiſh'd in 1675, there is a Letter of that author *in Vindication of his Writings*; in which Letter he endeavours, 1. To magnify *Democracy* as the beſt form of government, and to decry *Monarchy*: 2. To reflect upon the Clergy in general, and not thoſe of Rome only, as a ſort of people, *ſo far from holy, that they have nothing left of integrity or humanity.* "He tells us, continues the "Biſhop, *of an execrable ill quality inſeparable from "prieſt-craft, and the conjuration or ſpell of their new "invented ordination; and would have them rooted "out ſo, as not one Sibra were left, &c.* When it "was printed (by whoſe authority or advice I know "not) a conſiderable piece (one whole leaf in folio) "was left out, which I have in manuſcript, and do "here enclоſed ſend you a copy of it. The buſineſs "of that piece, which is left out, is to tell us, *what "is not rebellion* (ſo he pretends;) and if his princi- "ples be true, we have had no rebellion in England "theſe forty years." VII. *The genuine Remains of that learned Prelate Dr. Tho. Barlow late Biſhop of Lincoln, containing divers Diſcourſes theological, philoſophical, hiſtorical, &c. in Letters to ſeveral Perſons of Honour and Quality. To which is added the Reſolution of many abſtruſe points. As alſo Directions to a young Divine of his ſtudy for Divinity, and Choice of Books, &c. With great variety of other ſubjects. Publiſh'd from his Lordſhip's original papers.* London 1693 in 8vo. This book was publiſh'd by Sir Peter Pett; to which he has prefixed an *Epiſtle to the Reader*, wherein he gives an account of the *Directions to a young Divine &c.* and tells us, that with regard to the following works of the Biſhop in that volume, which are written by way of letter to ſeveral perſons, he had ſeen them written under his own hand, and that many of them were written to himſelf; *which containing*, ſays he, *various matters relating to Eccleſiaſtical Law and Hiſtory, and points of Divinity ſo inſtructful both to Divines, Lawyers, and Hiſtorians, (and wherein he had ſhown ſuch a compleat maſtery of all that know- ledge in himſelf, that he had recommended the purſuit of to young Divines,) I thought the publication thereof could not be omitted without injury to the world, and bereaving the memory of ſo learned a Prelate of ſuch laſting monuments of praiſe, as theſe his works have erected for it.* But the publication of this Collection was very ſeverely reflected upon by Mr. William Offley, M. A. one of the Biſhop's domeſtic Chaplains, who publiſh'd at Oxford 1699 in 4to that Prelate's Αυτοσχεδιασματα, *De Studio Theologiæ*, or *Directions for the choice in the ſtudy of Divinity*; in the Dedication of which to James Lord Biſhop of Lincoln the editor obſerves, that Biſhop Barlow's memory had "ſuffered extremely from "thoſe two (*a*) relick-mongers, who printed a (*b*) ſpu- "rious book under his Lordſhip's commanding name "and character. And whereas neither religion or "gratitude were of any force to reſtrain their endea- "vours from blaſting their great benefactor's reputa- "tion after his death by publiſhing of many ſmall "Tracts, it was thought neceſſary for Biſhop Barlow's "Legatees (to whoſe care his Lordſhip had commit- "ted all his own original Manuſcripts) to undeceive "the world, and put a ſtop to mercenary proceed- "ings by expoſing the defect of thoſe papers, which "were ſurreptitiouſly printed. And, I hope, thoſe "*Reflections*, which were drawn up and publiſh'd in "the year 1694 by my brother Chaplain (the late in- "genious Mr. Henry Brougham) and myſelf, have "been ſo far ſerviceable, as to do juſtice to our pious "Patron's memory, and to vindicate ourſelves from "all ſuſpicion of being any way concerned in ſo baſe "an action, as that of *ſelling to be printed* many pri- "vate papers with the ſpecious title of the *Genuine "Remains of that learned Prelate Dr. Thomas Barlow.*" Mr. Offley likewiſe in his *Preface* tells us, that if the method for *the ſtudy of Divinity had not been firſt print- ed, and prefix'd to many other papers, which ſwelled the book to ſuch a* * *price, that few cared to buy, it might the ſooner have paſſed without cenſure, conſidering the uſefulneſs of ſuch a Treatiſe, whereſoever it ſhould be kindly received. But being ſenſible withal that ſeveral copies of this method were diſperſed abroad, and that many things already falſly printed did prejudice the Church of England, and leſſen the great Author's reputation; I thought it my duty to publiſh theſe Directions from the original manuſcript, (which the late* mercenary Editors *never ſaw,) without the long train of letters, which are of no uſe, but to expoſe the* ſecrets *of a* private *and* haſty correſpondence.

(*a*) Sir P. P. S. W.

(*b*) *Genuine Remains, &c.*

* Six ſhillings and ſix pence.

[*R*] *With an inſcription.*] It is as follows: *Exuviæ Thomæ Barlow S. T. P. Collegii Reginenſis Oxon. Præpoſiti, Protobibliothecarii Bodleiani, Archidiaconi Oxonienſis, pro Dom. Margaretâ Comitiſſâ Richmondiæ S. Theol. Profeſſoris, Epiſcopi (licet indigni) Lincolnienſis, in ſpem lætæ Reſurrectionis. Epitaphium hoc moriens compoſuit, tumulum rev. Prædeceſſoris Gulielmi Barlow rabie fanaticâ ruiturum ſumptibus propriis extruxit. Obiit* 8 *die Octob.* 1691 *an. ætatis ſuæ* 85. i. e. "Here lie "the Remains of THOMAS BARLOW, Doctor of Di- "vinity, Provoſt of Queen's College Oxon, Chief- "Keeper of the Bodleian Library, Archdeacon of "Oxford, Lady Margaret's Profeſſor of Divinity, "and (tho' unworthy) Biſhop of Lincoln, in hope of "a joyful Reſurrection. He wrote this Epitaph as "he was dying, and at his own charge rebuilt the "monument of his right reverend Predeceſſor WIL- "LIAM BARLOW, which was almoſt demoliſhed by "fanatical rage. He died the 8th of October 1691, "in the 85th year of his age." T.

☞ BARNARD or BERNARD (JOHN) the ſon of a Gentleman of both the ſame names, was born at Caſtor in Lincolnſhire, and educated in the Grammar School there; from

from whence he was removed to Queen's College at Cambridge. He went from thence to Oxford in order to obtain preferment from the Visitors there, who were appointed by the Parliament, at the latter end of the year 1647 (a). He was created Bachelor of Arts April the 15th 1648 (b); and on the 29th of September following he was by the order of the Visitors made Fellow of Lincoln College (c). February the 20th 1650 he took his Degree of Master of Arts, and about that time became a Preacher in and near Oxford. He afterwards married the daughter of Dr. Peter Heylin, who then lived at Abingdon, and became Rector of Waddington near Lincoln, the perpetual Advowson of which he purchased, and held for some time, with the Sine Cure of Gedney in the same County. After the Restoration he conformed to the Church of England, and not only kept his Rectory, but was likewise made Prebendary of Asgarby in the Church of Lincoln (d). July the fifth 1669 he took the Degree of Bachelor and Dr. of Divinity (e). He wrote several books [A]. He died at Newark in his journey to the Spa on the 17th of August 1683, and was buried in the Chancel of his Church of Waddington (f).

(a) Wood, *Ath. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 736, 737. 2d edit. London 1721.

(b) Idem, ibid. and *Fasti Oxon.* col. 63.

(c) Idem, *Athen. Oxon. ubi supra.*

(d) Idem, ibid.

(e) Idem; *Fasti Oxon.* col. 175, 176.

(f) Idem, *Athen. Oxon. ubi supra.*

[A] *He wrote several books.*] I. Censura Cleri, *or against scandalous Ministers, not fit to be restored to the Churches livings, in point of prudence, piety, and fame.* London 1660, in three sheets in 4to. This was published in the latter end of the year 1659, or beginning of 1660, to prevent those persons from being restored to their Livings, who had been ejected by the opposite party in 1654, 1655, &c. His name is not prefixed to this pamphlet; and he did not care afterwards, when he saw the event of affairs, to be known to be the Author of it. II. Theologo-Historicus; *or the true Life of the most reverend Divine and excellent Historian* Peter Heylin, D. D. *Sub-Dean of Westminster.* London 1683 in 8vo. He published this, as he tells us, to correct the errors, supply the defects, and confute the calumnies of George Vernon M. A. Rector of Bourton on the Water in Glocestershire, who had before published a Life of the Doctor. III. *Answer to Mr. Baxter's false accusations of Dr. Heylin.* Printed with the *Theologo-Historicus, &c.* IV. *Catechism* for the use of his Parish. Mr. Wood tells us (1), that he was informed by his son, Mr. John Barnard, who was Fellow of Brazen-Nose College in Oxford, that our Author left a manuscript chiefly against Socinianism. T.

(1) *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 737.

BARNES (ROBERT (a) Professor of Divinity, and Chaplain to Henry VIII [A], King of England, was sent to Germany by his Master in the year 1535 [B]. He had a conference immediately with the Protestant Divines upon the affair of the Divorce; after that he had several audiences of the Elector of Saxony, and joined with the English Embassadors, who proposed to this Elector an alliance against the Pope, and desired that Henry VIII might be associated in the League of Smalcalde. He gave them hopes of a Reformation in England; but at the bottom, they had no other design than to obtain their Doctors approbation of the Divorce of their Master, and a political Alliance, in order to find the Emperor more employment, who threatned to revenge the injury upon King Henry for divorcing his aunt. They carried away with them the opinion of the Divines of Wittemberg; which was not entirely favourable to them [C]; but they suppressed

(a) See the remark [A].

[A] *He was Professor of Divinity and Chaplain to Henry VIII.*] He has these titles in the credential letters, which the King his master gave him to negotiate in Saxony; and these letters are dated from Windsor the 8th of July 1535 (1). His Christian name does not appear in those letters before that of Barnes. He gave himself in Germany the name of *Anthony Amarius*, though his true name was Robert Barnes. In the Dedication of his *Lives of the Popes* to the King of England in 1535, he signed *Robert Barnes, Doctor* (2). We find in a Preface of Luther's (3), that Barnes concealed his name and quality of Doctor at Wittemberg on account of the persecutors. Melancthon calls him *D. Antonius Doctor*, or *D. Antonius*, in a letter which he wrote to the King of England the 13th of March 1535 (4).

(1) *See* Seckendorf, *Hist. Lutheran.* lib. 3. p. 110. in the Addition.

(2) Idem, *in Supplementis ad Indicem* 1. num. 10.

(3) In that which he prefixed to the *Relation of the martyrdom of Barnes*, inserted in the 7th volume of his Works. *See* Seckendorf, lib. 3. p. 262.

(4) It is 26th of the 1st book.

[B] *He was sent into Germany by his master in the year* 1533.] The Preface, which I have quoted, informs me that Barnes lived at Wittemberg about the year 1530, and that he lodged likewise at Luther's house. *Quis ante annos hoc decus in Barnesio quæsivisset? & quod Christus ipse in eo nobiscum versatus esset? domesticum enim & commensalem habuimus* (5). Barnes might have lived in Germany till the year 1535, and there received credential Letters from Henry VIII to negotiate with the Elector of Saxony. According to that account it might justly be said in the *History of the Reformation of England*, that Fox *Bishop of Hereford being at Smalcalde* (in the year 1536) *sent him over to England, where he was received and kindly entertained by Cromwel, and well used by the King* (6). According to that account, I say, this representation would be exact; for all the reason that Mr. Seckendorf alledges to criticize upon it, is that Barnes came from England into Germany in the year 1535 with a commission from Henry VIII (7). So that he was returned to England before the Bishop of Hereford sent him thither: and consequently we must not consider the message which that Bishop charged him with, at his return to his own country. But can it be proved, that the credential Letters were not sent to Barnes into Germany, and that he was sent himself into that country? It is certain it can be proved; Seckendorf has proved it from the Records, which have furnished him with a prodigious number of good pieces. *Venerat Wittenbergam* (Reg. X. fol. 99. n. 42.) *verno hujus anni* 1535 *tempore, Doctor* EX BRITANNIA *ab Henrico Rege* MISSUS (8). Melancthon confirms the same thing in Greek; for he makes use of that Language to acquaint his good friend Camerarius, that there was an Envoy from England there, who spoke of nothing but the King's second marriage, and said that Henry VIII concerned himself but very little about the affairs of Religion. Ἦλθε δὲ πρὸς ἡμᾶς ξένος τις πρεσβεὺς ἐκ τῆς Βρεττανίας, μόνον διαλεγόμενος περὶ τοῦ δυτέρου γάμου τοῦ Βασιλέως, τῶν δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας πραγμάτων ἐ μέλει, ὡς φησι, τῷ Βασιλεῖ (9). But though I cannot place this upon the same foot that I have mentioned, yet it may be said that the relation in question is not faulty. The History says only, that the Bishop of Hereford sent Barnes to England; he does not deny that Barnes was returned thither before.

(5) Luther. *apud* Seckendorf, lib. 3. pag. 262.

(6) Burnet's *Hist. of the Reformation*, lib. 3. p. 295. edit. London 1679.

(7) Seckendorf, lib. 3. p. 262.

(8) Idem, ibid.

(9) Melancthon, Lett. 170. lib. 4. dated the 11th of March 1535.

[C] *He and his Collegues . . . . carried away with them the opinion of the Divines of Wittemberg, which was not favourable to them.*] Dr. Burnet has given an exact account of the particulars of it. *They also thought*, says he, *the Laws in Leviticus were not moral . . . . yet after much disputing they were induced to change their minds, but could not be brought to think that a marriage once made might be annulled, and therefore demurred upon that* (10). He relates this under the year 1530. He does not do that, because he was ignorant that this opinion was given in the year 1536; but only without doubt in order to shew his readers all at once the different sentiments of the Divines upon

(10) Burnet, *Hist. of the Reformation*, book 2. pag. 94. *ad ann.* 1530.

preſſed the concluſion, when they ſhewed it to the King. It was in this concluſion that there was ſomething, which could not but diſpleaſe that Prince (*b*). Barnes's conduct pleaſed the King extremely; which induced him to employ him in carrying on a correſpondence with the Princes of Germany. *He was ſent ſeveral times to thoſe Courts; and among other Negotiations, he was the firſt, who was employed in the project of the Marriage with Anne of Cleves* [*D*]. He was an hearty Lutheran, which de did not conceal in his Sermons; for in Lent in the year 1540 he confuted the Sermon, which Biſhop Gardiner had preached againſt Luther's doctrine. He took the ſame text as Gardiner had done, and taught a doctrine abſolutely contrary to that, which this Prelate had laid down concerning Juſtification; nay he even attacked the Biſhop perſonally in an indecent manner, and jeſted upon the name of Gardiner. Gardiner's friends complained to the King of this, who ordered Barnes to give him ſatisfaction, to ſign certain articles, and to make a formal recantation in the pulpit. All this was done, but in ſuch a manner, that there was a complaint, that in one part of his Sermon he very ſubtilly maintained what he had retracted in the other. Upon theſe complaints he was ſent to the Tower by the King's command, which he never came out of but to ſuffer death in the midſt of the flames [*E*]; for he was condemned as an Heretic by the Parliament, without being permitted to make his defence. He declared his belief a little before his death, he rejected Juſtification by Works, Invocation of Saints, &c. and deſired that the King would undertake a thorough Reformation (*d*). His freedom of ſpeech had for a long time before expoſed him to trouble.

(*b*) Seckendorf, *Hiſt. Lutheran.* lib. 3. pag. 110, *& ſeq.*

(*d*) Taken from the *Hiſtory of the Reformation of England*, written by Dr. Burnet (now Biſhop of Salisbury) B. 3.

While Henry VIII's divorce. Mr. Seckendorf believed ſo; for when he has remarked that the opinion of the Divines of Wittemberg is to be found in the *Hiſtory of the Reformation of England* in the volumes of records and original pieces, amongſt thoſe, which relate to the year 1530, he adds this parentheſis (*forte per occaſionem*); that is, *perhaps occaſionally*. *Annus & Dies reſponſo hinc non eſt aſcriptus, & Burnetus illud inter Acta anni* 1530 (*forte per occaſionem*) *retulit* (11) lib. 2. fol. 94. i. e. "The date of the day and "year is not fixed to this anſwer; and Burnet, B. 2. "fol. 94. places it (*perhaps occaſionally*) among the "Tranſactions of the year 1530." The Biſhop of Meaux did not know that the decree of Wittemberg is of the year 1536. He mentions only with regard to that year the opinion of Melancthon, and does not criticize upon Dr. Burnet for placing the anſwer of the Divines of Wittemberg under the year 1530 (12). Mr. Seckendorf obſerves that the copy of this anſwer, which he had read among the Records of Weimar, is longer than that which is inſerted among Dr. Burnet's original pieces. Here is what Henry VIII's Embaſſadors retrench'd in it: *Etſi conſentiamus cum Dominis Legatis ſervandam eſſe legem de uxore fratris non ducendâ, manſit tamen inter nos controverſum, quod legati ſtatuunt diſpenſationi locum non eſſe, nos verò putamus eſſe illi locum. Neque enim ſtrictius obligare nos lex poteſt quam Judæos: ſi autem lex diſpenſationem admiſit, vinculum matrimonii utique fortius eſt quam lex illa altera de uxore fratris.* That is, "Though we agree "with the Embaſſadors that the Law of not marrying a brother's wife is to be obſerved; yet ſtill it "continued diſputed among us, becauſe the Embaſſadors "are of opinion that there is no room for a diſpenſation; but we think there is. For the Law cannot "bind us more ſtrictly than the Jews; but if the "Law admitted a diſpenſation, the bond of marriage "is much ſtronger than the other Law of not marrying a brother's wife." Mr. Seckendorf conjectures that the Embaſſadors ſuppreſſed this paſſage, that they might deprive their maſter of all hopes, that the Divines of Wittemberg would at laſt approve his ſecond marriage.

(11) Seckendorf, lib. 3. pag. 112.

(12) See his *Hiſtoire des Variations*, lib. 7. num. 58.

This thought is very reaſonable; and in general theſe Doctors might ſuppoſe very juſtly that there are ſome things which ought not to be done, and yet ought to be maintained when once they are done; but I own I cannot well comprehend how the beginning and end of their opinion can be reconciled together. They acknowledge on one hand, that the ordinances of the Levitical Law are divine, natural, and moral; that no Law can be eſtabliſhed contrary to theſe; and that the whole Church has always determined that a marriage with a brother's widow is inceſtuous. *Hoc manifeſtum eſt, & negare nemo poteſt, quod lex tradita Levit. xviii. 20. prohibet ducere fratris uxorem, &c. ſed divina, naturalis, & moralis lex eſt intelligenda tam de vivi quam de mortui fratris uxore, & quod contra hanc legem nulla contraria lex fieri aut conſtitui poſſit* (13); and they maintain on the other hand, that this Levitical Law is capable of a diſpenſation. *Legati ſtatuunt diſpenſationi locum non eſſe, nos verò putamus eſſe illi locum.* If it may admit of a diſpenſation, Henry VIII ought to have conſidered himſelf as lawfully married to Catherine of Arragon. If it may not admit of one, if it be a divine, natural, and moral Law, and ſuch in ſhort as cannot allow of any contrary conſtitution, and laſtly, if the Church has always determined that a marriage not conformable to this Law is inceſtuous, Henry VIII ought not to have conſidered his commerce with Catherine of Arragon any otherwiſe than as inceſtuous, and therefore he ought to have renounced it immediately; the Divines of Wittemberg ſhould not have heſitated the leaſt, whether they ſhould approve or diſapprove of his divorce. The maxim, *that there are things, which ought not to be done; but yet when they are once done, ought not to be undone*, could not poſſibly be admitted here, ſince the debate was concerning the continuation of an inceſtuous commerce. Perſons, who are fond of ſlander, and engage in recrimination, will not readily acquieſce in what Dr. Burnet obſerves, that if in the conduct of the Saxon Divines there does not appear the cunning, the policy, and the diſſimulation of the Court of Rome, yet there appears in it at leaſt the candour, the ſincerity, and good conſcience of the Apoſtolic times (14). For my own part, I ſhould chooſe rather to ſay, that they did not argue conſequentially, than pretend that they would have the pleaſure of reflecting upon the Pope's diſpenſation, and at the ſame time were prudent enough to have a regard for Charles V, and the intereſts of the Princeſs Mary his couſin; but enemies, who love to give a bad turn to every thing, might eaſily, by way of repriſal, paſs ſuch a malicious judgment upon their conduct (15).

(14) Burnet's *Hiſt. of the Reformation*, lib. 2.

(15) *See* Monſ. de Meaux, *Hiſt. des Variat.* lib. 7. num. 57.

WHETHER the Divines of Wittemberg have reaſoned conſequentially.

(13) *Apud* Seckendorf, p. 112. *and* Burnet *in Documentis*, Part 1 lib 2. num. 35.

[*D*] *He was employed in the project of the marriage with Anne of Cleves.*] This was a misfortune to Barnes; for the King's marriage with the Lady *Anne of Cleves giving him ſo little ſatisfaction, all who were the main promoters of it fell in diſgrace upon it.* The Biſhop of Saliſbury aſſures us of this (16). Luther has touched upon another circumſtance; he ſays that the true cauſe of Henry VIII's hatred to Robert Barnes was the freedom with which that Doctor adviſed him againſt repudiating Anne of Cleves (17). Mr. Seckendorf pretends that Dr. Burnet obſerves the ſame thing (18); I doubt that very much; for I cannot meet with that fact in his *Hiſtory of the Reformation of England*.

(16) *Hiſt. of the Reformat.* B. 3. pag. 295. *ad ann.* 1540.

(17) *In præfat. Relation. Martyrii Barneſii, apud* Seckendorf, lib. 3. p. 262. num. 25.

(18) Seckendorf, ibid.

[*E*] *He was ſent to the Tower . . . . which he never came out of but to ſuffer death in the midſt of the flames.*] The relation of his martyrdom was ſent from England into Germany: Mr. Seckendorf found it in the Archives of Weimar, tranſlated into High-Dutch (19). Luther publiſhed it (20), and added a preface to it, in which he commends among other things the modeſty of Barnes. *He was not ignorant*, ſays he, *of the defects of Henry VIII, and he did not diſſemble them, when he was with his friends; but upon all other occaſions he never ſpoke of that Prince but in terms of reſpect and honour* (21).

(19) Idem, ibid.

(20) It is inſerted in the 3d tome of his Works, edit. of Altorf. fol. 422. Seckendorf lib. 3. p. 262. num. 25.

(21) Ibid. num. 25.

While Wolſey was in favour, he preached ſo vehemently at Cambridge againſt the luxury of Prelates, that every body ſaw immediately, that he deſigned it againſt the Cardinal. *Upon that account he was carried to London, where by the ſollicitations of Gardiner and Fox . . . . he was reſcued from that proſecution, having agreed to abjure ſome Articles which were propoſed to him.* " Afterwards he was again committed to priſon upon ſome new " accuſations; and then it was generally believed that he would be burnt, but he eſcaped, " and went over into Germany, where he applied himſelf entirely" to the ſtudy of the Bible and Divinity: in which he made ſo great a progreſs, that he was very much eſteemed by the Doctors and Princes. When the King of Denmark ſent Embaſſadors to England, he deſired Barnes to accompany them (*e*), or even to be one of them (*f*). The Biſhop of Saliſbury, whom I quote in the margin, may be eaſily vindicated in a point, which has been criticiſed upon in him (*g*). We have at leaſt two books written by Barnes [*F*].

(*e*) Ibid.
(*f*) Fox relates this laſt opinion, which ſeems doubtful to Dr. Burnet, ibid.
(*g*) See the remark [*B*].

[*F*] *We have at leaſt two books written by Barnes.*] One contains *the Articles of his Faith*, the other is *the Hiſtory of the Popes*. The former was printed in Latin with a Preface by Pomeranus, at whoſe houſe Barnes lodged at that time. It was printed in High-Dutch at Nuremberg in the year 1531. It contains nineteen Theſes according to Luther's principles, and ſeveral proofs from Scripture and the Fathers. The other book was printed at Wittemberg in the year 1536 with a Preface by Luther: it contains the Lives of the Popes, from St. Peter to Alexander III. It is dedicated to the King of England: the author wrote the Epiſtle Dedicatory the 10th of September 1535. He treats the Popes with great ſeverity; he promiſed to continue the Hiſtory of them down to his own time (22). Mr. Seckendorf thinks this book would deſerve a ſecond edition (23), and he has inſerted the Preface in his Indexes, becauſe he ſays it is very difficult to be found, and may be conſidered as a loſt piece. *Quia liber ipſe rariſſimè invenitur, & pro deperdito haberi poteſt* (24). But it is very certain that there was a new edition of it publiſh'd at Leyden in the year 1615, which contains likewiſe the Lives of the Popes by John Bale, and which is not yet very ſcarce.

(22) *Ex Scholiis ſive Supplementis Seckendorfii ad Indicem* 1.
(23) *Recudi meretur.* ibid.
(24) Idem *in Indice* 3. *ad ann.* 1536.

BARNES (JOHN) in Latin *Barneſius*, an Engliſh Benedictin Monk, was one of thoſe Roman Catholics, who, after the example of Eraſmus, Caſſander, Wicelius, Modrevius, Father Paul, and a great many others, have made a profeſſion all their life of the Catholic Religion, though they obſerved in it an infinite number of abuſes, which they paſſionately wiſhed might be reformed. He wrote a book againſt *Mental Reſervations*, which did not at all pleaſe the Jeſuits [*A*], though he dedicated it to Pope Urban VIII. His *Catholico-Romanus pacificus* is full of ſuch things, as cannot but be diſreliſhed by thoſe, who are called good Papiſts [*B*]. He was deſirous without doubt to bring the two Communions as near each other as poſſibly he could. The Court of Rome was extremely diſpleaſed with him upon that account. This unhappy man, whoſe morals were unexceptionable (*a*), was at Paris, when he was ſeized [*C*], and ſtript of the Habit of his Order, and carried away into Flanders bound on horſeback. After this he was ſent to Rome, where he continued in the priſon of the Inquiſition till he was removed into that of the Lunatics.

(*a*) See the remark [*B*].

[*A*] *He wrote a book againſt* Mental Reſervations, *which did not at all pleaſe the Jeſuits.*] It was printed at Paris in the year 1625 under the title of *Diſſertatio contra Æquivocationes*: it was publiſhed in French the ſame year and at the ſame place under the title of *Traité & Diſpute contre les Equivoques*. The approbation of the Faculty of Divinity acquaints us, that John Barnes was *Doctor of Arts in ſacred Theology, and Profeſſor of the Engliſh Miſſion, and firſt Aſſiſtant for the Congregation of Spain*; and it is dated the 13th of July 1624. The author's Dedication is dated from Paris the 13th of January 1625. Father Theophilus Raynaud is therefore miſtaken, when he tells us that Barnes was carried to Rome, and put into priſon under the Pontificate of Paul V. I ſhall quote his own words, becauſe they inform us of ſomething relating to this poor Benedictin. *Joannes Barneſius, Jeſuitis admodum infenſus, ob nonnullas ſuſpiciones de compertâ illis vitâ ſuâ, eo loco fuit apud Paulum V, ut eum tanquam novæ fidei fabrum per Albertum Auſtriacum è Galliâ abductum, & è Belgio Romam avectum judicaverit carcere dignum, donec emoto cerebro inter fatuos pone S. Pauli minoris ædem ſacram fatuari deſiit cum aliorum periculo* (1). i. e. " John Barnes, a great enemy to " the Jeſuits on account of ſome ſuſpicions, which he " had of their being acquainted with his manner of " life, was conveyed from France into the Low- " Countries by order of Archduke Albert of Auſtria, " as an heretic, and carried thence to Rome, where " he was condemned by Pope Paul V to impriſon- " ment, till having loſt his ſenſes, he was removed to " the hoſpital of Lunatics behind the Church of St. " Paul the Leſs, where he was prevented from doing " any more miſchief in his madneſs." This paſſage has been quoted by Edward Brown in page 826 of his Appendix to the *Faſciculus rerum expetendarum*, printed at London in 1690. See the following remark. We are informed by the *French Mercury* (2), that this honeſt Benedictin believed, *that the Jeſuits had a mortal hatred towards him after the printing of his book againſt Equivocations, which Dr. Gamaches, (who was eſteemed one of the greateſt Divines of his age,) would not approve, though he was required to do it*; and *that he wrote this book while he was Confeſſor to the Convent of Chelles* (3).

(1) Theophil. Rayn. *in Theologiâ antiquâ de veri Martyrii adequatè ſumpti notione.* This book was printed at Lyons in 1656 under the name of *Leodegarius Quintinus.* The paſſage which I quote is in page 174 of his *Apopompæus.*

(2) Tom. 12. pag. 752.

(3) *Mercure François*, tom. 12. pag. 751.

[*B*] *His* Catholico-Romanus Pacificus *is full of ſuch things, as cannot but be diſreliſhed by . . . . good Papiſts.*] It was printed at London in 1690, in the Appendix to the *Faſciculus rerum expetendarum*. The author of the *Appendix* informs us, that he had three manuſcript copies of this work of Barnes; and he quotes theſe words of John Baſier, Profeſſor of Divinity. *Bonus ille Irenæus* (4), *tametſi vitæ inculpatæ & famæ integræ fuit, mediâ Lutetiâ correptus, ſuo habitu exutus, & quadrupedis inſtar barbarum in modum alligatus ad equum, & ita vehementiſſimè avectus primò in Flandriam, deinde Romam, ibi in Inquiſitionis barathrum, deinde in maniacorum ergaſtulum erat detruſus* (5). i. e. " This honeſt Pacificator in Religion, tho' a man of " irreproachable morals, was ſeized in the midſt of " Paris, ſtript of his habit, and bound like a beaſt in " a barbarous manner upon an horſe, and conveyed " in that violent manner firſt into Flanders, and after- " wards to Rome, where he was caſt into the Inquiſiti- " on, and at laſt removed into the Hoſpital of Lunatics."

(4) That is to ſay *Barnes the Benedictin.*

(5) Brown *in Appendic. Faſciculi rerum expetendar.* He quotes John Baſier *in Diatribâ de antiquæ Eccleſiæ Britannicæ Libertate*, printed at Bruges in the year 1656.

[*C*] *He was at Paris when he was ſeized.*] He would have been forced away the day he was taken, if the Captain of the Watch had been as impatient as the Father Procurator of the Benedictines at Doway. But this impatience of his was obliged to wait till the next day. Then Father Barnes was carried in a coach to Vilette, where two Benedictines waited to go along with him, and with the Guards, who had orders to convey him to Cambray. He was tied upon the horſe, and delivered to the Governor of Cambray, who had him convey'd to the Caſtle of Waerden (6). Father Theophilus Raynaud was miſtaken in mentioning the orders of Albert of Auſtria; this Arch-Duke was dead long before Barnes was ſeized. I have quoted that Jeſuit's words in the firſt remark.

(6) *Mercure François*, tom. 12. pag. 753.

Lunatics (*b*). In this laſt place he ended his days, worthy without doubt of a better fate. He was a profeſſed Monk of the Convent of Benedictins at Doway, and had been Superior of it (*c*); but not being able to agree with the Monks of his Order, he had retired to France, and did not obey the ſummons of the Benedictins to return to Doway, or to retire into ſome other of their Convents. At Paris he lodged near the College of Navarre, then in the College of Burgundy, and at laſt in the Prince of Portugal's Houſe, where the Captain of the Guard ſeized him the fifth of December 1626. He was writing an *Anſwer* to a book intitled *Apoſtolatus Benedictinorum in Angliâ*, in which he would have inſerted his own private ſentiments concerning the diſcipline of the Church (*d*). Father Theophilus Raynaud, diſguiſed under a fictitious name, wrote againſt his Treatiſe of Equivocations [*D*].

(*b*) See the *Mercure François*, tom. 14. pag. 336.

(*c*) Ibid. tom. 12. pag. 752.

(*d*) Ibid.

The reader perhaps will be pleaſed to ſee here the reaſon why Barnes was an enemy to the Jeſuits [*E*]; I mean the reaſon which they have reported.

[*D*] *Father Theophilus Raynaud, diſguiſed under a fictitious name, wrote againſt his Treatiſe of Equivocation.*] I mean a book intitled, *Splendor veritatis moralis; ſeu de licito uſu Æquivocationis, pro Leonardo Leſſio, adverſus Joannem Barneſium, Anglum Monachum.* It was printed at Lyons in 1627 in 8vo. The author aſſumed the name of *Stephanus Emonerius*. I have a ſtronger proof of this, than that which Mr. Placcius has formed by joining two paſſages of Father Alegambe (7), in one of which it is ſaid that Theophilus Raynaud wrote *ſub nomine alieno* the Treatiſe, which I have given the title above (8); and in the other, that he diſguiſed himſelf under the name of *S. Emonerius* (9). The proof I inſiſt upon is this. Father Abram tells us in his Treatiſe *of Lying* (10), that Theophilus Raynaud owned for one of his works the book of Emonerius, intitled *Splendor Veritatis moralis*, and that it was eaſy to diſcover him in that piece. *Miror te hunc pro Theophili partu agnoſcere*; i. e. "I wonder "you ſhould take this of one of Father Theophilus's "productions:" thus ſpeaks one of Father Abram's Interlocuters: the other replies, *Quid ne verò agnoſcam, cum illum in ſuis moralibus ſuum eſſe fateatur* (11)? *Quem ſi abdicaret, nullo tamen negotio patrem vel ex ipſâ filii facie cæteriſque corporis lineamentis agnoſcere poſſemus,*

Sic oculus, ſic ille manus, ſic ora ferebat.

That is,

"Why ſhould I not take it for his performance, ſince "he owns it to be ſo in his Moral Works? And tho' "he had diſowned it, yet we may eaſily diſcover the "true father by the reſemblance, which every part "of it bears to him:

"The eyes, the hands, and ev'ry feature like."

Here is a paſſage of Theophilus Raynaud, which informs us, that he acknowledged for his work the Confutation of Barnes, and that this Benedictin was living in the year 1650. *Dixi ego ſanè in præfatione operis de Æquivocatione, adverſus Cæitani germanum, bipedum omnium effrontiſſimum, Joannem Barneſium Anglium, qui vicenario carcere, in quem curante ſummo Pontifice recluſus eſt, necdum deterſit multiplicis adverſus Deum & Religionem Catholicam, ac S. Benedicti familiam malignitatis rubiginem . . . . Societatem Jeſu, &c.* (12). i. e. "In the Preface to my book concern- "ing *Equivocation*, againſt Caetan's true brother, the "moſt impudent of mankind, John Barnes, an En- "gliſhman, who tho' he has been confined twenty "years in priſon, into which he was caſt by the Pope, "has not yet diveſted himſelf of his inveterate ma- "lice againſt God himſelf, the Catholic Religion, "and the Benedictine Order. . . . I have ſaid, that "the Jeſuits, &c."

(7) Placcius *de Pſeudon.* pag. 189.

(8) Alegambe, *Bibliotb. Soc. Jeſu*, pag. 432.

(9) Idem, pag. 452.

(10) Printed with his *Pharus Veteris Teſtamenti*, at Paris, in 1648 in folio.

(11) He owns the ſame thing in his *Syntagma de Libris propriis*. See the following remark.

(12) Theoph. Raynaud. *Hoplotb.* Sect. 2. Serm. 2. cap. 12. pag. 256. edit. Lugd. *an.* 1650.

[*E*] *The reaſon, why he was an enemy to the Jeſuits.*] Upon his return from Spain to the Low-Countries, he was preſent at one of their public diſputes, in which the Reſpondent propoſed this quodlibetal Theſis, *An Joannes in Hiſpaniâ infamis, poſſit hic in Belgio abſque peccato infamari?* i. e. "Whether John, "being infamous in Spain, might be innocently de- "famed in the Netherlands?" Such caſes of conſcience have been examined by Soto, Molina, and ſeveral other writers; but after a general manner, though with the addition of ſeveral circumſtances. But they did not keep to ſuch general terms in the diſpute, at which John Barnes was preſent; for the queſtion was reduced to ſuch preciſe terms, by pointing out in a very particular manner the time and place, that he thought that himſelf was perſonally intended, and he would never be convinced of the contrary, though they proteſted to him in a very humble manner that they had no deſign to point him out. It is Theophilus Raynaud who relates this, when he mentions the Anſwer, which he wrote againſt Barnes's work. *Ad ſingularia locorum ac temporum adjuncta, illis in oris perfamiliaria, difficultas reſtricta eſt. . . . . Clara locorum deſignatione petitum ſe ratus Barneſius, bellum indixit inconciliabile Societatis Jeſu Doctoribus; nec ſe ullis unquam vel conteſtationibus, vel mollibus ac propè ſupplicibus verbis flecti paſſus eſt, ut nihil minus quam de eo notando cogitatum eſſe, in eo Theſium programmate ac proloquio perſuaderetur* (13). i. e. "The difficulty "was reſtrained to the particular circumſtances of time "and place, which are very common in theſe parts. "..... Barnes thinking himſelf pointed at by this "plain deſignation of the place, proclaimed an irrecon- "cileable hatred againſt the Jeſuit Doctors, and would "never be the leaſt prevailed upon by any aſſurances "given in the moſt ſubmiſſive terms, to believe that "he was not at all intended in that *Programma* to the "Theſes." He does not forget to mention that Barnes was condemned to perpetual impriſonment; and that having loſt his ſenſes he was removed to the Hoſpital of Lunatics. *Barneſium ob periculoſas novitates . . . . . carceri eſſe mancipatum, poſtea autem emotâ mente in fatuorum ergaſtulo Tranſtiberino* (vulgo gli Pazzarelli) *concluſus eſt; ubi anno* 1643 *erat ſuperſtes* (14). i. e. "Barnes on account of his dangerous "innovations . . . . . was caſt into priſon; and after- "wards falling mad was ſhut up in the Hoſpital of "Lunatics beyond the Tyber (commonly called *gli* "*Pazzarelli*), where he was ſtill living in the year "1643."

(13) Theoph. Raynaudus, *in Syntagm. de Libris propriis*, pag. 22. col. 2. *Apopompæi.*

(14) Idem, ibid. pag. 23. col. 1.

☞BARNES (JOSHUA) Profeſſor of the Greek Language at Cambridge in the beginning of the eighteenth Century, was born at London January the 10th 1654 of a Tradeſman of that City. He was educated at Chriſt's Hoſpital there, from whence he was ſent to the Univerſity of Cambridge, and admitted a Servitor in Emanuel College Dec. the 11th 1671, and elected a Fellow of that College June the 7th 1678 (*a*). He was choſen the Queen's Greek Profeſſor in 1695. He diſtinguiſhed himſelf very early by his knowledge of the Greek, which he wrote and ſpoke with the utmoſt facility; and he wrote, even before he went to the Univerſity, ſeveral Poems in Latin and Engliſh [*A*], which

(*a*) Regiſter of Emanuel College in Cambridge.

[*A*] *Several Poems in Latin and Engliſh.*] We ſhall extract our account of them from the catalogue of his works ſubjoined to the *Prolegomena* of his edition of *Anacreon*. I. *Sacred Poems* in five books, viz. 1. *Κοσμοποιία* or the *Creation of the World*. 2. *The Fall of Adam* and *the Redemption by Chriſt*. 3. *An Hymn to the Holy Trinity, &c.* 4. *A paſtoral Eclogue upon the Reſtoration of King Charles II.* *An Eſſay upon the Royal Exchange.*

which he mentions in the catalogue of Works, which he had either publiſhed or deſigned to publiſh, ſubjoined to the firſt edition of his *Anacreon* at Cambridge 1705; which catalogue is omitted in the 2d edition of that Poet printed after his death in 1721, tho' it is mentioned in the *Contents* of the volume and in the *Prolegomena* (*b*). In the year 1675 he publiſhed at London a little piece intitled *Gerania, or a new Diſcovery of a little ſort of people called Pygmies*; and in 1679 at London in 8vo a poetical paraphraſe in Greek upon the Hiſtory of *Eſther* [*B*]. He afterwards applied himſelf to the ſtudy of Engliſh Hiſtory,

(*b*) Pag. 104.

Exchange. 5. *Panegyris, or the Muſes, Epigrams, &c.* All theſe pieces are in Engliſh, tho' the Dedication is in Latin, Anno 1669. II. *The Life of Oliver Cromwell the Tyrant*; an Engliſh Poem, 1670. III. Several dramatical pieces, the titles of which are *Xerxes, Pythias and Damon, Holofernes, &c.* part in Engliſh, and part in Latin, the latter of which he wrote in conjunction with others, and the former by himſelf; beſides ſeveral Tragedies of Seneca tranſlated into Engliſh. IV. Upon the Fire of London and the Plague, a Latin Poem in Heroic Verſe. V. A Latin Elegy upon the Beheading of St. John the Baptiſt.

[*B*] *A poetical Paraphraſe in Greek upon the Hiſtory of Eſther.*] It is intitled, Ἀνδρωνίτης, *ſeu Eſtheræ Hiſtoria, poeticâ paraphraſi, idque Græco Carmine, cui Verſio Latina opponitur, exornata: una cum Scholiis ſeu Annotationibus Græcis; in quibus (ad ſacri Textus dilucidationem) præter alia non pauca, Gentium Orientalium Antiquitates, Moreſque recondituriores proferuntur. Additur Parodia Homerica de eadem hac Hiſtoria. Acceſſit Index Rerum & Verborum copioſiſſimus*, i. e. "A Mirrour for Courtiers, or a poetical Paraphraſe in "Greek upon the Hiſtory of Eſther, with a Latin "Verſion oppoſite to it, and Greek *Scholia* or An"notations, in which (in order to give light to the "ſacred Text,) beſides a great number of other par"ticulars, the Antiquities and more remote Cuſtoms "of the Eaſtern Nations are explained. To which is "ſubjoined an Homerical Parody upon the ſame Hi"ſtory, with a copious Index of the Things and "Words contained in this volume." It was printed at his own charge, as appears by the title-page; and the *Imprimatur* is dated July 3d, 1676. The Dedication, which is dated Octob. 20th 1678, is addreſſed to Dr. John Dolben, then Biſhop of Rocheſter, and Dean of Weſtminſter, afterwards Archbiſhop of York, who, as Mr. Barnes obſerves, contributed a conſiderable part of the expence of the edition. *Præſertim cum & ipſe partem ſumptûs bene magnam in ejus editionem contuliſti.* Our author remarks likewiſe in this Dedication, that his ſubject was new and unattempted before, or at leaſt attempted without any great ſucceſs, and that the ſtyle, if not abſolutely Homeric, yet approached as near the majeſty of that great Poet, as he could poſſibly raiſe it. That the work itſelf was adorned with the embelliſhments of Poetry as far as was conſiſtent with a ſtrict regard to the truth of the Hiſtory; and that to all this he had added that diſtinguiſhing excellence of Callimachus, brevity. *Materia eſt prorſus nova, hoc eſt, à nemine hactenus, quod ſciam, aut ſaltem non ſupra æmulationem, libata. Stylus, ſi non omnino Homericus, ut ad Homerici tamen Carminis majeſtatem quam proximè accederet, diligenter curavi. Opus ita poeticis blandimentis refertum, ut divinæ veritati maximum & ſupremum locum relinquat. Quibus & Callimacheiam illam virtutem adjicere audebo, Brevitatem.* In his Preface he tells us (1), that he had finiſh'd this book about five years before; but had ſuſpended the publication of it, by the advice of his friends, in order to poliſh it at his leiſure. He obſerves likewiſe, that he had then by him ſix other books in Greek verſe, tho' not all of them in the ſame kind of meaſure; and that four of them were rendered into Latin verſe of the ſame kind. Among other Poems upon ſubjects of leſs importance, tho' moſt of them drawn from ſacred Hiſtory, he had deſigned an heroic Poem in twelve books concerning the Patriarch Joſeph, tho' he had finiſh'd but one of thoſe books; to which he had added by way of ſpecimen an heroic Poem intitled Ἀγλοβιλγομαχία, upon the ſea-fight between the Engliſh and Dutch, in which the Earl of Sandwich was killed; but he had no intentions to reduce that into the form of a complete Poem, but only to try his abilities for ſome work of more importance. He mentions likewiſe, that he deſigned an heroic Poem upon the Hiſtory of England and the Doctrines of the Chriſtian Religion. However he had reſolved abſolutely to ſuppreſs thoſe ſix books; as he had very near done that of Eſther, if it had not been for the dignity of the ſubject. He takes notice of an objection, which might be ſuggeſted againſt him, becauſe he has placed that Hiſtory after the time of Nehemiah, contrary to the opinion of a great many conſiderable writers. This objection he endeavours to anſwer particularly from the authority of Joſephus. He conſiders afterwards, who Ahaſuerus, mentioned in the Hiſtory of Eſther, is; and determines that he was the celebrated Xerxes. He ſhews the moral uſes, that may be made of his Poem; and replies to the objection, that might be urged againſt his conduct in it, for introducing the names of Pagan Deities and profane alluſions into a ſacred ſubject. He obſerves, that he choſe to write in Greek, becauſe it is more agreeable to men of learning than Latin, more laſting than our own tongue, and much more noble than any other language whatſoever; and in ſhort has all the graces and beauty imaginable.

Graiis ingenium, Graiis dedit ore rotundo
Muſa loqui.

Beſides he found it much eaſier to him to write in that language than in Latin or even Engliſh; ſince the ornaments of Poetry are almoſt peculiar to the Greeks; and ſince he had for many years been extremely converſant in Homer, the great Father and Source of the Greek Poetry. However that his verſes were not mere Cento's from that Poet, like Dr. Duport's; but formed, as far as he was able, upon his manner of ſtyle and verſification; ſince he had no inclination to be conſidered as a Rhapſodiſt of a Rhapſody, but was ambitious of the title of a Poet. *Omnia verò carminis ornamenta ſunt Græcis ferè propria; in Homero autem illo poetarum Coryphæo, Antеſignano, Jove, emicant, ardent, fulminant. Hunc indies à ferulâ mirari, ſuſpicere, colere non deſiiti; hunc legi, relegi, nec dum ſatis perlegi; aſſequi tamen (quod nemo unquam fecit facietve, aut ſiquis unquam*, Duportus *is eſt*) *me non poſſe quid mirum eſt? Nec verò hoc opuſculum ex Ὀρυμοκίνησις (quam ſcribendi palmam prædictus* Magdalenenſis *Magiſter omnibus præripuit,) ſed ex propriâ, ut potuimus, delâ, Homerici ope radii depictâ, ſegmentatum licetat gloriari. Non enim elegans verſuum conſarcinator, & (ut ita dicam) Ῥαψῳδίας Ῥαψῳδὸς, ſed Poeta fieri contendo.*

[*C*] *He publiſh'd the Life of King Edward III.*] It was printed at Cambridge in fol. 1688, under the following title; *The Hiſtory of that moſt victorious Monarch Edward III, King of England and France, and Lord of Ireland, and firſt Founder of the moſt noble Order of the Garter; being a full and exact account of the Life and Death of the ſaid King; together with that of his moſt renowned ſon Edward Prince of Wales and Aquitain, ſirnamed the* Black Prince: *faithfully and careſully collected from the beſt and moſt ancient authors domeſtic and foreign, printed books, manuſcripts, and records. By Joſhua Barnes Batchelor of Divinity, and one of the Senior Fellows of Emanuel College Cambridge.* It is dedicated to King James II. In the Preface he tells us that he had undertaken a work of ſo much difficulty, that nothing but a ſenſe of the honour and real advantage thereof could have animated him to it. For the obſcurity of our Hiſtories being ſo great, and the miſtakes and oppoſition of them one with another being ſo frequent, it muſt neceſſarily ſeem a labour not ſmall to endeavour to give a juſt account of the whole ſeries of all public actions for the continuance of fifty years and upwards at ſuch a long diſtance of time, as more than three Centuries. However he obſerves that his reſolution had been to ſhew ſo much diligence in the collecting, and ſo much integrity in the compoſing, that if he could not obtain the know-

(1) Pag. 1, 2.

ledge

Hiſtory, and in the year 1688 he publiſhed the Life of King Edward III [C]; in which he introduces his Heroes making long and elaborate ſpeeches, which ſeem to be the reſult of his own imagination, and an affectation of imitating Thucydides and others of the antient Hiſtorians. His edition of *Euripides* [D] appeared in 1694 in folio, and was dedicated to Charles Duke of Somerſet. In the year 1700 Mrs. Maſon of Hemmingford near St. Ives in Huntingtonſhire, a widow Lady of between 40 and 50 with a jointure of 200 *l. per annum*, who had for ſome time been a great admirer of him, came to Cambridge, and deſired leave to ſettle an hundred pounds a year upon him after her own death; which in a manner

ledge of all the moſt momentous truths, yet he ſhould purpoſely decline all fabulous narrations, all groundleſs opinions, all popular errors, partiality, and prejudice, and ſeriouſly conform himſelf to thoſe rules and decencies, which belong to a faithful Hiſtorian. That the ſubject matter of his diſcourſe is the honour of his Country, the life and actions of one of the greateſt Kings, whom perhaps the world ever ſaw, the rights of the Engliſh Crown, and how well our anceſtors were able to vindicate them. He informs us alſo, that he does not confine himſelf wholly to the relation of King Edward's exploits, or to thoſe of his invincible ſon the Black Prince, and the reſt of his noble and victorious children; but that whatever name he found memorable of his ſubjects in either of his Kingdoms, whether they were famed for arts of war or peace, he had endeavoured to pay them that juſt duty, which it ſeemed to him they deſerved; becauſe he thought it altogether fit, that thoſe, who then ſtood with their Sovereign in his grand offices of war or government, ſhould by no means now be deprived of a participation with him in his glorious Memoirs. *Eſpecially*, ſays he, *ſince not a few are ſtill remaining, derived from thoſe famous anceſtors, whoſe minds may be more ſtrongly affected with due incentives of honour, when they ſhall underſtand by what methods their forefathers attained ſuch eſtates and titles, which they now as worthily enjoy.*

(2) Pag. 39. ed. London 1697. in 8vo.

Mr. Nicholſon in the Preface (2) to the ſecond part of his *Engliſh Hiſtorical Library* tells us, that our author has "diligently collected whatever was to be had, far "or near, upon the ſeveral paſſages of this great King "Edward's reign. His quotations are many; and "generally his authors are as well choſen as ſuch a "multitude can be ſuppoſed to have been. His in"ferences are not always like a Stateſman; and ſome"times his digreſſions are tedious. His deriving of

(c) Pag. 294, 295.

"the famous Inſtitution of the Garter from the (c) "Phœnicians is extremely obliging to good maſter "Sammes; but came too late, it ſeems, to Mr. Aſh"mole's knowledge, or otherwiſe would have bid fair "for a choice poſt of honour in his elaborate book. "In ſhort this induſtrious author ſeems to have haſt"ened his work too much to the preſs, before he had "provided an Index and ſome other accoutrements, "which might have made it more ſerviceable to his "readers." There is an odd character of this work in Dr. Richard Rawlinſon's Engliſh Tranſlation of Mr.

‡ Vol. 2. p. 469. edit. London 1728, in 8vo.

Langlet du Freſnoy's *New Method of ſtudying Hiſtory* ‡, wherein we are told, that *Mr. Barnes's book is not ill eſteemed for the figures therein and its bulk.*

[D] *His edition of* Euripides. It was printed at Cambridge in fol. 1694 under the title of *Euripidis quæ extant omnia, Tragœdiæ nempe xx, præter ultimam omnes completæ: Item Fragmenta aliarum pluſquam LX Tragœdiarum; & Epiſtolæ V nunc primum & ipſæ adjectæ, &c.* i. e. "All the works of Euripi"des, which are extant: namely twenty Tragedies, "all complete except one; and the Fragments of "above ſixty other Tragedies; and five Epiſtles "now firſt publiſhed and added &c." The Authors

(3) Pag. 355.

of the *Acta Eruditorum* for Auguſt 1695 (3) in their account of this edition obſerve, that the Aldus's were the firſt who publiſhed theſe Tragedies from the manuſcripts in the year 1503; and that they were printed at Baſil in Greek, and afterwards in Latin likewiſe with the notes of Caſpar Stiblin and Jo. Brodæus in 1558 and 1562. William Canter publiſhed an edition at Antwerp in 1571, Æmilius Portus at Heidelberg in 1597, and Stephens at Geneva in 1602, with the Greek *Scholia* collected by Arſenius; beſides which they were printed in the *Corpus Poetarum Græcorum* at Geneva 1614. Theſe editions becoming very ſcarce Mr. Barnes, whom the Authors above quoted ſtile a man of very great ſkill in the Greek Language, *Græcè doctiſſimus Vir*, undertook a beautiful edition of theſe Tragedies, which ſhould not only contain the advantages of all the former, with the Greek *Scholia* upon the ſeven firſt Tragedies collected by Arſenius Archbiſhop of Monembaſia, and printed ſeparately at Venice in 1534 and at Baſil in 1544, and afterwards added by Paul Stephens to his edition; but likewiſe the ſelect obſervations of learned men, with the Editor's own conjectures, and continued Annotations upon all the Tragedies. With regard to the Text of Euripides, he has endeavoured to give us every where the genuine reading, which had been before corrupted, and particularly to reſtore the metre; upon which he has diſcourſed very fully in his preliminary Tract *de Tragœdia veterum Græcorum*, in which he has made very curious enquiries into the Laws of the Tragic Verſe. He has retained the Latin Tranſlation of William Canter, and has thought proper to infert the Tragedy of *Danae*, which was never publiſhed before but by Commeline, though it is very imperfect. He has likewiſe given us the Fragments of thoſe Tragedies, which are now loſt, particularly the *Ægeus*, *Æolus*, *Aloides*, *Alexander* or *Alexandra*, *Alcmæon*, *&c.*; and thoſe Fragments, which are quoted by Authors under the name of Euripides, but which are mentioned as Extracts from his Tragedies. Theſe Fragments are collected from *Stobæus*, *Athenæus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Juſtin Martyr*, *Plutarch*, *Macrobius*, *Strabo*, *Longinus*, *Euſtathius*, and the *Scholiaſts*, and pointed out by Grotius in his *Excerpta*, and Meurſius in many of his Writings. He obſerves very juſtly (4), that there are a great many names of Tragedies falſely aſcribed to Euripides, to be found among Authors, which are repreſented as the titles of entire dramatic pieces, whereas that is by no means the caſe. For when the Tragic Writers introduced any perſon ſpeaking, as for inſtance *Hermione*, *Polydorus*, *Atreus*, *Capaneus &c.* theſe have been miſtaken for the names of Tragedies, and by that means ſo many titles have been invented of Tragedies, which never were in being. Mr. Barnes has added likewiſe an Epigram, and an Epicedium of Euripides, and ſome Verſes from the Hymns written by him, with his five Epiſtles to King *Archelaus*, to *Sophocles* the Poet, and *Cteſiphon* his Friend; and he endeavours to prove that Euripides was the Author of theſe Epiſtles in oppoſition to thoſe, who are of a contrary opinion, though Aldus has publiſhed them as his in the Collection of Greek Letters printed in 1499. Mr. Barnes has retained the Verſion publiſhed by Canter and Æmilius Portus, but has corrected it in many places, eſteeming it preferable to the old Verſion, which paſſes under the name of *Dorotheus Camillus*, or that which was made by Melancthon, and printed by Oporinus at Baſil in 1558 and 1562. He has omitted the Tranſlations in Verſe, which Eraſmus has given us of the *Hecuba*, and the *Iphigenia* in *Aulis*, Buchanan of the *Medea* and *Alceſtis*, Grotius of the *Phœniſſæ*, with the Tranſlation of others of Euripides's Tragedies by other Authors. He has prefixed two curious Diſſertations, one concerning the Life and Writings of Euripides; and the other concerning the antient Greek Tragedy, the Scenes and Apparatus of it, the Theatrical Muſic, and the Laws of Tragic Verſe. The Life of Euripides is drawn up almoſt in the manner of Mr. Dodwell's Annals of St. *Cyprian* and *Velleius Paterculus*; for Mr. Barnes begins with the year when Euripides was born, which happened in the firſt year of the 75th Olympiad, about the middle of the Summer, on the 20th day of the month *Boedromion* (5), and gives us from the antient Greek Writers a regular account of the affairs of Greece for ſeventy ſix years to the death of Socrates, who ſurvived him ſix years. He has given us three *Index's*; the firſt upon the Poet himſelf; the ſecond upon the *Scholia*; and the third of the Authors quoted in the *Scholia* and the Notes.

(4) Pag. 442 and 458.

(5) Mr. Baſil Kennet tells us, *that his birth is placed by the* Arundelian Marble *in the fourth year of the 73d Olympiad*; tho', ſays he, *the learned Mr.* Barnes *following the common opinion .. brings him down ſix years later. Lives and Characters of the antient Greek Poets*, Part 1. pag. 107. edit. London 1697.

a manner peculiar to himself he refused to accept, unless she would likewise condescend to make him happy with her person, which was none of the most advantageous. The Lady was too obliging to refuse any thing to Joshua; *for whom*, she said, *the Sun stood still*; and soon after married him. His edition of *Anacreon* [E] was printed at Cambridge in 1705, and dedicated to the Duke of Marlborough. The Writers of the *Acta Eruditorum* (c) tell us, that this edition is a very beautiful one, and much more correct and perfect than any, which had been published before. But Mr. Baxter in the preface to the second edition of his *Anacreon* treats Mr. Barnes's with some contempt. In the year 1710 he published his edition of Homer [F], and dedicated the *Iliad* to the Earl of Pembroke, and the *Odyssey* to the Earl of Nottingham. When this edition was ready for the press, he wrote a long copy of English Verses, which are now extant in the Library of Emanuel College; the design of which is to prove that Solomon was the Author of that divine work. It is imagined, that he wrote these verses not so much from the persuasion of his own mind, as to amuse his wife, and by that means engage her to supply him with

(c) Octob. 1706. pag. 457.

[E] *His edition of* Anacreon.] It was published under the following title: *Anacreon Teius, Poeta Lyricus, summâ curâ & diligentiâ ad fidem etiam Vet. MS. Vatican. emendatus ac pristino nitori numerisque suis restitutus, dimidiâ ferè parte auctus, aliquot nempe justis poematiis & fragmentis plurimis ab undiquaque conquisitis.* i. e. "Anacreon the Teian, a Lyric Poet, "corrected with the utmost care and diligence by an "ancient manuscript in the Vatican Library, and restored to his former elegance, beauty and metre, and enlarged almost half by several entire Poems and a great "number of Fragments collected from a variety of "authors." Cambridge 1705 and 1721 in 12mo. This edition is dedicated to John Duke of Marlborough, and the Dedication is dated from Hemmingford near St. Ives in Huntingtonshire March 26th 1705. To this he has subjoined a Greek Anacreontic Ode upon the Duke's Victory at Blenheim with a Latin Translation in the same measure. Then follows his Life of Anacreon, wherein he endeavours to vindicate that Poet from the imputation of unnatural love; and to shew that his Poems contain nothing Indecent or shocking, nothing contrary to good manners, or unbecoming of a man of strict chastity and sobriety, or the least improper to be read by the youth. *Verum hic Catones hoc ex me audiant, nihil omnino, quod supra § xxi. dixerim, in toto hoc* Anacreonte *possunt illi nobis objicere, quod auribus honestis ingratum aut injucundum, probis moribus inimicum, casto sobrioque homine indignum, aut juventi φιλολόγῳ damnosum* *. But he observes that there are several pieces of a very exceptionable character in the Vatican manuscript, which he will not allow to be of Anacreon's composition. In his *Prolegomena* he discourses concerning the Antiquity and Invention of Lyric Poetry; with an account of the progress of it among the Greeks, and a character of Anacreon, and the qualifications necessary to form a right judgment of him. He treats likewise of the metre of that Poet; and takes occasion to reply to an objection urged against him, that as he was a man in holy Orders, and a Batchelor of Divinity of nineteen years standing; in short that as he was a Christian and a Divine, he should notwithstanding employ himself upon a work of that light nature. In answer to this, he tells us, that if he had any cure of souls, which would justly require his whole attention, the objection would be of some force. And that if those persons, who sit at the helm, would have called him forth to some nobler employment, and favoured him with their patronage in it, the case would have been different; whereas in the present circumstance of affairs debauchees, parasites, spies, and men of the worst of characters, monopolize their favour, to the exclusion of persons of the best learning and accomplishments, who have no other rewards but the satisfaction, which results from their studies. *Respondeo, si huic theologo ulla animarum cura contigisset, cui toto animo incumbendum fateor, tunc aliquid valeret hujusmodi objectio. Si quis illorum, qui ad gubernaculum sedent, in aliquo nobiliori studio paratum promoveret, ad majus opus alacrem vocaret, & amicâ indulgentiâ sublevaret, &c. Verum omnem illarum munificentiæ proventum filioli, nepotes, parasiti, calumniatores, mundinatores muneralî ambitu intercipiunt, sibique plane demetunt; sanctioriqué literaturæ cultores musarum suarum deliciis saturandos relinquunt* †. Since therefore notwithstanding his being a Clergyman he had no benefice, if he employed his studies in promoting of learning, propagating of the Greek literature, and searching out the truth, it was suitable to his character as Professor of the Greek Tongue, and not unworthy of that of a Christian, much less of a Divine, who has no living to require his care, and who, according to Dr. Stillingfleet in his *Origines Sacræ L. 2. c. 9. §. 18.* ought not to be an absolute stranger to the learning of the Heathens; as those generally are, who make such objections. *Interea si sacerdotis carens sacerdos doctrinæ illustrandæ, Græcis literis propagandis, veritati indagandæ operam det assiduam & diligentem; congruum hoc quidem Græcæ Linguæ professori, nec indignum Christiano, nedum theologo, non alias cum beneficio suo occupato; qui nec,* (vid. Stillingfleet's Origin. sact. L. 2. c. 9. §. 18.) *Ethnicâ Doctrinâ plane hospes esse debeat; quales ut plurimum sunt illi, qui hujusmodi objectiones proferunt* ‡. He afterwards vindicates himself on account of his introducing some passages from the Scriptures into his Notes; and of his making several alterations in the text of Anacreon from mere conjecture. He has subjoined to his edition the Epigrams of the ancients and moderns upon that Poet, and some Odes of his own composition under the title of *Anacreon Christianus*, with a Latin version of them in the same metre, and an *Index* to all the Odes and Fragments, &c.

‡ Ibid.

[F] *Publish'd his edition of Homer.*] It was printed in two volumes in 4to at Cambridge under the following title: *Homeri Ilias & Odyssea, & in easdem Scholia sive Interpretatio Veterum; &c.* i. e. "Homer's *Iliad* and *Odyssey*, with the *Scholia* of the ancients upon those two Poems. To which are added "continued Notes upon the Text and the *Scholia*, "many various Readings, &c. and a very correct "Latin Translation: besides the *Batrachomyomachia*, "the Hymns and Epigrams, the Fragments and two "Indexes. The whole collated with several ancient manuscripts and the best editions, &c. By "Joshua Barnes, Batchelor of Divinity, and Regius "Professor of the Greek Tongue in the University of "Cambridge." Tho' several ancient writers give us an account of Homer's Genealogy, of his Life, and of the time when he flourished; yet they differ so much in what they say of that admirable Poet, that our editor thought it necessary to make new enquiries about it. He informs us, that he had written a book upon that subject, which contains several considerable discoveries; and that this book is a *Treasure of Erudition*, wherein the riches of Homer are fully displayed; and that the great wisdom and learning of that Poet, with the design of his divine *Iliad*, appear in it in a much better light; and that whatever relates to the History of his Life is more clearly explained in that treatise than in any other account. He tells us, that he would have inserted those observations in this edition, had it not been for a particular reason; but that he designed to publish it at some other time. Mr. de la Roche assures us in his Account of this edition †, that there were great improvements in it, and that it is much more valuable than any of those, which had been published before; and he observes that Mr. Barnes, *famous*, says he, *for his great skill in the Greek Tongue*, tells us that Homer was his favourite author. He had a particular affection for that Poet from his younger years; and it was not in hopes of any gain, that he undertook an edition of him, but out of love for his author, and regard to the public good. He has corrected

† *Memoirs of Literature*, vol. 2. Art. 20. p. 67. ad edit. London 1722.

* *Anacreontis Vita.* Sect. 23.

† *Prolegomena*, Sect. 11.

with money to defray the expences of the edition. There is an account of it in the *Acta Eruditorum* for January 1711 (*d*); in which we are told that Mr. Barnes has given us a much more correct and perfect edition of Homer than any which had appeared before; and that he has shewn in it a great deal of industry and knowledge in the Greek Poetry. However we have there some exceptions proposed against it [G], which are ascribed to one of the greatest Critics * of our own, or perhaps any other age or nation. He died August the third 1712 in the fifty eighth year of his age, and was interred at Hemmingford, and had a monument raised to him by his widow [*H*]. Besides the books abovementioned we shall give a catalogue of those, which he either published or designed to publish, in

(*d*) Pag. 1, 54, 308.

* Dr. Bentley.

rected the text in a great many places, and added several verses to it; and rendered the Latin Version more accurate than it was before. The *Scholia* are enlarged, corrected, and disposed in a better order; and nothing added to, omitted, or mended in the Text and the *Scholia*, without giving notice of it. The various Readings are taken not only from Henry Stephens, but also from Eustathius, Plato, Aristotle, Strabo, and other ancient authors, and from several manuscripts and editions. Mr. Barnes carefully mentions all the manuscripts, which he consulted; and tells us, that the *Scholia* upon Homer are falsly ascribed to Didymus; and that they were not written by one man, nor in the same age, but by several hands, and at several times. He has prefixed several pieces to the Iliad in the first volume. 1. The *Life of Homer* commonly ascribed to Herodotus. 2. Three small pieces taken from a book of Leo Allatius *de Patriâ Homeri*. 3. A passage from Suidas, and another from Pausanias relating to Homer. 4. What Plutarch says concerning the Life of that Poet. 5. *Certamen Homeri & Hesiodi*. 6. A Dissertation concerning Homer's Poetry, which Mr. Barnes ascribes to Dionysius Halicarnassus. 7. *Porphyry's Quæstiones Homericæ*. 8. *De Nympharum Antro*, by the same author. 9. Dion Chrysostom's Oration concerning Homer. Dr. John Davis, afterwards Master of Queen's College in Cambridge, and well known for his learned and judicious observations upon several ancient authors, added some notes upon that Oration. All these pieces are printed in Greek, without a translation. The *Iliad* with a Latin version appears in the next place. Mr. Barnes has inserted under the text, 1. The Greek *Scholia*. 2. His Notes upon the Text. 3. His Notes upon the *Scholia*. 4. The various Readings. The second volume contains the *Odyssey*, and several other pieces ascribed to Homer. The *Scholia*, the Notes of the Editor, and the various Readings, are placed under the text of the *Odyssey* in the same order as in the *Iliad*. Mr. Barnes gives us his sentiments concerning the *Odyssey*: The subject of the *Iliad*, says he, is as vast as the whole universe; whereas the *Odyssey* is confined within narrower bounds.

Illius immensos miratur Græcia campos;
Est huic non magnus, sed benè cultus ager.

The persons mentioned in that Poem are not so considerable as those in the *Iliad*; but perhaps it affords more examples of virtue, and a great number of moral precepts for the conduct of life. The chief design of the Poet was to teach chastity, temperance, and conjugal affection. Penelope is proposed as an excellent model of those virtues. Homer describes likewise the wonderful prudence and constancy of Ulysses under all his misfortunes; and God's Providence, who never forsakes good and pious men, when they are exposed to the greatest dangers. The following pieces are inserted at the end of the *Odyssey*: 1. The *Batrachomyomachia*, or the Battle between the Frogs and Mice; which Mr. Barnes ascribes to Homer, and is of opinion that it was written by him in his younger years, and confutes Henry Stephens and some other authors, who judge it to be unworthy that Poet. 2. The Hymns of Homer. 3. His Epigrams. 4. His Fragments. All those pieces are illustrated with notes and various readings, and printed more correctly than they were before.

[G] *However we have there some exceptions proposed against it.*] We are told there, that tho' this edition is preferable to all the preceding, yet it is not complete enough to satisfy men of true learning; and several points in the *Prolegomena* are objected to; and Mr. Barnes is censured for retaining many of Schrevelius's absurd interpolations in the ancient Greek *Scholia*. We have likewise a censure upon some passages in the first book of the *Iliad*, in hopes, as the authors of the *Acta Eruditorum* observe, that some other person would undertake a more strict and severe criticism upon it, since they were informed that the editor had several formidable antagonists. *Est autem nobis constitutum, quædam tantum delibare ex prioribus aliquot Iliados libris; non enim defore speramus aliquem, qui seriam & severiorem in hanc editionem exerceat criticam, cum tam acres & validos adversarios habere intelligamus Cl. Editorem.* They observe, that such has been the fate of the writings of Homer, that the order of critics took their rise upon the occasion of them, and published their Observations and Emendations upon that Poet, the first and chiefest of whom was Aristotle, from whom Dion Chrysostom tells us the art of Criticism and Grammar was derived; and afterwards succeeded Zenodotus, Aristarchus, and others. *Et sunt sanè ea fata scriptorum Homericorum, ut olim quidem istorum occasione exorta sit Natio Criticorum, qui ἰνδόκους & διορθώτας Homeri fecerunt, quorum princeps Aristoteles* (ἀφ' οὗ καὶ φασὶ τὴν Κριτικὴν τε καὶ Γραμματικὴν λαβεῖν inquit Dio Chrysost.) *deinde Zenodotus, Aristarchus, alii.* All the modern editions of Homer, notwithstanding they have deserved a severe examination, have escaped with impunity, except that of Schrevelius, upon which Dr. Meric Casaubon, Prebendary of Canterbury, wrote a Dissertation. The authors of the *Acta Eruditorum* observe, that it will appear from the few observations, which they have made, how ample a field will be opened to the Critics in Mr. Barnes's edition, tho' more has been done it, and more study and labour seems to have been spent upon it, than upon any other before printed. *Ex illis autem paucis, quæ attingemus, apparebit, quanta messis parata sit criticis hac etiam editione; licet in eâ plus sit præstitum, plusque studii & laboris, ut videtur, adhibitum, quam in quavis aliâ typis impressâ.* They remark, that the chief assistances, which he had in it, was from the manuscripts, which he appears to have examined with great accuracy; and by this means has restored the text of Homer, having frequently abandoned the authority of Henry Stephens, which was esteemed so considerable from the edition, which he published, that most of the subsequent editors thought themselves sufficiently secure in following him.

[*H*] *Had a monument raised to him by his widow.*] The inscription upon it is as follows. H. S. E. Joshua Barnes S. T. B. *Collegii Emmanuelis Socius, Linguæ Græcæ in Academia Cantabrigiensi Professor Regius peritissimus. Plura Eruditionis & Industriæ Monument. reliquit. Ob. Aug.* 3. *A. D.* 1712. *Ætat.* 58. Maria Barnes *Conjugi dilectissimo* M. P.

Βαρνήσιος δ' ἀπαλὰς
Νύμφαι πολύτεχνος,
Λογογράφων φίλτατος,
Ἄνθος τι τῶν ἀοιδῶν.
Τῶν ἱερῶν μάγιστος,
Καὶ ῥητόρων ἄριστος,
Καὶ Μαρτίων Βαΐτης,
Βρεταννικῆς ἀρωγός.

The Greek Anacreontiques on the Monument English'd.

" Kind Barnes, adorn'd by every Muse,
" Each Greek in his own Art out-does.
" No Orator was ever greater;
" No Poet ever chanted sweeter.
" H' excell'd in Grammar mystery;
" And the Black Prince of History;
" And a Divine the most profound,
" That ever trod on English ground.

Mr.

in the Note [*I*]. He had a great deal of Enthuſiaſm in him, which diſcovered itſelf in many circumſtances of his life. He conſtantly maintained, that ſpiritual ſins, ſuch as pride, defamation, &c. were far more offenſive to the Deity, than thoſe which ariſe from the too great indulgence of the ſenſes. He believed, that charity ſeldom or never paſſes without its reward in this life. This opinion prevailed ſo far with him, that he has given his only coat to a vagrant begging at his door; and he uſed to relate ſome extraordinary retributions conferred upon him by unknown perſons for his charities of this kind. He was rather diſtinguiſhed for the extraordinary quickneſs of his wit, than the ſolidity of his judgment. And it was very remarkable that he could ſcarce ever correct what his firſt thoughts, which were very ſudden and rapid, ſuggeſted to him. He had an uncommon ſtrength of memory, and a prodigious readineſs in writing and ſpeaking of the Greek tongue; though perhaps there were many other learned men, who had not that faculty, and yet were better judges of the propriety and delicacies of that Language. The excellent Critic abovementioned uſed to ſay of him, that he underſtood as much Greek as a Greek Cobler.

Mr. Joſhua Barnes read a ſmall Engliſh Bible, that he uſually carried about him, one hundred and twenty one times over at leiſure hours. He was born January 10, 1654. All this is upon his monument.

[*I*] *A Catalogue of thoſe books which he either publiſh'd or deſigned to publiſh.*] We ſhall extract this chiefly from the Catalogue ſubjoined to the *Prolegomena* of his edition of *Anacreon*. *The warlike Lover*, or *the generous Rival*, an Engliſh dramatic piece upon the War between the Engliſh and Dutch, and the Death of the Earl of Sandwich. *Anno* 1672. Ἰωσηφιὰς or *Joſeph the Patriarch*; a Greek Heroic Poem in one book, mentioned above in note [*B*]. Ὁμιλογία, or our Saviour's Sermon upon the Mount, the Decalogue, the Apoſtles Creed, the Lord's Prayer, the *Magnificat*, with other Hymns from the old and new Teſtament, in Greek verſe. *Thuribulum*, or the Hymns and Feſtivals in Greek and Latin verſe. Miſcellanies and Epigrams in Latin and Greek verſe. Ἀγγλο-Βελγομαχία, or the Death of Edward Mountague, Earl of Sandwich, in Greek, Latin, and Engliſh verſe. Ἀλεκτρυομαχία, or a Poem upon Cock-fighting. *Anno* 1673. The Song of Songs, containing an hundred Hexaſticks in Engliſh Heroic verſe: *Anno* 1674. Ψυλλιάδες, a ludicrous Poem in Greek Macaronic verſe, upon a Battle between a Spider and a Toad: *Anno* 1673. Φλιὰδες, or a Supplement to the old ludicrous Poem of that title at Trinity-Houſe in Cambridge, upon a Battle between the Fleas and a Welſhman. A poetical Lexicon Greek and Latin; to which is added a Lexicon of proper names. Fol. 1675. A Treatiſe upon the Greek Accents in anſwer to Henry Chriſtian Heninius and others, with a Diſcourſe upon the points now in uſe. *Cant. Creditt.* a Comedy in Engliſh: 1674. Humorous Poems upon the ninth book of the *Iliad* and the ninth of the *Odyſſey*, in Engliſh; publiſhed in 1681. *Franciados*, an Heroic Poem in Latin, upon the Black Prince, eight books of which were done, and the whole was to contain twelve books. The Art of War, in four books in Engliſh proſe: 1676. *Hengiſt*, or the Engliſh Valour, an Heroic Poem in Engliſh in ſeven books. *Landgarth*, or the Amazon Queen of Norway and Denmark, an Engliſh dramatic Poem in Heroic verſe, deſigned in honour of the marriage between Prince George of Denmark and Princeſs Anne. An Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory from the beginning of the world to the Aſcenſion of our Saviour, in Latin fol. Miſcellaneous Poems in Engliſh. Philoſophical and divine Poems, publiſh'd at Cambridge at different times in Latin. Poems and ſacred daily Meditations continued for ſeveral years in Engliſh. A Diſſertation upon Pillars, Obeliſks, Pyramids &c. in Latin 1692. A Diſcourſe upon the Sybills, in three books in Latin. The Life of Pindar in four Lectures; and 32 Lectures upon his firſt Olympic Ode. The Life of Theocritus, and Lectures upon that Poet. The Life of David; of Scanderbeg; and of Tamerlane. Theſe three Lives, as he tells us, he never actually begun, but only made conſiderable collections for them. The Life of Edward the Black Prince. The Univerſity-Calendar, or a Direction for young Students of all degrees with relation to their Studies, and general Rules of Ethics, and a Form of Prayer: *anno* 1685. Thirty two Lectures upon the firſt book of the *Odyſſey*. Above fifty Lectures upon Sophocles. Lectures upon *Bereſhith*, with an Oration to recommend the ſtudy of the Hebrew Language. Three Diſcourſes in Engliſh; the firſt of which was intitled *The fortunate Iſland*, or *the Inauguration of Queen Gloriana*: 2. *The Advantage of England*, or *a ſure Way to Victory*: 3. *The Cauſe of the Church of England defended and explain'd*; publiſhed in 1703. A Sermon *ad Clerum* for his Degree of Bachelor of Divinity at St. Mary's in Cambridge 1686. A Sermon preached before King Charles II, at Newmarket Octob. 19th 1684. A Sermon preached before the Lord Mayor of London upon the Feaſt of St. Matthew; with an Apology for the Orphans of Chriſt's Hoſpital, 1703. A Sermon before the Lord Mayor at St. Paul's, upon the Feaſt of All-Saints, 1703. A Sermon printed at Huntington March 8th, on the Queen's Birth-day 1705. An Oration recommending the ſtudy of the Greek Language, ſpoken in the public Schools at Cambridge before the Vice-Chancellor &c. March 28th, 1705. A Greek Oration addreſſed to the moſt reverend Father Neophytus Archbiſhop of Philippopolis, ſpoken in the houſe of the Regents at Cambridge Sept. 13th 1701. A Prevaricator's Speech ſpoken at the Commencement at Cambridge 1680. A congratulatory Oration in Latin ſpoken at St. Mary's Sept. 9th 1683, upon the Eſcape of King Charles II and the Duke of York from the conſpiracy. Sermons, Orations, Declamations, Problems, Tranſlations, Letters, and other Exerciſes almoſt innumerable, in Engliſh, Latin, and Greek. A Satyr in Engliſh verſe upon the Poets and Critics. An Imitation of Plautus's *Trinummi* in Engliſh. Interpretations, Illuſtrations, Emendations, or Corrections of many paſſages, which have been falſely tranſlated, with Explications upon various paſſages of Scripture, from Geneſis to Revelations. Common places in Divinity, Philology, Poetry, and Criticiſm, and Emendations of various Greek and Latin Authors, with Fragments of many of the Poets.

T.

BARON (PETER) Profeſſor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Cambridge in the ſixteenth Century, was a Frenchman born (*a*). He occaſioned ſome troubles in that Univerſity by certain opinions, which he publiſhed there in the year 1590. It was pretended that his doctrine approached very near to that of the Pelagians. Whitaker, Tindal, Chadderton, Perkins, &c. attacked it in their Sermons, Lectures, and Books; but at firſt they ſpared their adverſary's name, out of regard to his great age. Afterwards perceiving that he continued to dogmatize, and that in his *Summa trium de prædeſtinatione Sententiarum* he maintained an heterodox hypotheſis, Whitaker declared himſelf his antagoniſt expreſly, and confuted his *Summa*. The affair was carried before Queen Elizabeth, and before the Archbiſhop of Canterbury. An aſſembly of Biſhops and Doctors

(*a*) He gave himſelf the name of *Stempanus*. I believe that is as much as to ſay of *Etampes*.

of Divinity was called at Lambeth. Whitaker was ſent thither, and maintained the common opinion there with ſo much force, that he made it triumph in a very glorious manner. That of Baron was condemned, and there were drawn up on the 20th of November 1597 nine Articles (*b*), which were received in the Univerſity by the public authority. Baron was diſmiſſed, and returned to France; by which means the peace of the Univerſity was reſtored (*c*). Some are of opinion that he was treated too ſeverely [*A*]. We ſhall ſee the titles of ſome of the Works of this Profeſſor [*B*].

(*b*) *A loco Lambethani dicti ſunt*; i. e. "they "were called the "Lambeth Ar- "ticles from the "place where "they were "drawn up." Alting, *Theolog. Hiſtor.* pag. 305, 306.

(*c*) Taken from the *Theologia Hiſtorica* of Henry Alting, p. 305, 306.

[*A*] *Some are of opinion that he was treated too ſeverely.*] The Extracts which Mr. Des Maizeaux was ſo kind as to ſend me from a book of Dr. Thomas Fuller, ſhall be all my Commentary upon this head. This book is the *Hiſtory of the Univerſity of Cambridge*, and is ſubjoined to *The Church Hiſtory of Britain from the birth of Chriſt till the year* 1648. "A conteſt "happened between Mr. Chadderton (afterwards "Maſter of Emanuel College), and Dr. Baro, Mar- "garet Profeſſor (1), about ſome heterodox opinions, "vented by the ſame Baro, both in his readings and "print, (viz. in his commentary on *Jonah*, and book "*de Fide*). Whereupon the Doctor procured Mr. "Chadderton to be called into the Conſiſtory, in the "preſence of the Vice-Chancellor, Dr. Hanford, Dr. "Harvey, and Dr. Legge, where he utterly denied "that he had ever preached againſt the Doctor; but "he propounded theſe queſtions as erroneous and "falſe;

(1) *The Lady Margaret, Counteſs of Richmond, mother to King Henry VII, built ſeveral Colleges at Cambridge, and founded two Profeſſorſhips in Divinity, one at Oxford, and another at Cambridge. Thoſe, who enjoy theſe Profeſſorſhips, and the ſalary annexed to them, are called* Margaret Profeſſors. John Tiſtor, *Biſhop of Rocheſter, was the firſt who enjoyed that at Cambridge, Eraſmus was the ſecond, and Baro the fourteenth.* This marginal note is Mr. Des Maizeaux's.

"1. *Primus Dei amor non eſt in naturâ fidei juſtifi-* "*cantis.*

"2. *Fides juſtificans non præcipitur in Decalogo.*

"Many papers in Latin paſſed between them, and "at laſt they were conceived to come nearer together. "The end of Peter Baro's triennial Lectures began to "draw near. Now although cuſtom had made ſuch "courteſy almoſt a due to continue the ſame Profeſ- "ſor, where no urgent reaſons to the contrary were "alledged, yet the Univerſity intended not to re-elect "him for the place, meaning fairly to cut him off "juſt at the time, (which would be the leſs pain and "ſhame unto him) when his years ſhould be expired "(2). He himſelf was ſenſible of it; and beſides, "he ſaw the Articles of Lambeth lately ſent to the "Univerſity, and foreſaw, that ſubſcription thereto "would be expected from, yea impoſed on him, to "which he could not condeſcend, therefore reſolved "to quit his place. So that this his departure was "not his free act, out of voluntary election, but that "whereunto his will was neceſſarily determined; wit- "neſs his own reply to a friend, requiring of him "the cauſe of his withdrawing: *Fugio*, ſaith he, *ne* "*fugarer*. Some conceive this to be hard meaſure, "which was uſed to one of Dr. Baro's qualifications. "For, I. He was a foreigner, a Frenchman; & *ne-* "*mini civitas quam non admittitur hoſpes.* II. A great "ſcholar; for he that denieth learning in Baro, (ſo "witneſſed in his works,) plainly affirmeth no ſcho- "larſhip in himſelf. III. An inoffenſive man for "life and converſation; ſeeing nothing of viciouſneſs "could be charged upon him, which otherwiſe in his "conteſt with Mr. Chadderton had been urged againſt "him. Laſtly an aged man, coming hither many "years ſince, (when the Profeſſor's place as much "needed him, as he it,) and who had painfully ſpent "his ſtrength in the employment. Others alledged, "that in ſuch caſes of conſcience there is no plea "for courteſy, and that Baro, as he was a ſtranger, "had brought in doctrines to the infecting the Uni- "verſity, the Fountain of Learning and Religion; "and therefore Archbiſhop Whitgift deſigned the re- "moving him from his place (3)."

(2) Fuller's *Hiſtory of the Univerſity of Cambridge, ad ann.* 1596.

(3) Idem, ibid. pag. 145, *& ſeq.* edit. London 1655.

You have here, Sir, (theſe are Mr. Des Maizeaux's words) *what Dr. Fuller ſays; I have choſen rather to tranſlate him literally, though with leſs elegance, than to run the riſque of departing from his ſenſe.* He remarks, that all the Engliſh conſtantly write *Baro* or *Baroe*; and that in original writings the Doctor ſigned *Baro*. From whence it might be concluded that I ſhould have called him *Baro*, and not *Baron*: unleſs it be ſaid that he Latiniz'd his name, when he ſigned *Baro*, and that the Engliſh called him after the Latin termination. It is certain however that in France the name *Baron* is incomparably more frequent than that of *Baro*, though that is not abſolutely unknown, as the Continuator of Aſtrea witneſſes (4).

(4) See *Hiſt. de l'Academ. Françoiſe*, pag. 321.

[*B*] *Here are the titles of ſome of Baron's Works.*] *Prælectiones xxxix in Jonam*; printed at London in 1579. *Summa trium Sententiarum de Prædeſtinatione. De Præſtantiâ & Dignitate divinæ Legis.*

BARON or BARO (PETER). Mr. Bayle's account of this great Man being very imperfect, and even erroneous, we ſhall here ſupply his defects, and correct his errors. Peter Baro was born in France, and admitted a Licentiate of the Law in the Univerſity of Bourges (*a*); but being of the Proteſtant Religion, he was obliged to leave his native country to avoid perſecution. He retired into England, and being a learned man, he was kindly received by the Lord Treaſurer Burghley, and entertained with humanity in that Nobleman's family. About the year 1575 he was at the recommendation of the ſame Lord then Chancellor of the Univerſity of Cambridge, choſen Lady Margaret's Profeſſor of Divinity there, and entertained at Peter-Houſe. Dr. Perne Maſter of Peter-Houſe, who was his friend, petitioned the Lord Treaſurer to make ſome addition to Dr. Baro's ſalary, ſince he was a married man, and had a family, and, as it ſeems, depended chiefly upon his ſalary for his maintenance. The Lord Burghley was ſo kind as to promiſe to Dr. Perne, that he would take care of Dr. Baro; who thereupon wrote in November 1580, a modeſt and handſome letter to the Treaſurer [*A*], in which he put him in mind of his promiſe, and deſired him to perform it when occaſion ſhould offer.

(*a*) Strype's *Annals*, vol. 4. pag. 231.

We

[*A*] *A modeſt and handſome letter to the Treaſurer.*] He repreſents to his Lordſhip, that "It was now full "ſix years ſince he had been admitted into his poſt "by the votes and ſuffrages of the chief men in the "Univerſity, who had been pleaſed to ſhew him "their friendſhip in this: that all this time he had "endeavoured and ſtill did his utmoſt to be ſervice- "able to the Univerſity; that confiding in the Lord "Treaſurer's kindneſs to him, he made bold to write "to him, hoping his Letter would not diſpleaſe. "That his Lordſhip had been acquainted with his "circumſtances by Dr. Perne, and promiſed to take "his caſe into conſideration, and even to aſſiſt him. "Confiding in this, he thought his Lordſhip would "not be offended at him, for refreſhing his memory, "and deſiring him, if any occaſion to ſerve him "ſhould offer, not to let it ſlip." This is the ſubſtance of his letter, which ſhews that he was not in very good circumſtances; but the letter not being very long, the reader will not perhaps be diſpleaſed to find it here. *Cum Spartam, quam mihi bis authoritate ac ſuffragiis primariorum hujus Academiæ virorum, mihique amiciſſimorum, natus ſum, nullis parcens laboribus, exornare, jam totos ſex hoſce annos, conor ac contendam; hoc eſt, quum tua hujus Academiæ utilitati ac dignitati inſerviens pro viribus quotidie enitar, Præſtantiſſime Domine; eumque me ante tanta cum humanitate menſa etiam tua excipere dignatus ſis: hac fretus benitati, hac*

We do not find whether or in what manner his petition was granted; but in 1584 he wrote a letter of thanks to the ſame Lord, who had prevailed with Dr. Perne to elect Baro's ſon, and to admit him, with another, into the year of Probation (*b*). He enjoyed his Profeſſorſhip for ſeveral years with tranquillity, notwithſtanding his diſputes in writing with Dr. Whitaker, the other Profeſſor of Divinity, who differed from him in the point of Predeſtination, and maintained the rigid ſyſtem of Calvin concerning abſolute Election and Reprobation, whereas Baro defended a more moderate ſyſtem. They explained their opinions in their Lectures (*c*), and the controverſy was carried on with ſome mildneſs till the latter end of the year 1595, when Whitaker preached a Sermon before the Univerſity, wherein he laboured to defend the doctrine of the Church, as he called it, that is, abſolute Predeſtination. Dr. Baro aſſerted the contrary opinion alſo in a Sermon to the Clergy of the Univerſity, and as the former was heard with applauſe, ſo the latter was brought into trouble, however humbly and modeſtly he had propoſed his opinion (*d*). The Queen (Elizabeth) hearing of this Sermon of Dr. Baro was highly diſpleaſed with it, and diſcovered her anger in a converſation which ſhe had concerning theſe matters with Archbiſhop Whitgift, telling him, that Dr. Baro being an alien, ought to have carried himſelf quietly and peaceably in a country, where he had been ſo humanely harboured and infranchized, both himſelf and his family. The Archbiſhop excuſed him as much as lay in his power, and gave the Queen a very good character of him. He alſo acquainted him in a friendly manner with this converſation. Whereupon Baro wrote him a letter of thanks, in which he gave him an account of his principles [*B*], and diſcovered at the ſame time his loyalty to the Queen (*e*). The famous Lambeth Articles agreed upon November the 20th 1595, having been carried to Cambridge by Dr. Whitaker, who died ſoon after (*f*), the Heads of the Colleges had their eyes upon Dr. Baro, who was the chief oppoſer of abſolute Predeſtination, and therefore theſe Articles were ſoon offered him for his conſent and approbation. The occaſion or rather pretence of it, and the cauſe of all the vexations he ſuffered afterwards was a Sermon which he preached before the Univerſity January the 12th $159\frac{5}{6}$, in which he declared his thoughts upon the controverted points [*C*], though being a foreigner, he behaved himſelf modeſtly, and ſtudied

(*b*) Strype's *Life of Archbiſhop Whitgift*, B. 2. ch. 2. pag. 92, 93.

(*c*) Idem, ibid. B. 4. ch. 14. pag. 434.

(*d*) Idem, ibid. ch. 17. p. 460.

(*e*) Ibid. pag. 464, 465.

(*f*) Ibid. ch. 19. pag. 479.

ad te breviſſimas literas ſcribere auſus ſum, eas ſperans tuæ dignitati non fore ingratas. Quibus te imprimis quam officioſiſſime ſalutans, tuam etiam de meo hic ſtatu memoriam refricarem. Audiſti enim prius à Doctore Perne, qualis hic, & quam tenuis ſit mea conditio; imo te hujus rationem habiturum, ac mihi proſpecturum dixiſti. Cui verbo quia confido, tibi in memoriam hoc revocare, ingratum non fore exiſtimavi. Ac ſi qua forte ſeſe mihi juvandi occaſio offerat, eam tua erga me benevolentia effluere non ſinat. Quid autem ſit mihi commodum, id tua ipſius prudentia videre, & à Doctore Perne reſcire facilius poteſt, quam à me ipſo. Totum igitur hoc, meque adeo ipſum tuæ fidei illiuſque prudentiæ committens, Deum Opt. Max. oro atque obſecro, Illuſtriſſime Domine, ut te huic Regno, Eccleſiæ, ac Academiæ diu incolumem conſervet, ſuiſque bonis perpetuo cumulet. Cantabrigiæ, xi Cal. Decembr. 1580. *Tibi Obſervantiſſimus, P. Baro* (1).

(1) Strype's *Life of Archbiſhop Whitgift*, Appendix, pag. 38.

[*B*] *Dr. Baro wrote a letter of thanks to the Archbiſhop, in which he acquaints him with his principles.*] He ſaid, "That by what Dr. Nevill told him in the "Archbiſhop's name, he much feared that this kind- "neſs towards him had brought ſome cauſe of trouble "to his Grace; which would certainly be very griev- "ous to him, ſince he ever very much loved, he did "not ſay his Lordſhip, but his very perſon, for thoſe "eminent qualities of mind, with which he was en- "dowed; theſe he admired, and for that reaſon he "would depend upon him alone, ſince he had in this "his calamity, by a new and ſingular benefit, put him "for ever under the ſtrongeſt obligation, having ſpoken "for him to the Queen's Majeſty, which he ſhould "keep in his memory as long as he lived. But as to "the matters in controverſy, you are not ignorant, "moſt illuſtrious Lord, ſaid he, what my opinion is, "namely, *that God is not the author of ſin, nor will "have it committed, ſince he openly forbids it, and re- "proves men for nothing but for ſin, which he hates; "and that the faithful or the elect ought not to be ſe- "cure of their ſalvation.* Theſe were the chief things "which he and others defended, becauſe there were "certain articles (2), which were laid to be defined a- "gainſt him and others, tho' they ſcarcely touched the "ſtate of controverſy, and were almoſt ſuch, that "they might eaſily be proved, if they were dexter- "ouſly underſtood. Nor did he require a new ſenſe, "but the ſame which might be drawn from that letter of "Mr. Hooper, which he had mentioned in his Ser- "mon, and which he thought orthodox. But how- "ſoever theſe articles were underſtood, and wreſted "againſt him undeſervedly; yet it was certain that "he ſhould obey his Lordſhip, and that he would "keep peace as long as he ſhould be there. But he "wiſhed the Queen might be thoroughly acquainted "with his piety and reverence towards her; adding, "that for her, and for the defence of the ſtate of this "Church, which ſhe ſupported, he would ſhed his "blood, if it were neceſſary, with as willing and rea- "dy a mind, as her own faithful ſubjects ought to "do, and as ſhe would have him do, ſince ſhe had "been willing to make him free of her Kingdom, as "well as his wife and children, and to confirm it with "her ſeal. He ſaid, in the concluſion of his letter, "that theſe were the reaſons, why he did not aſpire to "the Queen's Profeſſorſhip of Divinity (now vacant "by the death of Dr. Whitaker); but that he hoped "his humanity would have regard to his labours, "ſince he ſpent his age at the Univerſity during "twenty years, for a very ſmall ſtipend, and had "been variouſly vexed by thoſe, who were not well "pleaſed with the ſtate of the Church of England "(3)." This letter is dated from Cambridge, 13th of December, 1595.

(2) He means the famous *Lambeth Articles.*

(3) Strype, *ubi ſupra*, B. 4. ch. 17. pag. 465.

[*C*] *A Sermon, in which he declared his thoughts upon the controverted points.*] He did not properly deny the Lambeth Articles, but rather moderate them, and ſtate, as he apprehended, the true ſenſe of them. He aſſerted theſe three propoſitions. I. That God created all men according to his own likeneſs in Adam; and conſequently to eternal life, from which no body was excluded, but for his ſins: as Damaſus taught, lib. II. *De Fide Orthodoxa.* II. That Chriſt died ſufficiently for all; againſt John Piſcator, a foreigner, who denied it; and whoſe opinion he ſhewed was contrary to the Confeſſion of the Church of England, and the Articles approved by the Parliament of this Kingdom, and confirmed by the Queen's authority; for the proof of which he repeated the 31ſt Article. III. That God's promiſes made to us, as they are generally ſet down, ought to be generally underſtood; for which he appealed to the ſeventeenth Article. Some of his auditors were not pleaſed with theſe propoſitions; namely thoſe, who then maintained, that God on purpoſe created the greateſt part of men to deſtruction, that by their perdition he might get glory to himſelf; and that Chriſt did not die for all, not becauſe they refuſed to accept his benefits, but

ſtudied as much as he could not to exaſperate any perſon; nor did he in his Sermon ſay the leaſt thing concerning the Lambeth Articles. Yet ſome of the Heads of the Colleges countenancing the doctrine of Calvin, and being reſolved to eſtabliſh it, if poſſible, in the minds of the Students, Baro was cited before Dr. Goad the Vice-Chancellor, in the Conſiſtory [D] (g). He had ſome hint of it before hand; therefore he came to London in order to acquaint the Archbiſhop with the truth of the matter (b). What paſſed between them will appear from a Letter which his Grace wrote to the Vice-Chancellor, the abſtract of which we ſhall give in the note [E]. Baro returned immediately to Cambridge, and appeared before the Vice-Chancellor and the Heads of the Colleges January the

(g) Ibid. ch. 17. pag. 465, 466.

(b) Ibid. p. 468.

but becauſe he would not, that his death ſhould profit them, and becauſe they were not created to ſalvation, as other, but to damnation. And for the ſame reaſon, they would not have the promiſes to be general, but extended or rather reſtrained them to thoſe few perſons only, who alone, they ſaid, were created by God to be ſaved. Dr. Baro's intention was to ſtop the ſpreading of thoſe dangerous poſitions, and to prevent the young ſcholars from being infected with Piſcator's book, which contained them, and which he ſaw was in the hands of many (4). He vindicated his ſentiments, and endeavoured to ſhew that they agreed with the doctrine of the Church of England in her avowed Articles: and with regard to the nine new propoſitions (5), he maintained that they were not to be underſtood in ſuch a ſenſe, as to vary from or to interfere with the old doctrine of the Church of England. This he repreſented to the Archbiſhop, in a letter dated January the 14th, 159⅓. He tells his Grace, "that he ſaw ſome "perſons at Cambridge, who took the Lambeth Ar- "ticles in ſuch a ſenſe, and ſo ſtretched them, as to "confirm from them all Piſcator's Paradoxes; and that "now it was come to that paſs, that he and others "might ſcarcely ſay, that God created the firſt man, "and in him the reſt, according to his image, and "ſo to eternal life; nor that he hated any, or re- "jected any as a man, (for otherwiſe he had rejected "and hated his own image) but only as a ſinner, ac- "cording to that ſaying of St. Auguſtin, *God hated "not Eſau as a man, but as a ſinner.* And that "they were hardly permitted to ſay, that the Offer- "ing of Chriſt was a perfect redemption, propitiation "and ſatisfaction for all the ſins of the whole world, as "well original as actual: which notwithſtanding were "the very words of the thirty firſt Engliſh Article. Or, "that the promiſes made to us in Chriſt were to be "generally taken and underſtood, tho' theſe were "alſo the words of the ſeventeenth Article (6)." For a further vindication of his orthodoxy, he ſent his Grace at the ſame time his own expoſition of the Lambeth Articles, which he explains in ſuch a manner, as to make them agree with the Articles of the Church of England. That expoſition is too long to be here inſerted; the reader will find it in Mr. Strype's Appendix to his Life of Dr. Whitgift (7).

(4) Idem, ibid. pag. 466.

(5) The *Lambeth Articles.*

(6) Ibid. pag. 467.

(7) Book 4. numb. 26.

[D] *Baro was cited before Dr. Goad the Vice-Chancellor in the Conſiſtory.*] Let us ſee the Vice-Chancellor's reaſons, as he wrote them himſelf to the Archbiſhop, the day after our Profeſſor had delivered his Sermon. He told the Archbiſhop, "that accord- "ing to his Grace's advice, when the nine Ar- "ticles came to the Univerſity, he uſed means, "by the Heads and Preſidents, that every College "ſhould take knowledge and warning thereof. He "alſo gave particular information of them to ſeveral "perſons of whom he doubted, eſpecially Dr. Baro "the Frenchman, cauſing him to ſee and read over "the ſame propoſitions, as alſo that clauſe in parti- "cular of the Archbiſhop's letter, *That nothing ſhould "be publickly taught to the contrary.* He thanked God, "that ſince that time all things were ſo peaceable "and quiet, that he thought there had been nothing "doing againſt the Articles, even in private. But he "was ſure, that in publick, in Divinity exerciſes, "either in the ſchools, or in St. Mary's, where he "had been continually preſent, he had not heard the "leaſt contradiction; . . . ſo that it was very proba- "ble, that the former troubleſome controverſies would "within a ſhort time have worn out of men's minds, "and been forgotten; but that the unhappy, as he "called it, and unexpected reviving of them by Dr. "Baro in his Sermon, would be, he feared, a great "and dangerous occaſion of overturning that quiet "ſtate they enjoyed. For notwithſtanding the Vice- "Chancellor's orders, which had been notified to "him, and the private advertiſements that had been "given him, yet the whole courſe of his Sermon was "concerning the ſame controverſies; and eſpecially "the three laſt propoſitions concerning *Univerſal "Grace*, were by him oppoſed, and even with more "earneſtneſs and vehemency, than was remembred "that he ever ſhewed before; to the great offence and "grief of all, who were ſoundly affected to the truth, and "to the encouragement of his diſciples and adherents. "This was the more ſtrange and unexpected, ſince the "text he choſe gave no manner of occaſion to treat "of thoſe ſubjects; it being James i. 27. *(Pure Re- "ligion and undefiled before God and the Father, is this, "to viſit &c.)*" This is the account, which the Vice-Chancellor gave of Baro's Sermon, in order to lay the charge of diſobedience and faction as home upon him as he could. The ſame day he confered privately and ſeverally, firſt with Dr. Clayton, and then with Mr. Chaderton, two of the Heads, who were preſent at the Sermon, in order to know what they thought of it. He found them of the ſame opinion with him; they wondered, they grieved, that Baro durſt revive theſe matters; they feared it would be an occaſion of diſturbing again the peace of the Univerſity, which began to be ſettled; unleſs ſome effectual remedy were in time provided. This the Vice-Chancellor acquainted the Archbiſhop with in the ſame letter, adding, "that the care of this affair lay in him "as Vice-Chancellor, but that he was perplexed, not "knowing what courſe to take, nor by what ſtatute "to deal with Baro. Therefore he deſired his Grace's "advice, the more ſince he was reſolved ſhortly to "call Baro before him, and before the Heads of the "Colleges. Unleſs it ſhould pleaſe his Grace, in con- "ſideration that he taught againſt the Lambeth Arti- "cles, to call him before the High-Commiſſion (8)."

(8) *Life of Whitgift, ubi ſupra*, pag. 467, 468.

[E] *A letter which his Grace wrote to the Vice-Chancellor.*] That letter is dated January the 16th. The Archbiſhop ſays, "that he was very ſorry Baro "ſhould ſtill continue his troubleſome courſe of con- "tending, notwithſtanding all the advice that had "been given to him, and the ſolemn promiſe he had "made. That he had lately informed him, how "angry her Majeſty had been againſt him for theſe "cauſes, and how improper it was for him, who "was a ſtranger, and had been ſo kindly received "here, to be thus buſy in another Commonwealth, "and make himſelf the author of new diſputes and "diviſions. That when Baro was laſt at London, he "(the Archbiſhop) ſhewed him the propoſitions, and "aſked his opinion of every one of them ſeverally, "and that at two different times. And tho' the laſt "time he ſeemed to make ſome frivolous and childiſh "objections againſt one or two of them only; yet he "did confeſs that they were all true, and that they "were not repugnant to any of his aſſertions. Therefore "the Archbiſhop ſaid, he could not but wonder what "his meaning could be thus to act contrary to the "charge given him, and to which he promiſed to "ſubmit. This the Archbiſhop deſired the Vice- "Chancellor to repreſent to Baro, when he ſhould ap- "pear before him. He added, that he ſuſpected Baro "had received ſome kind of encouragement from "thoſe, who eſteemed his judgment in theſe matters, "and took a delight in commending him both pub- "lickly and in private. That poſſibly alſo Baro "might have heard, that the Lambeth Articles were diſ- "liked by ſome perſons in authority (9); but that if "he depended upon this, he might probably find "himſelf after all diſappointed in his expectations. "The Archbiſhop's advice to the Vice-Chancellor "was, Baro's friend.

(9) The Archbiſhop meant perhaps the Lord Treaſurer Burghley, who was

the 19th, 21ſt, and 29th. He was charged with having preached ſuch doctrines in his late Sermon, whereby he had revived the controverſies that were pacified, againſt the peace of the Univerſity, and the command of the Vice-Chancellor, ſignified to all the Colleges, as alſo againſt the propoſitions approved of by the moſt Reverend Fathers [*F*]. The reader will find hereunder the particular Articles, with which Dr. Baro was charged, and his anſwer to them [*G*]. At his laſt appearance January the 29th, the concluſion was, "That whereas Baro had promiſed to the Vice-Chancellor upon his de-"mand a copy of his Sermon, but his Lawyers had adviſed him not to deliver the ſame, "the "was, that he ſhould call Baro before him, and re-"quire a copy of his Sermon, or at leaſt, command "him to ſet down in writing the principal points "thereof; and alſo demand of him, what could move "him to continue that courſe, notwithſtanding the "orders given to prevent new diſputes, and the many "advertiſements he had received. Laſtly, as the "Lambeth Articles made ſome noiſe (10), his Grace "adviſed the Vice-Chancellor and Heads of the Col-"leges not to proceed to any determination againſt "Baro, till they had acquainted him (the Archbiſhop) "with his anſwer, and with the particular points of "his Sermon, and received his Grace's directions con-"cerning what was beſt to be done in this affair (11)." We may obſerve here, that tho' Baro acknowledged the truth of the Lambeth Articles, as the Archbiſhop here ſays, it was only by explaining them in ſuch a ſenſe, as was not very conſiſtent with the intention of thoſe, who drew them up, that is, with abſolute predeſtination, as appears by his expoſition of them, mentioned above (12). We ſhall give but one inſtance of it; it is, his expoſition of the fourth Article; the Article is as follows: *Thoſe who are not predeſtinated to ſalvation, ſhall be neceſſarily damned for their ſins.* This Baro explains in the following manner: "They, who on "account of their obſtinacy in their ſins and final in-"credulity, are not partakers of Divine Predeſtinati-"on, ſhall neceſſarily be damned for theſe their ſins "and incredulity. For it is neceſſary, that they "who do not believe ſhould periſh. But this neceſſity "is not abſolute, but only hypothetical, or condi-"tional; becauſe being addicted to their ſins, they "do not receive the Goſpel, or having received it, "rejected it again." His own words are, *Qui propter contumaciam in peccatis, & finalem incredulitatem divinæ prædeſtinationis non ſunt participes, neceſſario propter illa ſua peccata & incredulitatem damnabuntur. Neceſſe enim eſt, ut pereant, qui non credunt. Sed hæc neceſſitas non eſt ſimplex & abſoluta, verum ex iſta tantum hypotheſi, quod ſcilicet peccatis addicti, Evangelium non recipiant, vel receptum rejiciant.*

[*F*] *Againſt the propoſitions approved of by the moſt Reverend Fathers.*] Theſe words, *the moſt Reverend Fathers*, have ſomething awful in them; but if we enquire into the authority, by which the Lambeth Articles were ſet forth, we ſhall find, that they could by no means be binding. Let us hear Dr. Heylin upon this ſubject. "The authority by which they were "made, *ſays he* (13), was ſo far from being legal and "ſufficient, that it was plainly none at all. For "what authority could there be in ſo thin a meeting "conſiſting only of the Archbiſhop himſelf, two o-"ther Biſhops, of which but one had actually receiv-"ed conſecration, one Dean, and half a dozen Doc-"tors and other Miniſters, neither empowered to any "ſuch thing by the reſt of the Clergy, nor authorized "to it by the Queen? And therefore their determina-"tions were of no more authority, as to the binding "of the Church, or preſcribing to the judgment of "particular perſons, than as if one Earl, the eldeſt "ſon of two or three others, meeting with half a do-"zen Gentlemen in Weſtminſter-Hall, can be affirm-"ed to be in a capacity of making Orders, which "muſt be looked upon by the ſubjects as Acts of Par-"liament. A Declaration they might make of their "own opinions, or of that, which they thought fitteſt "to be holden in the preſent caſe, but neither Articles "nor Canons to direct the Church; for being but "opinions ſtill, and the opinions of private and par-"ticular perſons, they were not to be looked upon as "publick doctrines. And ſo much was confeſſed by "the Archbiſhop himſelf, when he was called in que-"ſtion for it before the Queen. For her Majeſty, "being acquainted with all that paſſed by the Lord "Burghley, who neither liked the tenets, nor the "manner of proceeding in them, was moſt paſſion-"ately offended, that any ſuch innovation ſhould be "made in the publick doctrine of this Church, and "once reſolved to have them all attainted of a *Præ-"munire*. But afterwards, upon the interpoſition of "ſome friends, and the high eſteem ſhe had for the "excellent Prelate, the Archbiſhop, whom ſhe com-"monly called her *black Husband*, ſhe was willing "to admit him to his defence; and he accordingly "declared in all humble manner, that he and his aſ-"ſociates had not made any Articles, Canons, or "Decrees, with an intent, that they ſhould ſerve here-"after for a ſtanding rule to direct the Church, but "only had reſolved on ſome propoſitions to be ſent to "Cambridge, for the appeaſing of ſome unhappy dif-"ferences in the Univerſity. Her Majeſty being "ſomewhat appeaſed with this anſwer, commanded "nevertheleſs, that he ſhould ſpeedily recall and ſup-"preſs thoſe Articles; which was performed with ſuch "care and diligence, that a copy of them was not to "found for a long time after. And though we may "admit this relation upon the Hiſtory of the Lambeth "Articles printed in Latin in 1651, or on the credit "of Biſhop Mountague, who affirms the ſame in his "Appeal (14), *Anno* 1625; yet ſince the authority of "both has been called in queſtion, we will take "our warrant for this narrative from ſome other "hands; and firſt we have it in a book called *Ne-"ceſſaria Reſponſio* (15), publiſhed by the Remonſtrants "in 1618, who poſſibly might have had the whole "ſtory of it from the mouth of Baroe (16), or ſome "other, who lived at that time at Cambridge, and "might be well acquainted with the former paſſages. "And ſecondly, we find the ſame aſſerted by the Bi-"ſhops of Rocheſter, Oxon, and St. David's in a "Letter (17) to the Duke of Buckingham, Auguſt "the 2d 1625, in which they ſignify to him, that "the ſaid Articles being agreed upon, and ready to "be publiſhed, it pleaſed Queen Elizabeth upon no-"tice given how little they agreed with the practice "of piety, and obedience to all government, to cauſe "them to be ſuppreſſed, and that they had continued "ſo ever ſince, till then of late ſome of them had re-"ceived countenance from the Synod of Dort." We may judge from this account, with how much juſtice Dr. Baro was proſecuted and brought into trouble, either for not admitting theſe Articles, or for preaching againſt them, ſince they were eſtabliſhed by no competent Authority.

[*G*] *The particular Articles with which Dr. Baro was charged, and his anſwer to them.*] The Articles with which he was charged, as we find them in Mr. Strype's Life of Archbiſhop Whitgift (18), were as follow. I. That God by an abſolute will created all men and every individual for eternal life; for he created them all according to his own image, and therefore for happineſs; ſo that he deprives no body of ſalvation, but for his ſins. II. That there is a twofold will in God, an antecedent and a conſequent will: that by his antecedent will God rejects no body, otherwiſe he would condemn his own work. To explain this, Dr. Baro alledged the inſtance of a King, a Father, and an Huſbandman; a King makes Laws for the good of his ſubjects; a Father does not beget a ſon to have him hanged, or to diſinherit him; an Huſbandman does not plant a tree, to root it out again. III. That Chriſt died for all men; and that they all might know they can find a remedy in him; according to what is ſaid, that Chriſt *came to ſave that which was loſt* (19). But all were loſt in Adam; therefore he came to ſave all; for the remedy muſt be as extenſive as the evil is; and *God is no reſpecter of perſons* (20). IV. That God's promiſes are univerſal, and relate to Cain,

(10) At London it ſeems, and at Court.

(11) *Life of Whitgift, ubi ſupra*, pag. 468, 469.

(12) Quot. (7).

(13) *Quinquarticular Hiſt.* pag. 3. ch. 20. §3. in the *Collection of his Hiſtorical and Miſcellaneous Tracts*, printed in 1681, fol. pag. 622, 623.

(14) Pag. 71.

(15) *Reſp. Nec.* pag. 146.

(16) Thus Dr. Heylin writes the name of our Baro.

(17) *Cabala* pag. 117.

(18) *Ubi ſupra*, ch. 18. p. 470.

(19) Matth. xviii. 11.

(20) Act. x. 34.

" the Vice-Chancellor did now, by virtue of his authority peremptorily command him " to deliver him the whole and entire Sermon, as to the ſubſtance of it, in writing, which " Baro accordingly promiſed he would do the next day. And laſtly he did peremptorily " and by virtue of his authority command him, that he ſhould wholly abſtain from thoſe " controverſies, propoſitions and articles, and leave them altogether untouched as well in " his Lectures, Sermons, and Determinations, as in his Diſputations, and other Exerciſes." They did not think it proper to proceed further againſt him, without advice from their Superiors; therefore the Vice-Chancellor wrote an account of this whole affair to the Chancellor [*H*] that very day; and it is ſtrange he had not done it before, the matter having been ſo long in debate (*i*). The Vice-Chancellor's account being calculated to render Dr. Baro criminal in the eyes of the Lord Burghley, he did not neglect in his own defence to repreſent his caſe to him [*I*]; upon which the Chancellor wrote to the Heads of the

(*i*) Ibid. ch. 18. pag. 470, 471.

Cain, as well as to Abel; to Eſau as well as to Jacob; to Judas as well as to Peter. That Cain was not more rejected of God, than Abel, before he excluded himſelf; that men exclude themſelves from heaven, but God does not exclude them, according to this paſſage, *O Iſrael, thou haſt deſtroyed thyſelf* (18). He acknowledged that he had aſſerted theſe propoſitions, but maintained that they were not repugnant to the nine Articles (19). And with regard to the Grace of God ſufficient to eternal ſalvation, which Grace he had ſaid was offered to all, he interpreted his words thus, *Quoad homines univerſos, non quoad menſuram gratiæ datæ.* That is, " With reſpect to all men in general, but not " to the meaſure in which Grace was given them." For to ſome, ſaid he, was given the greater Grace, to others leſs, to ſome more talents, to others fewer. To which the Vice-Chancellor anſwered, that his opinion of univerſal Grace ſufficient for ſalvation was not only repugnant to the propoſitions of Lambeth, but alſo againſt experience; becauſe out of the Church, the Turks, and other Barbarous Nations, altho' they had external gifts, common to this life, granted them by God, yet were altogether deſtitute of Grace ſufficient to ſalvation (20). We are not told what Baro anſwered to this objection, which is indeed very preſſing againſt thoſe, who maintaining the Arminian ſyſtem, do yet deny, that thoſe to whom the Goſpel has not been made known, will be ſaved, if they make a good uſe of their reaſon, and obſerve the precepts of Natural Religion (21).

(18) Hoſea xiii. 9.

(19) See the remark [*M*].

(20) *Life of Whitgift, ubi ſupra*, p. 471.

(21) See *An Anſwer to the Poſtſcript of the ſecond part of Scripture Vindicated*, printed for Knapton, in 1731.

[*H*] *The Vice-Chancellor wrote an account of this whole affair to the Chancellor.*] " So is it, Right Honourable, (ſays he) that certain new controverſies being " here raiſed about ſubſtantial points of Religion, to " the great trouble of the Univerſity, before my coming in office, it pleaſed God ſhortly after my entrance, " by the good travail of my Lord his Grace of Canterbury, my Lord of London, and other Divines there, " to bleſs us with a good ſucceſs and a happy peace " and quietneſs in the Univerſity Untill Dr. Baro, " the Lady Margaret's Reader in Divinity, contrary to " the good advice given by my Lord of Canterbury in " his letter, to the commandment given by me to every " College, and particularly ſignified to him Dr. Baro " (22), and againſt the peace of the Univerſity, did " again offenſively revive in publick the ſaid controverſies by his Sermon." He added, " That for remedy thereof, this evil being ſo dangerous to the " peace of the Univerſity and the Church, he had, " with the advice and aſſiſtance of ſuch of the Heads " as were at home, proceeded in ſuch a manner, as " would appear by the copies he ſent to his Lordſhip " (23). That this being a matter of ſuch importance " and eccleſiaſtical concernment, he had thought fit " alſo to acquaint his Grace of Canterbury therewith, " in order to ſtop the inconveniencies already in part " ſuffered amongſt them, and to prevent in time thoſe " evils which were like to break out in the Univerſity, and conſequently in the Church, upon this " publick occaſion. Therefore it was his requeſt, " that it might pleaſe his Lordſhip to direct him, " and the reſt of the Heads preſent, with his wiſe " and honourable advice, the rather becauſe there " wanted a ſufficient number of Heads at home. And " he ſaid, that he would reſt without any further proceedings againſt the party, till he received his Lordſhip's advice. Yet meaning, with his conſent, to " retain the final determination there, in regard to " the Univerſity's juriſdiction and privileges, which " he was obliged to maintain." Dated from King's College, Cambridge, January the 29th, 1595. We may obſerve upon this letter, that tho' it be not poſitively ſaid, that Baro preached againſt the Lambeth Articles, yet it is ſufficiently inſinuated, and no notice is taken of what he ſaid in his own defence. For the Articles, which were ſent together with this letter, were drawn up by Baro's adverſaries, and therefore not to be depended upon without being compared with his anſwers (24).

(22) His name is always written Barow in this Letter.

(23) The one contained the four Articles mentioned in the foregoing notes; the other may be ſeen in the Appendix to the 4th book of the *Life of Whitgift*, numb. 26.

(24) *Life of Whitgift, ubi ſupra*, ch. 18. p. 471, 472.

[*I*] *He repreſented his caſe to the Lord Burghley.*] Here follows a tranſlation of his Letter to that Lord (25). " It is with the utmoſt grief, moſt noble Lord, " ſays he, that I hear, Dr. Goad Vice-Chancellor of " this Univerſity has accuſed me before your Lordſhip, nor do I well know what it is he charges me " with. For which reaſon I make bold to write to " you, in order to ſay plainly and with ingenuity " before your Lordſhip what has given him a pretence to attack me, and if I have failed in any " thing, I willingly ſubmit to your Lordſhip's judgment and cenſure." He then gives an account of his Sermon, the ſame as we have given above (26). Then he adds, " This did not pleaſe ſome, who " endeavour to perſuade us, that God has purpoſely " created, and ſtill creates every day, the greateſt " part of mankind for deſtruction, in order to be glorified by their damnation: and that Chriſt did not " die for all men, not becauſe many reject the benefit of his death, but becauſe he himſelf is not willing that his death ſhould prove beneficial to them, " they not being like others predeſtinated to ſalvation, but created for deſtruction. For that reaſon alſo " they deny God's promiſes to be univerſal &c. (27). " Theſe then are the ſubjects for which I ſtand accuſed, and for theſe I am traduced before your Lordſhip. Indeed I own, with that frankneſs and ingenuity, which becomes a man, who ſpeaks before " ſo learned and religious a Judge as you are, that I " have ſaid thoſe things, and ſtill believe them to be " true, and the very foundation of our, that is, the " Chriſtian Religion. The Vice-Chancellor has acted with me in ſuch a manner, as not to charge me " with having delivered falſe doctrine, but rather with " having ſpoken againſt the nine Articles, which were " lately tranſmitted hither. This I denied, and ſaid " I had not the leaſt thought of it, intending only to " maintain the truth of the Goſpel-Doctrine againſt " John Piſcator. This is a true account of the whole " matter. If I have done any thing amiſs, I am in " your Lordſhip's power, nor, as I have ſaid, do I " decline your judgment. This only I beg of you, " for God's ſake, whoſe Religion is here concerned, " that according to your celebrated wiſdom and clemency, before you pronounce any thing concerning me, or entertain any ill opinion of me, you " will be pleaſed to enquire into the truth of the three " Articles I have mentioned, according to your known " piety and learning. And if you find that I ſpoke " nothing but the truth, you will be ſo kind as to " prevent the Vice-Chancellor from making any ſevere " decree againſt me. It is indeed very hard upon " me, that having taught Divinity twenty four years " in your Univerſity, and that for the ſmall ſalary of " twenty pounds a year, now that I am worn out with " age, and expected ſome reward for my long labours, " from your Lordſhip, our Chancellor, a Man of Letters, " and the Patron of the learned, I ſhould be thus defamed to you. However your ſound and ſolid " judgment in the moſt difficult and abſtruſe matters " is a comfort to me; and gives me hopes, that your " Lordſhip

(25) Ibid. App. to B. 4. num. 28.

(26) Rem. [*C*].

(27) See ibid.

the Colleges in ſuch a manner, as diſcountenanced their proceedings againſt the Profeſſor [K]; which appears by his continuing in his poſt till his reſignation (k). He had ſtill ſome friends left even in the Univerſity [L], but he had much trouble and oppoſition to ſuffer from the Vice-Chancellor, and from Mr. Chaderton, who had ſeveral years before conceived a prejudice againſt him, and took this opportunity to deprive him, if poſſible, of his Profeſſorſhip, on the plauſible pretence that he had in his Sermon contradicted the Lambeth Articles: this they laboured to perſuade the Archbiſhop, which obliged Baro to write another Letter to his Grace in his own vindication [M]. This letter is dated February the fourth. The Archbiſhop knowing his great learning and merit, would not prejudice him either in his place or reputation, but only charged him to forbear thoſe arguments and ſubjects, which would provoke contentious diſputations. Baro returned him thanks in a letter [N] dated March the 22d 159⅝ (l), and the time of his Profeſſorſhip

(k) This expreſſion of Mr. Strype's is not exact, for he did not properly reſign his place; ſee the note [O].

(l) Ibid. p. 473, 467.

" Lordſhip will keep an ear open to me: Here I reſt " as in a ſafe harbour, praying to God, &c." Dated at Cambridge, February the 9th, 1595.

[K] *Diſcountenanced their proceedings againſt the Profeſſor.*] We have not the entire letter of the Lord Burleigh, but only ſome ſhort ſentences of it, relating to the Vice-Chancellor's and the Heads of the Colleges vigorous proceedings againſt Baro, and their putting interrogatories to him, as tho' he had been ſome great offender. Yet theſe ſhort ſentences ſufficiently ſhew the Chancellor's mind; therefore we ſhall tranſcribe them here, as we find them in the Life of Archbiſhop Whitgift (27). " I am ſorry to hear &c. The matters I can- " not conceive, as others take them, &c. Broached " and publiſh'd by, &c. Whereby came to the Queen, " &c. (Theſe were ſome of their accuſations of Baro in their letter to the Chancellor, which he ſaid *he could not conceive as they took them.*) " As good and " as ancient are of another judgment, &c. *Omnia* " *licent, at omnia non expediunt &c.* That is, *All* " *things are lawful, but all things are not expedient* " (28). Ye may puniſh him if ye will, but ye ſhall " do it for well doing, &c. in holding the truth in " my opinion. Ye ſift him with interrogatories, as " if he were a thief, &c. This ſeems done of ſto- " mach amongſt you, &c. The witneſſes do not a- " gree (which he obſerved by the depoſitions, that were ſent him of a great many Bachelors of Divinity, and ſome Maſters of Art, that heard Baro's " Sermon.) If he has done contrary to order and " commandment, in renewing therein, (that is, the controverſies and contentions about thoſe diſputed points, that were pretty well quieted) " he has not " well done; I will write to him myſelf, and charge " him as Chancellor, &c." (that is, to forbear any further mentioning thoſe doctrines either in his readings or diſputations. It appears from hence, that tho' the Chancellor was deſirous to preſerve the peace of the Univerſity, yet he was far from condemning Baro's opinions, nor did he approve the proceedings againſt him. What conſequence may be inferred from the Chancellor's conduct will appear below (29).

(27) *Ubi ſupra*, pag. 473.

(28) 1 Cor. vi. 12.

(29) Note [O].

[L] *He had ſtill ſome friends left, even in the Univerſity.*] Mr. Overal, Dr. Clayton, Mr. Harſnet, and Dr. Andrews favoured his cauſe. The latter was at this time with the Archbiſhop, ſo that Baro thought proper to write to him, to recommend his caſe to that Prelate, who ſeemed not to be averſe to the doctrine of univerſal Grace, and of God's good Will to all mankind; for there was a good underſtanding between him and Dr. Andrews. It appears by Baro's letter to the latter, that Mr. Overal (who was now Regius Profeſſor in the room of Whitaker), freely and openly declared himſelf of Baro's opinion, when he appeared before the Vice-Chancellor, and that Dr. Clayton on the ſame occaſion had not obſcurely favoured him. Their agreeing with him had no doubt a great influence upon the Vice-Chancellor's conduct, who when that meeting broke up, declared, that there might be another concerning the ſame matter, becauſe all things could not be tranſacted at once (30). It is probable that the Vice-Chancellor, ſeeing that Baro was ſupported by ſeveral eminent men, who were of his opinion, durſt not carry his proceedings ſo far as he would have otherwiſe done. There are in this letter of Dr. Baro to Dr. Andrews ſome other particulars, which deſerve to be mentioned. Baro acquaints his friend, that a book was publiſhed, in which were the following propoſitions: *Chriſt died for all neither ſufficiently nor efficaciouſly*; and in the margin it was written, *We muſt not pray for all men.* Alſo in another place, *God willeth ſin, and worketh it.* This book was printed at London 1594. Baro alſo tells his friend, that Mr. Perkins had confuted the reaſons, which Mr. Overal had alledged to prove *that Chriſt died for all*; he added that Mr. Overal had obtained from the Biſhops of Canterbury and London, that thoſe, who contradicted him on account of his preaching *pro Chriſto* (in vindication of Chriſt's merits) ſhould be repreſſed. He added, that if ſuch letters might be obtained, peace would be better provided for (31). It appears by this, that Dr. Baro, tho' a learned and pious man, was not free from faults; and that contrary to the cuſtom of thoſe, who when they ſuffer perſecution preach up a general Toleration, he tho' under great troubles on account of his ſentiments, would reſtrain others from publiſhing theirs.

(30) *Life of Whitgift, ubi ſupra*, pag. 473.

(31) Ibid. pag. 474.

[M] *Another letter to his Grace, in his own vindication.*] He tells the Archbiſhop, " that when he heard " that thoſe two perſons (Dr. Goad, and Mr. Chaderton who chiefly attempted theſe things againſt him;) " went ſtill forwards, moving every ſtone, to prove, " that . . . he had made a Sermon againſt ſix of the " nine Articles, he could not but fly to him, who was " his friendly ſafeguard, that he might not be oppreſſed by their arts, which he wiſhed were known to " him. Therefore he humbly and earneſtly beſought " him, that he would read ſomething, which he " here ſhould propoſe to him. . . . Firſt, that they, as " his Grace very well knew, had for many years paſt " been evil affected towards him, and that for no other " cauſe, than that he approved of the rights and ſtate " of this Church and acquieſced in it. Tho' one of " them, viz. Mr. Chaderton, might have beſides a ſpecial cauſe of hatred againſt him, namely that he defended and ſhewed againſt him, that *Faith was* " *commanded by the Law* (32). And that hence certainly it was, that taking hold of this occaſion " from his Sermon, they moved every thing againſt " him. And that although they would ſeem to deal " with him by law, yet they regarded not to retain " the form of law; for this one thing ſeemed enough " to Mr. Vice-Chancellor, to have accuſers and witneſſes, that he might prove, that he ſpoke ſuch " and ſuch things, which he did not deny; but that " he ſpoke againſt the Articles, which was the matter of law, belonged to Judges and not to witneſſes." He then gives again an account of the three propoſitions of his Sermon, and ſhews that he did not intend to ſpeak againſt the Articles, which he had not ſo much as mentioned. Laſtly, he told the Archbiſhop, that he was forbid by the Vice-Chancellor, to treat either in Lectures or Diſputations, of the matters controverted; which he promiſed to obſerve, but at the ſame time, he aſked the Vice-Chancellor to explain, of what matters controverted he underſtood it, which nevertheleſs was not defined by him, tho' he thought it was meant of the Lambeth Articles. But fearing ſome advantage might notwithſtanding be taken againſt whatſoever he might read or ſay, he obſerv'd that if they were to proceed by conſequences, an occaſion would eaſily be taken from one word. But he promiſed the Archbiſhop, that he would take as much pains and care as poſſibly he could, that even that might not happen. Wherefore he earneſtly beſeeched his Grace, who he ſaid was his patron, that he would ſoon determine concerning theſe things (33).

(32) *See* Strype's *Annals*, vol. 3. pag. 48.

(33) *Life of Whitgift, ubi ſupra*, pag. 475, 476.

[N] *Returned him thanks in a letter.*] He told the Archbiſhop, that he was now reſcued at length by his

ſhip ending three days after, he did not think fit to ſtand again for it at the new election [O], but retired to London, where he died three or four years after (*m*), and was decently buried in the Pariſh-Church of St. Olave-Hartſtreet, his pall being ſupported by ſix Doctors of Divinity, and his corps attended by the Miniſters of the City, according to an order of Dr. Bancroft, then Biſhop of London. Baro left ſeveral children behind him; his eldeſt ſon Samuel Baro was a Phyſician, and lived and died at Lyn-Regis in Norfolk (*n*).

(*m*) Dr. P. Heylin's *Quinquarticular Hiſtory*, B. 3. ch. 21. § 9. In a *Collection of his Hiſtorical and Miſcellaneous Tracts*, printed in 1681. fol. pag. 626.

(*n*) Strype's *Ann.* vol. 4. pag. 231.

his favour from thoſe perſecutions, with which he was ſo oppreſſed before: For he obſerved that ſince the return of the Vice-Chancellor (who it ſeems had been with the Archbiſhop, and received his inſtructions) neither he, nor any one elſe had ſpoken to him of paſt matters; which he doubted not but was done out of a reverence to his Grace; otherwiſe, thoſe who laboured thus againſt him, would have very hardly deſiſted; for they were thoſe very perſons, who, if he miſtook not, did ten or eleven years before decree certain things againſt him unheard, in a clandeſtine Synod held at London, (probably by Cartwright and his followers), the Acts of which were with his Grace; and having been informed of it by one Fontanus, he preſently took a journey to London, and complained to Dr. Goad, who had been preſent at that Synod in King's-College houſe near the Thames; praying him, that he would at leaſt ſhew him, what they had decreed concerning him, or againſt him; which he ſaid he could not obtain of him, nor knew it, before Dr. Bancroft, by the Archbiſhop's commands, ſhewed it him in a certain book three or four years ago. It was from that time, he ſaid, that they hated him, and always privily obſerved him, till at laſt they took occaſion from his Sermon, to endeavour to caſt him out of the Univerſity with ſhame, which, as they had prepared all things againſt him, they had eaſily performed, if they had not been prevented by his Grace's authority, and as with a bridle reſtrained (33). The reſt of the letter contains his thanks for this favour; and his petition for his Grace's pardon, if, tho' what he had ſaid in his Sermon be true, yet he had failed in ſpeaking the truth in an improper place, which occaſioned all the trouble he underwent, promiſing to be more cautious and prudent for the future (34).

(33) Ibid. pag. 476.

(34) Ibid. pag. 477.

[O] *The time of his Profeſſorſhip ending three days after, he did not think fit to ſtand again for it at the new election.*] Let us hear Dr. Heylin's account of this matter, which will correct the errors of Dr. Fuller, in that paſſage, which Mr. Des Maizeaux communicated to Mr. Bayle. "The Lambeth Articles, ſays Dr. Heylin (35), were ſo far from appeaſing the preſent controverſies, and ſuppreſſing Baro and his party, that his diſciples and adherents became more united, and the breach wider than before. And tho' Dr. Baro not long after deſerted his place in the Univerſity, yet neither was he deprived of his Profeſſorſhip, as ſome ſay, nor forced to leave it for fear of being deprived, as is ſaid by others. For that Profeſſorſhip being choſen from two years to two years, according to the Statutes of Lady Margaret, he kept the place till the expiring of his term, and then gave off, without ſo much as ſhewing himſelf a ſuitor for it; which had he done, it may be probable enough that he had carried it from any other candidate or competitor, of what rank ſoever; the Anti-Calvinian party being grown ſo ſtrong, as not to be eaſily overborn in a publick buſineſs by the oppoſite faction. This appears plainly by what followed on the death of Dr. Whitaker; who died within a few days after his return to Lambeth with the nine Articles ſo much talk'd of. Two Candidates appeared for the Profeſſorſhip after his deceaſe: Wotton of King's College, a profeſſed Calvinian and one of thoſe who wrote againſt Mountague's Appeal in 1626, competitor with Overal of Trinity-College, almoſt as far from the Calvinian doctrine in the main platform of Predeſtination, as Baro, Hurſnet, or Barret are conceived to be. But when it came to the vote of the Univerſity, the place was carried for Overal by the major part: which as it plainly ſhews, that tho' the doctrines of Calvin were ſo hotly ſtickled for here by moſt of the Heads, yet the greater part of the learned body entertained them not; ſo does it alſo render it very improbable, that Baro ſhould be put out of his place, by thoſe who had taken in Overal, or not confirmed therein, if he had deſired. And therefore we may rather think, as before is ſaid, that he *relinquiſhed the place of his own accord*, in which he found his doctrine croſſed by the Lambeth Articles, and afterwards his peace diſtracted by ſeveral informations brought againſt him, by the adverſe faction." This account is the more probable, ſince, as we have ſeen, he was ſupported and favoured by the Chancellor of the Univerſity, and by the Archbiſhop. It is to be wondered that the Gentleman, who ſent Mr. Bayle the abſtract from Fuller, ſhould take no notice of Dr. Heylyn's confutation of it, or ſhould not have known that there was ſuch a confutation. As for Baro having introduced a new doctrine, this is fully confuted by Dr. Heylin, who ſhews from Latimer, Hooper, and others, as alſo from the very Articles of the Church of England, and particularly from the ſeventeenth, that abſolute Predeſtination in the ſenſe of Calvin, is not the doctrine of the Church of England (36). How then can Baro be ſaid to have *introduced a new Doctrine to poiſon the Univerſity?* This Mr. Des Maizeaux ought to have obſerved. But perhaps Heylin's works were not then known to him. P.

(35) *Ubi ſupra*, § 4. pag. 623.

(36) Ibid. pag. 2. ch. 9, 10. & *alibi paſſim.*

BARON (VINCENT) in Latin *Baronius*, a Monk of the Order of St. Dominic, was eſteemed in the ſeventeenth Century for ſeveral books which he publiſhed. He had for an antagoniſt the famous Theophilus Raynaud; and I cannot tell whether his deſire of engaging with ſo renowned a champion did not occaſion him to take for that Jeſuit's Work what was not ſo. He acknowledged ſometimes that he was miſtaken in his conjectures upon that point. The works of Father Baron, which are come to my knowledge, are a book *concerning Juſtification againſt the Doctrine of the Calviniſts*; *a moral Theology* divided into three parts [A], and *an Apology for his*

[A] *He wrote a* Moral Theology, *divided into three parts.*] The firſt is deſigned againſt the Doctrine of Probability, *adverſus laxiores probabiliſtas* (1). In that part he confutes Caramuel, who had written four Letters againſt the Diſſertation, which Mr. Fagnano, Dean of the Prelates of Rome, had inſerted in his Commentaries upon the Canon Law. Mr. Fagnano maintains very ſtrongly, that an opinion, which is thought to be leſs probable, ought never to be preferred to one which is believed more probable. Caramuel confutes this, and was himſelf confuted by our Vincent Baron. Father Theophilus Raynaud was confuted in the ſame Work, with regard to an opinion of Suarez condemned by Clement VIII. Suarez had aſſerted that a perſon might confeſs by Letters: Father Theophilus contrived ſome Expedients to defend his brother againſt the Pope's cenſure; and it was againſt theſe Expedients that Father Baron took up his pen. He attacked at the ſame time the Janſeniſts, ſince he maintained to Wendrokius, that *there are ſome caſes, though very rare, in which there may be an invincible ignorance with reſpect both to the Law of Nature, and the Poſitive Law* (2). In the ſecond part he attacks Amadæus Guimenius, and not only aſſerts that the looſe opinions imputed to the Dominicans are not their true ſentiments; but ſhews likewiſe what judgment is to be formed of thoſe opinions. He acknowledges in his preface the error which he had fallen into

(1) See the *Journal des Savans* for the 8th of March 1666, pag. 194.

(2) Ibid. pag. 198.

his Order [*B*]. In his moral Theology he has chosen the principal points, which are in dispute between the Dominicans and Jesuits. He was a celebrated Preacher.

Here is a memorial which I have recovered since the first edition of this Work (*a*). " Father Vincent Baron was born at Martres in the Diocese of Rieux in Gascony. He entered into the Order of the Preaching Friars at Toulouse in the year 1622. He taught Divinity several years with applause in the Convent of the same City, and was made Prior there; as he was likewise at Avignon, and in the General Novitiate of the Suburb of St. Germain at Paris. He was Definitor for his Province in the General Chapter held in the year 1656, in which he presided at the Theses dedicated to Pope Alexander VII, which gained him the esteem of all the City and his whole Order. He was present at the Assembly, in which the Pope ordered the Definitors, and Fathers of the Chapter to be told, from him, that he was extremely grieved to see the Christian Morality sunk into such a deplorable relaxation, as some of the new Casuists had reduced it to, and that he exhorted them to compose another system of it, which should be conformable to the doctrine of St. Thomas. This was what engaged Father Baron to undertake the Works which he wrote upon that subject. He was again chosen Provincial; and afterwards sent by the Father General as Commissary to Portugal, upon important affairs, which he managed with such success, that the Queen, the Court, and all the Monks gave testimony of his merit by a public Act. He returned to Paris to the General Novitiate, and died there the 21st of January 1674, aged seventy years. Besides several *Latin Poems*, which he left as instances of his capacity in polite Literature, he published the Works which shall be mentioned below [*C*]." You will find a passage very much to his honour in the Historical Apology for the Censures of Louvain and Doway (*b*). The Congregation of the Index was not favourable to him [*D*].

(*a*) By means of Mr. *Pinsson des Riollet*.

(*b*) Published in 1688, by Mr. Gery, Bachelor of Divinity. This passage is in page 243.

BARONI

into in writing his book; he had imagined that Amadæus Guimenius was only a fictitious name, which Father Theophilus had assumed (3). In the third part he treats of Human Liberty, and the *Media Scientia*, and asserts that the Prescience of God has no other foundation than his decrees, and that this Prescience is so far from destroying the liberty of the creature, that it establishes it (4). This ought not to be considered as a paradox; for whoever should speak in a different manner, would not follow the definition of Liberty, which must be laid down in the system of Physical Predetermination. By means of the different ideas of Liberty, the contest may still be continued, and the reader may be so far imposed upon, that he shall not perceive when his cause does not succeed.

(3) *Journal des Savans* of the 12th of April 1666, pag. 36.

(4) *Journal des Savans* of the 21st of June 1666, pag. 257.

[*B*] . . . . *And an* Apology for his Order.] This work is in Latin, as well as the former. It serves for answer to the cruel Invective of Father Theophilus Raynaud intitled *de Immunitate Cyriacorum à Censuris*, and to that, which pretended to shew that of all the works ascribed to Thomas Aquinas, it is well if the tenth part be really his. Father Baron enters likewise into the lists with Mr. de Launoi, who maintained that several passages of the Fathers quoted in a treatise of Thomas Aquinas against the Greeks, are supposititious. This Dominican wrote not only an Apology for his Order, but even a Panegyric upon it (5).

(5) *Journal des Savans*, of the 7th March 1667, pag. 92.

[*C*] *He publish'd several works, which shall be mentioned below.*] What I am going to transcribe is word for word contained in the Memorial, from whence I have taken the addition to this article. " *Theologia* " *Moralis*, at Paris in 1665, in two volumes in 8vo. " *Primus Tomus ejusdem correctus, Editio secunda* in " 1667 in 8vo. *Libri Apologetici contra Theophilum* " *Rainaudum*, at Paris, in 1666, in two volumes in " 8vo. *Mens sancti Augustini & Thomæ de Gratiâ* " *& Libertate*, in 1666, in 8vo. *Ethica Christiana*, " at Paris, in 1666, in two volumes in 8vo. *Re-* " *sponsio ad Librum Cardanæ*, ibid. in 8vo. *L'Here-* " *sie Convaincue*, at Paris, in 1668, in 12mo. *Pa-* " *negyriques des Saints*, ibid. in 1660, in 4to. The " book intitled, *Ethices Christianæ septemdecim loci*, " written against one Matthew Moya, who had as- " sumed the name of Amadæus, was censured at Rome " by the intrigues of Cardinal Nitard, who was of- " fended at it, and Capisucchi Master of the sacred " Palace, who had approved of it, was deposed, and " Father Hyacinthe Libelli, afterwards Archbishop of " Avignon, put in his place. Capisucchi was after- " wards restored, and since made a Cardinal."

I do not find in this list of Father Baron's works the *Exercitatio*, which Mr. de Launoi has confuted with an incredible warmth and acrimony in one of his Letters (the XIVth of the fifth part.) See the remark [*P*] of the article of JOHN DE LAUNOI at the beginning.

Two or three months after I had received this Memorial, there was sent me what follows: " Apologia " pro sacrâ Congregatione Indicis, ejusque Secretario " & Dominicanis, contra Petri à Valle clausâ Libel- " lum famosum inscriptum *de Immunitate Authorum* " *Cyriacorum à Censurâ*. Romæ typis . . . . . " M.DC.LXII, in 4to. Advertat lector præter in- " numera errata ex prælo passim sensum & stylum " auctorum mutantia, addita nonnulla necessaria ser- " mone simplici, & multa adjecta convitia: has au- " tem labes tollet secunda editio. i. e. " *An Apology* " *for the sacred Congregation of the* INDEX, *and their* " *Secretary, and for the Dominicans, against the libel* " *of Peter à Valle clausa, intitled*, The Exemption of " the Writers among the Dominicans from Censure. " *Printed at Rome by* . . . . . 1662 *in* 4to. *The* " *Reader may observe, that besides innumerable errors* " *of the press, which every where alter the sense and* " *style of the authors, there are some important things* " *in plain language, and many reproachful terms insert-* " *ed. The second edition will correct these faults.* This " second edition was printed at Paris by Simon Piget " in 1666, in two volumes, divided into five books. " The first, printed at Rome, at the desire of Cardi- " nal Capisucchi, then Master of the Sacred Palace, " who gave his approbation of it, was the occasion " of the same Capisucchi's being deposed from his " office by Alexander VII, a great friend of the Je- " suits. It was likewise put into the Index the 28th " of February 1664."

[*D*] *The Congregation of the Index was not favourable to him.*] Here is an Extract from their Decree of the 27th of September 1672. *Duo primi Tomi operum Fr. Vincentii Baronii inscripti* Theologiæ Moralis Summa bipartita, *prohibentur; tertius verò præfati auctoris suspenditur, donec corrigatur. Ultimi autem duo tomi ejusdem auctoris, scilicet quartus & quintus, quinque libros apologeticos continentes, pariter prohibentur* (6). i. e. " The two first volumes of F. Vincent Baron's " works, intitled, *Theologiæ Moralis Summæ bipartita*, " are prohibited: the third volume of the same au- " thor is suspended, till it be corrected, and the last " two volumes of the same author, namely the fourth " and fifth, containing five apologetical pieces, are " likewise prohibited." See the End of the preceding remark.

(6) *See* Father Papebroch. *Responsi. ad Exhibit. Errorum*, p. 287.

BARONI (LEONORA) an Italian Lady, who had one of the fineſt voices in the world, flouriſhed in the ſeventeenth Century. She was daughter to the beautiful ADRIANA of Mantua, and was ſo greatly admired, that a prodigious number of the Wits wrote verſes in her praiſe. There is a volume of excellent pieces in Latin, Greek, French, Italian, and Spaniſh, printed at Rome under the title of *Applauſi Poetici alle glorie della Signora Leonora Baroni* [*A*]. Thoſe who would know particularly the perfections of her manner of ſinging, may read what a good judge, who heard her ſing, ſays of her [*B*]. It is from him that I have borrowed what I have ſaid above.

[*A*] *There is a volume of pieces in her praiſe under the title of* Applauſi Poetici alle glorie della Signora Leonora Baroni.] Nicius Erythræus ſpeaks of this work, when he ſays: *Legi ego in Theatro Eleonoræ Baronæ, cantricis eximiæ, in quo omnes hic Romæ, quotquot ingenio & poeticæ facultatis laude præſtant, carminibus, tum Etruſcè tum Latinè ſcriptis, ſingulari ac prope divino mulieris illius canendi artificio tanquam fauſtos quoſdam clamores & plauſus edunt: legi, inquam, unum Lælii (Guidiccioni) Epigramma, ita purum, ita elegans &c.* (1). i. e. "I have read in the Theatre of "Eleonora Baroni, an excellent Singer, in the praiſe "of whoſe extraordinary and almoſt divine manner "of ſinging, all the Wits at Rome, who have any "talent of Poetry, have publiſh'd their Congratulati-"ons both in Latin and Italian Verſe: I have read, "I ſay, in that Collection an Epigram of Lælius, "(Guidiccioni) ſo pure, and elegant, &c.

(1) Nic. Eryth. *Pinac.* 2. pag. 129.

[*B*] *What a good judge, who heard her ſing, ſays of her.*] "She has a fine genius, and an excellent judg-"ment in diſtinguiſhing good from bad Muſic; ſhe "underſtands it perfectly well, and even compoſes "herſelf: which qualifies her to be miſtreſs of what "ſhe ſings, and to pronounce and expreſs the ſenſe of the "words perfectly well. She does not pique herſelf "upon being a beauty; but ſhe is not diſagreeable, "and no coquet. She ſings with a bold and generous "modeſty, and with a ſweet gravity. Her voice is "ſtrong and has a great compaſs, it is juſt, ſonorous, "harmonious; ſhe ſoftens and raiſes it without any "difficulty, and without making any grimaces. Her "raptures and ſighs are not wanton; her looks have "nothing laſcivious in them, and her geſtures ſhew "a modeſty, that would become the chaſteſt virgin. "In paſſing from one tune to another, ſhe makes us "ſenſible ſometimes of the diviſions of the Enhar-"monic and Chromatic kind, with ſo much addreſs "and elegance, that every body is raviſhed with that "beautiful and difficult manner of ſinging. She has no "occaſion to deſire any perſon to aſſiſt her with a theorbo "or viol, without one of which her ſinging would "be imperfect; for ſhe plays upon theſe two inſtru-"ments perfectly herſelf. In ſhort I have had the "pleaſure of hearing her ſing ſeveral times above "thirty different Airs, with the ſecond and third "couplets, which ſhe compoſed herſelf. I muſt tell "you, that one day ſhe did me the particular favour "of ſinging with her mother and her ſiſter, her mo-"ther playing upon the lyre, her ſiſter upon the harp, "and herſelf upon the theorbo. This concert com-"poſed of three fine voices, and three different in-"ſtruments, ſurprized my ſenſes in ſo ſtrong a man-"ner, and raiſed ſuch a rapture of pleaſure in my "mind, that I forgot my mortal condition, and ima-"gined myſelf ſeated amongſt the Angels, enjoying "the happineſs of the Bleſſed in heaven." I have taken this paſſage from a Diſcourſe upon the Italian Muſick, printed with the Life of Malherbe and ſome other Tracts, at Paris in 1672, in 12mo, at the end of which we find theſe words: *This Diſcourſe was writtn by Mr. Maugars, Prior of St. Peter de Mac, the King's Interpreter for the Engliſh Tongue, and likewiſe ſo famous for playing on the viol, that the King of Spain and ſeveral other Sovereigns of Europe deſired to hear him.*

BARONIUS (DOMINIC) a Prieſt and Preacher of Florence in the ſixteenth Century, wrote very ſtrongly againſt the Church of Rome, and concurred with the Vandois in Piedmont to maintain the orthodox faith; but at laſt he was conſidered as a falſe brother, becauſe he aſſerted that in time of perſecution it was not neceſſary to declare the truth openly [*A*]. Celſus Martinengue, Miniſter of the Italian Church at Geneva, wrote againſt him upon that ſubject, and replies were made on both ſides. Theſe books are become very ſcarce, for what reaſon I cannot tell. Our Baronius compoſed a Maſs according to his own fancy, and he thought it a proper expedient for reconciling the differences of the two Religions. But he ſaw himſelf diſappointed in his attempt, for the Reformed rejected his projects (*a*).

(*a*) Taken from the *Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory of the Churches of the Vaudois*, written by Peter Gilles, chap. 10. p. 62, *& ſeq.* Geneva edit. in 1644.

[*A*] *He aſſerted that in time of perſecution it was not neceſſary to declare the truth openly.*] He does not therefore deſerve the name of Anti-Nicodemite, which Peter Gilles has given him, but rather that of Nicodemite. Let us ſee in what manner that Hiſtorian ſpeaks of him. *Dominic Baronius*, ſays he (1), *was a Florentine, a Maſs-Prieſt, and Popiſh Preacher, of conſiderable reputation, and one who in the times of leſs danger had ſhewn ſome zeal for the true Religion, giving almoſt an entire conſent to it, and condemning almoſt all the ſuperſtitious conſtitutions of Popery: he retained but a few particular points, which he uſed to ſpeak of in ſuch ambiguous terms, that it was ſcarce poſſible to know what he believed, as appears from ſeveral Italian and Latin Tracts, which he wrote, and eſpecially from that concerning human Conſtitutions, in which he endeavoured to ſhew what might be admitted, and what ought to be rejected. In the ſame book, among ſeveral great errors, which he condemned in the Popiſh Church, he ſays of the Maſs.....* I ſhall not quote the paſſage cited by Peter Gilles; but here is what follows immediately after that citation. *He wrote in the ſame ſtyle of the Popiſh Superſtitions; but with all this he endeavoured to perſuade men, that in places and times of great danger it was lawful to diſſemble outwardly one's thoughts concerning ſuch errors as theſe, and even to go to Maſs, provided that a perſon conſtantly retained the truth inwardly, without approving any of thoſe errors in his heart. He ſaid that in ſuch times and places the Miniſter of Truth ought to employ himſelf among his Diſciples in ſhewing them the tares, and making them diſtinguiſh it from the good grain, and inducing them to hate the tares, and love the wheat in their heart; but with regard to the outward appearance, to let the Lord act in his own manner, without expoſing themſelves or others to great dangers..... The Sieur Celſus de Martinengue ..... confuted in an excellent long Treatiſe all the reaſons, which Baronius alledged to ſupport his opinion; and replies paſt to and fro on both ſides for ſome time. Baronius thinking himſelf capable of reconciling the two Religions, reformed the Maſs, in order, as he ſaid, that people might go to it with a ſafe conſcience, and he ſung it himſelf according to his own reformation of it, and did the ſame in ſeveral other points, imagining by this means he ſhould pleaſe all parties by thus acting the character of a Trimmer. But this conduct was condemned by a great number of ſincere Profeſſors, not only by words and writings, but likewiſe by actions, chooſing rather to loſe their earthly poſſeſſions and this temporal life, than to ſhew any outward conſent to the idolatry and ſuperſtitions of Popery* (2).

(1) Peter Gilles, *Hiſtory of the Churches of the Vaudois*, ch. 10. pag. 62.

(2) Pierre Gilles, ibid. chap. 10. p. 64. See likewiſe p. 246.

☞BARROW (ISAAC) one of the greateſt Mathematicians and Divines of the ſeventeenth Century, was the ſon of Mr. Thomas Barrow, a Citizen of London of good reputation, brother to Dr. Iſaac Barrow Biſhop of St. Aſaph, and ſon of Iſaac Barrow of Spiny-Abby in Cambridgeſhire Eſq; (where he was in the Commiſſion of Peace for forty years,) ſon of Philip Barrow Doctor of Phyſic, a Benefactor to Trinity-College in Cambridge, and there Tutor to Robert Cecil Earl of Saliſbury, and Lord Treaſurer in the reign of King James I (*a*). He was born at London in October 1630 [*A*]. His mother was Anne, daughter of William Buggins of North-Cray in Kent Eſq; whoſe tender care he did not long enjoy, for ſhe died when he was about four years of age. His firſt education was at the Charter-Houſe for two or three years, where he behaved in ſuch a manner, as gave but little hopes of the great Man he afterwards proved [*B*]; but upon his removal to Felſtead in Eſſex, he ſoon made ſo conſiderable a progreſs in Learning and every valuable qualification, that his Maſter appointed him Tutor to the Lord Viſcount Fairfax of Emely in Ireland, who was then his ſcholar. During his ſtay at Felſtead he was admitted into Peter-Houſe in Cambridge, of which College his uncle, who was afterwards Biſhop of St. Aſaph, had formerly been Member; but when he was fit for and removed to the Univerſity in February 1645, he was entered into Trinity-College, where his condition being low, his father having ſuffered very much in his eſtate for his adherence to the Royal Cauſe, his chief ſupport at firſt was from the generoſity of Dr. Hammond, to whoſe memory he paid his thanks in an excellent epitaph among his Poems (*b*), wherein he deſcribes that great Man and himſelf too; for the moſt and nobleſt parts of that character exactly agree to them both. Here he diſtinguiſhed himſelf by an intenſe application to his ſtudies, and every inſtance of the moſt exemplary behaviour [*C*]; ſo that when the time came that he could be choſen Fellow of his College in the year 1649, he obtained it ſolely by his merit, having no friend to recommend him, as being of a contrary perſuaſion to thoſe, who then carried all things in the Univerſity. Upon his election he reſolved upon the profeſſion of Phyſic, but afterwards changed his intention, and turned his thoughts chiefly to the ſtudy of Divinity [*D*]; though

(*a*) *See* Mr. Abraham Hill's *Account of the Life of Dr. Iſaac Barrow to the Reverend Dr. Tillotſon, Dean of Canterbury*, prefixed to the 1ſt volume of Dr. Barrow's Works.

(*b*) See the 4th volume of his Works, p. 301. edit. 1687.

[*A*] *He was born at London in October* 1630.] This is the account of Mr. Abraham Hill in his *Life of Dr. Barrow, addreſſed to the Reverend Dr. John Tillotſon Dean of Canterbury*, and prefixed to the *firſt volume of the Engliſh Works of Dr. Barrow*. But Dr. Walter Pope in his *Life of Dr. Seth Ward Lord Biſhop of Saliſbury* (1) tells us, that this is a miſtake with regard both to the year and month, ſince he had often heard Dr. Barrow ſay, that he was born upon the twenty ninth of February; and therefore it could not be either in October or in 1630, that not being a leap-year. Dr. Pope obſerves, that he ſhould not have aſſerted this merely upon the credit of his memory, if it had been any other day of any other month, it being told him ſo long before, but that he had this remarkable circumſtance to confirm it; that Dr. Barrow uſed to ſay, it was in one reſpect the beſt day in the year to be born upon, for it afforded him this advantage over his fellow-collegiates, who uſed to keep feaſts upon their birth-day, that he was treated by them once every year; whereas he entertained them but once in four years, when February had nine and twenty days. However we may obſerve on the other hand, that Mr. Hill's account is favoured by the Epitaph upon Dr. Barrow, which was drawn up from his father's information, and tells us, that he was in the 47th year of his age, when he died in 1677.

(1) Chap. 19. pag. 129. edit. London 1697.

[*B*] *Where he behaved in ſuch a manner, as gave but little hopes of the great man he afterwards proved.*] His greateſt delight there was in ſuch ſports, as brought on fighting among his ſchool-fellows, in which he took a peculiar pleaſure himſelf. His courage remained with him ever after, yet he had perfectly ſubdued all inclination to quarrelling; but a negligence of his cloaths always continued with him (2). He abſolutely diſregarded his book; and his father had ſcarce any hopes of his ſucceſs in the profeſſion of a Scholar, to which he had deſigned him. In ſhort there was then ſo little appearance of that comfort, which his father afterwards received from him, that he often ſolemnly wiſhed, that if it pleaſed God to take away any of his children, it might be his ſon Iſaac; *ſo vain a thing*, as Mr. Hill obſerves, *is man's judgment, and our providence unfit to guide our own affairs.*

(2) Hill's *Account of the Life of Dr. Barrow, &c. and Dr. Pope*, pag. 131.

[*C*] *Here he diſtinguiſhed himſelf by an intenſe application to his ſtudies, and every inſtance of the moſt exemplary behaviour.*] Tho' he was now as it were without relations, yet he did not abuſe the opportunity to the neglect of his ſtudies, or the indulgence of any licentiouſneſs in his manners, but ſeaſoned his years with the principles and the exerciſe of diligence, learning, and piety, the beſt preparatives for the ſucceeding varieties of life. He continued ſo firm a *Royaliſt*, that he could never be prevailed upon by any means to take the Covenant; tho' he behaved with ſo much fairneſs, candour, and prudence, that he gained the good will of the chief Governors of the Univerſity (3). He was likewiſe kindly treated by Dr. Hill, whom the Parliament had appointed Maſter of Trinity-College, in the room of Dr. Comber, ejected for adhering to the King (4); and this maſter one day laying his hand upon his head, ſaid to him, *Thou art a good lad; 'tis pity thou art a Cavalier.* And afterwards, when he had made an oration on the *Gun-Powder-Treaſon*, in which he had ſo highly celebrated the former times, as to reflect much on the preſent, ſome of the Fellows moved for his expulſion; but the Maſter ſilenced them with theſe words, "Barrow is a better man, than any of us (5)." *This*, ſays Dr. Pope, *is very remarkable, and an evident teſtimony of our young Scholar's irreſtible merits, which could, as the Poets feign of Orpheus,* — Lenire Tigres rapidoſque Leones; *that is*, Tame ſavage tygers and fierce lions, *make a Preſbyterian kind to a Cavalier and Malignant, which names the adherers to the King, Church, and Laws went under in thoſe days.* When the *Engagement* was propoſed, he ſubſcribed it; but upon reflection repenting of what he had done, he went back to the Commiſſioners, and declared his diſſatisfaction, and procured his name to be eraſed out of the liſt. He was always ready to give the Juniors his aſſiſtance, tho' for all the exerciſes, which he made for them in verſe and proſe, he never received any recompence but one pair of gloves. While he was yet a young ſcholar, his judgment was too great to reſt ſatisfied with the ſhallow and ſuperficial ſyſtems of Natural Philoſophy then taught and received in the Univerſities, with which Students of lower abilities contented themſelves; but he applied himſelf to the reading and conſidering the writings of the Lord Bacon, Des Cartes, Galileo, and other great Genius's of the laſt Age, who ſeemed to offer ſomething more ſolid and ſubſtantial (6).

(3) Hill's *Account, &c. ubi ſupra.*

(4) Dr. Pope, pag. 132.

(5) Idem, ibid. and Hill's *Account, ubi ſupra.*

[*D*] *Upon his election he reſolved upon the profeſſion of Phyſic; but afterwards changed his intention, and turn'd his thoughts chiefly to the ſtudy of Divinity.*] He found the times not at all favourable to men of his opinion in the affairs of Church and State; and therefore in order

(6) Hill's *Account, &c.*

though at the ſame time he made himſelf maſter of almoſt all parts of Learning [*E*]. We have ſeveral Latin Orations and Theſes of his compoſition about this time, publiſhed among his *Opuſcula*, and particularly a ſpeech delivered upon the fifth of Nov. 1651 (*c*), and a Theſis defended at the *Commencement* 1652, wherein he endeavours to ſhew, that the *Carteſian* hypotheſis of Matter and Motion is not ſufficient to account for the principal *Phænomena* of Nature (*d*); and an Ode upon the ſame ſubject written in 1653 (*e*). July the 12th 1653 he was incorporated Maſter of Arts in the Univerſity of Oxford immediately after the Act (*f*). When Dr. Duport reſigned the Chair of Greek Profeſſor, he recommended his pupil Mr. Barrow for his ſucceſſor; who juſtified his Tutor's opinion of him by an excellent performance of the Probation-Exerciſe. But the governing party thinking him inclined to Arminianiſm, he was diſappointed in the choice. However he always acknowledged the favour which Dr. Whichcote ſhewed him on that as on all other occaſions. Soon after this he entered upon his travels [*F*], in which he ſaw France and Italy, and proceeded as far as Conſtantinople. He has given us an account of his voyage

(c) Ibid. p. 327.

(d) Pag. 155.

(e) Ibid. p. 265.

(f) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 103. 2d edit. London 1721.

der to qualify himſelf, as he then thought, to do moſt good, he bent his ſtudies for ſome time towards Phyſic, and particularly made a great progreſs in the knowledge of Anatomy, Botany, and Chymiſtry. But afterwards upon deliberation with himſelf and conference with his uncle, afterwards Biſhop of St. Aſaph, he thought that profeſſion not well conſiſtent with the oath, which he had taken, when he was admitted Fellow, to make Divinity the end of his ſtudies; upon which he abandoned Phyſic, and applied himſelf principally to what his oath ſeemed to oblige him to (7).

(7) Idem, ibid.

[*E*] *He made himſelf maſter of almoſt all parts of learning.*] While he read *Scaliger on Euſebius*, he perceived the dependence of Chronology on Aſtronomy, which engaged him in the ſtudy of Ptolemy's *Almageſt*; and finding that book and all Aſtronomy to depend on Geometry, he applied himſelf to *Euclid's Elements*, not being ſatisfied till he had laid firm foundations. And thus he made his firſt entrance into the Mathematics, having the learned Mr. John Ray then for his companion in his ſtudies, and ſometimes his fellow-traveller in collecting of plants, and always for his very much eſteemed friend. He proceeded to the demonſtration of the other ancient Mathematicians, and publiſh'd his *Eutlid* in a leſs form and clearer method, than any one had been done before him. At the end of his *Apollonius* he has written, *Intra hæc temporis intervalla peractum hoc opus*; i. e. "This "work was finiſh'd between the 14th of April and "the 16th of May." In all his ſtudies his method was not to leave off his deſign, till he had brought it to effect, except in the Arabic language, in which he made an eſſay for a little while, and then deſerted it. When his opinion was demanded, he generally ſpoke to the importance as well as to the truth of the queſtion; which was an excellent advantage, and to be met with in few men's converſation; for as Cardan ſays, *Tractare res multi norunt, æſtimare pauci* (8).

April 14. May 16.

(8) Idem, ibid.

[*F*] *Soon after this he entered upon his travels.*] The partiality ſhewn againſt him, when he was Candidate for the Greek Profeſſorſhip was ſuppoſed by ſome to be one reaſon, that forwarded his Deſire to ſee foreign countries. And Mr. Hill obſerves, that there is no doubt but that he, who in leſs occurrences very judiciouſly conſidered all circumſtances, formed this reſolution upon good grounds. Dr. Pope tells us (9), that his diſappointment, the melancholy aſpect of public affairs, and a deſire to ſee ſome of thoſe places, which are mentioned in the Greek and Latin Writers, were the motives, which induced him to travel. In order therefore to provide for his voyage, in the year 1654 he converted his books into ready money, and went firſt to Paris, where he found his father attending the Engliſh Court, and out of his ſmall *Viaticum* made him a ſeaſonable preſent. He gave his College an account of his voyage thither in a Latin Poem dated from Paris February 9th 1655 (10); and made ſome farther obſervations in a Latin Letter (11), which ſhews his piercing judgment in political affairs, when he applied his thoughts that way. He gives in it an account of the diſputes between Monſr. Arnaud the Janſeniſt and the Jeſuits; and obſerves, that the ſecurity of the Proteſtants in that Kingdom then appeared evidently from a circumſtance, which had juſt before happened. The Archbiſhop of Tholouſe, celebrated among his own party for his great learning, having come to Paris, waited upon the Queen; and after other converſation, began to declaim againſt the Proteſtants, and complained, that they enjoyed too great a liberty in his Dioceſe. He deſired her Majeſty therefore to repreſs them, and reproached them with the appellations of heretics and ſeditious perſons. The Queen ſtop'd him in the midſt of his paſſionate ſpeech, and aſſured him, that ſhe had ſufficiently experienced their fidelity, and found them to be more faithful ſubjects than thoſe, who accuſed them of ſedition. *Quæ ingerentem excipiens Regina, ſe illorum fidem expertam affirmavit, & fideliores ſubditos comperiſſe, quam qui ſeditionis ipſos inſimularent* (12). One of the Mareſchals of France, who ſtood by the Queen, ſupported what ſhe had ſaid. At laſt the King himſelf came in, and being informed of the ſubject of the diſpute, ſignified that he was of the ſame opinion, and would continue to thoſe of the Reformed Religion the liberty, which had been granted them by the Edicts of his predeceſſors. *Tandem ipſe Rex interveniens, & argumentum diſquiſitionis edoctus, ſe in eâdem eſſe ſententiâ, & velle libertatem anteceſſorum ſuorum edictis conceſſam ipſis præſtare ſignificavit.* Mr. Barrow remarks afterwards, that when he came to give an account of the famous men in that celebrated Univerſity, he was entirely at a loſs, ſince he could not recollect any one of eminence there, except Monſr. Arnaud and Roberval, who was admirably well ſkilled in the Mathematicks. He can find no longer any of the Petavius's, the Sirmondus's, the Merſennus's, or the Gaſſendus's, there. That when he paſſes thro' and views the Colleges there, he ſees nothing remarkable but the walls and buildings themſelves; tho' in his opinion the Univerſity of Cambridge had no reaſon to envy that of Paris even upon this account; ſince if the Colleges of Sorbonne, Navarre, and Clermont were all thrown into one, it would not equal, much leſs exceed Trinity-College at Cambridge either in extent or magnificence. *Numeroſa collegia pedibus peragranti oculiſque perluſtranti præter tecta nihil eminens, præter parietes nihil conſpicuum ſe objecerit. Quanquam hiſce, ſi oculi mei æqui ſint arbitri, Cantabrigia non inviderit. Nec ſi Sorbonæ ipſi, unà cum Collegio Navarreno in unum conjiciatur Claromontanum Jeſuitarum hoſpitium, totus ille acervus unicam S. Trinitati dicatam ædem vel amplitudine vel magnificentiâ exæquare, nedum excedere queat.* After ſome months ſtay at Paris he went to Italy, and remained ſome time at Florence, where he had the favour, and neglected not the opportunity of peruſing a great many books in the Grand Duke's Library, and ten thouſand of his medals, and diſcourſing concerning them with Mr. Fitton, *the fame of whoſe extraordinary abilities*, ſays Mr. Hill, *in that ſort of learning had cauſed the Duke to invite him to the charge of that great treaſury of antiquity.* Dr. Pope (13) appears to have miſtaken the ſenſe of this paſſage in that Gentleman; for he tells us, that Mr. Fitton found our author's *abilities ſo great in that ſort of learning, that upon his recommendation the Grand Duke invited Dr. Barrow to take upon him the charge and cuſtody of that great treaſure of antiquity.* Florence was too dear a place for him to remain in long; his deſire was to viſit Rome rather than any city, but the plague then raging there, he went to Leghorn (14); where he was much careſſed by the Engliſh Merchants reſiding there (15). From thence he ſailed in November 1657 for Smyrna. But in his voyage they were attacked

(9) Ch. 19. pag. 133.

(10) See the 4th volume of his Works, p. 317, & *ſeq.*

(11) Ibid. pag. 352, & *ſeq.*

(12) Ibid. pag. 354.

(13) Pag. 134.

(14) Hill's *Account, &c.*

(15) Dr. Pope, *ubi ſupra.*

age from Leghorn to that city in one of his Poems. Upon his return to his own country he was epiſcopally ordained [G]. In the year 1655 he publiſhed *Euclid's Elements compendiouſly demonſtrated* [H]. At the Reſtoration of King Charles II his friends expected, that as he had ſuffered and merited ſo much, he would immediately be preferred; but he complained

tacked by a pirate; and tho' he had never ſeen any thing like a ſea-fight, he ſtood to the gun appointed him with great reſolution (16); for he tells us in his Poem, intitled, *Iter Maritimum à portu Liguſtico ad Conſtantinopolim* (17), that liberty was dearer to him than life, and that he was much leſs fearful of death than ſlavery; in ſhort, that rather than ſuffer the miſeries of it, he ſhould chooſe to be ſtruck dead with thunder, or to precipitate himſelf into a chaſm of earth, or labour under the peſtilence, or bear all the inconveniencies of the utmoſt poverty, or pour out life thro' a thouſand wounds, or undergo any other calamity, which fortune, or fate, or the wrath of Heaven could inflict upon him.

(16) Hill's *Account, &c.*

(17) Publiſhed in the 4th volume of his Works, pag. 211, & *ſeq.*

Almaque libertas vitali charior aurâ,
Libertas! bullit cor, animuſque tumet:
Ut tibi ſubjiciar, monſtrum ſervile, coactus
Ut ſubdam arbitrio libera colla tuo:
Ut tua perpetiar generoſo verbera tergo
Vinctus, ſimque tuus, beſtia fœda, canis!
Me prius irato percellat Jupiter igni,
Intrepidum ferient tela ſuperna caput:
Aut mihi ſi tellus diſcluſo ventre debiſcat,
Ingrediar terræ lætus ovanſque ſinus.
Vexet acerba lues, paupertas durior illâ,
Quam fero, ſqualenti comprimat arcta jugo;
Sanguine perfundar totus, per vulnera mille
Exultans luteo carcere vita ruet;
Fluctibus exagiter, quos aut fortuna ciere,
Aut fatum valet, aut mitior ira Deûm;
Sim liber modo, nec mea mens obtemperet ulli,
Du mea, præſertim, barbare Turca, tibi.

(18) Pag. 136. Dr. Pope tells us (18), that it was an Algerine pirate, who attack'd them; and that Mr. Barrow during the fight betook himſelf to his arms, and ſtaid upon deck, chearfully and vigorouſly fighting, till the pirate, perceiving the ſtout defence, which the ſhip made, ſteered off and left her. *I aſk'd him*, continues Dr. Pope, *why he did not go down into the hold, and leave the defence of the ſhip to thoſe, to whom it did belong.* He replied, "It concerned no man more than myſelf; I "would rather have loſt my life, than have fallen "into the hands of theſe mercileſs Infidels." At Smyrna he was kindly entertained by Mr. Spencer Bretton, the Conſul there, (upon whoſe death in 1659 he wrote an Elegy in Latin (19),) and by the reſt of the Factory. At Conſtantinople he received many favours from Sir Thomas Bendiſh the Engliſh Embaſſador, and Sir Jonathan Daws; and there ever after continued between them an intimate friendſhip. As he could preſently learn to play at all games, ſo he could accommodate his diſcourſe to all capacities, ſo that it ſhould be agreeable and profitable. He could argue a point without arrogance or paſſion to convince the learned, and could talk pleaſantly for the entertainment of eaſier minds, tho' he ſtill maintained his own character, which had ſome ſuch authority, as is inſinuated in theſe words of Cicero to Atticus; *Non te Bruti noſtri vulticulus ab iſtâ oratione deterret* (20)? At Conſtantinople, the See of St. Chryſoſtom, he read over all the works of that Father, whom he much preferred before any of the others. He remained in Turky above a year, and then returned to Venice, where he was no ſooner landed, but the ſhip, which brought him, took fire, and was with all its cargo conſumed to aſhes, the men only eſcaping. From Venice in his way to England, he paſſed thro' Germany and Holland; and ſome part of theſe travels and obſervations are likewiſe related in his Poems (21).

(19) Printed in the 4th volume of his Works, pag. 302.

(20) Epiſt. 20. lib. 14.

(21) Hill's *Account, &c.* and Dr. Pope, pag. 135.

[G] *Upon his return to his own country he was epiſcopally ordained.*] The term of time was now ſomewhat paſt, before which all the Fellows of Trinity College are by the oath obliged to take upon them prieſtly Orders, and quit the College. He had no reſt therefore in his mind, till he procured himſelf to be epiſcopally ordained, which it is thought was done by Biſhop Brownrig, notwithſtanding the times were then very unſettled, the Church of England in great diſtreſs, and circumſtances much altered from what they were when he took the oath, wherewith others ſatisfied themſelves in the neglect of orders (22).

(22) Hill's *Account, ubi ſupra.*

[H] *In* 1655 *he publiſhed* Euclid's Elements compendiouſly demonſtrated.] It was printed at Cambridge in Latin; and an Engliſh tranſlation of it was publiſhed at London 1660. In the preface he tells us, that in this Work he had two points in view; the firſt of which was to join the greateſt compendiouſneſs of demonſtration with as much perſpicuity as the quality of the ſubject would admit; which he obſerved, that he had ſo far attained, that though poſſibly ſome other perſon might with greater curioſity, yet he preſumed none could with more conciſeneſs have demonſtrated moſt of the propoſitions; eſpecially ſince he had altered nothing in the number and order of the propoſitions, nor taken the liberty to leave out any of *Euclid's* as leſs neceſſary, or to reduce certain of the eaſieſt into the claſſes of Axioms; which however had been done by ſome other Writers, and particularly that moſt accurate Geometrician Andrew Tacquet, from whom he acknowledges that he had taken ſome things. He obſerves likewiſe that he ſhould have attempted nothing himſelf of that Author's elegant edition, if that learned Gentleman had not thought proper to publiſh only eight of Euclid's books illuſtrated by him, conſidering the other ſeven as leſs relating to the Elements of Geometry. But that for his own part, he had a different view from the beginning, not to compoſe Elements of Geometry at his own diſcretion, but to demonſtrate the whole of Euclid himſelf with all poſſible brevity. For with regard to four of his books, the ſeventh, eighth, ninth, and tenth, though they have not ſo immediate a relation to the Elements of plain and ſolid Geometry, as the ſix firſt, and two ſubſequent books; yet no perſon, who has obtained any meaſure of ſkill in Geometry is ignorant, how extremely uſeful they are in geometrical ſubjects, both with reſpect to the great affinity between Arithmetic and Geometry, and to the knowledge of commenſurable and incommenſurable magnitudes, which is of the higheſt importance to the underſtanding both of plain and ſolid figures. And the noble Theory of the five regular bodies contained in the three laſt books could not be omitted without prejudice, ſince Euclid being a follower of Plato's School, is ſaid to have compiled the whole ſyſtem only in reference to that contemplation, which Proclus declares in the following paſſage: Ὅθεν δὴ καὶ τῆς συμπάσης στοιχειώσεως τέλος προυτίθετο τὴν τῶν καλουμένων Πλατωνικῶν σχημάτων σύστασιν. Beſides Mr. Barrow was eaſily induced to believe, that it would be acceptable to all lovers of thoſe Sciences to have the intire work of Euclid as it is uſually cited and recommended. He was determined therefore to leave out no book or propoſition of thoſe, which are to be found in Peter Herigon, whom he was obliged to follow cloſely by having reſolved to make uſe for the moſt part of his ſchemes, becauſe he was apprehenſive that his ſudden departure out of England would not allow him time to deſcribe new ones, though he was ſometimes deſirous of doing it. Upon the ſame account alſo he purpoſed to uſe generally no other than Euclid's own demonſtration contracted into a more ſuccinct form, except perhaps in the ſecond and thirteenth, and ſometimes in the ſeventh, eighth, and ninth books, where it ſeemed convenient to vary a little from him. The other end, which he propoſed in this Work, was to gratify thoſe, who more affect ſymbolical than verbal demonſtrations; in which kind, as moſt perſons of our own Nation were accuſtomed to the Notes of Mr. Oughtred, he thought it moſt convenient to make uſe of them chiefly throughout. For no other Author that he knew of till then, except Peter Herigon, had attempted to publiſh and explain Euclid in that way. However the method of that learned Writer, though in many other reſpects excellent, and exactly accommodated to his peculiar purpoſe, ſeemed to him defective in two points; firſt, becauſe of ſeveral propoſitions brought to prove ſome particular Theorem or Problem,

complained in two Latin Verſes, which he has not left among his Poems, that no perſon had more ſincerely wiſhed for his Majeſty's return, or was leſs ſenſible of the effects of it with regard to himſelf (*f*). However he wrote an Ode upon that occaſion, wherein he introduces *Britannia* congratulating the King upon his return (*g*). In 1660 he was choſen without a competitor to the Profeſſorſhip of the Greek Tongue in Cambridge, and ſpoke a Latin Oration upon his entrance into that Chair [*I*]. Mr. Hill (*h*) informs us, that ſome friend of our Author borrowed his Lectures, which he read there, without ever reſtoring them. July the 16th 1662 (*i*) he was elected Profeſſor of Geometry at Greſham-College upon the death of Mr. Laurence Rook, by the intereſt of Dr. Wilkins, afterwards Biſhop of Cheſter; and not only diſcharged the duty incumbent on him, but ſupplied the abſence of his Collegue Dr. Walter Pope, the Profeſſor of Aſtronomy there. His Latin inaugural Oration [*K*] is extant in the fourth volume of his Works (*k*). Among his other Lectures there were ſeveral upon the Projection of the Sphere, which with many other papers were lent out by him, and loſt (*l*). The ſame year he wrote a Greek *Epithalamium* upon the marriage of King Charles and Queen Catherine (*m*). About this time he was offered a living of good value; but the condition annexed of teaching the Patron's ſon made him refuſe it, as too like a Simoniacal contract. He was likewiſe invited to take the charge of the Cotton-Library; but upon trial for ſome time he

(*f*) *Te magis optavit rediturum, Carole, nemo; Et nemo ſenſit te rediiſſe minus.*

(*g*) *Opuſcul.* pag. 309, & *ſeq.*

(*h*) *Account of the Life of Dr. Iſaac Barrow* &c.

(*i*) Wood, in his *Faſti Oxonienſ.* vol. 2. col. 103. 2d edit. ſays it was in 1660.

(*k*) Pag. 90, & *ſeq.*

(*l*) Hill's *Account*, &c. *ubi ſupra.*

(*m*) *Opuſcul.* pag. 275, 276.

Problem, the latter does not always depend on the former; and it cannot readily be known when they do cohere with each other and when not, either from their order, or any other way; by which means, for want of the conjunctions and adjectives, *Ergo*, *rurſus*, &c. there ariſes a difficulty, eſpecially to thoſe, who are but little verſed in thoſe points. Again, it often happens, that this method cannot avoid ſuperfluous repetitions, by which means the Demonſtrations became ſometimes prolix, and ſometimes perplexed and intricate. All which inconveniences are eaſily remedied in Mr. Barrow's method by intermingling of words and ſigns at diſcretion.

[*I*] *Spoke a Latin Oration upon his entrance into that Chair.*] It is publiſhed in the fourth volume of his Works (21); and in it he pays a great compliment to the memory of Eraſmus, who had been a very noble inſtrument in reviving the ſtudy of the Greek and Latin Tongues, of Sir Thomas Smith; Sir John Cheeke; Downs; Crichton; and Dr. Duport. He repreſents his own inability to fill that Chair in a proper manner; and obſerves, that in all his travels abroad he had ſeen no where ſo many advantages for the cultivation of Learning, or ſo much good ſenſe, true judgment, real wit, and extenſive Learning, as in the Univerſity of Cambridge. That he ſhould have had no great concern, if he had been to have ſpoken before the Germans, whoſe brains are clouded with yeſterday's debauch; or the Hollanders, whoſe ears are little ſenſible of true elegance and politeneſs; or the light and fantaſtic French; or the Italians, who ſcarce underſtand any thing beyond their mother-tongue. *Equidem apud Germanorum heſternâ crapulâ obnubilita cerebella, in Batavas aures pingui Minervâ obſtipatas, coram defultoriis Gallis, aut ad Italos ultra vernaculum idioma parum ſapientes, nihil admodum moraret verba faſturus* (22). Whereas he was now to addreſs himſelf to men of the moſt accurate taſte and judgment, and who were particularly eminent for their ſkill in the Greek Language, ſo that Greece itſelf ſeemed to have tranſplanted itſelf from its former ſeat, and to have ſettled among them. He then apologizes for his own inſufficiency, ſince he had been expoſed to a long ſeries of diſtreſs and poverty, and cut off from all converſation with polite Authors by his travels into remote and barbarous countries. However as he had the honour of being elected, he ſhould endeavour to ſupply the want of genius by induſtry and unwearied application. And that the greateſt encouragement to him imaginable, was that the reputation of Learning was now reviv'd upon his Majeſty's Reſtoration, whereas the times before had been very unpropitious to the Muſes, and the ſtudy of arms alone had been regarded, ſo that Ennius's verſes might have juſtly been applied to them,

Spernitur Orator bonus, horridus miles amatur;
Bellipotentes ſunt magè quam ſapienti potentes.

No perſon ſhall now any longer be ſuſpected or obnoxious on account of his eminent learning or probity, as he lately muſt have been; when the din of war ſilenced all the poliier arts and ſciences, and ſuperior force enabled the loweſt and moſt profligate of mankind to trample upon men of the moſt diſtinguiſhed merit and genius. He then expatiates upon the excellence and advantage of the Greek Language above all others, which is the moſt ancient except the Hebrew, and prior to all the ſciences, as a parent to her off-ſpring, or a root to its branches. If we conſider its uſe, it extends itſelf to every kind of knowledge, and is remarkable for the force and energy and graces of it, ſo that it is peculiarly adapted to charm the ear, and touch the paſſions. *Quanto magis incumbendum Græcæ linguarum principi, reliquas omnimoda excellentia quæ tanto ſuperat intervallo? Si ætatem ejus ſpectamus, præter unam humanæ loquelæ coævam Hebraicam antiquiſſima eſt, imò ſcientiâ omni non aliter quam parens ſobole, radice ſurculis, vetuſtior. Si uſum, is ampliſſimus eſt, ad omnis ſapientiæ ſtudium, ad omnem ingenii cultum ſe exporrigens; ſi commoditatem, vim, aut gratiam reſpicimus, nullam arbitror extiiſſe unquam mortali ſpiritæ modulatam, hac, quæ fuerit aut explicandis ſenſibus aptior, aut demulcendis auribus gratior, aut affectibus commovendis efficacior* (23). He proceeds then to point out the ſeveral advantages of that tongue, and the merits of its writers in every branch of learning; and obſerves that the Latins borrowed all their knowledge; as Tully from the Greek Rhetoricians and Philoſophers; Virgil in his Bucolics from Theocritus, in his Georgics from Heſiod, and in his Æneid from Homer; Terence from Menander, and Seneca the Tragic Writer from Euripides. He remarks likewiſe, that the two noble Emperors, *par nobile Cæſarum*, Marcus Antoninus and Julian were ſo ſenſible of the defects of their own language, that they choſe to write in Greek, as moſt proper to expreſs every ſentiment with a peculiar beauty and energy.

[*K*] *His Latin inaugural Oration is extant in the fourth volume of his works.*] He opens it with a compliment upon Sir Thomas Greſham, the Founder of the College; and then proceeds to one upon Mr. Henry Briggs, who was the firſt Lecturer in Geometry there, and improved the invention of Logarithms; and Mr. Chriſtopher Wrenn, and Mr. Laurence Rooke, who had likewiſe held that Profeſſorſhip. He expreſſes his regret, that his own low abilities and qualifications rendered him incapable of filling in a proper manner the place of ſuch great men, his predeceſſors; having been a long time converſant among remote and barbarous Nations; and after his return employed in mere Grammatical Learning, and the little purſuits of Words and Phraſeology; ſo that he had been obliged to abandon the Mathematicks and all parts of Philoſophy, except Ethics, without almoſt any hopes of ever returning to them. *Cui ab omnibus bonis literis tot annos exulanti, Barbaros Scythas inter & incultos Sarmatas verſanti, peragranti terras, trajicienti æquora, cum utriuſque elementi periculis, tumque gravioribus infortunii procellis conflictanti, tantum temporis decretum eſt, tantumque defluxit, exilibus nugis occupato. Qui ex quo, infauſto errore perfunctus, conquieſcere cæperam, in grammaticum mox priſtinum detruſus, & vocularum miſerabili aucupio damnatus, mathemati-*

(21) Pag. 160.

(22) Ibid. pag. 104.

(23) Ibid. pag. 106.

he chose rather to settle at Cambridge. In the year 1663 he was appointed Mr. Lucas's Professor of Mathematics [*L*]. And though his two Professorships were not inconsistent, yet he contented himself with that of Cambridge, and May the 20th 1664 resigned that at Gresham-College, and was succeeded in it by Mr. Robert Hook, who obtained it by Dr. Wilkins's interest. His Mathematical Lectures read at Cambridge, while he was Mr. Lucas's Professor there, were published after his death at London in 12mo, 1684, under the title of, *Isaaci Barrow Mathematicæ Professoris Lucasiani Lectiones habitæ in Scholis publicis Academiæ Cantabrigiensis, annis Domini* 1664, 1665, 1666, *& ultimæ quatuor incerti temporis.* They were dedicated to the University of Cambridge by Mr. G. Wells, who observes that it would have been highly unreasonable to suffer any of the valuable performances of our Author to perish, when his *divine Genius* had restored to immortality the writings of those admirable antient Authors, *Euclid*, *Theodosius*, *Archimedes*, *Apollonius*, *&c.* The Writers of the *Acta Eruditorum* for February 1684 tell us (*n*), that though these Lectures are written merely upon the more obvious points, which are preparatory to the study of the Mathematics, yet they exhibit every where marks of our Author's admirable sagacity, judgment, and profound knowledge of the antient Philosophy, and contain several curious digressions upon several of the most important subjects. In 1669 he resigned likewise his Mathematical Professorship at Cambridge to his friend Mr. Isaac Newton, and determined to leave entirely the study of Mathematics for that of Divinity [*M*]. And now he was only a Fellow of Trinity-College, till his uncle, the Bishop of St. Asaph, whose

(n) Pag. 85, 89.

eis protinus scientiis, & philosophiæ omni (unam forsitan moralem excepero) nuncium remiserim, imò bellum denunciaverim, vale saltem (ut mihi videbar) æternum dixerim (24). He afterwards proceeds to display the great advantages of the science of Geometry, which is not a mere amusement of the mind in chimerical and insignificant pursuits, but founded upon solid principles, and productive of the most useful consequences; the fruitful parent of so many arts, the immoveable basis of so many sciences, and the constant source of so many noble discoveries for the benefit of mankind. *Tot artium fæcunda parens, tot scientiarum inconcussa basis, tot in rem humanam commoditatum perennis scaturigo, Geometria.*

(24) Ibid. p. 97.

[*L*] *He was appointed Mr. Lucas's Professor of Mathematics.*] He had discharged his Professorship at Gresham-College in such a manner, and performed so well what Dr. Wilkins had undertaken for him, that when Mr. Lucas in the year 1663 founded a Mathematical Lecture at Cambridge, the same good and constant friend recommended him to the executors, Mr. Raworth and Mr. Buck, who very readily conferred upon him that employment. And the better to secure the end of so noble and useful a foundation, he took care, that himself and his successors should be oblig'd to leave yearly to the University ten written Lectures; and those of his, which have been published, will best shew how well he acquitted himself of that service (25). We have his *Prefatory Oration* spoken in the public mathematical school March 14th, 1664, published in the *fourth* volume of his works (26); in which he gives us a noble encomium upon Mr. Lucas, the Founder of the Lecture, and pays a compliment to Mr. Robert Raworth and Mr. Thomas Buck his executors. He then mentions his reasons for resigning his Greek Lecture for that of the Mathematics, and observes, that he had undertaken the former, at a time when the duty of it was very great, and the profits very inconsiderable: but that when the circumstances of it were changed to great advantage, he imagined several persons would undertake that province, who might execute it with more success than himself; upon which account he thought himself at liberty to pursue the bent of his own genius, and to exchange a very laborious task for one of less fatigue. For tho' he had never been averse to the study of Philology, yet he owned, that Philosophy had much greater charms for him; and though he did not despise that part of learning, which is merely conversant about words, yet he was still more pleased with the study of things. He afterwards shews the excellent uses and advantages of the Mathematics, and observes particularly, that it rescues the mind from credulity, fortifies it against the vanity of Scepticism, restrains it from rashness and presumption, inclines it to assent to things upon proper evidence, subjects it entirely to the just authority of reason, and clears it from the tyranny of delusive prejudices; fixes the caprice and fickleness of the imagination, sharpens the heavy genius, corrects the luxuriant, restrains the impetuous, and awakens the indolent and slow. *Quin etiam his disciplinis assuefactam mentem à credulâ simplicitate penitus liberari; contrà scepticam vanitatem fortissimè muniri; à temerariâ præsumptione validè cohiberi; ad debitum assensum facillimè inclinari; legitimo rationis imperio perfectè subjici; iniquæ fallacium præjudiciorum tyrannidi contumaciter obluctari. Instabilem porrò phantasiam hac veluti saburrâ librari; hâc fluctuantem anchorâ retineri; obtusum ingenium hac cote exacui, luxurians hâc falce castigari, præfervidum hoc fræno reprimi, torpidum hoc stimulo excitari* (27).

(25) Hill's *Account*, *&c.*

(26) Pag. 78, *& seq.*

(27) Ibid. p

[*M*] *Determined to leave the study of Mathematics for that of Divinity.*] Tho' his *Geometricæ Lectiones* had been some time in the world, he had heard of very few, who had read and considered it throughly besides Mr. Slusius of Liege, and Mr. Gregory of Scotland, two persons indeed, whose judgment were more than equivalent for that of a great number. But the little relish, which mathematical discoveries met with at that time, was a means of loosening Dr. Barrow from those speculations, and engaging him more closely in the study of Morality and Divinity, which had always been so predominant, as Mr. Hill observes, that when he commented on *Archimedes*, he could not forbear in his discourse to prefer and admire much more *Suarez* for his book *de Legibus*; and before his *Apollonius* he wrote this beautiful ejaculation. Ὁ Θεὸς γεωμετρεῖ. *Tu autem, Domine, quantus es Geometra? Quum enim hæc scientia nullos terminos habeat; cum in sempiternum novorum theorematum inventioni locus relinquatur, etiam penes humanum ingenium; tu uno hæc omnia intuitu perspecta habes, absque catenâ consequentiarum, absque tædio demonstrationum. Ad cætera penè nihil facere potest intellectus noster; & tanquam brutorum phantasia videtur non nisi incerta quædam somniare, unde in iis quot sunt homines, tot existunt ferè sententiæ. In his conspiratur ab omnibus, in his humanum ingenium se posse aliquid, imò ingens aliquid & mirificum visum est, ut nihil magis mirum, quod enim in cæteris penè ineptum, in hoc efficax, sedulum, prosperum, &c. Te igitur vel ex hac re amare gaudeo, te suspicor, atque illum diem desidero suspiriis fortibus, in quo purgatâ mente & claro oculo non hæc solum omnia absque hac successivâ & laboriosa imaginandi curâ, verum multo plura & majora ex tuâ bonitate & immensissimâ sanctissimâque benignitate conspicere & scire concedetur*, &c. i. e. "God acts the Geometrician. "But how great a Geometrician art thou, O God? "For since this science has no limits, and since there "is always room even for a human mind to discover "an infinite number of new theorems, thou perceivest "all these truths at one view, without any chain of "consequences, or the fatigue of long demonstrations. "Our understanding can scarce effect any thing in other "points; and like the fancy of brutes, seems only to "dream of some doubtful objects; for which reason "there are almost as many opinions in those points "as there are men. But in those subjects they all "unanimously agree; in them the human mind seems "capable of something even great and stupendous; "for

whoſe conſecration Sermon to the Biſhoprick of Man he had preached July the 4th (o) 1663 upon Pſalm cxxxii. 16. gave him a ſmall *Sine-Cure* in Wales; and Dr. Seth Ward Biſhop of Saliſbury, who highly valued his converſation, conferred upon him a Prebend in his church; the profits of both which he beſtowed in charity, and reſigned them as ſoon as he was made Maſter of his College (p). The Biſhop of Saliſbury offered him the Archdeaconry of North-Wiltſhire, which he modeſtly refuſed (q). In 1670 he wrote a Latin Poem upon the death of the Ducheſs of Orleans (r); an *Epicedium* upon the Duke of Albemarle (s); and a Latin Ode upon the *Trinity* (t). And on Wedneſday in Eaſter Week 1671 he preached the Spittal Sermon before the Lord Mayor and Court of Aldermen concerning *the Duty and Reward of Bounty to the Poor* upon Pſalm cxii. 9. In 1672 he publiſhed his *Optical Lectures* [N], to which were added ſeveral Lectures in Geometry; and in 1675 he publiſhed an edition of the works of *Archimedes*, *Apollonius's Conics*,

(o) Mr. Wood, *Athen. Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 1140. ſays the 5th.

(p) Idem, ibid.

(q) Dr. Walter Pope's *Life of Dr. Seth Ward, Biſhop of Saliſbury*, ch. 20. p. 143. edit. London 1697.

(r) *Opuſc.* pag. 293.

(s) Ibid. pag. 294.

(t) Ibid. pag. 273.

" for notwithſtanding its inſufficiency in other reſpects, " here it exerts itſelf with vigour and ſucceſs, &c. I " am inflamed therefore with love and admiration of " thee even upon this account, and I am anxious for " that day, in which I ſhall be permitted and enabled " by thy immenſe goodneſs and benignity to perceive " and underſtand not only theſe things, but even ma- " ny more truths of the higheſt importance, with a " mind purged from error and prejudice, and with- " out this ſucceſſive and laborious effort of the imagi- " nation."

[N] *In* 1672 *he publiſhed his Optical Lectures.*] The *Imprimatur* for publiſhing them is dated March 22d 166⅞; and they were printed at London in 4to 1672 under the following title: *Lectiones XVIII Cantabrigiæ in ſcholis publicis habitæ, in quibus Opticorum Phænomenon genuinæ rationes inveſtigantur ac exponuntur. Annexæ ſunt Lectiones aliquot Geometricæ. Ab Iſaaco Barrow, Socio Collegii S. Trinitatis, Matheſeos Profeſſore Lucaſiano, necnon Societatis Regiæ Sodale.* i. e. " Eighteen Lectures read in the public Schools of " the Univerſity of Cambridge; in which the true " Reaſons of the *Phænomena* in Optics are inveſtigat- " ed and explain'd. To which are added ſeveral " Lectures in Geometry. By Iſaac Barrow, Fellow " of Trinity College, Mr. Lucas's Profeſſor of Mathe- " mathics, and Fellow of the Royal Society." Dr. Barrow has dedicated this work to Robert Raworth and Thomas Buck Eſqs; the executors of Mr. Lucas, the Founder of the Mathematical Profeſſorſhip. In the *Epiſtle to the Reader* he informs us, that theſe Lectures were not deſigned to be publiſhed; tho' he was prevailed upon to ſuffer it by the importunity of others, and the deſire of ſetting an example to his ſucceſſors in that Profeſſorſhip, by his attempt at leaſt to promote the improvement of the ſciences; nor was he without hopes, that this work might prove uſeful in ſome reſpects. He deſires thoſe, who were well ſkilled in thoſe ſciences to conſider, that it was not written for men of their character alone, nor compoſed upon choice, nor drawn up at leiſure and after a long meditation, but that it was mere *School-Lectures*, which he was obliged to write in haſte, and adapted to a promiſcuous and popular audience, upon which account many things, which might ſeem low and trivial to thoſe of greater advancement in knowledge, were introduced; and therefore the reader was not to expect a performance, compoſed with accuracy, and digeſted into the beſt form. *Meminiſtis autem obteſtor, qui in his Literis profectior es, quale ſcriptum attrectas; non utique tibi ſoli elaboratum; non ſponte productum; non diuturnâ meditatione ſubactos exhibens feriantis ingenii conceptus; at* Lectiones Scholaſticas, *primum officii neceſſitate expreſſas; tum ſubindè properantius effuſas, ut abſolveretur penſum, ac hora deflueret; demum ad promiſcui literarii populi inſtructionem comparatas, cujus intererat complura (qualia tibi videbuntur) leviora non prætermitti; ut fruſtra futurus ſis (id quod te monitum oportuit, ne multùm expectando tibi pariter obſis, ac mihi) accuratum hic quicquam, affabrè poſitum, aut contiunè digeſtum ſperans.* Among thoſe friends of his, who perſuaded him to publiſh this work, he particularly mentions Mr. Iſaac Newton, his collegue, *a man*, ſays he, *of a very excellent genius and prodigious knowledge*, who reviſed the copy, and pointed out ſeveral things, which wanted correction, and made ſome additions of his own, which Dr. Barrow has inſerted and diſtinguiſh'd with a peculiar commendation. *Quorum unus . . . . D. Iſaacus Newtonus, Collega noſter (peregregiæ vir indolis ac inſignis peritiæ) exemplar reviſit, aliqua corrigenda monens, ſed & de ſuo nonnulla penu ſuggerens, quæ noſtris alicubi cum laude innexa cernes.* The other friend, to whom he acknowledges his obligations, was Mr. John Collins, whom he ſtiles the *Merſennus* of our country, and who took a great deal of pains in the publication of this work. To this book he has ſubjoined *thirteen Lectures on Geometry*, which treat principally of the *general properties of curve lines*. In his *Preface* to them, he tells us, that he had deſigned to publiſh the ſix laſt with another in this volume, as an Appendix to his *Optical Lectures*; and that otherwiſe he ſhould never have had any intentions of printing them. But as his Bookſeller thought proper, that they ſhould be publiſh'd ſeparately from his *Optics*, he had been prevailed upon to add the five firſt Lectures, which relate to the ſame ſubjects as the other, and which he had drawn up ſome years before without any deſign of publiſhing them, ſince they contained nothing but what was adapted to the uſe of young Students in thoſe ſciences. But with regard to the other *ſeven* Lectures, he publiſh'd them with leſs reluctance, ſince he was in hopes, that they contained ſome things, which perſons, who were more advanced in this ſcience, might be pleaſed to ſee. *Alteras quas dixi ſeptem conſpectui tuo lubentiùs expono, nonnulla ſperans in illis haberi, quæ nec eruditiores piguerit inſpicere.* The laſt was extorted from him by a friend of his, who had the greateſt right to command him in all reſpects, and was a man of great integrity, tho' in affairs of this kind, a very importunate Sollicitor. *Ultimam Amicus (vir ſanè cum primis probus, aſt in hujuſmodi negotiis Flagitator improbus) extorſit, aut certè pro jure, quod meritò obtinet ſuo, exegit.* The Gentleman meant here was Mr. John Collins, who was the principal means of obtaining from our author the publication of moſt of his mathematical works; and with whom Dr. Barrow maintained a conſtant correſpondence by letters, in one of which dated on Eaſter-Eve 1669, he has the following paſſage, with relation to his *Optical Lectures*, which we ſhall give the reader from the original communicated by the learned William Jones Eſq;

Dear Sir,

" I have received all yours. The firſt, if it had been " delivered to me in time, might have prevented you " ſome trouble; for had I known Monſr. Huygens " had been printing his *Opticks*, I ſhould hardly have " ſent my booke. He is one, that hath had conſide- " rations a long time upon that ſubject; and is uſed " to be very exact in what he does; and hath joyn- " ed much experience with his ſpeculations. What " I have done is only what in a ſmall time my " thoughts did ſuggeſt, and I never had opportunity " of any experience; ſo that I have great reaſon to " believe what he hath done with ſo much advan- " tage in all reſpects, will be much more perfect. " Yet ſeeing perhaps there may be in mine ſome " things, which have not occurred to him, or which " he did not intend to conſider, you may, if you " think good, proceed in ordering the impreſſi- " on; the manner of which I wholy refer to your " diſcretion. . . . . I have ſeverall new (I ſuppoſe) " geometricall theoremes of a general importance; " which perhaps I may put together, and add as an " *Appendix*, having digeſted them into Lectures &c. " I intended to ſend you ſome of them, but my bu- " ſyneſſe hath hindered me; which (beſides pupills " and other ordinary imployments) hath been impoſed

" upon

Conics, and *Theodosius's Sphærica* [O]. He had hitherto possessed but a very small estate, which however was made easy to him by a contented mind; and he was far from envying the most opulent fortune. With the same decency and moderation he maintained his character under the temptations of prosperity, when he was appointed by the King Master of Trinity College in 1672 [P], upon the promotion of Dr. John Pearson to the Bishopric

" upon me by the College. 'Tis to make Theological " Discourses (as our Statutes order) upon the chiefe " points of Catechisme (the Creed, Decalogue, Lord's " Prayer, Sacraments, &c.) which out of terme so " takes up my thoughts, that I cannot easily apply " them to any other matter. For I have that imper- " fection, as not to be able to draw my thoughts ea- " sily from one thing to another." We have another original Letter to Mr. Collins to the same purpose dated from Trinity-College the twenty third of April 1670, and communicated by the Gentleman abovementioned.

Deare Sir,

" I received your last, and thereby perceive " that your honest Printer is yet somewhat slow " in performance. I request you to blott out those " four verses inscribed *Juventuti Academicæ*: for a " friend, whose advice I asked, hath perswaded me " that they are not proper. For the 13th Lec- " ture, being I tooke the pains to exscribe it, and " prepare it (as well as ever I should doe it, as I " thinke) I had rather it should passe; but am con- " tent you should doe therein as you please. If you " doe not like those words in the Epistle (27) (in " which I meant to jest with you, no more) concern- " ing it, I pray expunge them, and substitute these; " *Ultimam apposui, materiâ quidem à reliquis abjunc- " tam, at scopo non ita dissitam, nonnullis eam haud " inutilem arbitratus.* Concerning the Character, " which you spoke of, of my bookes, I shall esteeme " my selfe obliged to you, if you will effect, that " there be nothing said of them in the *Philosophicall* " *Reports* beyond a short and simple accompt of their " subject. I pray let there be nothing in commen- " dation or discommendation of them; but let them " take their fortune or fate *pro Captu Lectoris*. Any " thing more will cause me displeasure, and will not " doe them or me any good."

(27) Dr. Barrow means those words quoted above, *Ultimam Amicus, vir sanè cum primis probus, ast in hujusmodi negotiis Flagitator improbus &c.*

[O] *An edition of the Works of* Archimedes, Apollonius's Conics, *and* Theodosius's Sphærica.] It was printed at London in 4to under the following title: *Archimedis opera, Apollonii Pergæi Conicorum Lib. IV. Theodosii Sphærica: Methodo nova illustrata, & succincte demonstrata. Per Is. Barrow, Exprofessorem Lucasianum Cantab. & Societatis Regiæ Soc.* i. e. " The " Works of Archimedes; the four books of Conics of " Apollonius Pergæus; and Theodosius's Spherics; " explained in a new method, and demonstrated in a " succinct manner. By Is. Barrow, formerly Mr. " Lucas's Professor at Cambridge, and Fellow of the " Royal Society." In the preface to the reader before the *Lemmata* of *Archimedes* he observes, that gratitude obliges the Moderns to rescue from oblivion the antient Authors, who were the inventors of the Sciences. For though the greatest part of their discoveries are surpassed by those of the latter age with regard both to expedition and conciseness, yet the reading of the Antients has its proper use. For it is very agreeable to observe from what a foundation the Sciences are raised to such perfection; and it is of advantage to taste of those sources, from whence almost all the inventions of the Moderns have been derived; for the industry of the latter has appeared very conspicuous by pursuing or imitating the ingenious and subtle methods of the former. *Neque tamen est quæ continent pleraque nostris artificiis vel promptius elici, vel concisius astrui possent, fructu penitus destituitur illorum lectio. Nam amœnum imprimis videtur quibus à fundamentis tantum in fastigium evectæ sunt Scientiæ dispicere; tum haud inutile fuerit degustare fontes, è quibus cuncta ferme recentiorum inventa dimanârunt; istorum quippe perquam ingeniosas atque subtiles persequendo vel æmulando methodos horum emicuit industria.* Besides there is no better method of obtaining a true taste and skill in demonstration than from writings of the Antients, who are distinguished by a peculiar force and elegance in forming of Theorems; which as no person can ever excel, so scarce any one can obtain, who is a stranger to their Works; not to insist upon another consideration, that as these Writings are cited every where by the Moderns in confirmation of their own, it is absolutely necessary for those who treat of these subjects, to have them always at hand, and to be very conversant in them. *Porro sincerum demonstrandi gustum ac peritiam non aliunde quis opinor felicius hauserit, quam ex iis, quorum in theorematis deducendis præcipuæ relucent solertia ac elegantia; quas ut nemo transgredi possit, ita vix assequi quisquam valeat ab illorum scriptis peregrinus; ut taceam, cum à posteris hæc Scripta suis firmandis præsternantur, allegenturque passim, illorum referre, qui hæc studia tractant, ea præsto ad manum, ne dicam ad unguem habere.* The edition of these treatises of the Antients was principally owing to the sollicitations of Mr. John Collins mentioned in the preceding Note, as appears from the two following Letters of Dr. Barrow to him, communicated by the ingenious Gentleman mentioned in the preceding Note. The former is dated from Trinity College March the third 1665, " For your proposition concerning Archimedes and " Apollonius, I cannot well tell what to an- " swer. I have been offered by a friend to be " at the charges of printing them for me, which " would yield me, I suppose, a considerable benefit, " for I thinke I could put off many here. But till I " be necessitated by some engagement, I shall hardly " ever induce my selfe to take the pains, and spend " the time requisite for the reviewall of them; al- " though within two or three months I thinke I " could performe that. If the Stationer you mention " should make me a round offer, and propose faire " conditions, I might perhaps be moved. Till such " occasion I am likely to supersede. I have been " also urged to review that little *Euclid*, which ten " or eleven years ago I writ very hastily. I would " however gladly have it in my disposall; and there- " fore would know whether Mr. Neeland (who " printed it) his widow doe make any accompt there- " of. He gott (as I have been told from himselfe) " some hundreds of pounds by it; and did not keep " conditions with me in printing it so well as he " did promise me, so that I might presume to right " myselfe; but I would not have any controverfy, " nor doe the shadow of an injury to any. Where- " fore if you have opportunity of inquiry, and could " informe me, whether Mr. Neeland's Relict would " consent, that I dispose thereof at my pleasure, you " would favour me therein. Indeed if I should re- " solve about *Archimedes* or *Apollonius*, I should wil- " lingly have that booke goe along with them (correct- " ed and enlarged, and polished somewhat) by rea- " son of some short *Scholiums*, that might be conveni- " ently interserted as lemmatical and preparatory to " their demonstrations; as also I should add Theodo- " sius his *Sphæricks*, and some other elementary " things. But this is spoken in way of supposition, " &c." The latter Letter dated from Trinity-College October the 11th 1670, is as follows. *Since my being at London I have been at* Audley Inn, *waiting there upon the Queene's family for one of my friends. Being thence returned I have bethought my selfe of my promise to you concerning my* Perspective Lectures; *the which I now send you, although I see part of them written so ill and so confusedly, that I feare you will hardly be able to make any thing of them. I have also with it sent you my* Apollonius, *which yet is little worth your looking in, having in it nothing considerable, but its brevity. It hath lyed by me without looking on for many years.* The Lectures upon *Perspective* mentioned in this Letter were lost by some means or other.

[P] *Appointed by the King Master of Trinity-College in* 1672.] When the King advanced him to that dignity, he said, that *he had given it to the best Scholar*

ſhopric of Cheſter. In this ſtation he acted in the moſt exemplary manner imaginable [Q]. But his valuable life was cut off May the 4th 1677, to the general regret of all good men [R]. His Engliſh Works were publiſhed in 1683 in three volumes in folio by Dr. John Tillotſon, afterwards Archbiſhop of Canterbury [S], who as well as Mr. Hill gives a noble character of our Author [T]. His Sermons are admired by all good judges

in England. He was then his Majeſty's Chaplain in ordinary (28), who had ſeveral times done him the honour to diſcourſe with him; and this preferment was not at all obtained by faction or flattery. It was the King's own Act, tho' his merit engaged thoſe of the greateſt power and influence to contribute to it, and particularly Dr. Gilbert Sheldon, then Lord Archbiſhop of Canterbury, and the Duke of Buckingham then Chancellor of Cambridge, and formerly a Member of Trinity-College (29). When the Patent for the Maſterſhip was brought, wherein there was a clauſe permitting him to marry, as it had been made before for ſome of his predeceſſors, he cauſed the Grant to be altered, judging it not agreeable to the Statutes, from which he neither deſired nor would accept of any diſpenſation. *And he choſe rather*, ſays Dr. Pope (30), *to be at the expence of double fees, and procure a new Patent, without the marrying clauſe, than perpetually to ſtand upon his guard againſt the ſieges, batteries, and importunities, which he foreſaw that honourable and profitable preferment would expoſe him to.*

(28) Dr. Pope, ch. 22. p. 164.

(29) Hill's *Account, ubi ſupra.*

(30) Pag. 165.

[Q] *In this ſtation he acted in the moſt exemplary manner imaginable.*] To ſhew his humility and care of the College-revenue, he remitted the charge of keeping a coach for him, which had been allowed a long while before to other Maſters (31). Beſides the particular aſſiſtance, which he gave to many in their ſtudy, he concerned himſelf in every thing, which was for the intereſt of his College; and he ſoon excuſed the Fellows from ſome expence and allowances, which they had made to his predeceſſors. Upon the ſingle affair of building their Library, he wrote out whole quires of paper, chiefly to thoſe perſons, who had been of the College, firſt to engage them, and then to give them thanks, which he never omitted. Theſe letters he did not eſteem enough to keep copies of them, but by the generous returns, which they brought in, they appeared to be of no ſmall value. He had always been a conſtant and early attendant at the chapel, and now continued to do the ſame; and was encouraged therein not only by his own devotion, but by the efficacy, which his example had upon many others of his College. *In this place*, ſays Mr. Hill, *ſeated to his eaſe and ſatisfaction, a ſtation, wherein of all others in the world he could have been moſt uſeful, and which he meant not to make uſe of as a ſtep to aſcend higher, he abated nothing of his ſtudies. He yielded the day to public buſineſs, and took from his morning-ſleep many hours to increaſe his ſtock of Sermons, and write his Treatiſe of the Pope's Supremacy. He underſtood Popery both at home and abroad; he had narrowly obſerved it, militant in England, triumphant in Italy, diſguiſed in France; and had earlier apprehenſions than moſt others of the appearing danger, and would have appeared with the forwardeſt in a needful time.*

(31) Idem, ibid.

[R] *His valuable life was cut off May the 4th 1677 to the general regret of all good men.*] Dr. Pope tells us (32), that a few days after he came to London to the election of Weſtminſter-School, he went to viſit Dr. Seth Ward Lord Biſhop of Saliſbury at Knightsbridge, where at dinner Dr. Pope obſerving that he did not eat, aſk'd him concerning the ſtate of his health. He anſwered, that he had a ſlight indiſpoſition, with which he had ſtruggled two or three days, and that he hoped by faſting and opium to cure it, as he had removed another and more dangerous ſickneſs at Conſtantinople ſome years before. But theſe remedies were ineffectual; for his diſtemper proved in the event an inward, malignant, and inſuperable fever, of which he died in mean lodgings at a Sadler's near Charing-Croſs, which he had uſed for ſeveral years. *For tho'*, ſays Dr. Pope, *his condition was much better by his obtaining the Maſterſhip of Trinity-College, yet that had no bad influence upon his morals; he continued the ſame humble perſon, and could not be prevailed upon to take more reputable Lodgings.* Mr. Hill informs us, that being invited to preach the *Paſſion-Sermon* April 13th 1677 at Guildhall-Chapel (which was the ſecond Sermon, for which he ever received any pecuniary recompence,) he never preached but once more, for he fell ſick of a fever, which proved fatal to him. And Dr. Tillotſon obſerves in the *Preface* to the firſt volume of our author's works, that the Paſſion-Sermon was the laſt he preached but one; and *I think*, ſays he, *the occaſion of his death, by a cold he then got, which in all probability was the cauſe of the fever, of which he died, to our unſpeakable loſs. This he ſent to the preſs himſelf, but did not live to ſee it publiſh'd.* The Earl of Nottingham, then Lord High Chancellor of England, ſent a meſſage of condolance to his father, who had then ſome place under him, importing that he had but too great reaſon to grieve, for never father loſt ſo good a ſon; but that this was a conſideration, which ought to mitigate his ſorrow (33).

(32) Pag. 166, 167.

(33) Dr. Pope, pag. 167, 168. and Hill's *Account, ubi ſupra.*

[S] *His Engliſh works were publiſhed in three volumes in folio by Dr. John Tillotſon, afterwards Archbiſhop of Canterbury.*] The *firſt* volume contains thirty two Sermons preached upon ſeveral occaſions, the five firſt of which, as Dr. Tillotſon obſerves in his *Preface*, are deſigned to recommend Religion to the eſteem and practice of mankind from the conſideration of the various excellencies and advantages of it. The four following treat of the two great duties of Religion and parts of divine worſhip, *prayer* and *thankſgiving*, and contain likewiſe a very powerful perſuaſive to the practice of them. The *three* following were preached upon three ſolemn occaſions; the *firſt* of them upon the 29th of May 1676, the anniverſary of King Charles the ſecond's Reſtoration; the *ſecond* upon the 5th of November 1675, in commemoration of the Nation's great deliverance from the *Powder-Treaſon*; both in the year of his Vice-Chancellorſhip. The *third* at the conſecration of his uncle to the Biſhopric of Man; *in which*, ſays Dr. Tillotſon, *he pleads for the due reſpect and reverence of the Clergy with ſo much modeſty, and yet ſo great force of reaſon and eloquence, that the whole profeſſion may juſtly think themſelves for ever indebted to him. Some of thoſe twelve Sermons were the very firſt that he made, by which we may judge with what preparation and furniture he entred upon this ſacred employment. The firſt of them was preached at St.* Mary's *in* Cambridge *June the* 30*th* 1661, *and was, I think, the firſt that he ever preached.* Thoſe two excellent Sermons of *Thankſgiving* were the next; and the fourth in order was the firſt, which he preached before the King. The next *ten* Sermons relate to the Vices of the Tongue; and the *eight* following explain and enforce the two great Commandments of the Law, the Love of God and of our Neighbour. The *two* next were publiſhed by himſelf, and only theſe two. The *firſt* of them, concerning *the Duty and Reward of Bounty to the Poor*, was preached at the *Spittal*, and received with univerſal approbation; *and perhaps*, ſays Dr. Tillotſon, *there is nothing extant in Divinity more perfect in its kind. It ſeems to have exhauſted the whole argument, and to have left no conſideration belonging to it untouched.* The other was on the *Paſſion of our bleſſed Saviour.* The next part of the *firſt* volume contains his *brief Expoſition of the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and the Decalogue, with the Doctrine of the Sacraments:* and his *Treatiſe of the Pope's Supremacy, with his Diſcourſe concerning the Unity of the Church.* The *ſecond* volume contains his Sermons upon the ſeveral Articles of the Creed, *wherein*, ſays Dr. Tillotſon, *he hath not only explain'd and confirmed the great Doctrines of our Religion, but likewiſe ſhewn what Influence every Article of our Faith ought to have upon our practice.* The *third* volume contains many other of his Sermons upon ſeveral uſeful and important ſubjects of Divinity.

[T] *Who as well as Mr. Hill gives a noble character of our author.*] Dr. Tillotſon obſerves in the *Preface* to his edition of Dr. Barrow's Engliſh works, that he *was ſo publicly known, and ſo highly eſteemed by all learned and good men, that nothing either needs or can be ſaid more to his advantage*; and that *he ſhall not within*

judges on account of the inexhauſtible fund of excellent ſenſe, of which they are full [*U*]. He was extremely fond of Poetry, and well ſkilled in it; and the greateſt part of his Poems are written in hexameter and pentameter verſe, after the manner of Ovid, whom he had a great eſteem for, preferring him even to Virgil himſelf, and declaring, that he thought the latter could not have written the *Metamorphoſes* ſo well as Ovid (*u*). He very much valued that part of Poetry, which conſiſts in deſcription; but the hyperboles of ſome modern Poets he as much deſpiſed. He was an enemy to dramatic entertainments, as a principal cauſe of the debauchery of the age; and the other cauſes he thought to be the French education and ill examples of great perſons. As for Satyrs he never wrote any; his wit was pure and peaceable (*x*). His *Treatiſe of the Pope's Supremacy*, and his Diſcourſe concerning *the Unity of the Church*, are excellent performances [*X*]. His leſſer pieces, written for the moſt part in Latin, were publiſhed in fol. in 1687 [*Y*], and dedicated by his Father to Dr. John Montague Maſter of Trinity-College in Cambridge, and

(*u*) Dr. Pope's *Life of Biſhop Ward*, ch. 21. pag. 151.

(*x*) Hill's *Account, &c.*

in the narrow limits of a Preface ſo much as attempt the character of him, of whom either not a little or nothing at all ought to be ſaid. He tells us afterwards, that our author, as he was exemplary in all manner of converſation, ſo he was particularly free from the vices, detraction, and ſlander, and all the other vices of the tongue; "coming as near as is poſſible for hu- "man frailty to do to the perfect idea of St. James "his *perfect Man*." Mr. Hill in his *Account of the Life of Dr. Barrow*, informs us, that *his Sermons were the counterpart of his actions*, and that he has drawn in them *the true picture of himſelf*. That he *was always one by his exact conformity to the rule in a virtuous and prudent converſation, and ſteered by the ſame compaſs to the ſame port, where the ſtorms forced him to ſhift his ſails*. In ſhort, that all he had or could ſay, *is far ſhort of the idea, which Dr. Barrow's friends have formed of him, and that character, under which he ought to appear to them, who knew him not.*

[*U*] *His Sermons are univerſally admired by all good judges &c.*] Dr. Tillotſon obſerves in his *Preface*, that they *as little need commendation as the author; their own excellency and eloquence will praiſe them beſt*; and that *as they want no other kind of excellency, ſo particularly they are animated throughout with ſo genuine a ſpirit of true piety and goodneſs, that he muſt either be a perfectly good, or prodigiouſly bad man, that can read them over without being the better for them*. Mr. Hill tells us, that when he began to apply himſelf entirely to Divinity, he took a courſe very convenient for his public perſon as a Preacher, and his private as a Chriſtian; for thoſe ſubjects, which he thought moſt important to be conſidered for his own uſe, he caſt into the method of Sermons for the benefit of others, and herein was ſo exact as to write ſome of them four or five times over. His Sermons were all large and finiſh'd, and fairly written, which he was very ready to preach, i. e. to read or lend them as often as deſired. Had he been a ſettled Preacher, he intended them ſhorter, and he would have truſted to his memory. Mr. le Clerc remarks in his *Bibliotheque Univerſelle* (34), that the method of Dr. Barrow in his Sermons is ſuch as the ableſt Divines of the Church of England obſerve; and that having applied himſelf much to the Mathematics, he had acquired a habit of writing with exactneſs, of proceeding directly towards the point, and making uſe of ſolid proofs rather than figures of Rhetoric. And he tells us afterwards (35), that our author's Sermons are rather treatiſes or exact diſſertations, than harangues to pleaſe the multitude; and that if he had not reſolved to keep within the bounds of a mere Hiſtorian, he might aſſert, that he had never known a Sermon-maker comparable to him. It is ſaid that King Charles II uſed to call him an *unfair Preacher*, becauſe he uſed to exhauſt every ſubject, and left no room for any other perſon to write after him upon it. We may obſerve here, that his ſtyle is ſometimes objected to; but Mr. Hill remarks, that *being engaged with variety of men and ſtudies, his mind became ſtored with a wonderful plenty of words, wherewith to expreſs himſelf; and it happened that ſometimes he let ſlip a word not commonly uſed, which upon reflection he would doubtleſs have altered, for it was not out of affectation.*

(34) Tom. 3. pag. 312.

(35) Ibid. pag. 326.

[*X*] *His Treatiſe of the Pope's Supremacy, and his Diſcourſe concerning the Unity of the Church, are excellent performances.*] Dr. Tillotſon tells us in his preface to thoſe two works, that Dr. Barrow gave him upon his death-bed a particular permiſſion to publiſh his *Treatiſe of the Pope's Supremacy*, with this modeſt character of it, that *he hoped it was indifferent perfect; tho' not altogether as he intended it, if God had granted him longer life*. He deſigned indeed to have tranſcribed it again, and to have filled up thoſe many ſpaces, which were purpoſely left in it, for the further confirmation and illuſtration of ſeveral things by more teſtimonies and inſtances, which probably he had in his thoughts. And it would certainly have added much to the beauty and perfection of this work, if he had lived to have given it his laſt hand. *However as it is*, ſays Dr. Tillotſon, *it is not only a juſt, but an admirable diſcourſe upon this ſubject, which many others have handled before, but he hath exhauſted it; inſomuch that no argument of moment, nay hardly any conſideration properly belonging to it, hath eſcaped his large and comprehenſive mind. He hath ſaid enough to ſilence the controverſy for ever, and to deter all wiſe men of both ſides from medling any further with it.* The Doctor proceeds to obſerve, that whoever will carefully peruſe this Treatiſe, will find, that this point of the Pope's Supremacy, (upon which Bellarmin hath the confidence to ſay, *the whole of Chriſtianity depends*,) is not only an indefenſible, but an impudent cauſe, as ever was undertaken by learned pens. And nothing could have kept it ſo long from becoming ridiculous in the judgment of mankind, but its being ſo ſtrongly ſupported by a worldly intereſt. To this Treatiſe is added, for the affinity of the argument, Dr. Barrow's *Diſcourſe concerning the Unity of the Church*; "which he ſo explains, *ſays Dr. Tillotſon*, as quite to "take away the neceſſity of a viſible Head over the "whole Church for the preſervation of its Unity, "which is the only ſpecious, but yet a very remote "pretence for the Pope's Supremacy. For if a *viſi- "ble Monarch of the Church* were granted neceſ- "ſary, many things more muſt be ſuppoſed (which "neither yet are, nor ever can be proved) to make the "Biſhop of Rome the man." Mr. Hill tells us, that by this little piece of the *Unity of the Church* he has better deſerved of the Church and Religion than many, who make a greater figure in Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory and Polities. *For upon his principles Eccleſiaſticiſm would be for edification and not for deſtruction. It is the learned Mr. Thorndyke he diſputes againſt; but that did not abate the intimate friendſhip, that was between them.* The *Teſtimonies* relating to this *Diſcourſe* and the *Treatiſe of the Pope's Supremacy*, were very few of them tranſlated by the Author; which he certainly intended, having left ſpaces for it, and is ſince done with great care by two of his learned friends of his own college.

[*Y*] *His leſſer pieces written for the moſt part in Latin, were publiſhed at London in fol. in* 1687.] The firſt Tract is concerning the Holy Ghoſt, in which he endeavours to ſhew, that the Holy Ghoſt is a diſtinct perſon, co-eſſential with the Father and Son, and proceeding from them both. *Spiritus Sanctus eſt perſona diſtincta, Patri Filioque coeſſentialis, & ab utroque procedens.* The ſecond is concerning the Government of the Church by Biſhops, in ſupport of this propoſition, that the rejection of the Epiſcopal Government, where orthodox and lawful Biſhops may be had, properly conſtitutes a mortal ſchiſm. *Rejectio Regiminis Epiſcopalis, ubi habentur orthodoxi & legitimi Epiſcopi, facit propriè ſchiſma mortale.* Or as he concludes that Theſis, *Epiſcopalis itaque Regiminis abjectionem quiſquis animo*

and to the Fellows of that College. He was one of the greateſt Mathematicians before Sir Iſaac Newton. He was an indefatigable Student; and during the Winter months and ſome part of the reſt roſe always before it was light (*y*). He had an undaunted courage, as appeared from ſome inſtances [*Z*]; and was remarkable for too great neglect of his dreſs, which expoſed him ſometimes to inconveniences, where he was not known [*AA*]; and for

(*y*) Dr. Pope, pag. 145.

animo pravo (*contentioſo ſcilicet, arrogante, pervicace, faſtidioſo, vel utcunque perverſo*) *eum quidni cum doctiſſimo reſpondente ſchiſmatis* (*& quidem mortalis, hoc eſt, peccati graviſſimi*) *reum pronunciem?* i. e. "If any "man therefore ſhall endeavour the removal of Epiſcopal Government with an ill mind, (that is with a contentious, arrogant, obſtinate, haughty, or perverſe "mind in any reſpect,) why ſhould not I with the "learned Reſpondent pronounce him guilty of ſchiſm "(and indeed a mortal one, that is, of a very heinous crime)?" The third piece is concerning the three Creeds, upon this *Theſis*, that "the relaxing of the "faith in the three Creeds mentioned in the eighth Article of the Church of England, cannot be admitted "without the ſcandal of apoſtacy from the Univerſal "Church." *Relaxatio fidei trium Symbolorum in octavo articulo Eccleſiæ Anglicanæ propoſitorum admitti non poteſt ſine dato ſcandalo apoſtaſiæ ab Eccleſiâ Univerſali.* Our author obſerves, that the Creed aſcribed to St. Athanaſius does not receive its ſanction from the author, concerning whom the learned are not well agreed, nor from the antiquity of it, ſince it has not been generally known but for about a thouſand years, nor from the general aſſent paid to it, ſince it is only received by the Weſtern Church; but that it maintains its authority, becauſe it has been delivered down for ſo many Ages, and embraced thro' ſo large an extent of the Chriſtian world, and has this intrinſic advantage in it, that it is in ſome meaſure more perfect and full than the reſt, and more adapted to the ſupport of orthodoxy. *Tertium, S. Athanaſio adſcriptum, ſymbolum, non auctoris claritate* (*is enim apud doctos haud adeo certus eſt*) *nec antiquitatis compertæ gratiâ* (*nam duntaxat à mille circiter annis ejuſce notitia percrebuit,*) *neque conſenſûs amplitudine* (*cum ab occidentali tantùm Eccleſiâ recipiatur*) *ita commendatum; hoc tamen nomine dignitatem ſuam tuetur, quod undicunque profectum tot per ſecula, tantamque per orbis Chriſtiani partem invaluit; quin & à ſe intrinſecùs hoc habet, quod reliquis quodammodo perfectius & plenius eſt, necnon ad ὀρθοδοξίαν adſerendam accommodatius.* He remarks afterwards that ſome perſons except againſt ſome particulars in that Creed, and particularly againſt the damnatory clauſe. To which objection he replies, that this does not relate to the belief of the Creed, and conſequently has nothing to do with the queſtion, as appears from the order of the words themſelves; for immediately after the Introduction is added, *And the Catholic Faith is this.* And to the end of the Creed are ſubjoined theſe words, *This is the Catholic Faith*, which is likewiſe followed with the damnatory clauſe; ſo that the Creed itſelf is contained between theſe two ſevere ſentences. In the ſecond place, this ſentence does not ſeem to extend equally to all points of the Creed, but to thoſe chiefly which have been determined in univerſal Councils, and the contrary opinions which have been anathematized by the Fathers as hereſy. Thus for inſtance, a great many Divines, who are extremely attached to this Creed, would not for ſeveral important reaſons rank the Greeks among heretics, and exclude them from ſalvation, on account of their doctrine concerning the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt. For they conſider, that it would be very ſhocking to ſubject to ſo ſevere a ſentence ſo great a part of the Church, who have maintained that opinion ever ſince Photius's time at leaſt, that is, above eight hundred years. Beſides, ſay they, whence comes it, that moſt of the Greek Fathers eſpecially are in ſuſpence concerning this point, or affirm nothing definitively? Whence comes it, that the principal of them aſſert, that the manner of the Proceſſion of the Holy Ghoſt is not a point of belief the leaſt eſſential to ſalvation? Why did the Council of Conſtantinople paſs it over without any particular determination? Or the following Councils prohibit that any definition ſhould be added upon that ſubject? How came Theodoret to oppoſe this doctrine with impunity, without any anſwer from Cyrill, and without being ſtigmatized upon that account with the name of Heretic by any one of his numerous antagoniſts? In the third place Dr. Barrow obſerves, that theſe damnatory ſentences are to be tempered and underſtood in ſuch a manner, as not to involve under them every perſon, who is merely ignorant, or errs and refuſes his aſſent out of ſimplicity, but only thoſe, who from corrupt affections, and with a mind really heretical, that is, ſelf-condemned, or hypocritical, raſh, factious, arrogant or obſtinate, oppoſe to the truth, ſuch men, who, according to St. Paul (36), are of *corrupt minds, and therefore deſtitute of the truth.* *Ejuſmodi judicia ſic temperanda ſunt, ut iis non quilibet ignarus aut ſimpliciter errans & incredulus ſubjaceat; at ii ſaltem, qui pravis affectibus, animo revera hæretico* (*hoc eſt* αὐτοκαταχρίτῳ, *vel hypercritico, temerario, factioſo, arrogante, contumace*) *pateſactæ circa fidei doctrinam veritati præfracte obnituntur atque reclamant,* ἀνθρώπους *juxta Apoſtolum,* διεφθαρμένους τὸν νῦν, *ac inde,* ἀκρίτους περὶ τὴν ἀλήθειαν. The next piece is to explode the notion of the Preexiſtence of Souls; and that which immediately follows is concerning *the Power of the Keys*, which he concludes with obſerving from St. Jerom upon this Text, in St. Matthew c. xvi. 19. *And I will give unto thee the keys of the Kingdom of heaven*, that ſome Biſhops and Prieſts miſtaking the ſenſe of it, aſſume to themſelves ſomething of the inſolent pretences of the Phariſees, ſo as to take upon themſelves either to condemn the innocent or to abſolve the guilty; whereas God regards not the ſentence of the Prieſts, but the life of the ſinner. *Iſtum locum Epiſcopi & Preſbyteri non intelligentes aliquid ſibi de Phariſæorum aſſumunt ſupercilio, ut vel damnent innocentes, vel ſolvere ſe noxios arbitrentur; cum apud Deum non ſententia ſacerdotum, ſed eorum vita quæratur.* This is followed by his Sermon *ad Clerum* upon Joel ii. 12. and by ſeveral Orations and Theſes, ſome of which we have already mentioned in this article; an *Epitome of the Faith and Religion of the Turks* in Latin; a Diſcourſe in Engliſh of *the Superſtition of the Turks*, with ſeveral Turkiſh Proverbs; and *a Relation of the deſigns managed by the old Queen wife of Sultan Ahmed, and mother of Sultan Morat and Sultan Ibrahim, Emperors, againſt her grand-child Sultan Mehmed Chan, who now reigns, and of the Death of the ſaid Queen and her complices.* This piece was written by Albert Bobovius, then Muſician of the Seraglio, and a Spectator of thoſe tranſactions. Then follow Dr. Barrow's Poems, with a Latin Oration ſpoken upon the 5th of November 1651, and another at the commencement, a Letter in the ſame language, a little Tract upon the Roman *Seſtertium*, and ſome Latin Verſes to Dr. Tillotſon, and Mr. Chriſtopher Wren.

(36) 1 Tim. vi. 5.

[*Z*] *Of undaunted courage, as appeared from ſome inſtances.*] We have mentioned above in the note [*F*] the great reſolution which he ſhewed in defence of the ſhip againſt the pirate. To this we may add another inſtance from Mr. Hill and Dr. Pope (37). Being at a Gentleman's houſe in the country, and going out very early, even before day, a fierce maſtiff, which uſed to be chained up all day, and let looſe late at night for the ſecurity of the houſe, perceiving a ſtrange perſon in the garden at that unſeaſonable time, ſet upon him with great fury. The Doctor ſeized him by the throat, threw him down, and lay upon him; and whilſt he kept him down, conſidered what he ſhould do in that exigence. Once he had a mind to kill him, but he changed this reſolution, judging, that it would be an unjuſt action, ſince the dog did but his duty. At laſt he called out ſo loud, that he was heard by ſome of the houſe, who came out and parted them, without any other hurt to the Doctor, than the ſtraining of his hands, which he felt ſome days after.

(37) Ch. 19. pag. 137.

[*AA*] *Remarkable for the too great neglect of his dreſs, which expoſed him ſometimes to inconveniences, where he was not known.*] Dr. Pope gives us a great inſtance of this (38). While Dr. Wilkins was Rector of St. Laurence-Jewry, being indiſpoſed, he deſired Dr. Barrow to give him a Sermon the next Sunday; who

(38) Chap. 20. p. 138, & ſeq.

for the length of his Sermons [*BB*]. He lies buried in Weſtminſter-Abby, with a monument erected by the contribution of his friends; an inſtance of gratitude not uſual in this age, and a reſpect peculiar to him among all the glories of that Church (z). His dear friend Dr. Mapletoft wrote his epitaph [*CC*]. He was of a healthy conſtitution, and uſed no exerciſe or phyſic but Tobacco, in the uſe of which he was very free, affirming that it was a *Panpharmacon* or Univerſal Remedy (*aa*), and imagining that it helped to regulate his thinking (*bb*). He was extremely fond of fruit, but it was to him Phyſic as well as food; and he thought that if fruit kills hundreds in Autumn,

(z) Hill's *Account, &c. ubi ſupra.*

(aa) Dr. Pope, pag. 145.

(bb) Hill's *Account.*

who accordingly came with an aſpect pale, and meagre, and unpromiſing, careleſly dreſſed, his collar unbuttoned, and hair uncomb'd. He mounts the pulpit, and begins his prayer; *Immediately*, ſays Dr. Pope, *all the congregation was in an uproar, as if the Church were falling, and they ſcampering to ſave their lives, each ſhifting for himſelf with great precipitation. There was ſuch a noiſe of pattens of ſerving-maids and ordinary women, and of unlocking of pews, and cracking of ſeats, cauſed by the younger ſort haſtily climbing over them, that I confeſs, I thought all the congregation were mad. But the good Doctor ſeeming not to take notice of this diſturbance, proceeds, names his text, and preached his Sermon to two or three gathered or rather left together, of which number, as it fortunately happened, Mr. Baxter, that eminent Non-Conformiſt was one, who afterwards gave Dr. Wilkins a viſit, and commended the Sermon to that degree, that he ſaid, he never heard a better diſcourſe.* "There was alſo among thoſe, who "ſtaid out the Sermon, a certain young man, who "thus accoſted Dr. Barrow as he came down from "the pulpit; *Sir, be not diſmayed, for I aſſure you* "*'twas a good Sermon.* By his age and dreſs he ſeem-"ed to be an apprentice, or at the beſt a foreman of "a ſhop; but we never heard more of him. I aſked "the Doctor, what he thought, when he ſaw the "congregation running away from him? *I thought*, "ſaid he, *they did not like me, or my Sermon; and I* "*have no reaſon to be angry with them for that. But* "*what was your opinion*, ſaid I, *of the Apprentice? I* "*take him*, replied he, *to be a very civil perſon, and* "*if I could meet with him, I'd preſent him with a* "*bottle of wine.*" There were then in that pariſh a company of formal, grave, and wealthy Citizens, who having been many years under famous Miniſters, as Dr. Wilkins, Biſhop Ward, Biſhop Reynolds, Mr. Vines, &c. had a great opinion of their skill in Divinity, and their ability to judge of the goodneſs and badneſs of Sermons. Many of theſe came in a body to Dr. Wilkins to expoſtulate with him, why he ſuffered ſuch an *ignorant, ſcandalous fellow*, meaning Dr. Barrow, to have the uſe of his pulpit. They repreſented, that he looked like a ſtarved Cavalier, who had been long ſequeſtered, and thrown out of his living for delinquency, and was come up to London to beg, now the King was reſtored. Mr. Baxter happened to be with Dr. Wilkins at that time, who let them run themſelves out of breath, and when they had done ſpeaking, and expected an humble ſubmiſſive anſwer, replied to them in this manner: *The perſon you thus deſpiſe, I aſſure you, is a pious man, an eminent Scholar, and an excellent Preacher. For the truth of this I appeal to Mr. Baxter here preſent, who heard the Sermon you ſo vilify. I am ſure you believe Mr. Baxter is a competent judge, and will pronounce according to truth.* Then turning to him, *Pray, Sir*, ſaid he, *do me the favour to declare your opinion concerning the Sermon now in controverſy, which you heard at our Church the laſt Sunday.* Mr. Baxter upon this declared, that *Dr. Barrow preached ſo well, that he could willingly have been his Auditor all day long.* When they heard this encomium, they were all aſhamed and confounded; "for though, *ſays Dr. Pope*, they had a good opi-"nion of themſelves, yet they durſt not pretend to be "equal to Mr. Baxter; but at length, after ſome "pauſe, they all, one after another, confeſſed, *they* "*did not hear one word of the Sermon, but were carried* "*to miſlike it by his unpromiſing garb and mien, the* "*reading of his prayer, and the going away of the* "*congregation*, for they would not by any means have "it thought, if they heard the Sermon, they ſhould "not have concurred with the judgment of Mr. Bax-"ter. After their ſhame was a little over, they ear-"neſtly deſired Dr. Wilkins to procure Dr. Barrow "to preach again, engaging themſelves to make him "amends, *by bringing to his Sermon their wives and* "*children, man-ſervants, and maid-ſervants, in a* "*word their whole families, and to enjoin them not to* "*leave the church till the bleſſing was pronounced.* Dr. "Wilkins promiſed them to uſe his utmoſt endeavour "for their ſatisfaction, and accordingly ſollicited Dr. "Barrow to appear once again upon that ſtage; but "all in vain, for he would not by any perſuaſions "be prevailed upon to comply with the requeſt of "ſuch conceited, hypocritical coxcombs."

[*BB*] *And for the length of his Sermons.*] Dr. Pope tells us (39), that beſides his too great negligence in dreſs, he had but one fault, (if it deſerves that name,) which was, that he was generally too long in his Sermons. *And now*, ſays he, *I have ſpoke as ill of him, as the worſt of his enemies ever could, if he ever had any. He did not conſider, that men cannot be attentive to any diſcourſe of above an hour's duration, and hardly ſo long; and that therefore even in plays, which are diſcourſes made for diverſion, and more agreeable to mankind, there are frequent pauſes and muſic between the acts, that the ſpectators may riſe from their ſeats and refreſh their weary bodies and minds. But he thought he had not ſaid enough, if he omitted any thing that belonged to the ſubject of his diſcourſe, ſo that his Sermons ſeemed rather complete Treatiſes, than Orations deſigned to be ſpoken in an hour.* He was once requeſted by the Biſhop of Rocheſter then Dean of Weſtminſter to preach at the Abbey, and at the ſame time deſired not to be long, for that Auditory loved ſhort Sermons, and were uſed to them. He replied, *My Lord, I will ſhew you my Sermon.* The text was in the tenth chapter of Proverbs, the latter part of the eighteenth verſe; *He that uttereth ſlander is a fool.* The Sermon was accordingly divided into two parts; and the Dean deſired him to content himſelf with preaching only the firſt part; to which he conſented, though not without ſome reluctance; and in ſpeaking that only, he took up an hour and an half. This diſcourſe is ſince publiſhed in two Sermons, as it was preached. "An-"other time, ſays Dr. Pope (40), upon the ſame per-"ſon's invitation, he preached at the Abbey on an "Holiday. Here I muſt inform the reader, that it "is a cuſtom for the ſervants of the Church upon all "Holidays, Sundays excepted, betwixt the ſermon and "evening prayers, to ſhew the tombs and effigies of "the Kings and Queens in wax to the meaner ſort "of people, who then flock thither from all corners "of the town, and pay their two pence to ſee *the* "*play of the dead Volks*, as I have heard a Devonſhire "clown not improperly call it. Theſe perceiving Dr. "Barrow in the pulpit after the hour was paſt, and "fearing to loſe that time in hearing, which they "thought they could more profitably employ in re-"ceiving; theſe, I ſay, became impatient, and caus'd "the organ to be ſtruck up againſt him, and would "not give over playing till they had blowed him "down." But the Sermon of the greateſt length was that concerning *Charity* before the Lord Mayor and Aldermen at the *Spittal*, in ſpeaking of which he ſpent three hours and an half; and being asked when he came down from the pulpit, whether he was not tired, *Yes indeed*, ſaid he, *I began to be weary in ſtanding ſo long.*

(39) Pag. 146.

(40) Pag. 147, 148.

[*CC*] *His friend Dr. Mapletoft wrote his Epitaph.*] It is as follows: Isaacus Barrow. S. T. P. *Carolo II. à ſacris. Vir propè divinus & verè magnus, ſi quid magni habent Pietas, Probitas, Fides, ſumma Eruditio, par Modeſtia, Mores ſanctiſſimi undequaque, & ſuaviſſimi. Geometriæ Profeſſor* Londini Greſhamenſis, *Græcæ Linguæ & Matheſeos apud* Cantabrigienſes *ſuos. Cathedras omnes, Eccleſiam, Gentem ornavit. Collegium S. S. Trinitatis Præſes illuſtravit, jactis Bibliothecæ verè regiæ fundamentis auxit. Opes, honores, & univerſum vitæ ambitum, ad majora natus, non contempſit,*

Autumn, it preſerves thouſands (*bb*). His picture was never taken from the life; and the effigies on his tomb reſembles him very little. He was in perſon of the leſſer ſize and lean, of extraordinary ſtrength, of a fair and calm complection, a thin ſkin, very ſenſible of the cold; his eyes grey, clear, and ſomewhat ſhort-ſighted; and his hair of a light auburn colour, very fine and curling. He is well repreſented by the figure of *Marcus Brutus* in his *Denarii* (*cc*), whoſe character from Cowley, Mr. Hill applies to our Author; and obſerves, that Dr. Barrow *had in himſelf this diſadvantage of wanting foils to augment his luſtre, and low places to give eminence to his heights; and that ſuch virtues as his contentment in all conditions, candour in doubtful caſes, moderation among differing parties, knowledge without oſtentation, are ſubjects fitter for praiſe than narrative.* Mr. John Craige in *his Methodus Figurarum lineis rectis & curvis comprehenſarum quadraturas determinandi* (*dd*) highly extols his diſcoveries in Mathematics; but Baron Tſchirnhaus was of opinion, that theſe compliments were carried too high, as appears from a Letter of his dated February the 20th 1686, and publiſhed in the *Acta Eruditorum* (*ee*) for March 1686, wherein he makes ſome animadverſions upon Mr. Craige's book. However he aſſures (*ff*) us, that his reflections were not deſigned to intimate as if he did not value Dr. Barrow's diſcoveries, ſince he had the utmoſt eſteem for them, and recommended them in the ſtrongeſt manner to thoſe, who applied themſelves to theſe ſtudies. Mr. Leibnitz in a piece of his *De Geometriâ reconditâ & Analyſi Indiviſibilium atque infinitorum* publiſhed in the *Acta Eruditorum* for June 1686 (*gg*), giving an account of the ſeveral improvements made by the greateſt Mathematicians in that ſpecies of Geometry tells us (*hh*), that Dr. Barrow in particular wonderfully improved that Science by the invention of ſeveral excellent Theorems. Dr. Henry Pemberton in his Preface (*ii*) to his *View of Sir Iſaac Newton's Philoſophy* having obſerved that he had often heard that great Man cenſure the handling geometrical ſubjects by *Algebraical* calculations, and that he called his book of *Algebra* by the name of *Univerſal Arithmetic*, in oppoſition to the injudicious title of *Geometry*, which Des Cartes had given to the Treatiſe, wherein he ſhews how the Geometer may aſſiſt his invention by ſuch kinds of computations; he tells us that Sir Iſaac frequently praiſed Dr. Barrow, as well as Sluſius and Huygens, for not being influenced by the falſe taſte, which then began to prevail. Dr. Pemberton afterwards affirms, that our Author "may be eſteemed as having ſhewn a compaſs of invention equal, if not ſuperior to any "of the Moderns, Sir Iſaac Newton only excepted." Mr. Echard in his *Hiſtory of England* (*kk*) tells us, that *he ſhewed himſelf of a moſt extenſive genius, profoundly verſed in Theology, as well as in other parts of learning, and had ſuch an invention and method, that all his Sermons ſeemed as compleat Treatiſes, in which the ſubject, after his peculiar manner, was exhauſted; and that his life was exemplary for piety, modeſty, and ſweetneſs.* A very learned and ingenious Gentleman (*ll*) has in his poſſeſſion a great number of original Letters of our Author to Mr. John Collins, from which we ſhall give ſome extracts in the note [*DD*]; and

(*bb*) Ibid.

(*cc*) Ibid.

(*dd*) Pag. 3. edit. London 1685, in 4to.

(*ee*) Pag. 169, & *ſeq.*

(*ff*) Ibid. pag. 176.

(*gg*) Pag. 292, & *ſeq.*

(*hh*) Pag. 298.

(*ii*) Edit. London 1728, in 4to.

(*kk*) Vol. 2. B. 2. cap. 1. *ad ann.* 1677.

(*ll*) William Jones Eſq; Author of the *Synopſis Palmariorum Matheſeos.*

contempſit, ſed reliquit ſæculo. Deum, quem a teneris coluit, cum primis imitatus eſt, pauciſſimis egendo, benefaciendo quam plurimis, etiam poſteris, quibus vel mortuus concionari non deſinit. Cætera, & penè majora ex ſcriptis peti poſſunt. Abi, Lector, & æmulare. Obiit iv. die Maii, Ann. Dom. MDCLXXVII. Ætat. ſuæ XLVII. Monumentum hoc Amici poſuere. That is, according to Dr. Pope's tranſlation of it (41), "This "monument was erected by his friends to perpetuate "the memory of ISAAC BARROW, Doctor of Divi- "nity, and Chaplain in ordinary to King Charles the "ſecond. He was a godlike and truly great man, "if probity, piety, learning in the higheſt degree, "and equal modeſty, moſt holy and ſweet manners "can confer that title. He was Profeſſor of Geo- "metry in Greſham-College in London, and after- "wards of the Greek Tongue and Mathematics a- "mongſt his Cantabrigians. An honour to all his "Profeſſions, the Church, and Nation. He illuſtrat- "ed Trinity-College, as Maſter, and augmented it "by laying the foundation of a truly royal Library. "Riches, honour, and all things deſirable by moſt "other men, he did not contemn, but neglect. He "imitated God, whom he had ſerved from his youth, "in wanting few things, and doing good to all, even "to poſterity, to whom, tho' dead, he yet preaches. "The reſt, and, if it be poſſible, greater things than "theſe, may be found in his writings. Go, Reader, "and imitate him. He died the 14th of May in the "47th year of his age, and of our Lord 1677."

(41) Ch p. 22. pag. 169, 170.

[*DD*] *Original Letters of our Author to Mr. John Collins, from which we ſhall give ſome extracts in the Note.*] The firſt we ſhall mention is without a date, but we find it in the following paſſages relating to the characters of ſome books.

Honoured Sir,

"I received th e booke of Snellius, and that of "your own compoſition, which you were pleaſed to "beſtow upon me, and for which I thank you, though "muſt confeſſe it doth ſomewhat ſurpaſſe my capa- "city, who have little acquainted my ſelfe with that "kind of practicks, and indeed hardly with any. "That little ſtudy I have employed upon mathema- "tical buſyneſſes, being never deſigned to any other "uſe than the bare knowledge of the general reaſons "of things, as a ſcholar, and no farther; ſo that if "you propound any thing to me, I pray pleaſe to "doe it in the moſt general and abſtract termes, as "neere the geometricall ſtyle, as you can; otherwiſe "I ſhall hardly underſtand the queſtions.

"Concerning the Bookes you mention I have moſt "of them, particularly *Hugenius de Magnitudine Cir- "culi*, (which I would gladly have compared with "Snellius,) but his Treatiſe *de Quadraturâ Circuli*, "&c. I have not, but would gladly ſee, and have "it to my ſelfe, if procurable; for I exceedingly "eſteeme his writings; and if true that he hath ſett "out an *Algebra*, I ſhould be glad to have it, though "I kenn no Dutch, and would try what I could di- "vine out of it.

"I was familiarly acquainted with Renoldinus at "Florence; and he was then working upon his *Al- "gebra*. We may expect a collection of what is in for- "mer writers, but whether much new I cannot tell.

"What you ſpeake concerning the *Parabolicall "Conoids*, I doe not underſtand whether it is by way "of inquiry or offer. If you aſke me, I anſwer, "that I thinke I have ſufficient reaſon to pronounce, "that generally the proportions betweene ſegments "made by plaines parallel to the axis (or otherwiſe) "cannot geometrically be found out; becauſe they "cutt all the circles parallell to the baſe in different "unexplicable proportions; ſo that it were but a "vaine labour to endeavour the invention of them. "However I am now employed in thoughts ſo dif-

"ferent

and ſeveral papers of his never yet publiſhed relating to the Mathematics, particularly a *Compendium pro Tangentibus determinandis*, and a ſhort piece *of the Nature of Equations*, both in the Author's own hand; *the Geometrical Conſtruction of Equations*, and *Additaments about Curves*, tranſcribed from his papers by Mr. Collins, and ſome *Conjectures upon the Nature of Colours*.

" ferent, that I cannot well compoſe my mind to " thinke upon it. If you remember, Merſennus and " Torricellius doe mention a general method of find- " ing the tangents of curve lines by compoſition of " motions; but doe not tell it us. Such a one I have " ſome time found out, and did thinke to ſend it to you, " it being only one theorem very eaſily and ſimply " demonſtrated; but wanting leiſure to dreſſe it, I " will attend till you call for it, if you thinke ſuch a " curioſity worth the regarding."

In another Letter dated from Trinity-College Septemb. 5th 1664, is the following paſſage:

Honoured Sir,

" Were I to compute the portions of Sphære or " Sphæroid, I ſhould onely uſe theſe rules out of *Archi-* " *medes*; $\frac{\varpi}{\delta}$ or $\frac{355}{113} : rnn - \frac{n^3}{3}$ * is the portion of the " Sphære (putting r for the Radius and n for the Axis " of the Portion) and $\frac{\varpi}{\delta} : \frac{rnn}{2} - \frac{r}{3t} n^3$ is the Por- " tion of the Sphæroid (putting r for the *latus rectum*, " and t for the *tranſverſum*, and n for the Axis of " the Portion."

* This is the ſame with $\frac{\varpi}{\delta} \times rnn - \frac{n^3}{3}$

In another Letter dated from the ſame College Novemb. 12th 1664 he writes as follows:

Honoured Sir,

" I have received, and thanke you for the *Mengo-* " *lus* †; I ſhall not have leiſure for a while to conſi- " der him ſeriouſly; but caſting my eye upon him, I " doe not wonder at Mr. Kerſey's not having pati- " ence to peruſe him; for I perceive he doth affect to " uſe abundance of new definitions and uncouth terms, " ſo that one muſt as it were learne new languages " to attaine to his meaning, though it may be only " ſomewhat ordinary is couched under them. I e- " ſteeme this a great fault in any writer; for much " time is ſpent and labour employed to leſs purpoſe " than needed, ſince there is little in any ſcience but " may be ſufficiently explained in the uſual manner " of ſpeaking, as particularly Mr. Cartes his *Geometry* " doth plainly ſhew, where ſo many uſefull rules are " delivered without any new words or definitions at " all. But I beginn to prate. However be pleaſed " to put this booke upon my accompt (ſeeing you can " furniſh your ſelfe with another;) for I love to have " by me divers bookes, which I do not much eſteeme; " upon which ſcore you need not ſcruple at your diſ- " cretion to ſend me any booke, that I have not. I " never matter the point of mony in this caſe, and " ſhall take any willingly and thankfully from you. " 'Tis hard if there be not one thing at leaſt to be " learned out of any new booke; and that ſatisfyes " me more than the expence of a few ſhillings can " diſpleaſe me."

† Author of the *Elementa Geometria Specioſæ*. Ben. 1659, in 4to.

In another dated from the ſame place Nov. 29th 1664 he writes thus:

Honoured Sir,

" Alſted's *Admiranda Mathematica* is nothing but " a very ſhort comprizall of the chiefe mathematical " Sciences, containing ſmall ſyſtemes of Arithmetick, " Geometry, Aſtronomy, Geography, Opticks, Mu- " ſick, Architecture, according to the methodicall or " *Ramiſticall* way. It is done, I thinke, well enough " according to the deſigne; but may well be wanted. " I cannot very well deſcribe to you Bartſchius his " *Planiſphære*. It treats more or leſſe concerning moſt " parts of Aſtronomy; but mainly concerning the " fixed Stars and their Aſteriſms, giving verball de- " ſcriptions, catalogues with Longitude and Latitude, " and three or four mapps or delineations of them *in* " *plano*. At the end are ſubjoined Ephemerides of the " Planets from the yeere 1662 to 1686, with ſome " other Aſtronomical Tables. Whether there be any " thing extraordinary in the booke, I cannot tell; for " I have looked very little upon it. But if you " pleaſe, I will ſend it you, that you may informe " yourſelfe. *Thomæ Albii*, (that is in plaine Engliſh " Mr. *Thomas White*) his *Chryſaſpis* is a very ſmall " Tract pretending to the Quadrature of the Circle (but " moſt eaſily confutable) as alſo to prove the Equality " of the Spiral Line to the Semicircumference of the " Circle, to which it appertains; both which errors " he hath recanted publickly. Whether Dibuadius " hath commented upon the laſt books of *Euclid*, I " cannot tell. Mine is only upon the firſt ſixe."

In another Letter dated from the ſame College Feb. 1. 166$\frac{4}{5}$ is another paſſage relating to Mengolus above mentioned:

Deare Sir,

" As for *Mengolus* I have been once or twice " looking into him; but his language is ſo uncouth " and ambiguous, his definitions ſo many and ſo ob- " ſcure, that I thinke it were eaſyer toward the un- " derſtanding any matter to learne Arabick than his " Dialect. So that (beſide that I doe very much diſ- " like ſuch kind of writing, and hope very little from " thoſe that uſe it) having buſyneſſe enough (which " the laſt yeere hath been encreaſed by divers Gentle- " men being committed to my care) I can hardly al- " low leiſure, and indeed have not patience enough " to ſearch into the depth of his obſcurityes. I ſee " that he propounds many ordinary things involved " in his way; but what he hath performed new I " cannot gueſſe." T.

BARTAS (WILLIAM DE SALUSTE, Seigneur du) a French Poet. See SALUSTE.

BARTHIUS (GASPAR) one of the moſt learned men, and moſt copious Writers of his age, was born at Cuſtrin in Brandenbourg, the 22d of June 1587 (*a*). His family was of an antient Nobility [*A*]; Charles de Barth his father, Profeſſor of Civil Law at Francfort upon the Oder, Counſellor to the Elector of Brandenbourg, and his Chancellor at

(*a*) Hulſemannus, *in Concione funebri, apud* Freherum, *Theatri Viror. Illuſt.* pag. 1546.

[*A*] *His family was of antient Nobility.*] There are few Gentlemen of title, few great Lords, who trace their origin higher than Barthius has done his. One of his anceſtors diſtinguiſhed himſelf in the war againſt the Vandals in the retinue of the Emperor Lewis the Debonnaire in the year 856. He was a Bavarian; he commanded the Horſe, and was killed in that war, as Cyriacus Spangenbergius obſerves (1). The grandfather of Barthius was one of the principal Gentlemen of Bavaria; he went and ſettled himſelf in the circle of upper Saxony, and bought there ſeveral eſtates; and in the year 1545 he was honoured with divers noble titles by the Emperor and the States of the Empire. *Avus idem noſter ne in his Terris minor eſſet gentibus ſuis alibi viventibus a Carolo quinto, Conſilio & Senatus-conſulto omnium Imperii ſtatuum tum Spiræ præſentium, ex integro Cæſareæ Majeſtatis & ſacri Imperii auctoritate utriuſque nobilis & miles Torneatius declaratus eſt, omniaque liberæ & veræ nobilitatis privilegia accepit, cum ſingulari integritatis, doctrinæ, & ſtrenuitatis teſtimonio anno Chriſtiano M. D. XLV* (2). i. e. " That my grandfather might not be inferior in " rank in this country to that, which others of his " family held in other parts of the world, he was " knighted

(1) *In Annalibus Saxonicis*, cap. C. pag. 138.

(2) Barthius *in Statium*, tom. 2. pag. 1026.

at Cuſtrin, died the 6th of February 1597 at Halberſtad, from whence his widow removed to Hall with her children. Gaſpar was ſent to Gotha, then to Eiſenac, and after that to divers Univerſities of Germany and Italy (*b*). He became ſo learned in a ſhort time, that his childhood was admired by great Men [*B*], and he wrote divers books before he had a beard [*C*]. He had a prodigious facility in making Verſes [*D*]; and he publiſhed a great many of them [*E*]. He learned the living Languages,

(*b*) Idem, ibid.

" knighted and declared noble by the Emperor Charles " V, and by the decree of all the States of the Em- " pire when aſſembled at Spires, and received all the " privileges of a free and true Nobility, with a ſin- " gular teſtimony of his integrity, learning, and va- " lour, in the year 1545." He exerciſed the office of Chancellor at the Court of Albert of Brandenbourg, Elector of Mentz, Archbiſhop of Magdebourg, and Cardinal. One of his anceſtors, whoſe name was Herman, was Grand Maſter of the Teutonic Order about the end of the twelfth Century (3). The old Annals mention him; Munſter ſpeaks of him in his Coſmography; and the Catalogues of the Grand Maſters of that Order, even thoſe, which Jerom Megiſerus has drawn up, have not omitted him. Other perſons of this family appear in the Accounts of Tournaments, and in the Collections of the Arms of the chief noble families of Germany. The father of Gaſpar Barthius had ſeveral brothers (4), who died all of them without children (5). One of them had been Maſter of the Horſe to ſome great Princes, and was a man of ſome learning (6). Barthius teſtifies that he ſhould be the laſt of his family: *Superſtes nunc ego omnibus paterni mei nominis familiam meam univerſam mecum rebus humanis brevi educam* (7). You will ſee him in the front of ſeveral of his Works with the title of *S. R. Imperii Eques*, that is, *Knight of the Holy Roman Empire*. The thought that his family would die with him afflicted him prodigiouſly: he laid it extremely to heart; he returned frequently to this melancholy object, which induces me to believe that he very eaſily comforted himſelf upon the death of his wife. She was barren, and he reckoned that his vigour of manhood would not laſt any longer than his wife; for otherwiſe he would not have ſpoken in the manner we have ſeen above. But when he leaſt expected it, his wife died. He ſoon married another, in order to ſee whether he could avoid the ſad fate, of which he had been ſo ſtrongly apprehenſive, of dying the laſt of his family. He did not conſider himſelf any longer as an uſeleſs weight upon the earth; this he might ſay properly enough, while he had no hopes of any children: but he had the good fortune of having ſons and daughters by his ſecond marriage; but he forgot to correct thoſe paſſages in his Commentary, wherein he appears to be without hopes of any ſucceſſor. If he would not correct his manuſcript, yet at leaſt he ſhould have added ſomething at the end of it concerning his ſecond marriage, which was more fruitful than the former. If it ſhould be aſked me whence I know that his firſt wife was not dead, when he complained that he was the only perſon remaining of his name, I anſwer, that I have made a ſhort calculation. Barthius's Funeral Oration informs me, that he became a widower in the year 1643, and that his mother died at Hall the 22d of January 1622. Now it was but eighteen years after her death that he made this complaint: *Ego inutile ferè pondus terræ omnibus mei nominis mortalibus ſuperſtes ſupervivo integro octodecennio* (8). That is, " I, though almoſt an uſeleſs load " upon the earth, have ſurvived all my family " full eighteen years." His firſt wife therefore was living then.

(3) Idem, ibid.

(4) In the ſpace of a few lines Barthius, pag. 1026, 1027, of his *Commentary upon Statius*, ſays, *that he had ſix uncles by his father's ſide, and that his grandfather left ſix ſons*. This is not exact.

(5) *Illiberes omnes ... exceſſerunt.* Barthius, *in Statium*, tom. 2. pag. 1027.

(6) Idem, ibid. pag. 1025.

(7) Ibidem.

BARTHIUS's falſe fear of dying without poſterity.

(8) Barthius *in Statium*, tom. 2. pag. 826.

[*B*] *His childhood was admired by great Men.*] Let me be permitted to extend the word *Infancy* a little beyond what it commonly is, and my text will be very true, ſince the great Scaliger had a conſiderable value for Barthius's firſt productions. " Cujus virtutem ju- " venilem accordatos auſus Joſephus Scaliger SUSPEX- " IT adeò, ut divinationis inſtar hanc illi de Barthio " vocem excidiſſe compertum ſit, *natum eſſe adhuc* " *unum æternitati ingenium, quod ſi ad maturita-* " *tem perveniret, literas aliquandiu vivere poſſe* " (9)." i. e. " Joſeph Scaliger had ſuch an eſteem " for his youthful virtue, and his ingenious attempts, " that it is certain he ſaid this of Barthius, which " appears to be prophetical: *There is ſtill one genius,* " ſays he, *which is born for eternity; and if he comes* " *to maturity, Learning may live for ſome time among* " *us.*" Daumius aſſures us that ſeveral great Doctors were not aſhamed to learn of this young ſcholar: *Eo adoleſcente uti Doctore non erubuerunt* Taubmannus, Siberus, Schmidius. *Quæ* Gruteri *aliorumque apud exteros virorum de eo tum lata fuerint judicia, domi eorum literæ aſſervatæ partim, partim lectæ docent* (10). Another learned man ſpeaks of him in this manner; *Novi . . . ante annos ferè quinquaginta pueri præſtabiles minas, cum ſub Wilkii p. m. maru eſſemus συσχολασαὶ: novi ante hos XLIII annos Witerbergæ adoleſcentem florentem gratia apud nonnullos, θαυμαζόμενον ἀεὶ κάτω ab æqualibus* (11). i. e. " I knew his promiſing ge- " nius, when he was a boy about fifty years ago, " when we were ſchool-fellows under Wilkius; I " knew him at Wittenberg forty three years ago, " when he was a youth greatly in favour with ſeveral " perſons, and admired every where by his equals.

(9) Spizel. *in Templo Honoris reſerato*, p. 381.

(9) Spizel. *in Templo Honoris reſerato*, p. 381.

(10) Daumius, Epiſt. xiv. *ad Reineſium.*

(11) Reineſius, Epiſt. 15. *ad Daumium*, p. 46. This Letter is dated the 14th of January 1651.

[*C*] *He wrote ſeveral books before he had a beard.*] Mr. Baillet, who has placed him in his catalogue of his *Famous Children*, will give us a better account of him than any perſon. He will inform us, that Barthius at twelve years of age turned *all David's Pſalms into Latin verſe of every kind of meaſure; and that he publiſhed the ſame year other Poems in the ſame language; and that the Collection of Miſcellanies, Satyrs or Sermons, Elegies, Odes, Epigrams, and Iambics, which he publiſhed at Wittemberg in the year* 1607, *contains all the Poems, which he wrote from the* thirteenth *to the* nineteenth *year of his age* (12). " We learn from him- " ſelf (it is Mr. Baillet ſtill ſpeaks (13) that when he " was but ſixteen years of age, he wrote a Treatiſe or " Diſſertation in the form of a letter concerning the " manner of reading to advantage the Authors of the " Latin tongue, beginning from Ennius to the end of " the Roman Empire, and continuing them from the " decay of that Language to the Critics of the latter " ages, who have reſtored the antient Authors *. This " compoſition the Author aſſures us coſt him but four " and twenty hours; but it is ſo compact and elabo- " rate a performance, that it ſhews us Barthius muſt " at that time read a prodigious deal; and that his " reading was ſo far from being indigeſted or confu- " ſed, that it was attended with a good judgment, " &c." We may add to this, that he was but eighteen years of age when he wrote a *Commentary upon Virgil's Æneis*, which was printed at Amberg in the year 1608, and contains a great deal of Learning.

(12) Baillet, *Enfans celebrés*, pag. 297, 298.

(13) Ibid. pag. 296.

* It is inſerted in the 50th book of his *Adverſaria.*

[*D*] *He had a prodigious facility at making verſes.*] Barthius having taken notice that Statius congratulates himſelf in ſome meaſure for having employed but two days in writing the Epithalamium upon Stella, which contains two hundred and ſeventy eight hexameters, adds that this did not expoſe him to Horace's cenſure (14), ſince this was not making two hundred verſes in an hour, as the perſon did whom Horace ridicules (15). *I find,* continues he, *a great hyperbole in this cenſure, though I am not ignorant what it is to make a great many verſes in a ſhort time; for in three days I tranſlated into Latin the three firſt books of the Iliad, which tranſlation contains above two thouſand verſes.*

(14) *Nam fuit hoc vitioſus, in horâ ſæpe ducentos,*
Ut magnum, verſus dictabat, ſtans pede in uno.
Horat. Sat. 4. ver. 9. lib. 1.

(15) Barthius, *in Statium*, tom. 1. pag. 7.

[*E*] . . . . . *And he publiſhed a great many of them.*] For beſides thoſe mentioned in the remark [*C*], he publiſhed at Francfort in the year 1623 a Poem intitled *Zodiacus Vitæ Chriſtianæ; Satyricon, pleraque omnia veræ ſapientiæ myſteria ſingulari ſuavitate enarrans.* It is divided into twelve books. He publiſhed the ſame year and at the ſame place, *Epidorpidum ex mero Scazonte Libri III, in quibus bona pars humanæ Sapientiæ metro explicatur.* His Epigrams, divided into thirty books, and dedicated to King James, were publiſhed under the name of *Tarræus Hebius* (16). The four Books *Amabilium Anacreonte decantati* were printed in the year 1612. He wrote *a Paraphraſe upon Æſop's Fables* in verſe; *a Tranſlation of Muſæus* likewiſe in verſe; and *a Poem of Leander* (17).

(16) Spizel. *in Templo Honoris*, pag. 382.

(17) Idem, ibid. pag. 386, 387.

I believe

Languages, and he has ſhewn by his tranſlations from Spaniſh and French [*F*], that he was not contented with a ſuperficial knowledge of them. It is ſurprizing what a prodigious multitude of Authors he muſt have read, as appears from his *Adverſaria*, and his *Commentaries upon Statius* and *Claudian*. The greateſt part of the Critics have ſatisfied themſelves with knowing the profane Authors; but he did not confine himſelf to them; he gained likewiſe a very conſiderable knowledge of the Eccleſiaſtical Authors, and eſpecially of thoſe who lived in the middle ages. His application to books engaged him to renounce all kinds of employment, and to lead a retired life at Leipſic (*c*). He formed very early his reſolution to diſengage himſelf entirely from the world and from profane ſtudies, in order to apply himſelf wholly to the great buſineſs of ſalvation [*G*]. He executed this deſign in the laſt years of his life; and it appears from his volume of *Soliloquies* publiſhed in the year 1654, that he was profoundly meditating upon the concerns of eternity [*H*]. He died the 17th of September 1658, being a little above ſeventy one years of age (*d*). The Works, which he left in manuſcript [*I*]; thoſe

(*c*) Spizelius *in Templo Honoris reſerato*, pag. 383.

(*d*) Witte, *Diar. Biograph.*

I believe his *Tranſlation of Quintus Smyrnæus* in verſe was never printed. He mentions it in page 584 of the third volume of his *Statius*.

[*F*] *His Tranſlations from the Spaniſh and French.*] I cannot tell whether he tranſlated any thing out of this latter language but *the Memoirs of Philip de Comines*, which he put into Latin. He had a great affection for the Caſtilian Tongue; which he has ſhewn in divers places; and his commendations of the Spaniſh Books were not unknown to Don Nicholas Antonio (18). I know of but two Spaniſh Books tranſlated into Latin by Barthius; one is the *Celeſtina*, which he knew not the author of; the other is *the Sequel of the Diana of Montemajor*. The title which he gave his Tranſlation of the *Celeſtina* is as follows: *Pornoboſcodidaſcalus Latinus. De lenonum, lenarum, conciliatricum, ſervitiorum, dolis, veneficiis, machinis pluſquam diabolicis, de miſeriis juvenum incautorum, qui florem ætatis amoribus inconceſſis addicunt, de miſerabili ſingulorum periculo & omnium interitu*; at Francfort 1624. He has added Notes to his Tranſlation. The Spaniſh author of this Work or Tragi-Comedy, calls himſelf *Rodericus Cota*. The Continuation of the Diana of Montemajor tranſlated by Barthius is the work of Gaſpar Gil-Polo. Barthius's Tranſlation was printed at Hanaw in 1625 under the title of *Erotodidaſculus ſeu Nemoralium Libri V*. He likewiſe tranſlated into Latin, as Mr. Baillet informs us (19), the *Pornodidaſcalus* of Aretin. It is without doubt the ſame book, that Daumius ſpeaks of in theſe terms: *Reliqua quæ . . . . . Barthius publicavit ex indiculo colloquio P. Aretini* de las Damas *ex Hiſpanico ab ipſo tranſlato, & a nobis recuſo nuper, adjecto cognoſcere poteris* (20). i. e. "The other things, which Barthius publiſhed, you "may know from the Index, added to the Dialogue "of P. Aretin *de las Damas* tranſlated by him from "the Spaniſh, and lately reprinted by me." We may conclude from hence that this Latin Tranſlation of Aretin was not done from the original, but only from a Spaniſh verſion.

(18) See the *Bibliotheque of the Spaniſh Writers*, vol. 1. pag. 403, 413; and vol. 2. pag. 211.

(19) *Jugemens des Savans*, tom. 1. pag. 542.

(20) Daumius in the preface to Barthius's *Commentaries upon Statius*, dated the 15th of March 1664.

[*G*] *He formed very early a reſolution to diſengage himſelf entirely from the world . . . . in order to apply himſelf . . . . wholly to the great buſineſs of ſalvation.*] Having told us, that his mother had a fore-ſight of her death three years before ſhe died, and that he had ſurvived his good mother eighteen years, being ſound in all parts of his body, except that his ſight was a little weakened (21), he adds, *Cupio autem cœptis ſcribendo laboribus demum aliquando defungi, & totum me Chriſto dedicare, quam rem ſæpius jam orſam hactenus infinita bellorum & bellicorum tumultuum exactionumque impedimenta hactenus ſuſpenderunt.* i. e. "I am very "deſirous to finiſh the works, which I have begun, "and to dedicate myſelf wholly to Chriſt; which re"ſolution I have often undertaken, but been delayed "in executing it by the infinite obſtacles I have met "with from the tumults and diſturbances of the wars." To know at what time he wrote this; we need only to recollect, that his mother died in 1622. See the remark [*A*] towards the end.

(21) Barthius, *Commentar. in Statium*, tom. 2. pag. 826.

[*H*] *He was profoundly meditating upon the concerns of Eternity.*] Here is the teſtimony which Theophilus Spizelius gives of him: *Sacrum nimirum ad Deum ſinceramque pietatem Barthius meditabatur acceſſum, plurimis piè literatorum ac Deo ſacratorum hominum exemplis incitatus. Quo de imprimis teſtatur inſigne* SOLILOQUIORUM OPUS, *extremis vitæ temporibus à Barthio publicatum, flagrantiſſimis ad Deum ſuſpiriis oppido plenum, & vel Auguſtino ſcriptore dignum, quod etiam hemiplecticus quotidiè revolvere, & per priorum meditationum veſtigia denuò cogitationes ſuas cœlo immittere conſuevit, quinimò divinum amorem, quem intimis fibris ſemel imbibiſſet, continuis precum ejaculationibus alendum jugiter atque roborandum putavit, quouſque è ſacræ pariter ac literariæ ſolitudinis diverſorio, annò ævi noſtri octavo & quinquageſimo, ætatis verò ſeptuageſimo primo emigravit* (22). i. e. "He reſolved "upon a nearer approach to God and to true piety, "animated by the examples of ſeveral Men of Learn"ing, who have devoted themſelves to God. This "we have a remarkable proof of in his excellent "Book of SOLILOQUIES, publiſhed by Barthius in "the latter end of his life, full of ardent breathings "to God, and worthy of the hand of St. Auſtin him"ſelf. This he uſed to turn over daily, when he "was ſeized with the palſy; and by the traces of his "former meditations to raiſe his thoughts to heaven; "he ſtrengthen'd and confirmed the love of God, "which he had the deepeſt impreſſions of in his mind, "by continual prayers and ejaculations, till he de"parted out of this devout and learned retirement in"to another life, in the year 1658, and of his "age 71."

(22) Spizelius, *Theat. Honor.* pag. 384, 385.

[*I*] *He left ſeveral works in manuſcript.*] Daumius has informed the Public, that there are among the author's papers the ſecond and third volume of his *Adverſaria*; *Notes and Gloſſaries upon the Writers of Paleſtine*, publiſh'd by James Bongars: *Benedictus Paulinus Petrocorius de Vitâ S. Martini, & Paullinus Pellæus cum Tertulliani Jona, Juretique & Barthii Animadverſionibus:* XXI Books of *Epigrams:* XII Books of *Anacreontics: the Zodiac of a Chriſtian Life*, corrected and enlarg'd in ſeveral places: ſeveral other *Poems*, moſt part of which were never printed, and others had been corrected; *Gloſſaries upon Valerius Maximus*, and *upon the Epiſtles of Pliny the Younger* (23). Daumius declares, that if the cruelty of the times, which are abſolutely averſe to polite Learning, would permit him, and by the generoſity of any Mecænas his heirs might gain any advantage by it, all theſe works might ſome time or other be publiſhed. *Si diritas permittat temporum politioribus heu Muſis prorſus infenſorum, fructuſque ſi aliquis Mæcenatum benignitate ad relictos τοῦ μακαρίτου hæredes ſit redundaturus* (24). I have not heard that any of theſe manuſcripts have been reſcued from the cloſet of his heirs, except *Paulinus Petrocorius de Vitâ S. Martini*, which was printed in 1681, by the care of Daumius. The Bookſellers would not catch at this bait, as they did formerly, when Barthius touched them in point of honour by declaring in a Preface of his, that he had a great number of books, which waited only for the courteſy of the Bookſellers to appear in public (25), and which ſhould be publiſhed as ſoon as a good Bookſeller ſhould offer himſelf (26). They produced a very ſpeedy effect with regard to ſome of his works, but a ſlower with regard to others; but notwithſtanding the greateſt part of the books, which he gave the titles of, were printed, when this Preface was mentioned in the *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*. Let us ſee in what terms it was mentioned; the paſſage deſerves to be quoted; it contains a criticiſm, which is a little ſevere, but well grounded. "There is a Preface be"fore it, in which we find the titles of ſeveral books, "which

(23) Daumius, *in præfat. Comment. Barthii in Statium.*

(24) Idem, ibid.

(25) *Sequentur deinceps, uti quidem Typographorum comitas erit.* Barth. *Præfat. in* Rutil. Itinerar. It is dated the 14th of October 1622.

(26) *Exſpectant Editionem, ſi ſollertem Typographum nacti fuerimus.* Idem, ibid.

thoſe which have been printed [*K*], thoſe which he loſt when his houſe was burnt [*L*], and thoſe, which it is known he was engaged in, and thoſe which are diſperſed I know not whither [*M*]; all theſe Writings, I ſay, riſe to ſuch a prodigious bulk, that one can ſcarce conceive a ſingle man could be capable of executing ſo great a variety of things. I cannot tell whether any perſons, who have lived to grow old amidſt the duſt of an office of Regiſters, ever wrote ſo much as this Author has done. There has been a ſtory told, which would much better have been ſuppreſſed, concerning a journey, which it is ſaid he took into Holland with a fair Lady [*N*]. Several men of abilities have complained of the printing of that ſtory, and treated it as a mere fable

" which the author promiſed to give the Public, but " a ſmall part of them only have appeared yet (27), " becauſe there were no Bookſellers to be met with, " as he obſerves himſelf (28), who had the ſame zeal " with himſelf for the advancement of polite Litera- " ture. But if all his works were like this, we may " be ſure that we have loſt nothing, at leaſt with re- " ſpect to part of them, but a vaſt number of quo- " tations, which we might eaſily diſpenſe with. Not " that there may not be valuable paſſages, as well as " in this; but they are hid as it were under the pro- " digious heap of quotations from the Ancients, ſo " that it would require a great deal of patience to diſ- " cover them (29)."

(27) It is certain that the beſt part of them is printed.

(28) He does not mention this at all in that Preface.

(29) *Bibliotheque Univerſelle*, tom. 5. pag. 240. in the Extract of Rutilius's *Itinerary*.

[*K*] . . . . . *Others, which have been printed.*] I ſhall only mention the chief of them: a large volume *in folio*, intitled, *Adverſaria*, divided into LX Books, *Quibus ex univerſa antiquitatis ſerie omnis generis loci tam Gentilium quam Chriſtianorum Scriptorum illuſtrantur & emendantur, cum rituum, morum, legum, formularumque obſervatione & elucidatione, cum undecim Indicibus, ſeptem Auctorum, quatuor Rerum*; at Francfort in 1624. The memory, reading and learning of this author appear here in a very ſurprizing manner; it is a pity that method and choice were not equally diſplayed in it. He left two volumes of *Adverſaria* of the ſame ſize, without reckoning his Reviſal and Correction of the former. *De quo Adverſariorum Tomo ſecundo aut tertio, uterque enim jam peractus eſt, primo etiam recenſito in iis, & amotis nebulis, quas illi inducere livor voluit* (30). The whole work would have contained CLXXX Books. There is ſomething immenſe in it, that tires even the imagination; but let us proceed to the other titles: *Galli Confeſſoris Chriſtianæ Doctrinæ Compendium, ſeu Sermonem Conſtantiæ habitum, C. Barthius recenſuit, & Animadverſionum librum adjecit*; at Francfort in 1623 in 8vo. *Phœbadius contra Arianos, cum Animadverſionibus. Guil. Britonis libri Philippidos, cum Notis. Claudiani Ecdicii Mamerti de Statu Animæ libri III, cum Animadverſionibus*; Cygneæ, 1655, in 8vo. *Æneæ Gazæi Dialogus de Immortalitate Animarum, cum Zachariâ Mitylenæo Philoſopho Chriſtiano, Græcè & Latinæ*, Lipſiæ, 1655, in 4to. Barthius gave a new Tranſlation of Æneas Gazæus, and made uſe of that of John Tarin with regard to Zacharias, and illuſtrated both theſe works with Notes. *Soliloquia rerum divinarum*, Cygneæ, 1654, in 4to. A large volume of *Notes upon Claudian*, printed in 1650 in 4to; and three large volumes *upon Statius*, printed in 1664 in 4to. He was not ſatisfied with this edition of Claudian, becauſe the Printer had not employed a good character (31). It is a pity that we have no Table of Contents, and no general Index to it. It is a defect, which his Commentaries upon Statius are free from.

(30) Barth. *in Statium*, tom. 1. pag. 110. *See likewiſe* Daumius's *Preface*.

(31) Barth. *in Stat.* tom. 1. pag. 434.

[*L*] . . . . . *Thoſe which he loſt when his houſe was burnt.*] It was a country-houſe of his; it was ſet on fire thro' the fault of the Farmer, or ſome ſuch perſon, who lodged in it. *Cum villa noſtra urbana non bello, non latronum manu, ſed perfidi incolæ temeritate conflagravit* (32). This without doubt is what Daumius calls *Incendium Sellerhuſanum*, that is, *the Fire at Sellerhuſe*, which happened in 1636. *Etiam nonnulla flammis*, ſays he (33), *incendio Sellerhuſano anno M. DC. XXXVI abſumpta, periere*. Barthius loſt upon that occaſion his *Index Appuleianus* (34); all that he had written upon Tertullian (35); his *Index* to Thucydides, &c. *In quo ſcriptore* (Thucydide) *per bellicos hos triennales motus & exceſſiones ingens damnum accepimus; indicem enim tam in auctorem quam ſcholiaſten (qui recentior tamen eſt quam vulgo attenditur) confeceramus, is cum parte Bibliothecæ periit* (36). *Flammæ . . . ingens ſcrinium manu meâ ſcriptis chartis effertum, ſimul abſtulerunt; & ſic perierunt mihi multa juvenilia & puerilia ſcripta* (37). i. e. " In which writer (*Thu-* " *cydides*), by reaſon of the diſturbances and removes, " which the wars have occaſioned for three years, " have ſuſtained a very great loſs; for the *Index*, " which I had made both for the author himſelf and " the Scholiaſt upon him, (which Scholiaſt is later " than is generally obſerved), is loſt with part of my " Library. The fire likewiſe deſtroyed a large ca- " binet full of manuſcripts of my writing; and by " this means a great many pieces, written by me in " my childhood and youth, were conſumed." He ſays that his Library had been twice plundered before the fire made a new depredation upon it: *Adeſſe Bibliothecæ non poſſumus miris modis duabus vaſtationibus depopulatæ, & uno incendio vix dimidiatim ereptæ* (38).

(32) Idem, ibid. tom. 3. p. 1398. He had ſaid in pag. 9. of the 1ſt volume, *Flammæ non ab hoſte ſed domeſtico ſcelere meæ tum manſioni injectæ*.

(33) Daumius *præfat. in Stat.*

(34) Barth. *in Stat.* tom. 1. p. 9. & *paſſim alibi*.

(35) Ibid. pag. 1338. of the 3d Tome, where he ſays, *Natæ noſtræ in integrum ferè Tertullianum*. i. e. " Our notes up- " on almoſt all " Tertullian.

(36) Ibid. tom. 2. pag. 306.

(37) Ibid. tom. 1. chap. 9.

(38) Ibid. tom. 2. pag. 372.

[*M*] . . . . . *Which have been diſperſed I know not whither.*] Daumius tells us, that after the author's death they ſought in vain for his *Commentary upon St. Auſtin de Civitate Dei*, his Book *de Superſtitionibus Veterum*, his Treatiſe *de dubiis Scriptoribus*, his *Characters*, and ſeveral other writings of that kind. Barthius quotes very often the books abovementioned, and gives us a very advantageous notion of them. It is very probable, conſidering the ſubjects of them, that they were not the leaſt valuable of his works. He had begun a great many others, to which he refers his readers, juſt as if they had been printed. See the *Index Authorum* to his Statius, in the word BARTHIUS.

[*N*] *There is a ſtory told . . . . . concerning a journey, which it is ſaid he took into Holland with a fair Lady.*] Mr. Colomies relates it upon the credit of Iſaac Voſſius. He was extremely blameable for printing ſuch things, which he had no other authority for but a mere ſtory told in converſation. Who does not know, that thoſe perſons, who value themſelves upon entertaining a company agreeably, are furniſhed with an infinite number of little hiſtories, which they add circumſtances to at their pleaſure, in order to render their ſtory more remarkable and agreeable? They would not take ſuch a liberty, if they knew that what they ſay would be printed. However that be, the ſtory is as follows: " Mr. Voſſius . . . . told me one " day that Barthius being come from Germany to Har- " lem to ſee Scriverius, brought with him a Lady, " who was perfectly beautiful; and that Scriverius " had no ſooner ſeen her, but he found means to " make Barthius drunk, that he might entertain that " Lady with more freedom; which deſign ſucceeded " according to his deſire. However this was not " carried on ſo, but that Barthius coming to himſelf " from his drunken fit had ſome ſuſpicion of what " had paſt, which was heightened in ſuch a manner, " that he carried away his Lady in a prodigious paſ- " ſion, and ſuffered her to be drowned in the Rhine " (39)." It muſt not be denied that Barthius had a bad reputation with regard to his morals. One of his beſt friends owns this; but he aſſirms that it was without grounds. *De Moribus quæ invidi nugati ſunt, quorumque causâ ego ignotum meo malo abhorrebam, rem aliter quindecennali hac cum eo converſatione comperi. Adeo quicquid de eo dixerunt ſcripſeruntque ego hactenus prorſus credere abnui, cujus intima neſcio an æque alii patuerint* (40). i. e. " With regard to his Morals, " concerning which his enemies reported many idle " ſtories, on account of which I entertained an aver- " ſion for him before I knew him, to my great diſ- " advantage; I have found by a converſation with " him of fifteen years ſtanding, that there was no " grounds for ſuch reports. And therefore I have hi- " therto refuſed any credit to the ſtories, which have " been told and written concerning him, which I can " do with the more confidence, ſince I think that no " perſon was ever ſo intimate with him as my ſelf."

(39) Colomeſii *Opuſcula*, p. 102. edit. Ultraject. an. 1669.

(40) Daumius, Epiſt. 14. *ad Reineſium*, p. 37.

fable [O]. Barthius had two wives (e); he married the firſt in the year 1630, and the ſecond in 1644. The firſt died in 1643, without having born him any children. The ſecond brought him one ſon and three daughters, and ſurvived him (f). He was four times in Cities which were beſieged, and eſcaped, having loſt his clothes and arms but once (g). He complained of being ill treated by Voſſius [P]. He warmly eſpouſed Scaliger's part againſt Scioppius [Q]; and he was not upon good terms with the learned Reineſius. The latter had too often ſurprized him in an error, not to have provoked him [R]. It was impoſſible that a man, who wrote ſo much, and with ſuch prodigious haſte, could eſcape the judicious cenſure of Reineſius. It is ſaid that it was not always through defect of memory that Barthius contradicted himſelf [S]. It will not ſeem ſurprizing

(e) Hulſemannus, *in Orat. fun. Barthii.*

(f) Idem, ibid.

(g) *Qui intra obſidendam obſeſſamque urbem aliquando fuerit. Id quod nobis quater contigit, nuſpiam læſis, niſi ſpoliatione una veſtimentorum & armorum direptione*, Barth. *in Stat.* tom. 2. pag. 1041.

[O] *Several men of abilities have complained of the printing of this ſtory, and treated it as a fable.*] Here is what Morhof ſays of it: *Quibus* (Colomeſii Opuſculis) *adjicitur libellus Gallica ſermone cui titulus* Recueil des Particularitez, *in quibus multa de eruditis familiariter à Voſſio aliiſque ſuppeditata laudato ſemper autore, vir ille effutivit, quæ inſignis ſane temeritas fuit. Multa tamen in his ſunt mendacia, quale illud de Caſparo Barthio horrendum, qui concubinam ſuam Rheno ſuffocaverit, quod ejus cum Scriverio amores deprehenderit* (41). i. e. "To which (*Opuſcula of Colomies*) is added "a French piece intitled *Recueil des Particularitez*, "in which that author has told ſeveral ſtories con- "cerning learned men, which he had in converſation "from Voſſius and others, always mentioning his au- "thority for them. But there are many falſities a- "mong them, particularly that horrid one concern- "ing Caſpar Barthius's drowning his miſtreſs in "the Rhine, upon his diſcovering her gallantries "with Scriverius."

(41) Morhof. *Polyhiſt.* pag. 71.

[P] *He complained of being ill treated by Voſſius.*] Few perſons have had reaſon to make ſuch complaints; for there never was a learned man of greater humanity and moderation towards thoſe, whom he criticized upon, than Voſſius. But let us ſee Barthius's complaint at length. *Quo loco vir doctiſſ.* (42) *pulchrè etiam de Lutatio judicat doctum eſſe lectuque dignum Exegeten, præter quidem gloſſemata. Sane longe melius & compertius, quàm nuper Joannes Gerhardus Voſſius, qui Lutatium ex Servio & Higinio compoſitum dicere auſus eſt maximam partem. Qui doctiſſimus homo cum alio nos loco perperam* (*ut clara res eſt, & demonſtratum jam nobis alibi*) *ineptiarum & abſurditatis nunquam à nobis læſus, & ab invidis planèque egregiè ineptis Thraſunculis incitatus, inſimulare auſus ſit, meritò utriuſque notæ hic habebitur, cum ea Commentariis Lutatianis inſint, quorum nec centeſimam partem Servianæ & Higinianæ Commentationes vindicare poſſint. Idem præſtantiſſimus vir incogitatè eodem loco ſcribit Lutatium à Lindebrogio primum editum* (43). i. e. "In which place that very "learned man rightly judges of Lutatius, that he is "a learned and valuable Expoſitor, except the gloſſes. "This is much more juſt and reaſonable than what "John Gerard Voſſius has lately ſaid, who ventures "to aſſert that Lutatius is compiled from Servius and "Higinius. And as this very learned man has ac- "cuſed me in another place very wrongfully (as is "plain, and has been demonſtrated by me elſewhere) "of ignorance and abſurdity, tho' he was never of- "fended by me, and only put upon it by ſeveral "trifling boaſters, who are my enemies, he may juſtly "fall under both theſe characters here, ſince there are "thoſe things in the Commentaries of Lutatius, the "hundreth part of which can never be claimed by "the Comments of Servius and Higinius. The ſame "excellent man has very careleſly aſſerted in the "ſame place that Lutatius was firſt publiſhed by Lin- "debrogius."

(42) That is to ſay, *Nicolaus Loenſis*, chap. 18. of his *Miſcellanea.*

(43) Barth. *in Stat.* tom. 2. pag. 871.

[Q] *He eſpouſed Scaliger's part againſt Scioppius.*] There are three pieces againſt that great man's antagoniſt aſcribed to him; and we find his name in the Anagram of *Tarræus Hebeius Nobilis à Sperga*, under which he concealed himſelf. *Reſoluto Anagrammate Gaſparis Barthii Berolinæi confirmat excellentiſſimus* Geiſlerus de Mutatione Nominum. *Exemplorum Decad. I. num.* 5 (44). Theſe three books are intitled as follows; the firſt, *Cave Canan, de Vitâ, Moribus, Rebus geſtis, Divinitate Gaſparis Scioppii Apoſtatæ, Satyricon*, Hanov. 1612. *in* 12*mo.* The ſecond, *Scioppius excellens; in laudem ejus & ſociorum; pro Joſepho Scaligero & omnibus probis Epigrammatum libri III, ex triginta totis hinc inde collati.* It is printed with the preceding. The third, *Amphitheatrum Sapientiæ*, Hanov. 1613 *in* 8*vo.* See Rhodius in the paſſage above cited; and Placcius pag. 262 of his *Pſeudonymous Writers.*

(44) Rhodius, *de Auctor. Suppoſ.* num. 54.

[R] *Reineſius had too often ſurprized him in an error, not to have provoked him.*] Theſe were not errors, which a man of wit might have room to diſpute about: they were ſo obvious, as to be immediately condemned; and this is what diſpleaſes and offends an author moſt. *A Cl. Barthio, quem tu tantum non in cœlum effers, & quem ſua defenſurum eſſe ſcribis, nihil indigni iniquive expecto, tam licèt ipſi in meis, ſi quando lucem adſpicient publicam, (lenta autem res eſt, & fortaſſe incumbent in ſpongiam, ut olim illius Ajax) quam in ipſius mihi licere viſum eſt experiri; non exiſtimo autem Soli obloquturum eſſe. Sunt enim pleraque, quæ nunc quidem produxi, adeò certa liquidaque, ut niſi temerè litigare velit, ne calamum quidem contradicturus mihi tingere debeat. Perpende, quæſo, mi cariſſimè* NESTERE, *ἔνθα πάθῃς, ubicunque ab eo diſſentio; maximè verò examina, quæ cap.* 8. *l.* 2. *quo ejus in Plinium Valerianum, dictum Empericum, illatæ emendationes producuntur, trado, & miraberis hominis doctiſſimi manifeſtiſſimas inſcitias, fruſtrationes, & puerilia παραράμματα, audaces etiam conjecturas in autorem non intellectum invectas deprehendes magno numero. Iſtas ſi quis præfractè tueri præſumpſerit, eum ne ſani quidem capitis eſſe dixero; Barthium autem mecum fore & viſurum, me quamvis indigno judice, id quod verum eſt, nullus dubito.* i. e. "I expect nothing but candid treat- "ment from the celebrated Barthius, whom you ex- "tol almoſt to the ſkies, and who, as you inform me, "will defend his writings. The ſame liberty, that "I have taken with his works, he may take with "mine, if ever they are publiſhed, (for it will be long "firſt, and perhaps they will come to the ſponge, "like Auguſtus's Ajax); but I do not ſuppoſe, that "he will venture to exclaim againſt the Sun. For "moſt of the obſervations, which I have now pro- "duced, are ſo clear and evident, that he ought not "to take up his pen againſt me, unleſs he is willing to "precipitate himſelf raſhly into a controverſy, in "which he cannot defend himſelf. Conſider, my "deareſt Neſterus, without prejudice, the points, in "which I differ from him; but particularly examine "what I obſerve in Chap. 8. B. 2. where his Emen- "dations upon *Plinius Valerianus*, called the *Empiric*, "are diſcuſſed; and then you will be ſurprized that "ſo learned a man ſhould fall into ſuch groſs errors "and childiſh miſtakes; and diſcover that he has "preſumed to introduce a great number of bold "conjectures into an author, whom he did not un- "derſtand. If any perſon ſhould pretend obſtinately "to defend theſe things, I ſhould venture to ſay, "that he was not in his ſenſes. But with reſpect "to Barthius, I do not doubt, but that he will be "of my opinion, and diſcover where the truth lies, "tho' I am unworthy to ſhew it him." Theſe are Reineſius's words in a Letter, which he wrote to Neſterus the 31ſt of March 1638 (45). See likewiſe his fifteenth Letter to Daumius.

(45) It is the 6th.

[S] *It is ſaid that it was not always through defect of memory that Barthius contradicted himſelf.*] "Some "perſons have obſerved that when he paſſes his judg- "ment, he falls ſometimes into contradictions for want "of memory (46)." Daumius pretends that thoſe, who have taken notice of ſuch kind of contradictions, do not know the deſign of Barthius. "He wrote, "*ſays he*, every thing that offered itſelf to his imagi- "nation, to day one thing, to morrow another, in "order that when he ſhould reviſe it again, this "contrariety of opinions might engage him to exa- "mine

(46) Baillet, *Jugemens des Savans*, tom. 3. pag. 464.

prizing that his memory, how prodigious ſoever it was, very often failed him extremely, conſidering the manner in which he wrote his books [T]. He never made uſe of any Collections or Common-Place-Book, and ſcarce ever corrected what he had once written.

" mine the ſubject more accurately, and give him a " better opportunity of correcting or confirming what " he had publiſhed." *Memini in publicis alicubi diſputationibus diverſæ ſententiæ ejus loca exagitata fuiſſe. Sed auctores ſcopum ſcriptoris neſcio an vel per tranſennam viderint. Novi enim, hoc conſilio, eoque fine* BARTHIUM *ea, quæ in mentem ſibi venerant, in chartam conjeciſſe, etiam diverſis diverſo tempore ſententiis, ut quandoque ad ea revertenti illa diverſitas ampliorem de veritate cogitandi ſuppeditaret materiam, occaſionemque longè commodiorem retractandi vel ſtabiliendi quod ſcripſerat. Id quod* fine Capitis VI Libri Undecimi, *& alibi ſæpius teſtatur* (47). See how Reineſius has confuted this Apology (48).

(47) Daumius, Epiſt. 14. *ad Reineſium*, p. 37.

(48) Reineſii, Epiſt. 15. *ad Daumium*, p. 45.

[T] *It will not ſeem ſurprizing that his memory ... ſhould fail him, conſidering the manner in which he wrote his books.*] Let us hear his own words. *Puto jam tale quid ſupra notaſſe. Non enim poteſt, ut nullis penitus rebus adjuti, omnium ſtrictam memoriam habeamus. Omnino enim aliter nos commentamur, quam ſolent homines etiam litteratiſſimi, dum auctores legunt, excerpentes quædam atque ea deinde excerpta in Silvam Obſervationum, eam porrò Silvam in Commentaria redigentes. Nunquam tale quid factum a nobis eſt. Sed ut cuique auctori enarrando benè facere volumus, arrepto illi Animadverſiones hoc genus imputamus, ſolius memoriæ beneficio nixi, quam marginalibus nonnunquam prius Notis inſtruimus, dum cum Libris veteribus Editiones comparamus. Cætera omnia è calamo fluunt, elegante & minuto literarum ductu. Nec inquam ſcripto repetitur; nec ullis lituris cruciatur. Quarum nec decem aliquas hactenus bi Commentarii agnoverint* (49). i. e. " I think I have " obſerved ſomething of that kind above; for it is " impoſſible for me, unaſſiſted as I am with the uſual " helps, to remember every thing exactly. For my " manner of writing is very different from that of " the moſt learned Men, who, when they read Au- " thors, extract from them, and enter thoſe Extracts " in their Collection of Obſervations, which Collecti- " on they reduce into their Commentaries. But I " have never uſed that method; but whenever I un- " dertake to explain any Author, I write ſuch Ani- " madverſions upon him as theſe are, merely upon " the ſtrength of memory, which I ſometimes aſſiſt " beforehand with marginal Notes, while I am com- " paring the editions of Authors with the old manu- " ſcripts. All the reſt flow immediately from my " pen in a neat and ſmall character; I never write " any thing over again, or make any blots or altera- " tions in it; ſo that I have not yet made ten correc- " tions in all theſe Commentaries." I cannot tell whether it was a proper thing for an Author to make ſuch a boaſt as this; I think a greater reſpect is due to the public.

(49) Barth. *in Stat.* tom. 3. pag. 866.

☞BARWICK (JOHN) an eminent Engliſh Divine in the ſeventeenth Century, was born April the 20th 1612 at Wetherſlack in Weſtmorland, of honeſt parents (*a*). His father George was deſcended of the antient family of the Barwicks of Fair Ridge (*b*) near the little village of Stavely in the North part of Lancaſhire. His mother's maiden name was *Barrow*. His parents, though poſſeſſed but of a ſmall eſtate, by their frugal and prudent management, educated all their children in a very decent manner (*c*), and particularly deſigned their ſons John and Peter for Learning. John, who was ſeven years older than his brother Peter, having at firſt been put under the care of very inſufficient maſters, was afterwards ſent to Sedburg School in Yorkſhire (*d*); and in the year 1631 May the 14th, at the age of eighteen years (*e*) admitted into St. John's College in Cambridge, and placed under the tuition of the Reverend Mr. Tho. Fothergil (*f*), and applied himſelf with great vigour to his ſtudies. He had ſcarce taken his degree of Bachelor of Arts, before he was intruſted with the management of ſome affairs of the College of no little importance, his ſucceſs in which ſoon procured him to be admitted Fellow of the College April the 5th 1636 (*g*). Upon the breaking out of the civil wars he had a conſiderable ſhare in ſending the plate of the ſeveral Colleges to the King at Nottingham; and wrote in conjunction with ſeveral other Gentlemen *Querela Cantabrigienſis, or the Univerſity of Cambridge's Complaint*, being a repreſentation of the violences uſed by the Parliament-party againſt the Royaliſts, and another Tract againſt the *Covenant* intitled *Certain Diſquiſitions and Conſiderations, &c.* But he was not long after obliged to retire from the Univerſity to London, where in order to negotiate the King's affairs more covertly, he placed himſelf in the family of Dr. Thomas Morton Biſhop of Durham [A], where he brought back to the King's intereſt Sir Thomas Middleton and Colonel Roger Pope, the latter of whom he attended when dying of the plague (*h*). After King Charles I had delivered himſelf up to the Scots army, and enjoyed ſome degree of freedom, Mr. Barwick attended upon him, and received his commands in perſon, and was frequently ſent by his Majeſty to his friends at London; and when the Parliament and Army declared againſt each

(*a*) *Vita Johannis Barwick S. T. P. a Petro Barwick, M. D.* pag. 1, 2. edit. London 1721.

(*b*) Mr. Bedford, the Editor of the Latin Life, in his Engliſh Tranſlation, renders thus *Bella Lira* in the Latin.

(*c*) *Vita Johannis Barwick*, pag. 3, 4.

(*d*) Ibid. p. 4, 5.

(*e*) See the note on pag. 9. of the Engliſh Tranſlation of that Life.

(*f*) *Vita, &c.* pag. 7, 8.

(*g*) Note on pag. 13. of the Engliſh Tranſlation.

(*h*) *Vita, &c.* pag. 30, 31.

[A] *In order to negotiate the King's affairs more covertly, he placed himſelf in the family of Dr. Thomas Morton Biſhop of Durham.*] Dr. Peter Barwick tells us (1), that he had the management of the King's affairs, and as a ſecret ſpy carried on a private correſpondence between London and Oxford, where the King's head-quarters were; on the one hand communicating to his Majeſty all the deſigns and endeavours of the Parliament-party, and conveying his orders and commands on the other, being a man of great courage, as well as of extraordinary prudence and ſagacity. He procured himſelf to be appointed Chaplain to the Biſhop of Durham, that together with his function he might be enabled to manage the King's affairs more ſecretly, and be leſs liable to ſuſpicion, ſince in that ſpacious houſe he had an opportunity of concealing whatever cyphers he had relating to the King's buſineſs, and becauſe as he was very tenacious of Chriſtian ſimplicity, he was by this means always furniſhed with a true as well as convenient anſwer, if he ſhould be queſtioned concerning his employment in London. For this was both then his firm reſolution, and what he afterwards always religiouſly obſerved, whenever he fell into the enemy's hands, either to anſwer all their queſtions with the ſtricteſt truth, or to make them no anſwer at all; for he did not think it conſiſtent with his duty, if taken at any time, to clear himſelf with fictitious excuſes, or do any thing that ſhould interfere with the ſincerity of the Goſpel, leſt Chriſtianity ſhould ſuffer by his means. He reſolved rather with ſilence to anſwer all their captious and enſnaring queſtions, how much ſoever he might ſuffer by it, than hazard the leaſt damage to the public by an imprudent anſwer (2).

(1) *Vita, &c.* pag. 25, *& ſeq.*

(2) Ibid. p. 27.

each other, he took arms with the latter by the King's order, and converſed intimately with many Lords and others. The King, in reward for his great ſervices, honoured him with a teſtimonial written with his own hand; and by his orders concerted with Sir Thomas Middleton, and Mr. Richard Brown, who was knighted after the Reſtoration, and by their means procured a treaty with his Majeſty to be voted, but the place to be the Iſle of Wight, betwixt which and London he rode in one day, and returned in another (*i*). His exceſſive ſorrow upon the King's death threw him into a dangerous illneſs, but by means of his brother Edward he ſtill carried on his correſpondence with the Miniſters of King Charles II, till they were both betrayed and caſt into priſon. Auguſt the 7th 1652 he was diſcharged from his confinement, and applied himſelf to his private ſtudies, till he could conveniently return to the management of the King's affairs. He lived for ſome time at Sir Thomas Erſfield's houſe in Suſſex; and February the 23d 1655 he wrote a Letter to the Biſhop of Durham on occaſion of the ordinance for decimating the Laity, who had adhered to the King, and prohibiting the Clergy to officiate [*B*]. Upon his return to London he lodged in his brother's houſe, and attended Dr. Hewet upon the ſcaffold (*k*). He was of very great ſervice in effecting the Reſtoration of King Charles II, as appears from the Latin Life of him written by his brother Dr. Peter Barwick (*l*), and the original Letters which paſt between him and that King, and Sir Edward Hyde, then Chancellor of the Exchequer, and afterwards Lord Chancellor of England, and publiſhed in the *Appendix* to his Life. He was ſent by the Biſhops to Breda to the King with inſtructions, and was there appointed to preach before him, and made one of his Chaplains (*m*). He would not wholly leave Cambridge till he had taken his degree of Doctor of Divinity; of which he had been admitted Bachelor at Oxford, February the 21ſt 1645 (*n*). The *Latin Theſis*, which he maintained upon his taking his Doctor's Degree, was, that *the method of impoſing penance and reſtoring Penitents in the primitive Church was a godly diſcipline, and that it is much to be wiſhed it were reſtored* (*o*). He was ſent with Dr. Dolben, afterwards Archbiſhop of York, to attend upon the Regicides after their condemnation (*p*). At the Counteſs of Derby's requeſt he reſigned his right to the Biſhoprick of the Iſle of Man in favour of her Chaplain Mr. Samuel Rutter (*q*), and declined the offer of the Biſhoprick of Carliſle [*C*]; but was advanced by the King to the Deanery of Durham [*D*] November the 1ſt 1660, in the room of Dr. William Fuller (*r*), which Deanery he held with the Rectory of Houghton in le Spring. Octob. 15th 1661 he was elected Dean of St. Paul's in London; in which ſtation he acted with the greateſt integrity and prudence imaginable. February 18th 1661 he was choſen Prolocutor of the Lower Houſe

(*i*) Ibid. pag. 57-63.

(*k*) Ibid. pag. 69-117.

(*l*) Ibid. pag. 118-185.

(*m*) Ibid. p. 188, 189, 190.

(*n*) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 50. 2d edit. London 1721.

(*o*) *Vita, &c.* pag. 194.

(*p*) Ibid. p. 201.

(*q*) Ibid. p. 206.

(*r*) Wood, *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 50.

[*B*] *Wrote a Letter to the Biſhop of Durham on occaſion of the ordinance for decimating the Laity, who had adhered to the King, and prohibiting the Clergy to officiate.*] Dr. Peter Barwick tells us (3), that it had been deliberated, whether all thoſe who were ſuppoſed really to favour the Royal Cauſe, ſhould not be deſtroyed, agreeably to Hobbs's doctrine then lately publiſhed; but that Cromwell following milder counſels, and knowing that the number of ſuch perſons was too great to be ſlaughtered, contented himſelf with plundering them, though they had been more than once plundered before. From thoſe of the Laity, who had any part of their eſtate left, he exacted part of their revenue. But the Clergy having been already deprived of all, he thunders out a moſt cruel Interdict (4) againſt them, threatning every one of them with the ſevereſt impriſonment, who either in a public aſſembly, or privately in any Gentleman's houſe, ſhould preſume to preach or read prayers according to the Liturgy of the Church of England, or teach any ſchool. How Mr. Barwick behaved himſelf in this afflicted ſtate of affairs appears from his Letter to the Biſhop of Durham; wherein he tells him, that he cannot but from the bottom of his heart commiſerate the condition of ſuch of the Clergy, as have wives and children to maintain; but that he more laments the hard fate of the Laity, ſince their eternal is to be preferred to the temporal eſtate of the other. That as for his own part, he bleſſed God, he was very little concerned, having no one elſe to be ruined with, and being a perſon of no great importance; and yet if it were otherwiſe, he ſhould certainly be ſo much the fitter to bear teſtimony to ſo glorious a cauſe with any hazard whatever; which by God's help he will not think much to do, if he cannot otherwiſe perform that duty, which is ſo neceſſary to the Church. For the offices of preaching and duly adminiſtring the Sacraments, which were of late forbidden them to exerciſe, were thoſe two great truſts, which God had committed to his charge, when he undertook that difficult province, to which he vouchſafed to call him. And as to the form of common prayer, it is ſo far prohibited, that even the Apoſtles Creed, the very Pſalms of David, and the Lord's Prayer itſelf, may ſeem to fall under the ſame prohibition. That he hoped his Lordſhip would approve of what he had determined to do, eſpecially when he underſtood, that for fear of failing the Church in ſo neceſſary a duty, he purpoſed to perform it with more caution and ſecrecy than uſual. *But this*, ſays he, *I have reſolved by God's aſſiſtance, that if ever I am proſecuted on that account, I will conceal nothing of what I do. For though I am not a perſon that would excuſe the madneſs of the* Circumcellians (5), *yet they were not condemned by the antient Fathers without ſome compaſſion for them. And certainly I had much rather ſuffer an unjuſt ſuſpicion of their temerity, than be accounted guilty of the crime of ſuch as were called Traditors, than which ſort of men nothing was of old more hateful either to God or Man. But I hope God will aſſiſt my infirmity in the diſcharge of this office &c.*

(3) Pag. 107, 108.

(4) That of January 1655. *Dr. Hammond's Life*, pag. 11.

(5) A Sect of *Donatiſts* in Africa in the 4th Century, who, through a miſtaken zeal for martyrdom deſtroyed themſelves. *See* S. Auguſt. *de Hæreſ.* cap. 60. *Contra Creſcon. Grammat.* lib. 3. cap. 42, 43. Poſidon. *de Vita Auguſtini*, c. 10.

[*C*] *Declined the offer of the Biſhoprick of Carliſle.*] The King was very urgent to advance him to that See; but the Doctor earneſtly entreated, that he might be excuſed from accepting this royal favour, leſt he ſhould ſeem to ſome perſons to have a little gratified his own ambition in his zealous endeavours to preſerve the Epiſcopal Succeſſion in England. He being therefore unwilling to be advanced higher than the degree of a Preſbyter, ſince there were not wanting men of great merit, who could bear the weight of the epiſcopal office with leſs envy, as he imagined, than he, his Majeſty in regard of what he had deſerved from him, as well as from the Church, promoted him to the Deanery of Durham (6).

(6) Ibid. pag. 246.

[*D*] *Advanced by the King to the Deanery of Durham.*] In this Deanery he enjoyed a very large revenue, with which he repaired the public buildings, relieved the poor, and kept hoſpitality in a very generous manner. His firſt care was, that the worſhip of God ſhould be celebrated with the utmoſt decency, and a Biſhop choſen for the conſolation of the Widow Church. His next concern was, that all the houſes of the Prebendaries, and eſpecially the Cathedral ſhould be

House of Convocation [*E*], and appointed one of the nine Assistants to the twelve Bishops, who were commissioned to hold a conference with the number of Presbyterian Ministers upon the review of the Liturgy at the Bishop of London's lodging in the Savoy (*t*). After a painful illness of two years continuance he died at London October 22d 1664. His funeral Sermon was preached by his intimate friend Dr. Peter Gunning; and his Epitaph written by Mr. Samuel Howlet, Fellow of St. John's College in Cambridge (*u*). He publish'd some pieces [*F*]. Mr. Echard in his *History of England* (*w*) styles him a man of *great worth and consideration*; and having observed (*x*) that he had been ejected of his preferments, and *notwithstanding his pious behaviour, used with inhuman barbarities*, he tells us, that he bore all these *with a noble constancy, and still kept an uninterrupted correspondence with Chancellor Hyde, and was not only very assisting to the necessities of the King in his exile, but was particularly instrumental in the restoration itself*; "for which after the King's return, he was rewarded first with the Deanery of Durham, "and then with that of St. Paul's, in which preferment he left the world, when he had "a just expectation of something still greater."

(*t*) Note upon pag. 325. of the English Translation.

(*u*) *Vita, &c.* pag. 237, 238, 239.

(*w*) Vol. 2. book 1. chap. 1. *ad ann.* 1662.

(*x*) Ibid. c. 1. *ad ann.* 1664-5.

be repair'd and beautified. He took care likewise to erect a Grammar-School from the ground. He brought water into the College to supply all the Prebendaries houses; and took upon himself with great readiness, affection, and zeal, to bring all the Officers of the Church under good discipline and to a regular life, and to augment the stipends and salaries of the poorer sort, not only of the Mother Church, but of all the Churches, which depended upon it (7).

(7) Ibid. pag. 207, & *seq.*

[*E*] *Chosen Prolocutor of the Lower House of Convocation.*] Dr. Peter Barwick tells us (8), that the favour and good will of those who advanced him to that dignity, gave him far more pleasure, than the dignity itself; when he found evidently, that some persons, whose interest it was very much, that the practice of Religion should be zealously promoted, were not yet sollicitous enough in their endeavours to restore the decayed discipline of the Church. But if the Convocation had thought fit, they might have consulted the reputation of the Clergy better either by reviving those old laws, which the late schism had rendered obsolete, or by making new ones, as in their prudence they should have seen occasion. "But who they were, *says* "*the writer abovementioned*, that prevented laying "hold of an opportunity of doing the Church that "service, it is not lawful to conjecture, where the "case is invidious, and perhaps not sufficiently known. "Yet this is most certain, that his sacred Majesty "granted this venerable Assembly liberty under the "Broad-Seal to accomplish this work. Nor is it "less certain, that the Convocation divided itself in"to divers colleges or committees for carrying it "on, and assigned each their peculiar share in it. "Yet to the very great regret of all good men these "preparations proved abortive; for the endeavours "of many, tho' very sincere, were wholly frustrated "by one or two, upon whom this affair wholly de"pended." This neglect of the interests of Religion afflicted Dr. Barwick in such a manner, that he declared, that neither the desperate disease, which he formerly laboured under, nor the severity of his confinement, nor death itself, nor the torture, which he was often threatned with, were ever so grievous to him. *Hic autem rei sacræ neglectus adeò pium Barwici animum excruciavit, ut in hujusmodi gemitus solutum audivimus; non morbum olim deploratum, non durissima vincula, non mortem, non cruciatum sæpius intentatum sibi unquam adeo gravia fuisse* (9). Dr. Peter Barwick observes, that it is not at all surprizing, that he should feel so exquisite a sorrow, since every man even of common humanity must have been affected to see such principles as these propagated with impunity by books exposed to public sale; that the murther of King Charles I and other atrocious crimes perpetrated by the late rebels, were facts done by persons not using their free-will, but necessarily complying with the will of God; and that God himself is both the Author and Persuader not only of all good, but likewise of all evil; nay that nothing is in its own nature either good or evil any farther than as it is forbid or permitted by the municipal law of every Government. *Regicidium scilicet aliaque nefanda scelera à nuperis perduellibus perpetrata, non à libero arbitrio utentibus, sed à divino nutui necessariò obsecundantibus fuisse admissa; Deumque ipsum, non bonorum tantum, sed & malorum quoque omnium authorem & suasorem esse: in eo nihil quicquam suâ naturâ bonum vel malum esse, nisi quatenus legibus cujusque civitatis municipalibus vetitum vel permissum* (10).

(9) Ibid. pag. 226.

(10) Ibid. pag. 226.

[*F*] *He published some pieces.*] I. *The Fight, Victory, and Triumph of St. Paul, accommodated to Thomas (Morton) late Lord Bishop of Duresme*; in a Sermon preached at his funeral in the parish church of St. Peter at Easton-Manduit in Northamptonshire, on 2 Tim. iv. 7, 8. London 1660 in 4to. II. *A summary Account of the holy Life and Death of Thomas late Lord Bishop of Duresme*: printed with the abovementioned Sermon. III. *Deceivers deceived*, or *the Mistakes of Wickedness*, &c. a Sermon preached at St. Paul's Cathedral Octob. 20th 1661, on Prov. xiv. part of the eighth verse. London 1661 in 4to. T.

☞ BARWICK (PETER), an eminent Physician, and brother of the preceding, was educated in the same schools, and at the same College with his brother, where he took the Degree of Bachelor of Arts at the end of the year 1642. And tho' he is so modest in the title of his book only to mention his having been *formerly Scholar of St. John's College in Cambridge*, yet he was certainly nominated and presented to a Fellowship there [*A*]. Leaving Cambridge, probably upon the ejectments, as his brother did, tho' he afterwards took his Degree of Master of Arts there in 1647, he was invited into Leicestershire, to be Tutor to a young Gentleman of great hopes, Ferdinando Sacheverell of Old Hayes in that County Esq; and acquitted himself so well of that employment, that his pupil dying some years after left him an annuity of twenty pounds for life, which was always most punctually paid him (*a*). In the year 1655 he was created Doctor of Physic; and about two years after he settled to practise in London (*b*), and

(*a*) See the Preface of the Editor of *Vita Johannis Barwick S. T. P. a Petro Barwick M. D.* edit. London 1721.

(*b*) *Vita, &c.* pag. 113.

[*A*] *He was certainly nominated and presented to a Fellowship there.*] The reverend and learned Mr. Thomas Baker, author of the *Reflections upon Learning*, who is of that College, informed Mr. Bedford the editor of Dr. Barwick's Life of his brother the Dean of St. Paul's, that it appears from Dr. Matthew Wrenn the Bishop of Ely's Register, that on the 3d of December 1644 Mr. Peter Barwick, then Bachelor of Arts, was nominated and presented by that Bishop, then a prisoner in the Tower, to the Fellowship of that College in the Bishop of Ely's gift, vacant by the marriage of Mr. John Topping Master of Arts. However tho' he had a right to this Fellowship, yet he was never actually admitted to it, as is evident from this, that there is no mention of his admission in the Register, and that Mr. John Heath was admitted April 26th 1650 in the next turn to Mr. Topping by the Visitors of the University; so that the Fellowship lay vacant for five years after it was quitted by that Gentleman (1).

(1) Preface to *Vita Joh. Barwick S. T. P. a Petro Barwick M. D.* edit. London 1721.

and married a widow of good fortune [*B*], by whom he had a ſon, who died an infant, and three daughters, the only ſurvivor of whom was married to Sir Ralph Dutton of Sherborn in the County of Gloceſter Baronet. Dr. Barwick lived happily with his Lady many years, and at laſt buried her in St. Faith's, his own Pariſh Church. Immediately after the Reſtoration he was appointed one of the King's Phyſicians in ordinary; and the year following, in acknowledgment of his own and the Dean his brother's faithful ſervices to the Crown, they and their heirs for ever had, by the King's command, the honour of an addition to the arms of their family, a red Roſe irradiated with gold, granted by a patent under the hand of Sir Edward Walker, the Garter Principal King at Arms, and under the ſeal of his office, dated 13 *Car.* 2. *ann.* 1661; a particular, which Dr. Barwick's modeſty would not permit him to take notice of in his brother's life. He was a zealous advocate for the immortal Dr. Harvey's Diſcovery of the Circulation of the Blood [*C*]. In the courſe of his practice he was particularly famous for his knowledge in the Small-Pox, and all kinds of Fevers; and did great ſervice in the time of the plague at London 1665 [*D*]. When the dreadful fire of that City the year following had forced him from the neighbourhood of St. Paul's, where he had purchaſed an houſe for the convenience of attending daily upon Divine Service in that Cathedral, the ſame pious reaſon determined him to take another houſe very near Weſtminſter-Abbey, where he lived to a great age, and conſtantly frequented the Prayers: he conſecrated the beginning of every day to God, as he always dedicated the next part of it to the poor; not only preſcribing them medicines at his own expence, but likewiſe charitably relieving their wants. About the year 1671, ſeven years after his brother's death (*c*), he began to draw up the Hiſtory of the Dean's Life in Latin [*E*]. In 1694 his ſight quite failed him; upon which he gave over his practice, and lived privately and retired, giving

(*c*) See *Vita Johan. Barwick*, pag. 59.

[*B*] *Married a widow of good fortune.*] Her maiden-name was Anne Brown, of the family of the Browns in the County of Norfolk. She had been firſt married to Dr. Richard Howlet Dean of Caſſels (2) in Ireland, and afterwards to Mr. Sayon a Merchant of London. She was nearly related to Archbiſhop Laud, as we learn from that Prelate himſelf (3), on occaſion of mentioning Dean Howlet her firſt huſband.

(2) Not of Kilkenny, as was ſaid in the preface to the Latin edition. See the preface to the Engliſh Tranſlation publiſhed in 1724, in 8vo.

(3) See the *Hiſtory of his Troubles and Trial*, pag. 194, 195.

[*C*] *He was a zealous Advocate for the immortal Dr. Harvey's Diſcovery of the Circulation of the Blood.*] When Dr. Harvey had publiſh'd this Diſcovery, notwithſtanding the great applauſe it met with from all men of candour and learning, ſome perſons envying him the honour of it, repreſented it as a mere fiction; while others, who could not deny the reality of it, endeavoured to deprive him of the merit of it, aſcribing it to Hippocrates, or to ſome of the modern writers (4). But Dr. Barwick reſenting the injuſtice done to ſo great a man, and out of mere regard to truth, reſolved to undertake his defence; and by his extenſive learning gave a conſiderable ſanction to Dr. Harvey's cauſe, and brought great light to ſome of his experiments which had lately been publiſhed. And as he was a man of prodigious ſagacity and acuteneſs of genius, and uncommon eloquence, he placed this new doctrine, which he found to be true by various experiments, in ſo clear a light, in ſeveral diſputes upon that ſubject, that there was no longer any room for doubt about it (5). He wrote likewiſe ſeveral Tracts upon the Heart, Veins, Arteries, and the Circulation of the Blood, which well deſerved to have been publiſhed, if his modeſty would have permitted him to have done it. And as he had read the ancient writers in Phyſic, eſpecially Hippocrates, and the moderns likewiſe, with the utmoſt accuracy and attention, by this means he was capable of vindicating Dr. Harvey from all ſuſpicion of ſtealing his diſcovery from others; who therefore acknowledged very gratefully the obligations, which he was under to Dr. Barwick on that account. And the latter Phyſician uſed often to declare before the late Doctor John Woodward, Profeſſor of Phyſic in Greſham-College, who was very intimate with him, and laid the firſt foundation of his ſtudies under him, that he never reflected with more pleaſure upon any tranſaction of his life, than upon his ſupporting that excellent man in his diſtreſs (6). The editor of our author's Life of his Brother in Latin, in the Preface to the Engliſh Tranſlation of that Book obſerves, that he had met with an objection to this account with regard to Chronology; to which he replies, that tho' this Diſcovery was firſt publiſhed by Dr. Harvey in his *Exercitatio Anatomica de Motu Cordis*, printed at Franckfort in 1628 (7), when Dr. Barwick was a ſchool-boy; yet it met with ſo much oppoſition, that he was a Doctor of Phyſic, and very capable of maintaining and defending it, before it was generally received. For tho' Dr. Harvey lived to his 80th year in 1657, two years after Dr. Barwick took his Degree, Mr. Wood obſerves (8), that it was with much ado, that he ſaw the Circulation of the Blood eſtabliſhed before his death. *He lived*, ſays he, *to ſee his doctrine with much ado eſtabliſhed, being the only one* (as he adds from Mr. Hobbes (9), *that did ſo.*

(4) Preface to *Vita Joh. Barwick.*

(5) Ibid.

(6) Ibid.

(7) *See* Dr. Goodal's preface to his *Hiſtorical Account of the College's Proceedings againſt Empiricks &c.* edit. London 1684, in 4to.

(8) *Faſti Oxon.* vol. 2. col. 6. 2d edit. London 1721.

(9) *In Præfat. ad Element. Philoſoph.* Sect. 1. *de Corpore.*

[*D*] *Did great ſervice in the time of the plague at London in* 1665.] He continued his attendance upon the ſick notwithſtanding he had been ſeized with that dreadful diſeaſe himſelf (10). Dr. Nathanael Hodges in his Λοιμολογία, *ſive peſtis nuperæ apud populum Londinenſem graſſantis Narratio Hiſtorica* (11), tells us, that among thoſe very excellent and celebrated men, who exerted their utmoſt endeavours in order to ſtop the courſe of the peſtilence, notwithſtanding the danger, to which they were expoſed, there were particularly thoſe learned and judicious Phyſicians, Dr. Francis Gliſſon, Regius Profeſſor of Phyſic in the Univerſity of Cambridge, Dr. Nathan Paget, Dr. Thomas Wharton, Dr. PETER BARWICK, Dr. Humphrey Brookes, and others. *Neque verò deerant inſuper inſigniſſimi & clariſſimi viri qui privatam in peſte compeſcendâ (periculi tanti conſortes) operam navârunt, è quorum numero (non ſine honoris præfatione nominandi) erant viri eruditi & ſagaciſſimi* Franciſcus Gliſſon, *Prof. Reg.* Cantab. Nathan Pagetius, Thomas Whartonus, Petrus Barwickius, Humphredus Brookes, & *alii haud vulgaris famæ etiamnum hodie in vivis.*

(10) Preface to *Vita Joban. Barwick, ubi ſupra.*

(11) Sect. 1. pag. 19. edit. London 1672.

[*E*] *He began to draw up the Hiſtory of the Dean's Life in Latin.*] He tells us himſelf (12), that he choſe to write it in Latin, in order to be prefixed to his brother's Theological Diſſertation in Latin, which he read, when he took his Degree of Doctor of Divinity in the Univerſity of Cambridge, that he might not be obliged to compoſe the ſame Hiſtory in a language not every where underſtood. *Autoris vitam Latinè enarrare inſtitui, ne eandem hiſtoriam linguâ non in omnibus eâdem contexuiſſe cogerer.* The Editor in his Preface to his Engliſh Tranſlation of it tells us, that with regard to the time when he finiſhed this work, he ſhall not inſiſt upon the calculation of his Latin Preface, becauſe he had determined upon farther conſideration, that Dr. Barwick's *Appendix* which he wrote upon Dr. Anthony Walker's publiſhing his *faithful Account of the Author of* Εικὼν Βασιλικὴ, muſt have been written before his eyeſight quite failed him, that is, before the year 1694, becauſe, though with ſome difficulty, he put his name; and conſequently the Life, which was compoſed twenty years before (13), muſt have been finiſhed before that year. But whereas Dr. Barwick ſays (14), that Dr. Walker, againſt whom that *Appendix* was made, was ſome years above ſeventy, *aliquot jam annis ſeptuageſimo major*, when

(12) *Vita Joh. Barwick*, pag. 196.

(13) *Vita, &c.* pag. 256.

(14) Ibid. pag. 255.

ing himſelf entirely up to contemplation and the converſation of a few intimate friends, and particularly his neighbour Dr. Richard Buſby, Maſter of Weſtminſter School (*d*). From this ſedentary courſe of life, the Stone, which was the only diſtemper he was troubled with, grew very much upon him; and toward the end of Auguſt 1705, being ſeized with a vomiting and looſneſs, followed with an intermitting fever, and in a few days after with a great and ſudden evacuation of blood, he died on the 4th of September following in the eighty ninth year of his age, and by his own direction was interred privately, and without any monument, near the body of his beloved wife. He wrote in the Latin Tongue with great purity and elegance.

(*d*) See Mr. Maittaire's *Latin Letter* at the end of the Preface of the Editor of the *Latin Life*.

when he publiſhed his book againſt King Charles I's claim to the Εἰκὼν Βασιλικὴ, this muſt undoubtedly be a miſtake; for by the time of his admiſſion in St. John's College (15) he appears to have been born about 1622; ſo that in 1692 he was but ſeventy years old, and that book of his muſt have been publiſhed that year at fartheſt, becauſe Dr. Hollingſworth's anſwer to it was printed that year. With regard to the manuſcripts, from which this Life was firſt publiſhed in Latin, the principal of them is that of St. John's College in Cambridge, by the author's direction, as well as at his own charge, fairly copied from his original, bound in Turkey leather, with three of the King's original Letters and an Acquittance, all in his Majeſty's own hand, and repoſited in the Library of that College; together with another volume of Chancellor Hyde's, Dr. John Barwick's, and other original Letters and Papers relating to the ſame ſubject, to be publiſhed when the College ſhould think proper. The author's own manuſcript preſerved by his grandſon Sir John Dutton Baronet, can hardly be conſidered as a different one from that, which was tranſcribed word for word from it. But there was another manuſcript of this Life, all written likewiſe in the author's own hand, given by him in his life-time to Dr. John Woodward abovementioned, and for ſome time, with the author's approbation at leaſt, repoſited alſo in another eminent Library, that of St. Martin's in the fields; which varying conſiderably from the former, and this in ſome particulars, that at firſt view ſeemed to be rather an amendment of that, than to have been amended by it, ſeveral good judges were for ſome time inclined to think that manuſcript the correcter of the two; tho' it was difficult to account for the author's making any conſiderable alterations in a work, repoſited with ſuch care and charge for the public benefit, and not ordering thoſe alterations to be made in the copy, for which he had ſhewn ſo much regard. This determined the editor rather to tranſcribe the manuſcript in St. Martin's Library for the preſs, but with an intention to add from that of St. John's College whatever particulars of any importance were not in the other, as he had obſerved there were ſome. Comparing them more diligently with this view, as he met with ſeveral expreſſions both in the one and the other, which ſeemed to challenge the preference to each other by turns; ſo he took notice of one various reading, that muſt abſolutely determine the controverſy in favour of the manuſcript of St. John's College, which was that in p. 201, which ſtiles Dr. John Dolben *now Archbiſhop of York*, where the other calls him *now Biſhop of Rocheſter*. This alteration might indeed have been made by the Tranſcriber, and the word *now* only refer to the time of his copying it; but when the editor found by Sir John Dutton's original, that the expreſſion was the author's own, he was convinced, that the manuſcript of St. John's College was the laſt draught of the Life, and therefore reſolved to follow that; yet not ſo ſcrupulouſly, as either to forbear adding out of the other what was of any moment, and ſeemed to be omitted in this, only to ſhorten the Life, (a reaſon of little weight with the reader,) or much leſs minutely to alter every word, phraſe, or place of a word by the laſt manuſcript, in what he had tranſcribed from the firſt, where the meaning was the ſame in both. The Latin edition was attacked by an advertiſement in the *Gazette* of July 18th 1721, wherein it is repreſented as *not genuine, but compiled out of two different manuſcripts, and modelled according to the editor's own humour and fancy*; becauſe ſome paſſages not contained in one of thoſe manuſcrips are printed from the other, and that other manuſcript is repreſented as the author's *undigeſted thoughts, and what upon better information he had rejected*. The editor juſtified himſelf from this imputation by an Advertiſement in the *Poſt-Boy* of the 25th of the ſame month. T.

(15) See the Engliſh Tranſlation of *Dr. John Berwick's Life*, pag. 16.

The End of the SECOND VOLUME.

In the Text of the article of *Godfrey Arnoldus*, page 324, line 2, inſtead of *Papiſts* read *Pietiſts*; and in page 441 in the Note [*DDD*] of the article of Biſhop *Atterbury* the reader is deſired to correct an Error; for we are aſſured by the Gentleman there named, that he did not write or publiſh any thing under the title there mentioned, and that he never gave the ſanction of Earl *Cowper's* or of any other perſon's name whatſoever to any thing written or publiſhed by him in all his life; and that the whole fact as there told, *ſo far as it concerns him*, was miſrepreſented to us.